negotiation and conflict management research

Negotiation and Conflict Management Research

Anger in Negotiations: A Review of Causes, Effects, and Unanswered Questions

David A. Hunsaker

Department of Management, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, U.S.A.

Keywords
anger, negotiation, emotion, attribution.

Correspondence
David Hunsaker, David Eccles School of Business, Spencer Fox Eccles Business Building, University of Utah, 1655 East Campus Center Drive, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, U.S.A.; e-mail: david.hunsaker@eccles.utah.edu.

Abstract

This article reviews the literature on the emotion of anger in the negotiation context. I discuss the known antecedents of anger in negotiation, as well as its positive and negative inter- and intrapersonal effects. I pay particular attention to the apparent disagreements within the literature concerning the benefits and drawbacks of using anger to gain advantage in negotiations and employ Attribution Theory as a unifying mechanism to help explain these diverse findings. I call attention to the weaknesses evident in current research questions and methodologies and end with suggestions for future research in this important area.

What role does anger play in the negotiation context? Can this emotion be harnessed and manipulated to increase negotiating power and improve negotiation outcomes, or does it have inevitable downsides? The purpose of this article is to review the work of scholars that have focused on the emotion of anger within the negotiation context.

I begin by offering some background on the field of research to be reviewed. I then explain why Attribution Theory is particularly helpful in making sense of diverse findings in the field. I review relevant research on anger's antecedents and main effects, all within the negotiation context. Throughout the review, I use concepts from Attribution Theory to help make sense of studies that have shown that anger helps negotiators get a better deal and studies that show the opposite effect. I end with a discussion about current methodological considerations in this literature and suggest future directions and potential areas of new research.

Background

The literature on anger within negotiations is situated within the much broader literature of negative affect and, even broader, all emotion within negotiations (for reviews see Barry, Fulmer, & Van Kleef, 2004; Martinovski, 2010; Olekalns & Druckman, 2014; Shu & Roloff, 2006; Thompson, Medvec, Seiden, & Kopelman, 2001; Thompson, Wang, & Gunia, 2010; Van Kleef & Sinaceur, 2013). Also positioned nearby is the literature on anger in organizations (for a review see Gibson & Callister, 2010) and anger in conflict (for a review see Van Kleef, van Dijk, Steinel, Harinck, & van Beest, 2008)—both much broader contexts than my narrower focus on negotiation.

Anger has not always been recognized as a factor of consequence in the negotiation context. In fact, several decades ago, some scholars believed that negotiation was a mechanical process based on skill and that emotion played no role in negotiator success (Lovell, 1952). However, other scholars such as White (1977) eventually realized that anger in particular played a role in political negotiations. Nearly 15 years later Fisher, Grant, Hall, Keashly, and Kinzel (1990) showed that the very activity of negotiating caused

Volume 10, Number 3, Pages 220–241

feelings of anger to increase in individuals. From this point on, scholars began to explore the workings of anger within the negotiation context. As research in this field unfolded, several theories, as well as many competing conclusions, have emerged.

Although many questions remain about anger's role in negotiation behavior and outcomes, scholars who have carried out work in this field should be given credit for a few important accomplishments thus far. First, the literature has made it clear that anger does play an important role in the negotiation setting, despite the assertion of previous scholars that emotion played no role in such interactions (e.g., Lovell, 1952). Second, scholars have adequately shown that anger affects negotiation outcomes and that it should be understood and carefully monitored if negotiators hope to achieve optimal results. Third, it is clear that anger can be both an advantage and a disadvantage to either negotiating party, depending on a host of situational factors, and the literature is beginning to make clear the parameters of those effects. Finally, those doing work in this field have created an important foundation upon which future anger and negotiation scholars can continue to build as this important topic continues to receive empirical and theoretical attention.

Although there have been two reviews of anger within negotiations within the last decade (Denson & Fabiansson, 2011; Van Kleef, 2010), neither had the same scope or purpose as this review. While Denson and Fabiansson (2011) discussed the pros and cons of expressing anger within negotiation and even made recommendations about regulating that anger, their review left out key pieces in the anger and negotiation literature regarding power, status, attribution theory, and fluctuating emotions, to name a few. Denson and Fabiansson (2011) also did not attempt to reconcile the varied findings about the effectiveness of expressing anger in negotiation, as I intend to do in this review.

Van Kleef's (2010) review on anger in negotiation, on the other hand, was quite a bit broader in scope than the present article, as it took in a considerable amount of literature from the research on anger in the context of general conflict. Van Kleef also includes findings on all emotions within the context of negotiation but acknowledges that anger is by far the most studied emotion in this context. He reviews literature that shows that expressing disappointment makes one's partner feel more satisfied and that expressing guilt builds positive relationships but does not elicit concessions. In contrast to his review, this article focuses specifically on anger within negotiations and therefore presents a clearer view of the state of this particular literature. This is particularly helpful to scholars and practitioners of negotiation who may be concerned about taking the findings regarding anger during conflict and applying them in negotiation situations that may not resemble other types of conflict. Furthermore, Van Kleef's (2010) review is understandably missing several more recent pieces that present key moderators to the main effects of anger on negotiation outcomes. Scholars on anger in negotiation have continued to be very prolific and active in recent years, and this review will incorporate these more recent studies in its effort to explain the apparent disparate findings in the current negotiation and anger literature.

In sum, the following review is necessary for scholars to take note, at this point in the literature's progression, of the seemingly conflicting findings about anger and to consider how these findings might fit into a broader theoretical framework so that research on this topic can continue to progress in a systematic way. This review will be both broad enough to incorporate literature left out of the Denson and Fabiansson (2011) review, and narrow enough to clearly see what progress has been made on anger specifically within the negotiation context without bringing in conflict in general as Van Kleef (2010) has done.

Defining Anger

Scholars struggled for decades to define anger (Schieman, 2010). Some have even called it a "fuzzy concept" that people know when they see or feel it (Russell & Fehr, 1994). However, this review draws upon the definition of anger provided by Gibson and Callister (2010) in their review on anger in organizations. They define anger as "an emotion that involves an appraisal of responsibility for wrongdoing by another person or entity and often includes the goal of correcting the perceived wrong" (p. 68).

Despite this useful definition, it is important to note that, to my knowledge, none of the empirical pieces included in this review expressly adopted the above or any other definition of anger. Scholars treated it as although it needed no definition or explanation. Coders are typically told to use an everyday definition of anger when coding interactions (Pillutla & Murnighan, 1996), anger is often operationalized by computer-generated messages like, "This offer makes me really angry" (e.g., Lelieveld, Van Dijk, Van Beest, Steinel, & Van Kleef, 2011; Steinel, Van Kleef, & Harinck, 2008; Van Beest, Van Kleef, & Van Dijk, 2008), and manipulation checks mostly consist of Likert scales with items like, "How angry do you believe your counterpart was?" (e.g., Pietroni, Van Kleef, Rubaltelli, & Rumiati, 2009; Van Kleef, De Dreu, Pietroni, & Manstead, 2006). Therefore, each empirical paper cited herein essentially has its own implicit definition of anger, which is usually defined only by the operationalization of the construct.

