

Do I Trust You? Depends on What You Feel: Interpersonal Effects of Emotions on Initial Trust at Zero-Acquaintance

Liuba Y. Belkin and Naomi B. Rothman

Department of Management, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, U.S.A.

Keywords

emotional displays, stereotypes, trust, zero-acquaintance.

Correspondence

Liuba Y. Belkin, Department of Management, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, 18015, U.S.A.; e-mail: lyb207@lehigh.edu.

Abstract

This article explores the interpersonal effects of emotions on stereotype formation and initial trust in zero-acquaintance interactions. In three experiments, we demonstrate that perceptions of partner sociability, morality, and competence are significantly influenced by emotional expressions and are important predictors of trust. Specifically, we show that in zero-acquaintance interactions, displays of happiness increase, but displays of anger decrease stereotypes of sociability, morality, and competence. Happiness expressions are also conducive to trust, whereas expressions of anger are detrimental to trust. We further demonstrate that expressions of ambivalence do not affect perceptions of sociability, but decrease perceptions of morality and competence. Overall, expressions of ambivalence have a negative effect on partner trust. Perceptions of morality consistently explain the effect of expressed happiness, anger, and ambivalence on initial trust across the three experiments and different bargaining contexts. Implications for research on emotions and trust in negotiations are discussed.

Negotiation processes and outcomes are often dependent on the level of trust partners have for each other (for a review, see Kong, Dirks, & Ferrin, 2014). Trust promotes collaboration (De Dreu, Beersma, Stroebe, & Euwema, 2006), helps negotiators avoid impasses and reach more integrative agreements (Anderson & Thompson, 2004; Bazerman & Neale, 1992; Kong et al., 2014; Thompson, Wang, & Gunia, 2010). However, interpersonal trust is fragile and is difficult to build and maintain (Kramer & Lewicki, 2010; Williams & Belkin, 2016). Trust development is especially complicated in contexts where there is no prior history of interpersonal interactions (e.g., zero-acquaintance) and limited information is available about the other party. In these contexts, negotiators are often forced to rely on available cues to determine whether someone is a friend or a foe, trustworthy or not (e.g., Borkenau & Liebler, 1992; Fehr & Gächter, 2000; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Sinaceur, Adam, Van Kleef, & Galinsky, 2013).

Emotional expressions are among the cues used to infer information about the interaction partners' character (Knutson, 1996) and social intentions (Keltner & Haidt, 1999; Rothman & Magee, 2016; Van Kleef, 2009; Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2010; Van Kleef, Homan, & Cheshin, 2012). Thus, it is likely that trust-related judgments, at least to some extent, would also be based on negotiation partners' verbal and nonverbal emotional expressions (Chen, Saparito, & Belkin, 2011; Oosterhof & Todorov, 2009; Potworowski & Kopelman, 2008). However, despite compelling evidence for the independent role of emotions (for a review, see Van Kleef & Sinaceur, 2013) and trust (for a review, see Kong et al., 2014)

in interpersonal bargaining exchanges, the emotions and trust literatures have predominantly developed separately from each other. The growing body of work that has examined the interpersonal effects of emotions in bargaining contexts has mainly focused on the impact of emotional expression on concessions and cooperation-related behavior in negotiations (e.g., Adam & Brett, 2015; Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004a, 2004b, among others), but has yet to extensively examine the impact of emotional expressions on trust. A few studies at the intersection of emotions and trust have examined the role of emotional *experiences* rather than emotional *expressions* on trust development (e.g., Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005; Lount, 2010; Mislin, Williams, & Shaughnessy, 2015). However, empirical research investigating the interpersonal effects of emotions on trust-related judgments specifically in zero-acquaintance contexts is largely missing from the literature. This is unfortunate, since initial trust-related judgments and behaviors may significantly alter subsequent negotiation exchanges and outcomes (e.g., Borkenau & Liebler, 1992; Dunning, Anderson, Schlosser, Ehlebracht, & Fetchenhauer, 2014) and so there is value in understanding the full spectrum of how initial trust-related judgments are formed, for example, through the interpersonal impact of emotional expressions.

This article integrates the trust and emotions literatures by building on the social functions of emotions' perspective (Keltner & Haidt, 1999; Van Kleef et al., 2010) and research on social cognition (i.e., Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007; Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999; Fiske et al., 2002) to explore the interpersonal effects of emotional expressions on trust-related judgments in dyadic bargaining settings at zero-acquaintance. Specifically, we ground our arguments in Fiske et al. (2002, 2007) Stereotype Content Model (SCM) to predict and examine the underlying mechanisms through which emotional expressions shape initial trust, defined as a psychological state that represents one's willingness to accept vulnerability and risk based on positive expectations of others' intentions and/or behavior (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998). We thus focus on unpacking how emotional expressions shape observers' stereotypes about their interaction partners' intentions and abilities, which then ultimately impact observers' levels of trust and behavior.

Whereas research employing the SCM has predominantly investigated individual emotional reactions as *outcomes* of formed stereotypes (e.g., Fiske & Dupree, 2014, 2015), in this study we look at emotional expressions as *antecedents* of such stereotypes. We investigate not only how unambiguous emotional expressions at the two ends of the emotional valence continuum—expressions of happiness and anger—shape these stereotypes, but we also explore the impact of more complex expressions—emotional ambivalence (Rothman, 2011). Incorporating the emotions as social information approach (e.g., Van Kleef, 2009) with the SCM (Fiske et al., 2002) adds to the research on the interpersonal effects of emotions by allowing us to predict and empirically explore the specific social stereotypes that these emotional expressions signal, and also examine the relative importance of these stereotypes in driving initial trust in zero-acquaintance negotiation contexts, thus extending insights from the SCM to the context of negotiations.

Literature Review

The Stereotype Content Model

According to Fiske et al. (2002, 2007), individuals form social perceptions of others that can be categorized along two fundamental dimensions—warmth and competence (Fiske et al., 2002, 2007). The broad dimension of warmth refers to the perceived intent of the person and includes assessments of (a) sociability (i.e., friendliness, kindness, and ability to form relationships) and (b) morality (i.e., perceived sincerity and integrity of the other party—Brambilla & Leach, 2014; Leach, Ellemers, & Barreto, 2007). Competence refers to the perceived ability to enact this intent (Fiske et al., 2002, 2007; Kervyn, Fiske, & Yzerbyt, 2013). Studies by Fiske and colleagues have shown that warmth and competence are universal and have broad applicability (see also Fiske & Dupree, 2014; Kervyn et al., 2013). Studies have also

shown that the subdimensions of sociability and morality (i.e., warmth) carry more weight in shaping subsequent judgments and behaviors as they rely more on perceptual input from nonverbal cues than competence evaluations, often evoking automatic affective responses that bias subsequent competence-related judgments (Fiske et al., 2007; Haidt, 2001; Willis & Todorov, 2006).

Emotional Expressions, Stereotyping, and Trust

A growing body of research demonstrates that emotional expressions shape observers' emotional reactions, judgments, and subsequent approach-avoidance behaviors in predictable ways (Marsh, Ambady, & Kleck, 2005; McAdams, Ambady, Macrae, & Kleck, 2006; Van Kleef et al., 2010). In this article, we build on this previous work and integrate it with the SCM to specifically investigate (a) what trust-related information emotional expressions signal to observers in zero-acquaintance bargaining contexts and (b) how stereotyping processes about warmth and competence drive these trust perceptions.

Warmth Stereotypes—Sociability and Trust

According to the SCM, stereotypes about sociability refer to perceptions of an individual's friendliness and kind intentions toward others (Fiske et al., 2002). Because individuals are unlikely to allow themselves to be vulnerable to someone whom they perceive to have unkind intentions toward others, we expect perceptions of sociability to have a positive impact on trust-related judgments (Fiske & Dupree, 2014).

In addition, since previous research demonstrates that displays of happiness convey high agreeableness and affiliation (Belkin & Kurtzberg, 2013; Harker & Keltner, 2001; Keltner & Haidt, 1999) and increase liking (Kopelman, Rosette, & Thompson, 2006), we also predict that expressions of happiness should positively shape stereotypes related to the expresser's sociability. By contrast, since anger expressions signal toughness and dominance (Belkin, Kurtzberg, & Naquin, 2013; Knutson, 1996; Rothman, 2011; Sinaeur & Tiedens, 2006), as well as low agreeableness and coldness (Knutson, 1996; Van Kleef et al., 2004a, 2004b), we also predict that anger expressions should negatively shape stereotypes of the expresser's sociability. Displays of ambivalence, which are the expressions of tension and conflict in the face and the body that result from the simultaneous experience of two contradictory emotional states (i.e., simultaneously happy and sad—Rothman, 2011), have been shown to convey greater deliberation and have been theorized to indicate more openness and receptivity to different perspectives (Rothman, 2011; Rothman & Melwani, in press). As such, ambivalence expressions are unlikely to be as strong and unambiguous of a signal of sociability as happiness expressions. Nevertheless, they are likely to convey receptivity to others' needs and, consequently, moderate levels of sociable and friendly intentions.

Warmth Stereotypes—Morality and Trust

Unlike sociability stereotypes that refer to expectations regarding an individual's intentions, such as their friendliness and kindness, morality expectations refer to *generalized* inferences about an individual's social values, such as their likely adherence to a common code of conduct (Brambilla, Rusconi, Sacchi, & Cherubini, 2011; Brambilla, Sacchi, Pagliaro, & Ellemers, 2013; Pagliaro, Brambilla, Sacchi, D'Angelo, & Ellemers, 2013). Morality stereotypes have been shown to play an important role in the formation of social perceptions, as well as to predict behavioral intentions for both ingroup and outgroup members (Brambilla & Leach, 2014; Brambilla et al., 2011). Importantly, prior work has linked perceptions of morality to the likelihood of trust development in social exchanges. For instance, in "blind" trust exchanges, when there is no information available about the other party's reputation, even slight information signaled about the others' moral values (e.g., a high probability of money returned in a trust game) significantly increases trust toward the other party and leads to greater cooperation (Manapat, Nowak, & Rand, 2013). Thus, we expect that perceptions of morality will be positively related to trust-related judgments.