Anger and Attribution Theory

Attribution Theory is well-known and predates most empirical work on emotion in negotiation (Weiner, 1985). This classic theory takes the view that all humans are scientists of a sort—interested in ascertaining the causes of various surprising events in their individual environments. Attribution theory explains the steps of observing a phenomenon and appraising its relevance to oneself, searching for the probable cause of the phenomenon, attributing the phenomenon to someone or something, feeling an emotional response, and then acting on the conclusions made.

Attribution theory has been used by several scholars studying anger in negotiation (Allred, 1999, 2000; Betancourt, 2004a, 2004b; Filipowicz, Barsade, & Melwani, 2011) and can be used to make sense generally of this particular literature for several reasons. Firstly, the theory explains the attributional process that leads to a feeling of anger. So it is helpful for answering the question, "Why does anger occur in negotiation?" and thereby making sense of the area of literature that explores the antecedents of anger in the negotiation context. Secondly, if we view anger in negotiation as the "unexpected event" that triggers attribution thought processes, attribution theory helps to explain how negotiators make sense of displays of emotion from their counterparts, how they make attributions about that behavior, and how they decide to respond to it. Finally, Attribution Theory also includes mechanisms that explain the *intra*personal effects of phenomena (Weiner, 2000), such as how anger expression affects the expresser, which is an important component of the literature on anger in negotiation. For these reasons, Attribution Theory is well suited to unify and make sense of the diverse findings in this particular literature and will be used as an explanatory and organizing mechanism throughout this review.

To understand how Attribution Theory helps to explain the rise of and response to anger in negotiation, we can imagine a situation in which A and B are negotiating. B makes an offer to A that is extremely unfavorable. A assesses this action as negative, reviews relevant situational information such as situational norms, decides that B's offer was lower than negotiation norms would allow, and determines that B has a mean, nonconforming personality. A decides that B's offer was intentional and controllable and feels anger toward B, which leads him to make an angry remark. Meanwhile, B notices A's anger and goes through the same process to decide what made him angry. Based on attributional processes, she may decide that A's anger is justified and rescind her unfavorable offer, or she may determine that his anger is not justified and respond with reciprocal anger and larger requests. While this *inter*personal process is playing out, both of them notice their own feelings of anger and use attributional processes to determine the reasons for their own feelings of anger. This *intra*personal process will also affect their negotiation decisions.

Often when one thinks of anger's relationship to attribution theory, she/he may focus heavily on the "causal dimensions" portion of the theory, which includes the constructs of locus, stability, globality, controllability, intentionality, etc (Weiner, 1985). Indeed, Weiner (1985) argues that anger occurs when the negative actions of others are perceived to be intentional and controllable. However, to fully utilize Attribution Theory's power to explain the diverse findings on anger in negotiation, one needs to also

expand into the parts of the theory that precede the actual causal dimensions of an event. This article will draw not only upon the causal dimensions aspect of Attribution Theory, but also upon the *causal antecedents* and *causal ascriptions* (Weiner, 1985, p. 565) phases of Weiner's original Attribution Theory which precede causal dimensions. The elements of these earlier phases of the theory are important to explore because they align closely with the research that has been conducted to date on anger in negotiation.

In the *causal antecedents* step of Attribution Theory, individuals use situational information to make their causal assumptions. For instance, individuals can use memories of the behavior of others in similar situations, their own past behavior, situational norms, or even cultural cues to collect information that will inform the next step—the *causal ascriptions* step—of attribution. During the causal ascriptions step, individuals take the information that is relevant and actually ascribe the event in question to a certain cause, such as one's ability, one's effort, one's strategy, one's personality, or luck. For instance, if my negotiation counterpart suddenly raises her voice and looks at me angrily, I collect relevant information about her outburst (causal antecedents), such as the fact that I just rejected her offer, and then I ascribe her behavior to a cause, such as the difficulty of reaching a deal (causal ascription). The causal ascription then affects my subsequent emotion (pity) and my behavioral response (changing my mind about her offer). The concepts of causal antecedents and causal ascriptions will prove very valuable in categorizing and interpreting findings within the literature at hand. They are broad enough to include and explain several moderators of anger's effect on negotiator behavior that have been explored in the literature, such as the power dynamics of the situation or cultural norms and will therefore help to explain why some scholars have found that anger expression helps negotiators, and others have found the opposite.

The review will first discuss the known antecedents, then the intrapersonal effects, and finally the interpersonal effects of anger in negotiation. Each section will be organized around portions of Attribution Theory that help scholars to categorize and make sense of the findings discussed.

Antecedents of Anger

I begin with a discussion of the causes of anger in negotiation. Surprisingly, in the approximately two decades of research on anger in negotiation, relatively few studies have investigated the causes of anger in negotiation. Psychologists have found that antecedents of anger can include feelings of disappointment and injustice, feelings of failure, and betrayal (Izard, 1991). Many of those who have studied the antecedent of anger within the specific context of negotiation have found similar results, as explained in this section. As discussed previously, Attribution Theory holds that an individual who has been harmed by another individual feels anger *if* she/he believes that 1) someone caused the situation, 2) the situation is not fair, 3) someone chose to do this, and 4) someone should have anticipated the outcomes (Davidson & Greenhalgh, 1999).

Empirical tests of the antecedents of anger support these assertions. For instance, Pillutla and Murnighan (1996) conducted a study of dyadic negotiations and found that feelings of unfairness led negotiators to feel anger. This finding echoed a similar conclusion by Daly (1991), who conducted a qualitative study of mergers and acquisitions and concluded that unfairness was one cause of anger during those negotiations. Additionally, Johnson, Cooper, and Chin (2009) studied online "flaming" and found that feelings of unfairness led to anger, which led to flaming behavior. The idea of anger resulting from a belief that others caused one's misery is supported by Butt and Choi (2006) who find that anger can result from believing that one's counterpart directly caused a previous negotiation failure. Previous negotiation impasses can also cause negotiators to feel angry (O'Connor & Arnold, 2001). The fundamental attribution bias (Ross, 1977) may be at play in these instances, biasing negotiators to blame their counterparts for previous failures and leading them to feel angry as a result.

Other scholars point to situational or cultural factors that lead more naturally to feelings of anger during negotiation. These factors would fall under the "causal antecedents" category of Attribution Theory. For instance, changing the framing of a situation by simply priming participants to be more

confrontational can cause negotiators to feel angry (Tamir & Ford, 2012; Tamir, Ford, & Gilliam, 2013). Independent self-construal (Zhang, Ting-Toomey, & Oetzel, 2014) and individualism (Betancourt, 2004a), which are highly correlated, can also lead to feelings of anger. Individuals from more collectivist cultures, on the other hand, are more likely to emphasize the attributional process of assessing whether or not their opponent's actions were intentional, before becoming angry. As further evidence of these findings, a study by Liu (2012) in which Chinese and American individuals engaged in hypothetical negotiations with undisclosed others showed that Americans are more likely than their Chinese counterparts to become angry when an opponent exhibits negative behavior. All of these findings could loosely be grouped under the "causal antecedents" portion of Attribution Theory, and even more specifically under the category of "causal rules." Both the framing of the situation and broader culture produce "rules" of acceptable behavior that can lead to attributions about whether a counterpart's behavior was fair, whether she/he could have anticipated the outcomes, and whether she/he actually had control over the situation.

In sum, Attribution Theory provides insight into the causes of anger in the negotiation context. Negotiators feel anger when they feel that their counterpart caused a negative outcome or when they feel that another's actions were unfair, but certain cultural backgrounds and contextual norms are more likely to nudge negotiators to feel anger than others. We will return to the topic of anger's antecedents in the section on future directions below.

Intrapersonal Effects of Anger

As with the antecedents of anger, relatively little research has been conducted on the *intra*personal effects of anger in negotiation. In the work that has been performed on this topic, some scholars have found that anger helps expressers by giving them enhanced negotiation ability, while others have found that expressing anger inhibits one's own thinking and likelihood of success in negotiation. Attribution Theory can provide insight into these findings as well, since the theory can be applied to both intrapersonal processes and interpersonal processes (Weiner, 2000). When an individual experiences anger, he may internally view it as a surprising event and try to make sense of its origin within himself. This sense-making process can yield various types of attributional conclusions and subsequent negotiation behaviors.

Most research on the intrapersonal effects of anger in negotiation conclude that anger hurts the angry individual. For instance, evidence suggests that anger affects negotiators' cognitive processes. Angry individuals think less clearly (Buck, 1991; Daly, 1991), and angry individuals can actually make errors in perceiving their own interests (Lerner, 2005). This decrease in focus during negotiation may be less a result of specific components of the attribution process and more a result of the process itself. Previous work has indicated that actually processing the anger occupies the angry individual's attention, causing the negotiator to pay less attention to the negotiation at hand and to his/her own goals (Daly, 1991). One example of such distraction occurs when angry negotiators tend to let their anger spill over into subsequent negotiations even though it is not warranted. This spillover effect ends up hurting the anger expresser's own negotiation outcomes (Lerner, 2005). Anger also causes individuals to engage in "flaming"—saying vulgar, unprofessional, or hostile words and phrases during negotiations (Johnson et al., 2009). Additionally, negotiators who are experiencing anger fail to present integrative offers to their counterparts (Liu, 2009), and even when they do achieve higher concessions from their counterparts, they end up less satisfied at the end of the negotiation than others who did not experience anger (Butt & Choi, 2006).

The literature suggests that these negative intrapersonal effects of anger can actually be overcome with certain causal antecedents. The first is power. When powerful negotiators experience anger in negotiation, it actually increases their ability to focus and be assertive, leading to better negotiation outcomes (Overbeck, Neale, & Govan, 2010). This may be because anger and power are closely associated, and

therefore, when experienced at the same time, anger is "less likely to produce cognitive disruptions" (Overbeck et al., 2010, p. 128). From an Attribution Theory perspective, anger is more understandable when one is also in a position of power and therefore engaging in the attribution process to understand one's own feelings of anger requires less cognitive effort and produces less distraction than anger in other circumstances.

To this point, I have discussed the benefits and drawbacks of experiencing anger. However, *experience* and *expression* can be two separate things, and it is important to highlight the potential intrapersonal benefits of expressing anger. Expressing anger in negotiation can be intrapersonally helpful when the individual feels such an intensity of anger that suppressing it actually decreases one's ability to focus and hurts negotiation performance (Shao, Wang, Cheng, & Doucet, 2015). This also makes sense given the cognitive effort argument discussed above. Given the causal antecedents at play, the behavior—either expression or suppression—that is most cognitively effortful will result in decreased negotiation performance.

Summary

The studies reviewed suggest that sometimes experiencing anger has negative intrapersonal consequences because cognitively processing and understanding one's own anger can be effortful and can cloud judgment during negotiation. However, experiencing and expressing anger can both have positive intrapersonal effects when the costs of actively suppressing it require too much cognitive effort or when one is in a position of high power and the experience of anger is congruent with that position and its behaviors.

Interpersonal Effects of Anger

The antecedents of anger have received relatively little attention in the literature, as compared to the question scholars have investigated in greater depth: How does the expression of anger affect one's counterpart? The broader anger literature finds that anger in diverse contexts can lead others to engage in reciprocal anger, revenge, and attempts to gain control of the situation (Izard, 1991) and can also lead anger recipients to feel threatened and experience significant cardiovascular changes (Van Beest & Scheepers, 2013). What do these effects look like in the negotiation context? Findings in the literature on anger within negotiation tend to fall into two basic camps. One camp of findings suggests that anger improves the outcome of a negotiation for the one who is angry (e.g., Sinaceur & Tiedens, 2006; Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004a). A second group of findings opposes this view, asserting that anger can severely hurt negotiation outcomes for the angry individual (e.g., Allred, 2000; Allred, Mallozi, Matsui, & Raia, 1997; Lerner, 2005). Once again, Attribution Theory can be used to help us sort out the moderators and processes that may be underlying these effects and bring these seemingly conflicting findings into a unified theoretical picture. Specifically, some studies point to causal antecedents that make anger more or less effective for negotiators, and other studies point to causal ascriptions that do the same. (For a summary of causal antecedents and ascriptions that influence positive or negative negotiation outcomes, see Table 1.) The following sections will therefore review the findings on when expressing anger helps and when it hurts, with specific subsections focusing on either causal antecedents or causal ascriptions.

When Anger Gets You a Better Deal

Causal Antecedents

Many scholars have shown empirically that displaying anger in a negotiation brings greater economic success to the angry individual and that anger causes the nonangry negotiator to offer greater concessions in the negotiation (Belkin, Kurtzberg, & Naquin, 2013; Butt & Choi, 2006; Lelieveld et al., 2011; Neale,

Table 1
Factors that Influence Interpersonal Outcomes of Anger Expression

Phase of attribution theory	Factors that result in positive outcomes for the anger expresser	Factors that result in negative outcomes for the anger expresser
Causal antecedents	Having high power	Having low power
	Balanced competitive/cooperative negotiation factors	Overemphasis of cooperative or competitive factors of negotiation
	Anger is directed at behaviors or offers	Anger is directed at one's own BATNA
	Negotiation is private	Negotiation is public
	Low time pressure	High time pressure
	Negotiation is not morally significant	Negotiation is morally significant
	Anger is perceived as situationally appropriate	The anger recipient has a powerful BATNA, has the option to negotiate with someone else, or has the option to deceive the anger expresser
	Anger recipient is European American	Anger spills over into future negotiations
		Negotiators have low interdependence
Causal ascriptions	Perceived toughness	Perceived selfishness
	Tracking—perceived as approaching one's reservation point	Perception of mistreatment
		Perception that anger is unjustified
		Perceived lack of benevolence
		Anger is perceived as fake and ascribed to strategy

2005; Sinaceur & Tiedens, 2006; Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004b; Van Kleef et al., 2004a; Wang, Northcraft, & Van Kleef, 2012). This section will review the causal antecedent factors that seem to be at play when anger is met with increased concessions from one's counterpart. As discussed previously, causal antecedents can be any situational factors or previous experiences that provide information to an individual about why a certain event may have occurred. In the case of anger expression during negotiation, the following situational factors serve as information to anger recipients. These factors help anger recipients make attributions about why their partner is expressing anger and why making concessions is the appropriate response to that anger.