In addition, we also predict that expressions of happiness should positively shape morality stereotypes. There is evidence that the experiences of general positive affective states are correlated with cooperation and helping (e.g., Belkin & Kouchaki, *in press*; Carnevale & Isen, 1986;Forgas, 1998; Lount, 2010), which is often interpreted as an indication of an individual's integrity and moral values (Pizarro & Tannenbaum, 2011). Thus, expressions of happiness should not only positively shape sociability stereotypes, but should also positively shape stereotypes about the expresser's morality. By contrast, anger expressions signal the potential for aggression (Van Kleef et al., 2010), malevolent intent toward an interaction partner, and low emotional control (Marsh et al., 2005; Sinaceur, Van Kleef, Neale, Adam, & Haag, 2011). Thus, displays of anger are likely to negatively affect stereotypes related to the expresser's morality.

Ambivalence expressions should also negatively affect morality-related stereotypes, but for different reasons. Prior research has suggested that because of the irresolute nature of ambivalence, interaction partners are likely to feel greater uncertainty about the intentions of their ambivalent partners (Bushman & Holt-Lunstad, 2009; Drolet & Morris, 2000), perceiving their ambivalent partners as more unpredictable than those who express more unambiguous and unequivocal states. We suggest that such unpredictability should have negative implications for perceptions regarding the ambivalent expresser's morality, as their unpredictability makes it unclear if the individual will adhere to a common code of conduct. For instance, the hesitance conveyed by ambivalence may be perceived as a lack of dependability, that is, a lack of ability to act consistently with one's moral principles or values (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995), or as an indication that the expresser has something to hide.

Competence Stereotypes and Trust

According to the SCM, competence refers to one's expectations that the partner will be able to enact their perceived intent. Even though individuals appear to be more sensitive to personal information that relates to sociability and morality than to information that relates to competence (e.g., Kim, Dirks, Cooper, & Ferrin, 2006; Kim, Ferrin, Cooper, & Dirks, 2004), judgments of competence are also likely to be important predictors of trust (e.g., Colquitt, Scott, & LePine, 2007). This is because individuals are unlikely to make themselves vulnerable to someone whom they perceive to be unable to enact their perceived intent, especially if they are working interdependently with this person.

Because expressions of happiness can signal that the expresser is high in confidence (Knutson, 1996) and has power in negotiations (Pietroni, Van Kleef, Rubaltelli, & Rumianti, 2009), we predict that such expressions are likely to increase perceptions of competence. However, even though prior research has also demonstrated that expressions of anger can increase perceptions of the expresser's power (e.g., Adam & Brett, 2015; Belkin et al., 2013; Van Kleef et al., 2004a), some evidence suggests that anger can be perceived as a sign of weakness and an inability to handle emotions (e.g., Sinaceur et al., 2011). In fact, responding to a specific emotion-eliciting situation neutrally, and displaying no emotion as opposed to displaying anger, can be perceived as a sign of competence (Hareli, Shomrat, & Hess, 2009), particularly for women expressers (Belkin & Kurtzberg, 2013; Lewis, 2000). Accordingly, there is reason to believe that expressed anger at the beginning of a bargaining encounter should signal relatively lower competence. Thus, we propose that happiness expressions will increase perceived competence, whereas expressions of anger will decrease it.

Expressions of ambivalence are also likely to reduce perceptions of an individual's ability to enact their intention, and thus their competence, as emotional ambivalence can convey indecisiveness and, in turn, a relative lack of knowledge (Marsh & Rothman, 2013). This inference may be especially likely in decision-making contexts like negotiations where the division of labor and the need to efficiently and effectively complete the task is more salient than the need to get along with one's partner (Rothman, 2011).

Overview of the Studies

To summarize, first we predict that happiness expressions increase trust in zero-acquaintance contexts because happiness expressions increase perceptions of sociability, morality, and competence. Second, we

predict that anger expressions undermine initial trust in zero-acquaintance contexts because they decrease perceptions of the expresser's sociability, morality, and competence. Third, we predict that ambivalence expressions undermine initial trust because they decrease perceptions of the expresser's morality and competence, but not sociability, due to a weak sociability signal from ambivalence. Importantly, since situational ambiguity, such as that found in zero-acquaintance contexts, enhances the salience of morality-relevant information (Gantman & Van Bavel, 2014), we expect morality evaluations to be a primary mechanism underlying the relationship between the three emotional expressions and initial trust judgments.

To test the robustness of our predicted effects, we conducted three studies varying the settings and tasks (i.e., competitive or cooperative). In all three studies, we manipulated information about the propensity of an individual to display specific emotions, thus allowing us to examine the extent to which people stereotype others based on emotional expressions. Studies 1a and 1b tested our predictions in competitive settings. Using vignettes that put participants in a context of a competitive one-shot decision-making game, Study 1a demonstrates the undermining effects of expressions of both anger and ambivalence on trust and the supportive effect of expressions of happiness on trust. Study 1b replicates these findings in a slightly different distributive context (i.e., a dictator game) and demonstrates that the effects hold when individuals observe the nonverbal emotional displays of their opponent at zero-acquaintance. Studies 1a and 1b further provide evidence for the underlying mechanisms explaining the effects of emotional expressions on trust development, pointing specifically to the importance of morality stereotypes. Study 2 tests our predictions in a purely cooperative context, where individuals observe the emotional displays of a future interaction partner (rather than an opponent). This study replicates the main effects from Study 1a and 1b and further demonstrates that in addition to morality stereotypes, sociability and competence stereotypes also play an important role in mediating the effects of emotional expressions on initial trust formation in cooperative contexts.

Pilot Test

Method

To ensure the validity of our scenario-based manipulations of emotional expressions, we first conducted a pilot test. One hundred and ninety-two individuals (all U.S. citizens or residents; 99% native English speakers) were recruited online through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) in exchange for payment. The sample consisted of 52% males, aged 21 to over 60 years old ($SD = 0.99$), and 75% were Caucasian. The majority were either college graduates or had some college experience (87%). Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four emotion manipulation conditions: Ambivalent ($n = 48$), Angry ($n = 48$), Happy ($n = 51$), or Control ($n = 45$). All participants read a vignette, which described the typical behavior of Pat (the androgynous name of their future negotiation opponent—Van Fleet & Atwater, 1997) in his or her communication with others. In the Happy condition, Pat was described as follows:

When interacting with peers Pat is known to display happiness, appearing pleased and cheerful in most circumstances. Typically, everyone who communicates with Pat notices that Pat's facial features, tone of voice, and gestures radiate happiness. Moreover, even when discussions touch upon sensitive and important issues Pat typically stays very positive and upbeat.

In the Angry condition, Pat was described as follows:

When interacting with peers, Pat is known to express anger, appearing annoyed and irritated in most circumstances. Typically, everyone who communicates with Pat notices that Pat's facial features, tone of voice, and gestures display anger. Moreover, even when discussions touch upon sensitive and important issues Pat typically comes across as hostile and angry.

In the Ambivalent condition, Pat was described as:

When interacting with peers, Pat is known to often display mixed feelings, appearing rather torn and conflicted in most circumstances. Typically, everyone who communicates with Pat notices that Pat's facial features, tone of voice, and gestures show conflicting feelings. Moreover, even when discussions touch upon sensitive and important issues Pat typically expresses ambivalence (i.e., tension and conflict about where he/she stands).

In the Control condition, Pat was described as:

When interacting with peers, Pat is known to show no emotions, staying neutral and non-emotional in most circumstances. Typically, everyone who communicates with him/her notices that Pat's facial features, tone of voice and gestures show no emotions. Moreover, even when discussions touch upon sensitive and important issues, Pat typically does not express any emotions.

After reading the short vignette, we introduced our dependent variable questions—to what extent does Pat appear to be happy, angry, ambivalent, and neutral (rated on 7-point Likert scale: 1—not at all; 7—completely; Rothman, 2011; Rothman & Northcraft, 2015).

Controls

We controlled for participants' demographic information (age, gender, race, education, and income levels) and what gender they thought Pat was (coded as 1—male; 2—female).

Results

A univariate ANOVA confirmed the effectiveness of all four emotion manipulation conditions. In the Ambivalent condition, individuals rated Pat as the most ambivalent out of all conditions, $F(3, 191) = 52.75; p < .001$. In the Angry condition, individuals rated Pat as the most angry out of all conditions, $F(3, 191) = 235.84; p < .001$. In the Happy condition, individuals rated Pat as the most happy out of all conditions, $F(3, 191) = 207.20; p < .001$. Finally, in the Control condition, individuals rated Pat as the most neutral out of all conditions, $F(3, 191) = 127.35; p < .001$. Additionally, 50% of respondents thought that Pat was male in the Happy condition, 74% thought that Pat was male in the Angry condition, 62% of respondents thought that Pat was male in the Ambivalent condition, and 71% thought that Pat was male in the Control condition. However, even though significantly more people thought that Pat was female in the Happy ($M = 1.50; SD = 0.51$) than in the Angry ($M = 1.26; SD = 0.44$); $t(1, 94) = 2.47, p = .015$ or Control ($M = 1.29; SD = 0.46$); $t(1, 93) = 2.14, p = .036$ conditions, when this variable was entered into our analyses along with all other demographic variables, the results remained unchanged with or without the controls.

Study 1a

Method

Participants and Design

Four hundred and two participants (all U.S. citizens or residents and over 21 years of age) were recruited online through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) to participate in Study 1a in exchange for payment.

Procedure

The study was introduced to participants as a 10-min study on how well people recall information and make decisions in social situations. Participants were asked to imagine that Pat is their “future opponent” in a decision-making game, where they will compete against each other. Specifically, they were told the following:

Imagine you are about to participate in a game with another individual, Pat, in which there will be no communication. This game will involve a “one-shot” offer in a financial profit context. You never met your opponent and you do not know anything about Pat. The only information that is available to you about Pat’s previous behavior is listed below.

Then, participants were randomly assigned to read one of the four versions of the vignette described in the pilot study in which Pat was described as typically expressing Happiness ($n = 114$), Anger ($n = 83$), Ambivalence ($n = 90$), or No Emotion ($n = 115$), thus allowing us to test the stereotypes that individuals develop about an opponent based on their typical emotional displays. We used the same vignettes for the emotional display manipulations as in the pilot test. Immediately after reading the vignette, each participant was asked to rate their perceptions of Pat, whether or not they trusted Pat, their demographic information, and their own emotional states at the present moment. Participants did not actually engage in a one-shot negotiation in this study, as we are interested in the relationship between emotional expression and initial trust-related perceptions. Thus, after answering the survey, participants were told that that they would not be making actual decisions in this game. They were then thanked and paid for their participation.