One such factor is the situation's power dynamics. Lelieveld, Van Dijk, Van Beest, and Van Kleef (2012) showed that angry negotiators inflict fear on their counterparts and cause them to concede more than they would otherwise, but only when the anger expresser is in a position of higher power than his/her counterpart. The tendency of low-power individuals to make concessions to high-power anger expressions has been replicated several times (Van Kleef & Côté, 2007; Van Kleef et al., 2004b, 2006). Additionally, angry negotiators that are high in power tend to not only claim but also create more value in the negotiation (Overbeck et al., 2010).

The context of the negotiation can also affect the attributes made about the anger expressed. For instance, in two computer-mediated negotiation studies, Adam and Brett (2015) found that framing the context of the negotiation as competitive or cooperative influenced whether expressing anger resulted in eliciting concessions from one's counterparts. These scholars found that when both competitive and cooperative components of the situation were balanced, anger elicited the greatest concessions.

A broader contextual factor that influences attributions made about anger during negotiation is culture. Several scholars have begun to explore the cross-cultural effects of anger in negotiation over the past decade. Adam, Shirako, and Maddux (2010) found, for example, that European Americans concede more to angry opponents than do Asians, simply because European Americans view anger as more appropriate within negotiation settings than do Asians. Additionally, Liu (2009) found that Chinese negotiators become more competitive when either their counterparts or they themselves (2012) show anger, while individuals from other cultures do not necessarily react that way. Adam and Shirako (2013)

explored how cultural stereotypes affect anger within negotiation. They showed that those who hold the stereotype that Asians are less expressive than Europeans give *more* concessions to an angry Asian counterpart than to an angry European counterpart. Finally, while not specifically a cultural study, Van Kleef and Côté (2007) also found that anger elicits concessions only when it is perceived as situationally appropriate, which can be influenced by cultural factors (Adam et al., 2010) or organizational norms (Callister, Gray, Gibson, Schweitzer, & Tan, 2014).

The focus of one's anger is another variable that has been explored which can fall under the category of causal antecedents. Scholars have shown that when anger is directed at the behaviors (Steinel et al., 2008) or the offers (Lelieveld et al., 2011) of one's counterpart, rather than at the counterpart directly, it can be effective in soliciting concessions. This may be because anger directed at an offer conveys the idea that concessions will fix the anger and help the dyad reach a deal, but when anger is directed at the counterpart, the counterpart may feel that conceding will not solve the anger. This is consistent with Weiner's (1985) concept of "expectancy of success." Additionally, when negotiators show anger about low-priority issues and happiness on high-priority issues, integrative behavior increases in the interaction (Pietroni, Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Pagliaro, 2008). Once again, this is an example of the focus of anger providing valuable situational information in the causal antecedent step of Attribution Theory.

A few other situational factors that influence the interpretation of anger and subsequent counterpart behavior in negotiations include whether the negotiation is public or private. Pietroni, Van Kleef, Steinel, and Rumiati (2008) found that in email negotiations, private negotiations (where others are not carbon-copied) resulted in more concessions. This could have something to do with the interpreted appropriateness of expressing anger in public versus private contexts and subsequent attribution processes. Additionally, Van Kleef et al. (2004b) found that low time pressure (allowing more time to think) caused negotiation dyads to reach better outcomes in the presence of anger. Finally, Dehghani, Carnevale, and Gratch (2014) demonstrated that negotiators concede more to angry counterparts if the negotiation is not morally significant.

The studies reviewed above all point to potential causal antecedents that appear to affect subsequent attribution processes and result in concessions from one's counterpart when anger is expressed during negotiation.

Causal Ascriptions

As explained above, causal ascriptions follow causal antecedents in Attribution Theory (Weiner, 1985). During the causal ascription phase of attribution, a negotiator ascribes the anger expression to a cause—whether that cause is the difficulty of the task at hand, the anger expresser's strategy, the personality of the anger expresser, or something else. This section will review causal ascriptions of anger that have been empirically shown to lead to a better deal.

Some scholars have demonstrated that expressing anger leads one's negotiation counterpart to give greater concessions because the anger causes the nonangry negotiator to perceive his/her angry counterpart as "tough," or having tough limits. "Toughness" mediates the effects of expressed anger on concessions of the opponent (Sinaceur & Tiedens, 2006; Van Kleef & De Dreu, 2010). Other scholars point to a similar mediator known as "tracking," which occurs when the nonangry counterpart sees the anger of the other negotiator as a signal that she/he is coming closer to his/her reservation point (Van Kleef et al., 2004a). This causes the nonangry negotiator to ask for smaller concessions. In these studies, negotiators ascribed their counterpart's anger to his/her tough negotiation limits. Because anger recipients believed the anger was not a result of one's general poor character and was somewhat out of the expresser's control, *and* because they believed that conceding more would help accommodate their counterpart's tough limits and lead to an agreement (expectancy of success), they chose to engage in helping behavior and make concessions to their counterpart.

This tendency to engage in cooperative behavior by making more concessions to an angry negotiator persists even through the medium of instant messaging (Johnson & Cooper, 2015). Additional evidence

demonstrates that in multiround negotiations, negotiators ask for less in the second round of negotiations when their counterpart expressed anger in the first round (Van Kleef & De Dreu, 2010). Additionally, this cooperative tendency may be at play when negotiations that include anger expressions lead to more integrative behavior between counterparts (Pietroni, Van Kleef, De Dreu, et al., 2008; Pietroni, Van Kleef, Steinel, et al., 2008).

Summary

The research on anger in negotiation suggests that certain causal antecedents help angry negotiators get a better deal from their counterparts. These antecedents include being in a position of high power when expressing anger, negotiating in a culture where anger expression is interpreted as appropriate, focusing the anger on offers rather than on one's counterpart, negotiating in private, and expressing anger in negotiations that do not have moral significance to the other party. Additionally, when anger recipients ascribe their counterpart's anger to "tough negotiation limits" or being close to reaching their reservation points, they engage in more concessionary behavior.

When Anger Hurts

While many scholars have found that anger can produce positive negotiation results for the angry individual, there seems to be at least an equal quantity of evidence that anger can backfire on anger expressers in the form of lower concessions from one's counterpart, backlash from one's counterpart, and poor relational outcomes. This section will explore these findings—once again dividing them into categories of causal antecedents or causal ascriptions, based on how Attribution Theory helps to theoretically explain why these findings seem so contradictory to the findings just reviewed, where anger seems to help negotiators.

Causal Antecedents

As mentioned previously, power seems to play an important role in determining whether an anger recipient will react by giving greater concessions or by returning reciprocal anger. Although expressing anger helps high-power individuals to gain more concessions from their counterparts, low-power individuals experience the opposite effect. Low-power individuals that express anger are met with fewer concessions (Lelieveld et al., 2012).

Several scholars have also explored how opponents of angry negotiators engage in different concessionary behavior depending on various opportunities and alternatives available to them at the time, which is essentially a way to increase one negotiator's power compared to his/her counterpart (Overbeck et al., 2010). Negotiators who have better alternatives or better BATNAs (best alternative to a negotiated agreement) concede less to angry opponents than negotiators whose BATNAs are poor (Sinaceur & Tiedens, 2006). Framed differently, if the consequences of rejecting an angry individual's offer are low, counterparts of those angry individuals will concede less (Van Dijk, Van Kleef, Steinel, & Van Beest, 2008). Additionally, if an anger recipient is given the opportunity to deceive the anger expresser about some of the issues during negotiation, she/he tends to take advantage of that opportunity and then give fewer concessions, making anger backfire (Van Dijk et al., 2008).

The poor consequences of expressing anger are not limited to economic outcome but can also be extended to exclusion. Negotiators are likely to exclude anger expressers from coalitions when they have the option to do so (Van Beest et al., 2008). Additionally, even if negotiators are forced to work with an angry counterpart initially, they report that they are less likely to work with those anger expressers if they have other options in the future (Van Beest & Scheepers, 2013). This is consistent with other work that reports worse counterpart relationships following a negotiation for anger expressers than for happiness expressers (Pietroni et al., 2009).

Another causal antecedent that affects the outcome of anger in negotiations is the focus of one's anger. As explained previously, anger focused on a counterpart's behaviors (Steinel et al., 2008) or offers (Lelieveld et al., 2011) can be advantageous, but anger that is directed at one's negotiation counterpart does not increase concessionary behavior. Another type of misdirected focus occurs when negotiators express anger about their BATNAs. Angry individuals fared worse than individuals who displayed happiness, when the emotion was directed at the negotiator's "exit option," or BATNA (Pietroni et al., 2009). These scholars concluded that sometimes happiness brings greater rewards than anger. Finally, Lerner (2005) discovered that in multiple rounds of negotiation, anger can cause a "hangover" effect. Angry individuals, when confronted with the same negotiation partner a second time, continued to show anger toward that partner despite the fact that the cause of anger was in the past. This misdirected anger again resulted in fewer gains for the angry negotiator during the second round of negotiations, although she/he simultaneously felt more satisfaction about the outcome of the negotiation.

Contextual factors can also be responsible for anger resulting in poor negotiation outcomes. Adam and Brett (2015) found that when negotiation contexts were framed as either completely cooperative or completely competitive, anger did not elicit greater concessions from one's counterpart. Moreover, public negotiations in which outside parties have the opportunity to observe interactions result in fewer concessions when anger is expressed (Pietroni, Van Kleef, Steinel, et al., 2008). Concessions as a response to anger also decrease under time pressure because counterparts have less time to process the meaning of the anger (Van Kleef et al., 2004b). Anger is also not advantageous when the negotiation has moral overtones (Dehghani et al., 2014). In fact, Harinck and Van Kleef (2012) find that anger elicits retaliatory behavior when it is directed at value-laden issues. Moreover, Olekalns and Smith (2009) discovered that in contexts where negotiators had low interdependence, introducing anger into the negotiations increased the use of outright lying between parties. Anger also causes the other side to distrust the angry negotiator overall, which can lead to more competitive intentions (Liu & Wang, 2010).

Causal Ascriptions

Several causal ascriptions also seem to lead to poor outcomes in the presence of anger expression, including a failure of negotiation counterparts to compromise or settle at all (Friedman et al., 2004; Pillutla & Murnighan, 1996; Stein & Albro, 2001). A series of studies conducted by Yip and Schweinsberg (2017) suggest that the high likelihood for anger expressers to reach an impasse may be a result of counterparts inferring that the anger expresser is selfish—a causal ascription. Furthermore, angry negotiators can elicit covert retaliation from their counterpart, particularly when the counterpart feels mistreated because of the anger (Wang et al., 2012). This may stem from reciprocal anger that rises when anger is expressed. Reciprocal anger is especially likely to rise when the initial anger seems unjustified (Friedman et al., 2004).

As mentioned previously, relational outcomes are particularly important to negotiators, since negotiations in corporate, legal, and other settings often take place with the same individual multiple times. Negotiating repeatedly with the same individual or within the same community leads to the development of a reputation, which can have even broader social effects than simply ruining a relationship with one counterpart, since members of a community often share praise or criticism about past negotiation experiences with others in the community. Each negotiation relationship should therefore be guarded with care, and negotiators should pay particular attention to the long-term reputation they are developing as a negotiator. Recent research on relational outcomes demonstrates that anger in negotiations reduces counterparts' trust, because anger signals low benevolence (Belkin & Rothman, 2016). This trust can be very difficult to restore.

As we consider the topic of trust and perceptions thereof during negotiation, it is pertinent to acknowledge that the negotiation literature is broadly used by negotiation practitioners and by instructors of negotiation. The findings that extol the benefits of expressing anger in negotiation are therefore likely to influence at least some negotiation practitioners to express anger as a negotiation tactic,

especially since many individuals believe it is more ethical deceive a counterpart with their emotions than with incomplete or false information (Fulmer, Barry, & Long, 2009). This raises an entirely new question: What are the effects of inauthentic anger, when used as a strategy in negotiation?

Weiner (1985) asserted that *strategy* is one possible causal ascription, and two sets of scholars in recent years found that when anger is used as a strategy, counterparts do not respond with concessionary behavior (Côté, Hideg, & van Kleef, 2013; Tng & Au, 2014). In fact, if the counterpart can tell that their opponent's anger is "fake," they are likely to demand even more concessions from the angry individual than they would otherwise have requested (Côté et al., 2013). This effect is mediated by distrust.

Summary

The literature reviewed suggests that anger hurts negotiators just as often as it helps. Anger can actually lead to fewer counterpart concessions, exclusion from current or future negotiation opportunities, lowered trust, deception and lying from one's counterpart, and retaliation. This is especially true when certain causal antecedents are present, such as a low-power position for the anger expresser, promising alternatives for the anger recipient, anger that is directed at the other party rather than at their behaviors, time pressure, and low interdependence. These effects are also likely when the anger recipient ascribes their counterpart's anger to selfishness, low benevolence, or strategy, and when recipients feel mistreated or feel that the anger is unjustified. These antecedents and ascriptions should be carefully heeded by would-be anger expressers as they ascertain the benefits and costs of expressing this emotion during negotiation.

Future Directions

Up to this point, I have reviewed the interpersonal and intrapersonal (both positive and negative) effects of anger within the negotiation context. Attribution Theory has been a useful tool in explaining why such seemingly conflicting results exist in the literature. The literature to date has provided valuable insight for negotiation practitioners seeking to understand the potential risks and benefits of expressing anger during negotiation, but much remains to be carried out if scholars are to more completely understand and harness the power of anger to influence objective and subjective negotiation outcomes. This section will explore extant emotion theories, opportunities for theoretical testing, and methodological opportunities that can be useful for scholars continuing to explore anger's role in negotiation.

Theoretical Opportunities

Several emotion theories are ripe for testing and can provide powerful insight into the role of anger in negotiation. Opportunities to continue to use Attribution Theory in this work will be explained, as well as opportunities arising from theories that dive deeper into the psychological, organizational, and negotiation-specific processes that may assist anger scholars. I will begin with the opportunities that Attribution Theory provides.