Dependent Variables and Proposed Mediators

All measures used a 7-point Likert scale (1—not at all to 7—completely). We measured perceptions of sociability, morality, and competence using Mayer et al. (1995) trustworthiness perception scales. Specifically, since perceptions of sociability refer to friendliness and benevolent intent, morality refers to one’s perceived values and integrity, and competence is one’s knowledge and ability to enact the intent, we employed the widely used scales of benevolence, integrity, and ability trustworthiness to test our propositions. We used a 5-item benevolence scale ($\alpha = .92$), with a sample item: “Pat would not knowingly hurt me.” We used a 6-item integrity scale ($\alpha = .89$), with a sample item: “Sound principles seem to guide this person’s behavior.” We used a 6-item ability scale ($\alpha = .93$), with a sample item: “Is very capable of negotiating effectively.” All items loaded together on their intended dimension. To measure *trust*, participants indicated on a scale from 1—not at all to 7—completely how much they trusted Pat (Maddux, Mullen, & Galinsky, 2008).

Controls

We controlled for participants’ age, gender, education level, whether or not they were native English speakers, and their own emotional states at the moment of filling out the survey. The results remained unchanged with or without these controls in the model—see Table 1 for descriptive statistics of the study variables.

Results

Main Effects

Consistent with our predictions, and as reported in Table 2, Happy Pats were perceived as significantly more sociable, $F(3; 394) = 115.11; p < .001, \eta^2 = .25$, moral, $F(3; 394) = 85.77; p < .001, \eta^2 = .22$, and competent, $F(3; 394) = 53.67; p < .001, \eta^2 = .17$ than Pats in any other condition. By contrast, Angry Pats were perceived as significantly less sociable, moral, and competent than Pats in any other condition. In addition, Ambivalent Pats were perceived as significantly more sociable $t(1, 199) = 2.74, p = .007$, but significantly less moral $t(1, 199) = -3.09, p = .002$, and less competent $t(1, 199) = -5.08, p < .001$ than Pats in the Control condition. As reported in Table 2, Happy Pats were trusted the most out of all conditions, $F(3, 384) = 48.30; p < .001, \eta^2 = .28$, and Angry Pats were trusted the least. Ambivalent Pats were trusted significantly less than Pats in the Control condition $t(1, 194) = -2.06, p = .041$.

Table 1
Study 1a—Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Study Variables

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Happy	0.28	0.45											
2. Angry	0.21	0.41	-0.32**										
3. Ambivalent	0.22	0.42	-0.34**	-0.27**									
4. Neutral	0.29	0.45	-0.40**	-0.32**	-0.34**								
5. Benevolence	3.91	1.32	0.59**	-0.51**	0.02	-0.15**							
6. Integrity	4.05	1.15	0.53**	-0.48**	-0.15**	0.04	0.82**						
7. Ability	4.19	1.06	0.43**	-0.38**	-0.22**	0.12*	0.65**	-0.77**					
8. Trust	4.09	1.6	0.43**	-0.41**	-0.11**	0.04	0.66**	0.65**	0.50**				
9. Age	3.27	1.27	0.17**	-0.09	-0.12*	0.01	0.07	0.03	0.05	0.17**			
10. Gender	1.61	0.49	0.03	-0.05	0.05	-0.03	-0.03	-0.01*	-0.07	-0.04	0.14**		
11. Education	3.84	1.22	0.03	0.07	-0.01	-0.09	0.01	-0.02	0.02	0.06	-0.07		
12. Native English Speaker	1.04	0.19	0.05	-0.05	-0.05	-0.00	-0.00	-0.08	0.00	0.05	-0.03	16*	*

Note: N = 402; *p < .05. **p < .01.

Emotional manipulation conditions were coded as dummy variables: Happy 1 the rest 0, etc. Age was coded in 10-year windows from <18(0) to ≥60(6). Gender was coded as 1 for male and 2 for female. Education was coded as < high school (1) to completed graduate school (6). Native English speaker was coded as 1 for native and 2 for nonnative.

Table 2
Study 1a—Means and Standard Deviations for Dependent Variables

Emotion expression condition	Perceived sociability	d	Perceived morality	d	Perceived competence	d	Trust	d
Happiness (n = 114)	5.15 (0.90)***	1.71	5.02 (0.89)***	1.06	4.91 (0.81)***	0.61	5.22 (1.40)***	0.77
Anger (n = 83)	2.62 (1.13)***	-0.94	2.99 (1.01)***	-1.22	3.42 (1.01)***	-1.04	2.79 (1.42)***	-1.02
Ambivalence (n = 90)	3.95 (0.92)**	0.39	3.74 (0.88)**	-0.44	3.75 (0.93)**	-0.72	3.77 (1.52)*	-0.29
Control (n = 115)	3.59 (0.93)	-	4.11 (0.82)	-	4.40 (0.87)	-	4.18 (1.29)	-

Note: *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Means represent raw means; standard deviations are in parentheses; Cohen d's denote the effect sizes; all contrasts made with the Control condition.

Mediation Analyses

The multiple mediation analysis demonstrated that the effect of happiness, anger, and ambivalence displays on trust was significantly mediated by perceptions of warmth, including both sociability and morality stereotypes. Specifically, the effect of happiness displays (happiness = 1; the rest = 0, controlling for anger and ambivalence, with Control condition as the reference point) on trust was fully mediated by sociability 95% CI [0.04, 0.34], and morality 95% CI [-0.38, -0.07], but not competence perceptions 95% CI [-0.07, -0.19]. Similarly, decreased perceptions of sociability 95% CI [-0.71, -0.23] and morality 95% CI [-0.90, -0.26] mediated the effect of anger displays on trust (anger = 1; the rest = 0, controlling for ambivalence and happiness with Control condition as the reference point), but competence perceptions did not 95% CI [-0.12, 0.28]. Similarly, the effect of ambivalence displays (ambivalence = 1; the rest = 0, controlling for anger and happiness with Control condition as the reference point) on trust was significantly and fully mediated by increased sociability 95% CI [0.37, 1.08], and reduced morality perceptions 95% CI [0.19, 0.70], but competence perceptions did not mediate 95% CI [-0.15, 0.06].

Study 1a Discussion

Using vignettes, Study 1a demonstrates the important role of emotional expressions in stereotyping and trust development. Specifically, we demonstrate the undermining effect of both anger and ambivalence on trust, and the supportive effect of happiness on trust, based on the general propensities of individuals to display specific emotions. Moreover, we demonstrate that, as predicted, perceptions of morality mediate the impact of emotional expressions on trust perceptions. We observed that perceptions of sociability were important drivers of initial trust in this study as well. Thus, both dimensions of warmth-related stereotypes appear to be primary mechanisms underlying the effect of emotional expression on initial trust development in this competitive decision-making context. Further, and as predicted, ambivalence expressions (unlike displays of happiness and anger) sent mixed signals to recipients; even though expressions of ambivalence signaled higher sociability relative to neutrality (Control condition), they also signaled lower morality and competence. Supporting our arguments about the salience of morality stereotypes, low morality stereotypes had a significant negative impact on trust as compared to neutrality.

This study provides initial evidence of the extent to which people stereotype others in zero-acquaintance competitive bargaining contexts based on information provided to them about their opponents'

typical emotional displays. In our next study, we aimed to replicate these findings in a different bargaining situation. We utilized videos of an actor displaying nonverbal expressions of happiness, anger, ambivalence, and neutrality rather than written vignettes to manipulate emotional displays. We also recorded participants' negotiation behavior. The scenario study (Study 1a) utilized an androgynous name for participants' negotiation partner, thus allowing for participants' beliefs about the gender of their partner to vary. The video studies (Study 1b and Study 2) used a female actor, thus allowing us to hold constant the gender of the negotiator that participants anticipated interacting with.

Study 1b

Method

Participants and Design

We used G*power 3.1 software to ensure that we had a sufficient effect size for our study and came up with the sample size of approximately 188 participants for a study powered at 95%, f of 0.37, which falls in the small–medium range (Cohen, 1988). Thus, one hundred and eighty-nine participants (all U.S. citizens or residents) were recruited online through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) to participate in the study in exchange for payment.

Procedure

As in Study 1a, participants were told that the study's goal was to test their ability to recall information and their decision-making skills. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four emotion manipulation conditions: Ambivalent ($n = 48$), Happy ($n = 52$), Angry ($n = 44$), and No Emotion/Neutral ($n = 45$). Participants were shown a brief video of a female (Pat) displaying one of these four emotions and told that the video portrays Pat, their future negotiation partner, engaged in a negotiation exchange with someone else. Their task was to carefully observe her behavior. Appendix A describes the video manipulations that have been validated by prior research (Rothman, 2011; Rothman & Northcraft, 2015).

Participants first watched the one-minute video on the computer and then completed a survey about their thoughts and feelings toward Pat. The survey also included several attention checks and filler items to mask the goal of the experiment. These questions asked participants to recall what Pat was wearing, the color of her hair, and what gestures she was making during the video. All participants passed the attention check. Next, we asked participants to imagine that they would engage in a silent game with Pat—a dictator game (Forsythe, Horowitz, Savin, & Sefton, 1994), and to record their offers for how to divide a pot of money (\$87.00 USD) between themselves and Pat. Specifically, the participants were told the following:

Now imagine you are about to participate in a silent negotiation with Pat, the individual you just saw in the video, allocating the size of the money pot.

The actual size of the pot is \$87. Pat will be told that your pot ranges between \$5 and \$90, but will not be given information on the actual size of the pot. Thus, Pat will not know exactly how much money is in the pot and, consequently, how much you will receive from the allocation. Please, behave as you would in real life given the circumstances. All decisions are anonymous and confidential.

The dictator game highlights the competitive nature of the social interaction and Pat's lack of sanctioning power, thus assessing trust and solidarity toward Pat (Bohnet & Frey, 1999).

Dependent Variables and Proposed Mediators

All measures used a 7-point scale (1—not at all to 7—completely). To assess sociability, morality, and competence perceptions, we used Mayer et al. (1995) 5-item benevolence scale ($\alpha = .93$), 6-item

integrity scale ($\alpha = .84$), and 6-item ability scale ($\alpha = .95$), as in Study 1a. Also, identical to Study 1a, participants indicated how much they trusted Pat, their future opponent in the negotiation (Maddux et al., 2008). Since trust is a common antecedent of information sharing and disclosure in negotiations (Butler, 1999; Maddux et al., 2008), we also recorded the size of the pot participants disclosed to Pat along with their offer. This was conducted to examine, on an exploratory basis, (a) whether emotional displays shape not only initial trust perceptions, but also subsequent behavior critical for effective negotiation, and (b) whether initial trust perceptions drive these behavioral outcomes.

Controls

We used participants' age, gender, education, and income levels, and whether or not they were native English speakers as control variables. In addition, we controlled for participants' own emotional states, using the full PANAS-X—60-item scale (Watson & Clark, 1999). All results remained unchanged when control variables were added to the model.

Results

Manipulation Check

After watching the video of their "opponent," participants rated the extent to which the person they saw in the video (Pat) conveyed the following emotions: happy, pleased, angry, irritated, sad, depressed, ambivalent, torn, conflicted, mixed feelings, no emotion, neutral, and disappointed (7-point scale). All manipulations were effective, with each intended emotion scoring significantly higher than the rest on their respective scale (see Table 3).

Main Effects

Consistent with the findings in Study 1a, and as we predicted, Happy Pats were perceived as significantly more sociable $F(3; 184) = 18.13; p < .001, \eta^2 = .23$, moral $F(3; 184) = 18.74; p < .001, \eta^2 = .23$, and competent $F(3; 184) = 25.15; p < .001, \eta^2 = .29$, than Pats in any other condition. By contrast, Angry Pats were perceived as significantly less sociable and competent than Pats in any other condition, and significantly less moral than Neutral Pats $t(1, 84) = -3.55, p = .001$. In addition, Ambivalent Pats were perceived as significantly less competent $t(1, 91) = -4.70, p < .001$ and less moral $t(1, 91) = -4.55, p < .001$ than Neutral Pats, but there was no difference in sociability perceptions $t(1, 91) = -1.65, p = .102, ns$. Moreover, Ambivalent and Angry Pats were trusted the least, each significantly different from the Neutral condition $t(1, 90) = -4.26, p < .001$ and $t(1, 87) = -4.77, p < .001$, respectively, and Happy Pats were trusted the most, $F(3, 183) = 28.11; p < .001, \eta^2 = .32$. Please see Table 4.

Mediation Analyses

Consistent with Study 1a, the multiple mediation analysis demonstrated that, as predicted, the effect of happiness, anger, and ambivalence expressions on trust was significantly mediated by perceptions of

Table 3

Study 1b—Means and Standard Deviations for Emotional Manipulation Checks

Emotional displays	<i>n</i>	Ambivalent		Angry		Happy		Neutral	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Ambivalence	48	4.47***	1.56	1.88	1.17	2.69	1.05	1.82	0.91
Anger	44	2.62	1.51	5.34***	1.02	1.21	0.52	1.19	0.69
Happiness	52	1.14	0.36	1.01	0.07	5.49***	0.80	1.22	0.47
Control	45	1.94	1.11	1.83	1.13	2.71	1.27	4.10***	1.52

Note: * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4
Study 1b—Means and Standard Deviations for Dependent Variables

Emotion expression condition	Perceived sociability	<i>d</i>	Perceived morality	<i>d</i>	Perceived competence	<i>d</i>	Trust	<i>d</i>
Happiness (<i>n</i> = 114)	4.83 (0.92)**	0.79	4.84 (0.68)†	0.43	5.17 (0.77)**	0.73	5.45 (1.01)**	0.63
Anger (<i>n</i> = 83)	3.20 (1.19)**	-0.75	3.89 (1.03)**	-0.64	4.08 (1.10)*	-0.39	3.30 (1.47)***	-1.01
Ambivalence (<i>n</i> = 90)	3.64 (1.33)	-0.34	3.58 (1.07)**	-0.94	3.48 (1.07)***	-0.97	3.40 (1.61)***	-0.89
Control (<i>n</i> = 115)	4.05 (1.06)	—	4.50 (0.88)	—	4.50 (1.04)	—	4.71 (1.33)	—

Note: **p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

Means represent raw means; standard deviations are in parentheses; Cohen *d*'s denote the effect sizes; all contrasts made with the Control condition.

warmth. However, in this study, only stereotypes about morality, but not stereotypes about sociability, mediated the relationship between emotional expressions and trust. Specifically, the effect of happiness expressions on trust (happiness = 1; the rest = 0, controlling for anger and ambivalence with neutrality as the reference point) was significantly and fully mediated by morality perceptions 95% CI [0.02, 0.47], but not sociability 95% CI [-0.02, 0.48] or competence perceptions 95% CI [-0.06, 0.29]. Similarly, the effect of anger displays on trust (anger = 1; the rest = 0, controlling for happiness and ambivalence, with neutrality as the reference point) was fully mediated by morality 95% CI [-0.68, -0.11], but not sociability 95% CI [-0.52, 0.02] or competence perceptions 95% CI [-0.26, 0.03]. Finally, morality 95% CI [-0.89, -0.20] mediated the effect of ambivalence displays on trust (ambivalence = 1; the rest = 0, controlling for happiness and anger with neutrality as the reference point), but neither sociability 95% CI [-0.38, 0.01] nor competence perceptions mediated 95% CI [-0.43, 0.08], as the intervals included zeros.

Additional Findings—Distributive Behavior

Participants observing Ambivalent Pat disclosed a significantly smaller size of the pot ($M = 68.66$, $SD = 25.51$) as compared to participants observing Neutral Pat ($M = 80.22$, $SD = 18.17$), $t(1, 90) = -2.51$, $p = .01$. There were no differences in disclosure between participants in the Neutral condition and the Happy Pat condition ($M = 77.45$, $SD = 16.46$), $t(1, 94) = -0.78$, $p = .44$, ns or the Angry Pat condition ($M = 76.26$, $SD = 19.71$), $t(1, 86) = -0.98$, $p = .33$, ns. Moreover, consistent with prior research (Rothman, 2011), participants also offered Ambivalent Pats less money ($M = 32.92$, $SD = 13.18$) than they offered Neutral Pats ($M = 38.49$, $SD = 12.47$), $t(1, 90) = -2.08$, $p = .040$. There was no difference between offers made to Neutral Pats and Angry Pats ($M = 38.58$, $SD = 13.65$), $t(1, 88) = -.03$, $p = .97$, or Neutral Pats and Happy Pats ($M = 38.90$, $SD = 10.38$), $t(1, 96) = -0.18$, $p = .86$.

Additionally, the mediation analyses revealed that initial trust judgments fully mediated the effect of observing Ambivalent Pat on both disclosure and offers. Specifically, the effect of ambivalence displays on disclosure (ambivalence = 1; the rest = 0, controlling for happiness and anger with neutrality as the reference point) was significantly and fully mediated by initial trust perceptions 95% CI [-10.93, -2.44]. Similarly, the effect of ambivalence displays on offers (ambivalence = 1; the rest = 0, controlling for happiness and anger with neutrality as the reference point) was significantly and fully mediated by trust 95% CI [-7.09, -1.84].

Study 1b Discussion

Consistent with Study 1a, Study 1b demonstrates that in competitive interactions with strangers, the expresser's displays of happiness positively influence sociability, morality, and competence stereotypes.

Further, they are conducive to initial trust, as compared to expression of neutrality, whereas expressions of anger negatively influence these same stereotypes and reduce initial trust. Unlike the singular displays of happiness and anger that uniformly affected social stereotypes (positively and negatively, respectively), displays of ambivalence again sent mixed signals to observers, simultaneously lowering perceptions of morality and competence, but not affecting perceptions of sociability. This is largely consistent with the Study 1a findings. Moreover, we demonstrate that both expressed ambivalence and anger reduce initial trust. Ambivalence displays also had a negative impact on the size of disclosure and offers, which were fully mediated by reduced trust perceptions toward ambivalent opponents. Importantly, and as predicted, this study demonstrates the primacy of morality stereotypes for initial trust formation, as both sociability and competence perceptions did not shape trust-related judgments. Taken together, the results from Studies 1a and 1b are consistent with findings by Pagliaro and colleagues that demonstrate the primary role of morality, but not competence evaluations in initial impressions and subsequent behavior toward strangers (Pagliaro et al., 2013), and they further support our arguments that nonverbal emotional displays can shape initial trust in negotiations at zero-acquaintance.

Whereas Study 1a and Study 1b tested our hypotheses in competitive (“zero-sum”) bargaining contexts, Study 2 further explores our predictions by placing individuals in a purely cooperative setting whereupon they have to “partner” with the person in the video in a decision-making game, and their individual gains clearly depend on their ability to cooperate as a pair.

Study 2

Method

Participants and Design

One hundred and seventy-nine participants (all U.S. citizens or residents, over 21 years old) were recruited online through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) to participate in a study in exchange for payment. Participants were told that the goal of the study was to explore individual decision-making ability. We used the same emotion manipulation videos as in Study 1b: Ambivalent ($n = 44$), Happy ($n = 45$), Angry ($n = 48$), and No Emotion/Neutral ($n = 42$). First, participants were told they would be playing a decision-making game with the individual they were about to see in a brief video. They were specifically told: “The video portrays Pat engaged in a negotiation exchange with someone.” Consistent with prior research (Burnham, McCabe, & Smith, 2000), we primed a cooperative context by employing the word “partner” in the instructions (as opposed to the “opponent” prime used in the previous experiment). To further reinforce the cooperative setting, participants were told that their gains in this game would directly depend on how well they worked with their partner. The more they cooperate with Pat, the higher their personal gains will be (Chan & Ybarra, 2002). After participants responded to the dependent variable questions and some filler items and prepared for the actual interaction, the study ended. Each participant was then asked several additional questions (e.g., participants’ emotional states, level of suspicion regarding whether they will, or will not, engage in the decision-making game with Pat, and the demographic information); they were thanked and paid.