As outlined in this review, the current literature has explored many different causal antecedents and causal ascriptions which affect the results of anger expression in negotiation. These have been explained using anger expression as the event that triggers the attribution process. However, one piece of Attribution Theory which could provide insight and which has only partially been explored is how such events, after being interpreted by the observer, lead to subsequent emotions within the anger recipient. True, several scholars have demonstrated that anger expression leads one's counterpart to feel reciprocal anger (e.g., Friedman et al., 2004; Van Dijk et al., 2008) or fear (Lelieveld et al., 2012), but other emotions found in Weiner's (1985) original theory have not been explored either interpersonally or intrapersonally as a consequence of anger. These include guilt, shame, gratitude, pity, hopefulness, and pride. Understanding how anger affects these emotional states and then affects subsequent negotiation outcomes

could help to explain more fully why sometimes anger helps negotiators get a better deal and other times it backfires. The relationship between anger and these emotions may prove to be a fruitful area for future exploration.

Perhaps even more important than understanding the single effect of anger on these emotions is the effort of understanding how emotional states change and influence one another in general throughout the course of a negotiation. Barry and Oliver (1996) proposed the Affect in the Negotiation Process (ANP) model, which addressed this very phenomenon—that is, the temporal nature of emotions, as well as the process of how emotions evolve throughout the course of a negotiation. These scholars divided the negotiation process into four temporal categories: prenegotiation, negotiation process, outcomes, and implementation. They proposed that affect was at play in each of the first three stages—anticipation affect (prenegotiation), experienced affect (during negotiation), and postnegotiation affect. According to their model, several situational factors lead to anticipation affect, which influences the choice of the opponent, the decision to negotiate, and prenegotiation expectations. These, in turn, lead to decisions about early negotiation tactics and behaviors, which influence experienced affect during negotiation. Experienced affect is related to late-stage tactics, outcomes, and outcome attributions, which in turn influence postnegotiation affect. And finally, postnegotiation affect influences satisfaction, desire for future interaction, and ultimately the implementation of the deal.

ANP has been underutilized as a theory that explains affect as a temporal construct that changes over time and influences tactics, behaviors, and perceptions at different stages of the negotiation process. While some of the propositions found in this model have been tested in the anger literature (such as the relationship between experienced anger and negotiation tactics), others remain untested (such as the temporal positioning of anger). To date, only two published papers investigate anger as an emotion that may change throughout the negotiation (Filipowicz et al., 2011; Sinaceur, Adam, Van Kleef, & Galinsky, 2013), and one paper has manipulated the timing of anger as a moderator (Yip & Schweinsberg, 2016). The preliminary results show that inconsistent displays of anger throughout the negotiation, as opposed to steady displays of anger throughout negotiations, lead to more concessions from the nonangry counterpart (Sinaceur et al., 2013) and to better relationships with the counterpart overall (Filipowicz et al., 2011).

All other studies reviewed (approximately fifty) treat anger as a one-time event or a steady emotion, which is completely inconsistent with the theoretical model presented by Barry and Oliver (1996). If the literature on anger in negotiation is to progress, it must begin treating anger as a fluid and fluctuating emotion, with diverse methods of presentation, and perhaps even cyclical or changing patterns throughout the negotiation. The timing of anger expression must also be directly examined. According to Barry and Oliver (1996), only this type of treatment can capture the real meaning of anger in real-world negotiations.

Related to the dynamic nature of anger in negotiation is the idea that anger can vary in intensity of expression "from slight irritation or annoyance to rage or fury" (Ekman & Friesen, 2003, p. 81). Although anger intensity has been studied in a broader organizational context (Gibson, Schweitzer, Callister, & Gray, 2009), to my knowledge, no research to date has directly investigated the effects of levels of anger intensity within negotiations. Even the broader literature on emotions has largely neglected this area of inquiry (Laukka, Juslin, & Bresin, 2005; Van Kleef & Sinaceur, 2013). For the emotion of anger, at least, the Dual-Threshold Model (DTM) of anger in organizations (Geddes & Callister, 2007) provides a compelling and rich theoretical framework from which anger researchers could build to understand the role of anger intensity. Although DTM speaks to anger in organizations more broadly, negotiation researchers can use its propositions to understand how anger intensity may influence different negotiation outcomes.

DTM proposes that felt anger can either be suppressed, expressed, or deviant (Geddes & Callister, 2007). When anger is suppressed, it is referred to as "muted anger" and is often hidden from those involved in the episode and instead expressed to organizational actors that are not directly related to the cause of anger (Geddes & Stickney, 2012; Stickney & Geddes, 2016). This often produces negative

organizational outcomes. However, certain factors, such as the intensity of the experienced anger, emotional expressiveness, and organizational cynicism can influence an individual to cross the "expression threshold" and express their anger (Geddes & Callister, 2007). DTM argues that expressed anger can actually lead to positive organizational outcomes, and recent work has indicated that expressed anger can lead to perceptions of improvement in the problematic situation (Stickney & Geddes, 2014). However, certain situational factors such as message characteristics, one's emotional intelligence, or observer attributions can take the expressed anger across the second threshold—the "impropriety threshold"—beyond which anger is perceived as inappropriate. When anger crosses this threshold, it is considered deviant and once again leads to poor organizational outcomes, particularly when it is met with sanctions from other organizational actors (Geddes & Stickney, 2011).

The impropriety threshold is a key contribution that DTM makes to the literature on anger in negotiation, because it can be very helpful in using an organizational perspective to explain why anger may sometimes lead to positive outcomes and other times lead to negative outcomes for negotiators.

Another emotion theory which has been used frequently in the past several years by scholars of anger in negotiation is the Emotion as Social Information (EASI) theory (Van Kleef, 2014). Like the Dual-Threshold Model, EASI is helpful in explaining why some expressions of anger might elicit cooperative behavior from one's counterpart while other anger expressions might elicit reciprocal anger and backlash. While DTM is focused on broader organizational factors and thresholds of expression intensity, the strength of EASI is that it provides insight into psychological mechanisms at play that determine diverse reactions to the same emotion (such as responding to anger with fear and submission versus reciprocal anger and aggression).

EASI asserts that when a negotiator displays an emotion, it leads to either an affective process or inference process within the negotiation counterpart (Van Kleef, 2014). These paths are not mutually exclusive, but the strength of each is influenced by the information processing motivation of the observer, as well as the perceived appropriateness of the emotion. An affective path leads the observer to engage in behavior that is symmetrical (i.e., to concede less to an angry negotiator because of feelings of reciprocal anger) and the inferential path leads the observer to engage in emotions and behavior that are asymmetrical (i.e., feeling fear and rewarding the angry negotiator with concessions because of inferences about his/her limits). EASI is uniquely suited to help scholars explain why the same emotion can elicit different responses in different situations. Unlike Attribution Theory, which assumes that information processing and inferential processes occur in every attributional interaction, EASI acknowledges that sometimes reactions are purely affective, and the theory provides an explanation for the circumstances under which these purely affective responses may occur.

Methodological Opportunities

To the credit of anger scholars, the current literature includes many diverse manipulations, measures, and methodological paradigms to investigate the role of anger in negotiations. However, many methodological opportunities remain. This section will explore future methodological directions that would help to solidify, validate, and extend current findings.

Research Design

First, a word about face-to-face negotiation is in order. According to a simple tally of articles or chapters dealing specifically with anger in negotiation, roughly 30% of published, empirical studies on anger are computer-mediated negotiation studies where the computer expresses anger with simple statements like, "This offer makes me really angry. I think I will offer. . ." and negotiation results are measured (e.g., Steinel et al., 2008). Results from computer-mediated studies have been replicated with other methods, such as face-to-face negotiations (e.g., Sinaceur & Tiedens, 2006), pictures (e.g., Pietroni, Van Kleef, De Dreu, et al., 2008; Pietroni, Van Kleef, Steinel, et al., 2008), and even surveys of full-time workers (e.g., Van

Kleef et al., 2006), so computer-mediated studies do have value and should not be discounted. Additionally, computer negotiations present a controlled environment and an easy way to manipulate expressed anger. However, we know from research in neuroscience that *seeing* expressions of anger in another individual is actually associated with greater activity in the orbitofrontal and anterior cingulate cortex of the brain (Blair, Morris, Frith, Perrett, & Dolan, 1999). Watching another person's behavior also stimulates the limbic system which is responsible for empathy and emotional contagion (Nummenmaa, Hirvonen, Parkkola, & Hietanen, 2008). So as a field, we should be careful to not let realistic visual and real-life stimulations become the exception in our work.

Leaving the visual aspect of anger out of negotiation research could leave scholars with skewed findings about how the expression of anger actually affects the response of the individual across the negotiation table from the one expressing the anger. Humans are very adept at measuring the intensity of a facial expression (Hess, Blairy, & Kleck, 1997), which is kept constant and "flat" in computer-mediated negotiations. If the rich aspects of anger were observed naturally (such as varying levels of intensity), theory suggests that scholars may begin to find curvilinear effects of anger on negotiation outcomes instead of linear effects (Geddes & Callister, 2007) To capture these possibilities and increase the external validity of our findings, scholars should seek to employ more face-to-face experimental designs whenever possible, where anger can be displayed and read naturally by negotiators and their counterparts. Even papers that use computer-mediated studies initially can follow up with at least one face-to-face negotiation experiment or field study to validate their results.

Another area of concern regarding research design in the literature is the manipulation of anger using confederates or individuals who are simply instructed to act angry. While these types of manipulations have been successful in finding significant results (e.g., Sinaceur & Tiedens, 2006), scholars should ask themselves whether this type of anger manipulation is authentic. The work reviewed previously that suggests that fake anger can be detected by counterparts and punished, rather than rewarded (Côté et al., 2013) should create some pause for anger scholars who are coaching or simply asking individuals to express anger during experiments. Perhaps manipulation checks that ask how much anger one actually felt would help scholars disentangle real versus fake anger in these contexts. More field studies where anger is naturally occurring and authentically experienced may also help to alleviate these concerns.

Additionally, in light of the experiments that have shown that anger affects future negotiation interactions (e.g., Becker, Cropanzano, & Goldman, 2014; Côté et al., 2013; Lerner, 2005; Van Kleef & De Dreu, 2010), scholars should seek to construct more experimental and even field research designs that examine a series of negotiation encounters. This idea aligns with the insights offered in the Bowles and Kray (2013) critique on the study of gender in negotiation. Bowels and Kray make the case that current experimental research models that use one-time negotiation encounters with completely quantifiable outcomes are unrealistic and do not reflect the true ongoing, relationally complex characteristics of negotiations in the organizational context. Using more series-negotiation experimental designs would help to clarify whether anger displayed over time affects relationships in a way that is overall positive or negative, which would help advance the discussion about the long-term costs and benefits of using anger as a negotiating tool.

Bowles and Kray (2013) also point out that current negotiation research operates with the assumption that negotiation outcomes are purely quantifiable, usually in a financial context. However, the work on subjective value in negotiation provides evidence that negotiators care equally about a host of issues aside from quantifiable outcomes (Curhan, Elfenbein, & Xu, 2006). The relationship with one's counterpart is one of these outcomes. In fact, as negotiator relationships continue over time, the relational outcomes of negotiation may prove to be even more important than the immediate quantitative ones. Since anger has been shown to affect relational outcomes like trust (Liu & Wang, 2010) and impressions of the opponent, (Côté et al., 2013; Van Beest et al., 2008), I join with other scholars in calling for more focus on social and relational outcomes of negotiations, as well as the material ones (Bowles, Babcock, & Lai, 2007; Curhan et al., 2006).

Measures of Anger

The current literature has very unstandardized measures, manipulations, and manipulation checks of anger. Most studies use a simple, self-report Likert scale to measure how angry an individual felt or how angry she/he perceived a counterpart to be. Current manipulations of anger frequently come from Van Kleef et al. (2004a) and include the simple statements mentioned above, often coming from a computer. Anger scholars need to design a more standardized measure for anger expressers to report their level of felt anger and for anger observers to report the anger observed in their opponent. Such measures could be used across studies to create some consistency, rather than scholars developing simple measures on their own for each study. Only when results can be compared across the literature in this way can progress really begin to be made. Moreover, current manipulations of anger must be examined for effectiveness, particularly as they come from a computer vs. from an in-person encounter.

That being said, too much emphasis on one measure of anger can cause undetected measurement errors to skew the direction of an entire body of work. This is where measures other than questionnaires can provide helpful triangulation of the measurement of anger. Such measures can provide more objective assessments of anger that do not rely on participant reports. Current practices that approach this idea are linguistic word counts of anger, based on the work of Pennebaker (Pennebaker, Francis, & Booth, 2001; Pennebaker, Mehl, & Niederhoffer, 2003), which allow for actual face-to-face interactions and have proven effective in a variety of contexts (Olekalns & Smith, 2009). Physiological measurements of anger can also be helpful as they increase in accuracy and availability. Neuroscientists and cardiologists have begun to understand what anger looks like in the brain (Denson, Pedersen, Ronquillo, & Nandy, 2009), and in the heart (Ironson et al., 1992). Neuroscience has also begun mapping what *responses* to a partner's anger looks like in the brain (Lelieveld et al., 2013; Ruz & Tudela, 2011). As technology advances, these methods may eventually provide a way to objectively measure anger with physiological responses from either the expresser, the recipient, or both.

Underexplored Questions

It became obvious as I reviewed the literature that some important questions remain unexplored regarding anger in negotiation. This section will offer some final insights into those areas that could use further exploration and which can provide fruitful opportunities for investigation.

Intrapersonal Effects

Relatively little work has been performed on the intrapersonal effects of anger in negotiation (Van Kleef, 2010). The majority of work on anger in negotiations has shown how the anger of one individual affects the actions of the counterpart, but that is only half of the story. I assert that more work is needed on the intrapersonal effects of anger in the negotiation context. How does anger affect the self-efficacy of the angry individual? How does it affect cognitive processes? How does it alter the way the angry individual perceives the actions or offers of his/her counterpart? The literature could use some expansion into these unknown areas to get a more complete picture of how anger affects negotiation.

Antecedents

Research on the antecedents of anger in negotiation largely ceased a decade ago, and most of the recent effort in the literature has been focused on understanding the effects of anger. This "effects-focused" literature treats anger as a *tool*, something that can be controlled and directed, almost assuming that individuals can deliberately choose which emotions to show and when to show them. However, as discussed previously, we know that if individuals attempt to fake anger, it produces negative negotiation outcomes for the anger-faking individual (Côté et al., 2013). This counters the idea that anger can just be used at will by negotiators. Instead it seems that we must begin to treat anger as something that occurs naturally and *may* be controlled or directed to produce positive outcomes. This being the case, scholars have a

strong reason to study the antecedents of anger more completely so that negotiators can anticipate naturally occurring emotions and have some insight about how to control them toward positive ends when they arise.