Study Variables

We used the same measures of sociability ($\alpha = .94$), morality ($\alpha = .94$), and competence ($\alpha = .85$), as used in Studies 1a and 1b. We measured trust in partner by adapting Levine and Schweitzer’s (2015) 2-item attitudinal trust scale: “I trust my future partner, Pat” and “I am confident that Pat will be cooperating with me.” We combined these items with one additional item: “I am willing to make myself vulnerable to Pat” (1—not at all and 7—completely ($\alpha = .91$)). In addition, we assessed whether participants liked their partner, in order to separate “liking” responses from trust (Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985). As with other variables in this study, we used a 7-point Likert scale with 1—not at all and 7—completely.

We included five liking questions: “I feel very favorable toward Pat,” “I think I would like Pat if I get to know her,” “I enjoy interacting with people that behave like Pat in the video,” “I am happy that Pat is my teammate,” and “Given the choice I would choose Pat to be my teammate” ($\alpha = .96$). As another measure of trust and solidarity (Bohnet & Frey, 1999), we also asked participants whether they were willing to share the gains from the game equally with Pat (7-point Likert scale with 1—not at all and 7—completely).

Controls

As in the previous studies, we used participants’ age, gender, education, and income levels, and whether or not they were native English speakers as control variables. In addition, we controlled for participants’ own emotional states at the moment of completing the survey, using the full PANAS-X—60-item scale (Watson & Clark, 1999). We also created a 2-item scale to check participants’ suspicion about whether or not they would actually participate in the game with Pat. Specifically, participants were asked to indicate “To what extent do you actually expect to interact with Pat in this study” (point scale from 1—not at all to 5—completely) and “To what extent do you think you will never play this game with Pat” (1—completely expecting and 5—was sure will never play—reverse-coded; $\alpha = .87$). All results remained unchanged with control variables in the model.

Results

Manipulation Check

We used the same emotion manipulation check measures as in Experiment 1b. All manipulation checks were confirmed (see Table 5).

Main Effects

The results for stereotyping of Happy and Angry Pats mostly replicated the results of Studies 1a and 1b. Consistent with the findings in Study 1a and Study 1b, and as we predicted, Happy Pats were perceived as significantly more sociable $F(3; 178) = 44.29; p < .001, \eta^2 = .43$, moral $F(3; 178) = 43.70; p < .001, \eta^2 = .48$, and competent $F(3; 178) = 53.69; p < .001, \eta^2 = .43$ than Pats in any other condition. By contrast, Angry Pats were perceived as significantly less sociable than Pats in any other condition, and significantly less moral $t(1, 88) = -3.35, p = .001$, and less competent $t(1, 88) = -4.38, p < .001$ than Neutral Pats. There was no difference in perceptions of morality $t(1, 90) = 0.69, p = .49, ns$, and competence $t(1, 90) = -0.08, p = .94, ns$, between Angry and Ambivalent Pats.

In addition, replicating Study 1b, Ambivalent Pats were perceived as significantly less competent $t(1, 84) = -3.51, p = .001$ and moral $t(1, 84) = -3.55, p = .001$ than Neutral Pats, but there was no difference in sociability perceptions $t(1, 84) = -.29, p = .78, ns$. Moreover, replicating Study 1b, Ambivalent and Angry Pats were trusted the least, each significantly different from the Neutral condition

Table 5
Study 2—Means and Standard Deviations for Emotional Manipulation Checks

Emotional displays	<i>n</i>	Happy		Angry		Ambivalent		Neutral	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Happy	45	5.61***	0.80	1.01	0.07	1.13	0.25	1.39	0.71
Anger	48	1.31	0.47	5.32***	0.98	2.31	1.14	1.23	0.58
Ambivalent	44	2.64	1.18	1.94	1.27	4.22***	1.35	2.11	1.29
Control	42	2.58	1.01	1.49	0.92	2.42	0.92	4.67***	1.62

Note: * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

$t(1, 84) = -3.55, p = .001$ and $t(1, 88) = -4.38, p < .001$, respectively, and Happy Pats were trusted the most, $F(3, 178) = 43.54; p < .001; \eta^2 = .42$. All results remained unchanged when control variables were added to the model (see Table 6).

Mediation Analyses

The multiple mediation analysis demonstrated that the effects of happiness and anger expressions on initial trust were significantly mediated by the sociability and morality dimensions of warmth as well as by perceptions of competence. Specifically, the effect of happiness expressions on trust (happiness = 1; the rest = 0, controlling for anger and ambivalence with neutrality as the reference point) was significantly and fully mediated by perceptions of sociability 95% CI [0.09, 0.59], morality 95% CI [0.28, 0.91], and competence 95% CI [0.03, 0.47]. Similarly, the effect of anger expressions on trust (anger = 1; the rest = 0, controlling for happiness and ambivalence, with neutrality as the reference point) was fully mediated by perceptions of sociability 95% CI [-0.46, -0.07], morality 95% CI [-0.60, -0.11], and competence 95% CI [-0.31, -0.02]. However, only morality 95% CI [-0.66, -0.14] and competence 95% CI [-0.32, -0.02] mediated the effect of expressions of ambivalence on trust (ambivalence = 1; the rest = 0, controlling for happiness and anger with neutrality as the reference point), but sociability perceptions did not 95% CI [-0.17, 0.10].

Additional Findings—Liking and Willingness to Share

Consistent with prior research, participants liked Happy Pats the most out of all conditions ($M = 5.44, SD = 1.11$), $F(3, 178) = 65.86; p < .001; \eta^2 = .53$. Angry Pats ($M = 2.42, SD = 1.04$) were liked the least out of all conditions. Ambivalent Pats ($M = 3.10, SD = 1.95$) were also liked significantly less than Neutral Pats ($M = 3.83, SD = 1.22$), $t(1, 84) = -3.10, p = .003$. Additionally, participants were willing to equally share gains from the game with Happy Pats, which was significantly more willingness to equally share than with Pats in any other condition ($M = 5.69, SD = 1.29$), $F(3, 178) = 7.80; p < .001; \eta^2 = .10$. There was no difference between Angry Pats ($M = 4.29, SD = 1.64$) and No Emotion Pats ($M = 4.71, SD = 1.63$), $t(1, 88) = -1.23, p = .224, ns$, in willingness to equally share gains. Also, there was no difference between Ambivalent Pats ($M = 4.50, SD = 1.90$) and No Emotion Pats, $t(1, 84) = -0.56, p = .575, ns$, in willingness to equally share.

Moreover, the mediation analyses demonstrated that the effects of happiness, anger, and ambivalence expressions on liking were significantly and fully mediated by initial trust perceptions 95% CI [0.68, 1.56], 95% CI [-1.09, -0.40], and 95% CI [-0.91, -0.22], respectively. Additionally, the effect of happiness expressions on equal sharing (happiness = 1; the rest = 0, controlling for anger and ambivalence, with neutrality as the reference point) was significantly and fully mediated by initial trust 95% CI [0.29, 1.50].

Table 6
Study 2—Means and Standard Deviations for Dependent Variables

Emotion expression condition	Perceived sociability	d	Perceived morality	d	Perceived competence	d	Trust	d
Happiness ($n = 45$)	5.37 (0.95)***	1.39	5.29 (0.77)***	1.29	5.59 (0.84)***	1.52	4.73 (1.29)***	1.16
Anger ($n = 48$)	2.78 (0.91)***	-1.04	3.65 (0.71)**	-0.71	3.58 (0.73)***	-0.93	2.48 (0.91)***	-0.93
Ambivalence ($n = 44$)	3.81 (1.28)	-0.06	3.53 (0.92)**	-0.77	3.60 (1.04)**	-0.75	2.69 (0.88)**	-0.72
Control ($n = 42$)	3.88 (1.19)	-	4.22 (0.88)	-	4.31 (0.84)	-	3.38 (1.03)	-

Note: * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Means represent raw means; standard deviations are in parentheses; Cohen d's denote the effect sizes; all contrasts made with the Control condition.

Study 2 Discussion

The aim of Study 2 was to replicate Studies 1a and 1b and extend them by examining our predictions about expressed emotions, stereotyping, and trust in a relatively more cooperative context than the prior studies. Study 2 demonstrated that despite the change of context, expressed happiness again increased stereotypes of the expresser's sociability, morality, and competence, as well as increased initial trust. Directly replicating the results of Study 1b, Study 2 further demonstrated that expressed ambivalence sent mixed signals by significantly reducing perceptions of the expresser's morality and competence, but not significantly shaping perceptions of the expresser's sociability. Tying our work to past research, we found the link between expressed happiness and enhanced economic outcomes in negotiations (e.g., Kong, Tuncel, & McLean Parks, 2011), and demonstrated that expressed happiness increases liking and willingness to share in a zero-acquaintance cooperative setting (e.g., Kopelman et al., 2006). Study 2 also provided additional evidence of important tangible effects of social stereotyping and initial trust on negotiation outcomes by demonstrating that initial trust mediated the relationship between expressions of happiness and willingness to equally share with partners. Additionally, we demonstrated that initial trust mediated the effect of expressions of happiness on increased liking, as well as the impact of angry and ambivalent expressions on decreased liking.

In Study 2, where participants worked on a cooperative task with shared incentives, competence became a significant mechanism for the first time. By contrast, warmth stereotypes were the predominant mechanisms in our first two studies. We did not directly theorize about how the change in context (e.g., competitive vs. cooperative) might alter the effects of emotional expressions on initial trust toward expressers. However, it seems plausible that when incentives or norms encourage individuals to cooperate with one another, social stereotypes about the competence of one's interaction partner should become relevant as drivers of initial trust, and thus willingness to accept vulnerability and risk.

General Discussion

Integrating insights from the social functions of emotions approach (e.g., Van Kleef, 2009; Van Kleef et al., 2010) and the Stereotype Content Model (Fiske et al., 2002, 2007) with research on trust in interpersonal exchanges, this article explores how emotional displays shape observers' perceptions of the emotion expresser and trust-related judgments *prior* to bargaining exchanges in zero-acquaintance settings. In the past two decades, research exploring how people form stereotypes about others offered vast empirical support for the idea that individuals form inferences about others' character and intentions (Fiske et al., 2002), which then significantly shape their behavior toward those individuals (Ames & Johar, 2009; Keltnner & Haidt, 1999; Kervyn, Fiske, & Yzerbyt, 2015). Extending this line of research, our findings demonstrate that expressions of happiness, anger, and ambivalence signal distinct information to observers, and differentially shape sociability, morality, and competence stereotypes, initial trust perceptions, and subsequent behavior in dyadic bargaining exchanges.

Across three studies, we find that expressions of happiness positively shape social stereotypes and increase initial trust, as well as liking and sharing of resources, whereas expressions of anger negatively shape those same stereotypes and decrease initial trust and liking. Expressions of ambivalence negatively shape social stereotypes of morality and competence across both competitive and cooperative contexts, but the findings are more mixed when it comes to sociability. Sometimes ambivalence increases these perceptions (Study 1a) and sometimes it has no effect (Study 1b and Study 2), across both competitive and cooperative contexts. We also demonstrate that ambivalence expressions decrease initial trust and liking and negatively impact opponents' disclosure preferences and offers in a competitive setting.

Overall, and consistent with Brambilla and colleagues' research (e.g., Brambilla & Leach, 2014; Brambilla et al., 2013) highlighting the critical role of morality evaluations in judgments of others' character and intentions, we find that morality is the most stable predictor of initial trust, and mediator of

emotional expressions on trust-related judgments across experimental settings. These findings are also consistent with Gantman and Van Bavel's (2014) conclusions about the perceptual relevance of morality evaluations in ambiguous contexts. Taken together, the consistency of our findings across both competitive and cooperative task environments demonstrates the robustness of our predictions and effects, as well as the relative importance of sociability, morality, and competence stereotypes in shaping trust-related judgments and behavior for three emotions that are likely to be some of the most commonly experienced and expressed in the context of negotiations: happiness, anger, and ambivalence.

We believe that our findings carry important implications for negotiations and conflict management research, as well as offer some specific contributions to both the trust and emotions literatures. First, this study contributes to research on emotions and trust by examining the intersection of these literatures in the context of dyadic bargaining exchanges and by utilizing social cognition research on stereotyping to help bridge these literatures. We contribute, specifically, by examining the social stereotypes that individuals develop based on the verbal and nonverbal information provided to them about partners' general tendencies to express specific emotions. In particular, we demonstrate that emotional expressions are important cues to others about the expresser's character and intentions (i.e., sociability and morality), and their ability to enact their intentions (i.e., competence). We then examine the impact of these stereotypes on initial trust at zero-acquaintance and further explore the impact of initial trust on subsequent behavior, such as disclosure, initial offers, and the equal sharing of resources in negotiations.

Our work also contributes to the growing body of research on the role of expressed anger in dyadic bargaining exchanges by not only replicating prior findings on expressed anger, but also extending these findings to examine the role of initial trust in this process. Specifically, our work is consistent with research by Adam and Brett (2015) who examined the effect of anger expressions on negotiation partners' concessions in different types of negotiations and demonstrated that anger expressions (as opposed to their absence) elicit greater concessions from partners in "balanced" negotiations, that is, settings where both competitive and cooperative elements are present, but have no effect when negotiations are either purely competitive or purely cooperative. Although not the primary focus of our research, our supplementary analyses replicate these findings in both Study 1b and Study 2, demonstrating that anger expressions do not significantly affect disclosure and subsequent offers (Study 1b) as well as the intent to share (Study 2) as compared to expressions of neutrality.

Our findings also extend prior research on the role of expressed happiness in dyadic bargaining exchanges. For instance, research by Belkin et al. (2013) has found that in balanced negotiations with both competitive and cooperative components, happiness expressions (unlike anger) may reduce others' concessions, thus hurting the expresser's individual outcomes because such expressions reduce how much power the emotions expressers are perceived to have. In the current research, our findings help to advance the study of expressed happiness in negotiations by demonstrating that the signaling function of expressed happiness appears to be different in competitive contexts. Happiness expressions do not appear to reduce others' concessions or disclosure behavior, relative to anger and neutrality expressions (see also Rothman, 2011, for a similar finding). In fact, we demonstrate that expressing happiness can be beneficial not only for improving trust-related judgments, but also for increasing liking and others' willingness to share in cooperative settings.

We also advance prior research on the expression of emotional ambivalence and its social function in bargaining settings (e.g., Rothman, 2011; Rothman & Northcraft, 2015) by examining the impact this complex emotion has on social stereotyping and trust development—relational outcomes that have not yet been explored in existing empirical research (see Rothman & Wiesenfeld, 2007) with critical downstream implications in contexts like negotiations. More broadly, our findings add to and extend existing research on the interpersonal effects of emotions in competitive and cooperative settings by examining the effects of a wider range of emotional expressions, from happiness to anger to ambivalence than are typically explored, and also by demonstrating how social stereotypes and the development of initial trust are integral for stimulating effective negotiation behaviors (see meta-analysis by Kong et al., 2014).

Second, we add to the literature on social stereotypes and the SCM, specifically, by looking at emotional expressions as *antecedents* rather than outcomes of social stereotypes and initial trust. Importantly, we demonstrate how both singular (happiness and anger) and complex (ambivalence) emotional expressions may seed specific social stereotypes in the context of negotiations, thus extending research on the origins of social stereotypes.

Third, our findings are consistent with, and further extend, the literature on social judgment. Specifically, like others, we show the importance of morality stereotypes for individual and group members' evaluations (e.g., Brambilla & Leach, 2014; Brambilla et al., 2013; Gantman & Van Bavel, 2014; Leach et al., 2007). We also extend our knowledge about the importance of morality stereotypes to show their implications for the development of initial trust in bargaining contexts. Our results suggest that in interpersonal exchanges emotional displays signal not only an individual's intentions toward one's partner and ability to enact those intentions, but they can also signal more general information about one's moral character. Considering the consistency of our findings that demonstrate the role of morality evaluations in negotiation processes and their specific impact on negotiation outcomes at zero-acquaintance, we believe that future research should not only attempt to replicate our effects, but also generalize them by examining these effects in different contexts and decision-making tasks.

With respect to practical implications, we believe that our findings can help practitioners to better understand how and why their emotional displays shape others' trust-related perceptions and behaviors in negotiations. Specifically, negotiators that want to build trust and ensure cooperation from their partners in first-time exchanges and/or in settings fraught with high uncertainty may want to avoid not only appearing angry, but also ambivalent. By contrast, our findings seem to point out that positive emotional displays, such as expressions of happiness, may not only help to increase initial trust in both competitive and cooperative contexts, but also may increase others' willingness to share and willingness to treat others fairly in cooperative settings. Additionally, our finding that perceptions of morality drive initial trust in a variety of contexts, particularly in competitive ones, implies that signaling any ambivalent or negative emotional information that might seed concerns about morality or integrity can be detrimental to trust and subsequent negotiation exchanges.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The consistency of our results in three studies with different tasks and samples lends support to our arguments. However, there are some limitations in the present research that we hope can be addressed by future studies. First, even though in this study we are interested in the initial stereotypes and trust-related judgments as a function of emotional expressions, the fact that the participants did not interact with others in our experiments may represent a limitation. However, utilizing vignettes and videos to manipulate emotional expressions afforded us greater control over information participants received about their partners. Since the only thing we manipulated was emotional expression of the future interaction partner, the controlled environment allowed us to systematically examine how emotional expressions shape initial perceptions, as well as subsequent behavior. Further, our use of both scenario and video-based manipulations complement prior research that has used only facial information when examining emotions and trust-related perceptions (for a critique and review, see Barrett, Mesquita, & Gendron, 2011). Nevertheless, future research that uses in-person interactive exchanges might shed more light on our research questions and, perhaps, could reveal the strength and longevity of initial trust-related judgments based on emotional displays.

Second, while our scenario study (Study 1a) utilized an androgynous name for participants' negotiation partner (Van Fleet & Atwater, 1997), our video studies (Study 1b and Study 2) used a female actor, thus allowing us to hold constant the gender of the negotiator that participants anticipated interacting with. It is possible, however, that the gender of the expresser could interact with

the emotion participants expressed to impact initial stereotypes and trust. After all, research demonstrates that emotional expressions can be beneficial or detrimental based not only on the task at hand, but also on the expresser's gender (Bowles, Babcock, & Lai, 2007). For instance, females that adopt gender incongruent behavior (i.e., agentic) in lieu of gender congruent behavior (i.e., communal) have been shown to become economically and socially disadvantaged (Belkin & Kurtzberg, 2013; Bowles et al., 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Unfortunately, we were not able to test that prediction in this article. Nevertheless, it is notable that the effects of the emotional expressions on stereotypes were largely consistent across both scenario-based and video-based studies, thus reducing concerns that our effects only apply to female (emotional) negotiators. One interesting difference we saw across the scenario (androgynous) and video (female) studies was that participants appeared to trust the ambivalent negotiator slightly more when no information was provided about the expresser's gender (Study 1a—*androgynous*) than when the expresser was shown to be female (Study 1b and Study 2). Future research is needed to examine whether the gender of the emotional partner or opponent interacts with the emotions they express to alter social stereotypes and trust in predictable ways.

Our findings also open up several additional questions for future research. Our focus was to study initial stereotype formation and its impact on trust prior to negotiation exchanges. Scholars studying the effects of emotional expressions on trust and negotiation behavior may wish to further investigate the moderating role of perceived authenticity on the relationship between emotional expressions and social stereotypes and trust. For instance, research demonstrates that surface acting, that is, expressing emotions that are not internally experienced (Gross, 1998), as opposed to authentic emotional expressions, may have differential effects on observers' perceptions and behavior (Côté, Hideg, & van Kleef, 2013; Gross & John, 2003).

Moreover, studies show that individual behavior changes in continuous interactions, as people predominantly base their future behavior on the past behavior of their partners (e.g., Ames & Johar, 2009; Pillutla, Malhotra, & Murnighan, 2003). Thus, emotional displays may have different effects on trust and subsequent behavior when individuals have multiple encounters with one another and engage in a series of negotiation exchanges, or have long-term relationship with each other as compared to what we have observed in this research on initial responses (e.g., Campagna, Mislin, Kong, & Bottom, 2016). Finally, investigating how the effects of emotional expressions on initial stereotypes and trust impressions at zero-acquaintance are moderated by various personality traits, such as trait affect (Schwartz et al., 2002; Wilkowski & Robinson, 2007), general propensity to trust (Colquitt et al., 2007), prosocial orientation (Grant, 2008), as well as individual's incidental affect (Chen, Belkin, McNamee, & Kurtzberg, 2013; Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005), may offer additional insights on individual judgments and decision-making ability in a variety of contexts.

Conclusion

Despite a wealth of research on trust in negotiations and the effects of emotions on negotiation processes and outcomes, research that explores the two literatures together is still in a nascent stage. This study makes it clear that emotional displays signal specific information to observers, have a tangible impact on social stereotypes about warmth and competence, and subsequently shape trust perceptions and behavior in zero-acquaintance bargaining contexts. Moreover, we demonstrate that the impact of these emotional expressions on stereotypes is relatively stable across bargaining contexts with morality evaluations being the most consistent driver of initial trust perceptions. Since emotions are commonly expressed in interpersonal exchanges and are evidently an important antecedent of trust-related judgments and behavior, our findings suggest that systematically including them into the research agenda will help to provide a more comprehensive understanding of trust and behavior in negotiations.

References

- Adam, H., & Brett, J. M. (2015). Context matters: The social effects of anger in cooperative, balanced, and competitive negotiation situations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 61, 44–58. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2015.07.001
- Ames, D. R., & Johar, G. V. (2009). I'll know what you're like when I see how you feel: How and when affective displays influence behavior-based impressions. *Psychological Science*, 20, 586–593. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02330.x
- Anderson, C., & Thompson, L. L. (2004). Affect from the top down: How powerful individuals' positive affect shapes negotiations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 95, 125–139. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2004.05.002
- Barrett, L. F., Mesquita, B., & Gendron, M. (2011). Context in emotion perception. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 286–290. doi:10.1177/0963721411422522
- Bartel, C. A., & Saavedra, R. (2000). The collective construction of workgroup moods. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 197–231. doi:10.2307/2667070
- Bazerman, M. H., & Neale, M. A. (1992). *Negotiating rationally*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Belkin, L. Y., & Kurtzberg, T. (2013). Affective displays in e-mail communication: The evidence from the lab and the field. In N. M. Ashkanasy, W. J. Zerbe & C. E. J. Härtel (Eds.), *Research on emotions in organizations* (Vol. 9, pp. 279–308). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Belkin, L. Y., Kurtzberg, T. R., & Naquin, C. E. (2013). Signaling dominance in online negotiations: The role of affective tone. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 6, 285–304. doi:10.1111/ncmr.12016
- Bohnet, I., & Frey, B. S. (1999). The sound of silence in prisoner's dilemma and dictator games. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 38, 43–57. doi:10.1016/S0167-2681(98)00121-8
- Borkenau, P., & Liebler, A. (1992). Trait inferences: Sources of validity at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 645–657. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.84.2.155
- Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & Lai, L. (2007). Social incentives for gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiations: Sometimes it does hurt to ask. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 103, 84–103. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.09.001
- Brambilla, M., & Leach, C. W. (2014). On the importance of being moral: The distinctive role of morality in social judgment. *Social Cognition*, 32, 397–408. doi:10.1521/soco.2014.32.4.397
- Brambilla, M., Rusconi, P., Sacchi, S., & Cherubini, P. (2011). Looking for honesty: The primary role of morality (vs. sociability and competence) in information gathering. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 41, 135–143. doi:10.1002/ejsp.744
- Brambilla, M., Sacchi, S., Pagliaro, S., & Ellemers, N. (2013). Morality and intergroup relations: Threats to safety and group image predict the desire to interact with outgroup and ingroup members. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 811–821. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2013.04.005
- Burnham, T., McCabe, K., & Smith, V. L. (2000). Friend-or-foe intentionality priming in an extensive form trust game. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 43, 57–73. doi:10.1016/S0167-2681(00)00108-6
- Bushman, B., & Holt-Lunstad, J. (2009). Understanding social relationship maintenance among friends: Why we don't end those frustrating relationships. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 28, 749–778. doi:10.1521/jscp.2009.28.6.749
- Butler, J. K. (1999). Trust expectations, information sharing, climate of trust, and negotiation effectiveness and efficiency. *Group & Organization Management*, 24, 217–238. doi:10.1177/1059601199242005
- Campagna, R. L., Mislin, A. A., Kong, D. T., & Bottom, W. P. (2016). Strategic consequences of emotional misrepresentation in negotiation: The blowback effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101, 605–624. doi:10.1037/apl0000072
- Carnevale, P. J., & Isen, A. M. (1986). The influence of positive affect and visual access on the discovery of integrative solutions in bilateral negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 37, 1–13. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(86)90041-5

- Chan, E., & Ybarra, O. (2002). Interaction goals and social information processing: Underestimating one's partners but overestimating one's opponents. *Social Cognition*, 20, 409–439. doi:10.1521/soco.20.5.409.21126
- Chen, C. C., Belkin, L. Y., McNamee, R., & Kurtzberg, T. R. (2013). Charisma attribution during organizational change: The importance of followers' emotions and concern for well-being. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, 1136–1158. doi:10.1111/jasp.12078
- Chen, C. C., Saparito, P., & Belkin, L. Y. (2011). Responding to trust breaches: The role of affect in trust, trust erosion, and trust reparability. *Journal of Trust Research*, 1, 85–106. doi:10.1080/21515581.2011.552438
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationship with risk-taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 909–927. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.909
- Côté, S., Hideg, I., & van Kleef, G. A. (2013). The consequences of faking anger in negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 453–463. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.12.015
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Beersma, B., Stroebe, K., & Euwema, M. C. (2006). Motivated information processing, strategic choice, and the quality of negotiated agreement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 927–943. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.6.927
- Drolet, A. L., & Morris, M. W. (2000). Rapport in conflict resolution: Accounting for how face-to-face contact fosters mutual cooperation in mixed-motive conflicts. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36, 26–50. doi:10.1006/jesp.1999.1395
- Duclos, S. E., Laird, J. D., Schneider, E., Sexton, M., Stern, L., & Van Lighten, O. (1989). Emotion-specific effects of facial expressions and postures on emotional experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 100–108. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.1.100
- Dunn, J. R., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2005). Feeling and believing: The influence of emotion on trust. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 736–748. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.5.736
- Dunning, D., Anderson, J. E., Schlosser, T., Ehlebracht, D., & Fetschenhauer, D. (2014). Trust at zero acquaintance: More a matter of respect than expectation of reward. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107, 122–141. doi:10.1037/a0036673
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 807–834. doi:10.1016/j.lequa.2003.09.004
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109, 573–598. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573
- Ekman, P. (1993). Facial expression and emotion. *American Psychologist*, 48, 384–392. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.48.4.384
- Fehr, E., & Gächter, S. (2000). Fairness and retaliation: The economics of reciprocity. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14, 159–181. doi:10.1257/jep.14.3.159
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11, 77–83. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2006.11.005
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878–902. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878
- Fiske, S. T., & Dupree, C. (2014). Gaining trust as well as respect in communicating to motivated audiences about science topics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(Suppl 4), 13593–13597. doi:10.1073/pnas.1317505111
- Fiske, S. T., & Dupree, C. H. (2015). Cognitive Processes Involved in Stereotyping. *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences: An Interdisciplinary, Searchable, and Linkable Resource*, 1–12. doi:10.1002/9781118900772.etrds0326
- Fiske, S. T., Xu, J., Cuddy, A. C., & Glick, P. (1999). (Dis) respecting versus (dis) liking: Status and interdependence predict ambivalent stereotypes of competence and warmth. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 473–489. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00128

- Forgas, J. P. (1998). On feeling good and getting your way: Mood effects on negotiator cognition and bargaining strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 565–577. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.565
- Forsythe, R., Horowitz, J. L., Savin, N. E., & Sefton, M. (1994). Fairness in simple bargaining experiments. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 6, 347–369. doi:10.1006/game.1994.1021
- Gosselin, P., Kirouac, G., & Dore, F. (2005). Components and recognition of facial expression in the communication of emotion by actors. In P. Ekman & E. L. Rosenberg (Eds.). *What the face reveals: Basic and applied studies of spontaneous expression using the facial action coding system (FACS)* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gantman, A. P., & Van Bavel, J. J. (2014). The moral pop-out effect: Enhanced perceptual awareness of morally relevant stimuli. *Cognition*, 132, 22–29. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2014.02.007
- Grant, A. M. (2008). Does intrinsic motivation fuel the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 48–58. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.48
- Gross, J. J. (1998). Antecedent- and response-focused emotion regulation: Divergent consequences for experience, expression, and physiology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 224–237. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.224
- Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 348–362. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.348
- Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108, 814–834. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.108.4.814
- Hareli, S., Shomrat, N., & Hess, U. (2009). Emotional versus neutral expressions and perceptions of social dominance and submissiveness. *Emotion*, 9, 378–384. doi:10.1037/a0015958
- Harker, L., & Keltner, D. (2001). Expressions of positive emotion in women's college yearbook pictures and their relationship to personality and life outcomes across adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 112–124. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.80.1.112
- Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (1999). Social functions of emotions at four levels of analysis. *Cognition and Emotion*, 13, 505–521. doi:10.1080/026999399379168
- Kervyn, N., Fiske, S. T., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2013). Integrating the stereotype content model (warmth and competence) and the Osgood semantic differential (evaluation, potency, and activity). *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 673–681. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1978
- Kervyn, N., Fiske, S., & Yzerbyt, V. (2015). Forecasting the primary dimension of social perception. *Social Psychology*, 46, 36–45. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000219
- Kim, P. H., Dirks, K. T., Cooper, C. D., & Ferrin, D. L. (2006). When more blame is better than less: The implications of internal vs. external attributions for the repair of trust after a competence- vs. integrity-based trust violation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99, 49–65. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.07.002
- Kim, P. H., Ferrin, D. L., Cooper, C. D., & Dirks, K. T. (2004). Removing the shadow of suspicion: The effects of apology vs. denial for repairing ability- vs. integrity-based trust violations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 104–118. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.104
- Knutson, B. (1996). Facial expressions of emotion influence interpersonal trait inferences. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 20, 165–812. doi:10.1007/BF02281954
- Kong, D. T., Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2014). Interpersonal trust within negotiations: Meta-analytic evidence, critical contingencies, and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57, 1235–1255. doi:10.5465/amj.2012.0461
- Kong, D. T., Tuncel, E., & McLean Parks, J. (2011). Anticipating happiness in a future negotiation: Anticipated happiness, propensity to initiate a negotiation, and individual outcomes. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 4, 219–247. doi:10.1111/j.1750-4716.2011.00081.x
- Kopelman, S., Rosette, A., & Thompson, L. (2006). The three faces of Eve: An examination of the strategic display of positive, negative, and neutral emotions in negotiations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99, 81–101. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.08.003
- Kramer, R. M., & Lewicki, R. J. (2010). Repairing and enhancing trust: Approaches to reducing organizational trust deficits. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4, 245–277. doi:10.1080/19416520.2010.487403

- Leach, C. W., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2007). Group virtue: The importance of morality (vs. competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of in-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 234. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.2.234
- Levine, E. E., & Schweitzer, M. (2015). Prosocial lies: When deception breeds trust. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 26, 88–106. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2014.10.007
- Lewis, K. M. (2000). When leaders display emotion: How followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 221–234. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200003)21:2<221::AID-JOB36>3.0.CO;2-0
- Lount, R. B. (2010). The impact of positive mood on trust in interpersonal and intergroup interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 420–433. doi:10.1037/a0017344
- Maddux, W. W., Mullen, E., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Chameleons bake bigger pies and take bigger pieces: Strategic behavioral mimicry facilitates negotiation outcomes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 461–468. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2007.02.003
- Manapat, M. L., Nowak, M. A., & Rand, D. G. (2013). Information, irrationality, and the evolution of trust. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 90, 57–75. doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2012.10.018
- Marsh, A. A., Ambady, N., & Kleck, R. E. (2005). The effects of fear and anger facial expressions on approach-and avoidance-related behaviors. *Emotion*, 5, 119–124. doi:10.1037/1528-3542.5.1.119
- Marsh, J. K., & Rothman, N. B. (2013). The ambivalence of expert categorizers. In M. Knauff, M. Pauen, N. Sebanz & I. Wachsmuth (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 35th annual conference of the cognitive science society* (pp. 984–989). Austin, TX: Cognitive Science Society.
- Mayer, R., Davis, J., & Schoorman, D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 709–734. doi:10.5465/AMR.1995.9508080335
- McAdams, R. B., Ambady, N., Macrae, C. N., & Kleck, R. E. (2006). Emotional expressions forecast approach-avoidance behavior. *Motivation and Emotion*, 30, 179–188. doi:10.1007/s11031-006-9020-2
- Mislin, A., Williams, L. V., & Shaughnessy, B. A. (2015). Motivating trust: Can mood and incentives increase interpersonal trust? *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 58, 11–19. doi:10.1016/j.soec.2015.06.001
- Oosterhof, N. N., & Todorov, A. (2009). Shared perceptual basis of emotional expressions and trustworthiness impressions from faces. *Emotion*, 9, 128–133. doi:10.1037/a0014520
- Pagliaro, S., Brambilla, M., Sacchi, S., D'Angelo, M., & Ellemers, N. (2013). Initial impressions determine behaviours: Morality predicts the willingness to help newcomers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 117, 37–44. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1508-y
- Pietroni, D., Van Kleef, G. A., Rubaltelli, E., & Rumiati, R. (2009). When happiness pays in negotiation. *Mind & Society*, 8, 77–92. doi:10.1007/s11299-008-0047-9
- Pillutla, M. M., Malhotra, D., & Murnighan, J. K. (2003). Attributions of trust and the calculus of reciprocity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 448–455. doi:10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00015-5
- Pizarro, D. A., & Tannenbaum, D. (2011). Bringing character back: How the motivation to evaluate character influences judgments of moral blame. In M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *The social psychology of morality: Exploring the causes of good and evil* (pp. 91–108). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Potworowski, G., & Kopelman, S. (2008). Strategic display and response to emotions: Developing evidence-based negotiation expertise in emotion management (NEEM). *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 1, 333–352. doi:10.1111/j.1750-4716.2008.00020.x
- Rempel, J. K., Holmes, J. G., & Zanna, M. P. (1985). Trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 95–112. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.49.1.95
- Rothman, N. B. (2011). Steering sheep: How expressed emotional ambivalence elicits dominance in interdependent decision-making contexts. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 116, 66–82. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.05.004
- Rothman, N. B., & Magee, J. C. (2016). Affective expressions in groups and inferences of relational well-being: The effects of socially engaging and disengaging emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 30, 150–166. doi:10.1080/0269931.2015.1020050

- Rothman, N. B., & Northcraft, G. (2015). Unlocking integrative potential: Expressed emotional ambivalence and negotiation outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 126, 65–76. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2014.10.005
- Rothman, N. B., & Wiesenfeld, B. (2007). The social consequences of expressing emotional ambivalence in groups and teams. In E. Mannix, M. Neale & C. Anderson (Eds.), *Research on managing groups and teams: Affect & groups* (pp. 275–308). London, U.K.: Elsevier.
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 393–404. doi:10.5465/AMR.1998.926617
- 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. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.83.5.1178
- Sinaceur, M., Adam, H., Van Kleef, G. A., & Galinsky, A. D. (2013). The advantages of being unpredictable: How emotional inconsistency extracts concessions in negotiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 498–508. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2013.01.007
- Sinaceur, M., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2006). Get mad and get more than even: When and why anger expression is effective in negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 314–322. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2005.05.002
- Sinaceur, M., Van Kleef, G. A., Neale, M. A., Adam, H., & Haag, C. (2011). Hot or cold: Is communicating anger or threats more effective in negotiation? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 1018–1032. doi:10.1037/a0023896
- Thompson, L. L., Wang, J., & Gunia, B. C. (2010). Negotiation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61, 491–515. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100458
- Van Fleet, D. D., & Atwater, L. (1997). Gender neutral names: Don't be so sure!. *Sex Roles*, 37, 111–123. doi:10.1023/A:1025696905342
- Van Kleef, G. A. (2009). How emotions regulate social life: The emotions as social information (EASI) model. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18, 184–188. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01633.x
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004a). The interpersonal effects of anger and happiness in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 57–76. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.86.1.57
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004b). The interpersonal effects of emotions in negotiations: A motivated information processing approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 510–528. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.87.4.510
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2010). An interpersonal approach to emotion in social decision making: The emotion as social information model. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 42). Burlington, MA: Academic Press.
- Van Kleef, G. A., Homan, A. C., & Cheshin, A. (2012). Emotional influence at work: Take it EASI. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 2, 311–339. doi:10.1177/2041386612454911
- Van Kleef, G. A., & Sinaceur, M. (2013). The demise of the “rational” negotiator: Emotional forces in conflict and negotiation. In M. Olekalns & W. Adair (Eds.), *Handbook of research in negotiation* (pp. 109–130). Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Edgar Publishing.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1999). *The PANAS-X: Manual for the positive and negative affect schedule-expanded form*. Ames, IA: The University of Iowa.
- Wilkowski, B. M., & Robinson, M. D. (2007). Keeping one's cool: Trait anger, hostile thoughts, and the recruitment of limited capacity control. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 1201–1213. doi:10.1177/0146167207301031
- Williams, M., & Belkin, L.Y. (2016). Maintaining trust through active meaning construction. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1, 11944. doi:10.5465/AMBPP.2016.286
- Willis, J., & Todorov, A. (2006). First impressions making up your mind after a 100-ms exposure to a face. *Psychological Science*, 17, 592–598. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01750.x

APPENDIX A Video Manipulation

A female professional actor was trained to express ambivalence, anger, happiness, or no emotion in short 1-minute videos (used and validated in prior research—Rothman, 2011; Rothman & Northcraft, 2015).

Specifically, the actor had been trained to feel the emotions she had to portray in the scenario (Gosselin, Kirouac & Dore, 2005) through nonverbal expressions only, as there was no sound in the video.

The instructions the actor was given for the expression of various emotions were based on previous research (e.g., Bartel & Saavedra, 2000; Duclos, Laird, Schneider, Sexter, Stern, & Van Lighten, 1989; Ekman, 1993; Gosselin et al., 2005; Rothman, 2011). Specifically, for the *ambivalent* emotional display video, the actor in the videotape *moved* between inner brow raising and lowering. With regard to body movement, she used fidgeting of the hands in front of the body, tilting of the head back and forth, and shoulder shrugs. In addition, her gaze shifted among having eye contact with an interaction partner, looking downward, and looking off into space. The distinguishing feature of this expressed ambivalence is that it reflects the internal conflict that the ambivalent person is experiencing by showing movement in one direction and then another direction (for further discussion of this point, see Rothman, 2011).

In the *angry* emotional display video, the actor pulled her eyebrows together and down, she pressed her lips together and clenched her teeth, she clenched her fists, squared her shoulders, and her forearms and elbows were on the table in front of her. Her upper body was erect but slightly forward leaning and her feet were directly on the floor below her, like she was poised for action. In addition, she made sporadic eye contact with her partner. Any movements were expansive, energetic, and active.

In the *happy* emotional display video, the actor smiled often and relaxed her face, she gestured with her hands freely during speech, her head tilted slightly toward her interaction partner, and at times she nodded. Her body was positioned to be inclusive (rather than exclusive) of her partner. In addition, she made eye contact with her partner. Any movements were energetic, active, and expansive.

Finally, in the *neutral* video clip, the actor engaged in very few if any of the nonverbal gestures used to express happiness, anger, or ambivalence in the other video clips, staying nonemotional throughout.

Liuba Y. Belkin (lyb207@lehigh.edu) is an associate professor in the Department of Management, College of Business and Economics, Lehigh University. She received her Ph.D. at Rutgers University. Dr. Belkin conducts her research in organizational behavior and negotiations fields, with an emphasis on individual and interpersonal effects of emotions, trust relationships, and communication media.

Naomi B. Rothman (nbr211@lehigh.edu) is an assistant professor of management at Lehigh University's College of Business and Economics. She received her Ph.D. from the Stern School of Business at New York University. Prior to joining Lehigh, Naomi served as an assistant professor at the College of Business, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. Her research interests include the social consequences of emotions, power, and justice in the workplace.