Gender

There have been substantial efforts within the broader negotiation literature to understand the role of gender in negotiation behaviors and outcomes (for reviews, see Bowles & McGinn, 2008; Stuhlmacher & Linnabery, 2013). While this work on gender has much room for improvement (Bowles & Kray, 2013), it has been invaluable in helping individuals within organizations understand how gender, gender stereotyping, and discrimination play into the context of negotiation. The research on anger within negotiation has not yet expanded to investigate issues of gender as a moderator of the effects of anger on negotiation performance and outcomes. Current anger research suggests that there are significant differences in how men and women express and regulate anger (Fischer & Evers, 2010). Therefore, bringing the topic of gender into this literature is an important and potentially fruitful area of further research.

Cross-Cultural Differences

While some work, which I have discussed previously, has been performed on cross-cultural differences of anger in negotiation, it is still fairly minimal. In a modern world of international trade, corporations need to know how different cultures might display, interpret, and respond to the emotion of anger. The current cross-cultural work in this area focuses on European Americans, Asian Americans, and Asians (Adam & Shirako, 2013; Adam et al., 2010; Liu, 2009, 2012). We must expand this work to include many different cultures and many new questions within the cross-cultural context. We need to answer (within the context of negotiation) questions like "How do different cultures perceive anger?" "How do they react to anger?" "How do they read anger?" "How does power interact with these effects across cultures?" Only then can we expand the knowledge about anger in negotiation to a broader, global audience.

Team Negotiations

Another recommendation for future directions in this literature is to expand our knowledge to team negotiations—both inter- and intra-team effects. Only two studies so far have addressed multiparty negotiations (Van Beest & Scheepers, 2013; Van Beest et al., 2008), and no studies have focused on actual team negotiations. I echo the call of other scholars who suggest that these areas could use expansion (Van Kleef & Sinaceur, 2013). We must learn what happens when one team member becomes angry, how anger affects intra-team processes, how teams display anger, and how anger affects intra- and inter-team information sharing, just to name a few. Teams and multiparty negotiations alike represent unexplored areas of research with great potential.

Disentangling Threat and Anger

A final opportunity for further exploration comes from Sinaceur, Van Kleef, Neale, Adam, and Haag (2011). This piece shows that "threat" mediates the relationship between anger and concessions from one's opponent. Scholars studying anger in general have already found that angry expressions cause the viewer to perceive threat from the angry individual (Adolphs, Russell, & Tranel, 1999; Whalen et al., 2001), but Sinaceur and his colleagues have now shown that anger and threat can be separated and that threat by itself is even more successful in eliciting concessions from a counterpart than anger. They assert that when threat is displayed without anger in a negotiation, the threatened party perceives that the threatening party has better control of his/her feelings and decisions.

It could be, then, that threat, as opposed to anger, is responsible for the positive outcomes of anger in negotiation, and that negotiators who are successful at isolating and using threat without anger can elicit these positive outcomes without simultaneously causing the negative results of anger. If this is the case, negotiators who employ threats without becoming angry may have the best of both worlds—higher

negotiation outcomes without the negative side effects of anger, although threat may have its own unpleasant list of side effects. This distinction deserves further exploration.

Conclusion

This article has reviewed the literature on anger within the negotiation context. Using Attribution Theory as a unifying framework, I have discussed the known antecedents of anger, the advantages and disadvantages of expressing anger, and possible areas for future research. Anger will likely continue to be one of the most salient emotions in negotiation. As such, it deserves continued scholarly attention as we attempt to explain its causes, manifestations, behaviors, and effects in this important context.

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.07.001

Adam, H., & Shirako, A. (2013). Not all anger is created equal: The impact of the expresser's culture on the social effects of anger in negotiations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*, 785–798. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032387

Adam, H., Shirako, A., & Maddux, W. W. (2010). Cultural variance in the interpersonal effects of anger in negotiations. *Psychological Science* (Sage Publications), *21*, 882–889. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610370755

Adolphs, R., Russell, J. A., & Tranel, D. (1999). A role for the human amygdala in recognizing emotional arousal from unpleasant stimuli. *Psychological Science*, *10*, 167–171. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00126

Allred, K. G. (1999). Anger and retaliation: Toward an understanding of impassioned conflict in organizations. In R. J. Bies, R. J. Lewicki & B. H. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research in negotiation in organizations*, Vol. *7* (pp. 27–58). U.S.: Elsevier Science/JAI Press.

Allred, K. G. (2000). Anger and retaliation in conflict: The role of attribution. In M. Deutsch & P. T. Coleman (Eds.), *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (pp. 236–255). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Allred, K. G., Mallozzi, J. S., Matsui, F., & Raia, C. P. (1997). The influence of anger and compassion on negotiation performance. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, *70*, 175–187. https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1997.2705

Barry, B., Fulmer, I. S., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2004). I laughed, I cried, I settled: The role of emotion in negotiation. In M. J. Gelfand & J. M. Brett (Eds.), *The handbook of negotiation and culture* (pp. 71–94). Stanford, CA: Stanford Business Books.

Barry, B., & Oliver, R. L. (1996). Affect in dyadic negotiation: A model and propositions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *67*, 127–143. https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1996.0069

Becker, W. J., Cropanzano, R., & Goldman, B. M. (2014). Subjective value during sequential negotiations: The mediating effect of anger. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, *1*, 11908. https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2014.82

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.

Belkin, L. Y., & Rothman, N. B. (2016). Emotional displays and partner trust in negotiations: The role of benevolence and unpredictability. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, *1*, https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2016.13006abstract.

Betancourt, H. (2004a). An attribution-empathy approach to conflict and negotiation in multicultural settings. In M. J. Martinko (Ed.), *Attribution theory in the organizational sciences: Theoretical and empirical contributions*. U.S.: Information Age Publishing.

Betancourt, H. (2004b). Attribution-emotion processes in white's realistic empathy approach to conflict and negotiation. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *10*, 369–380. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327949pac1004_7.

Blair, R. J. R., Morris, J. S., Frith, C. D., Perrett, D. I., & Dolan, R. J. (1999). Dissociable neural responses to facial expressions of sadness and anger. *Brain*, *122*, 883–893.

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.

Bowles, H. R., & Kray, L. J. (2013). Negotiation is a man's game: Ultimate truth or enduring myth? *Gender & Work: Challenging Conventional Wisdom. Research Symposium in honor of 50 years of women MBA*. Harvard Business School Press.

Bowles, H. R., & McGinn, K. L. (2008). Untapped potential in the study of negotiation and gender inequality in organizations. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *2*, 99–132.

Buck, N. L. (1991). Grief reactions and effective negotiation. *Negotiation Journal*, *7*, 69–86. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1571-9979.1991.tb00603.x

Butt, A., & Choi, J. (2006). The effects of cognitive appraisal and emotion on social motive and negotiation behavior: The critical role of agency of negotiator emotion. *Human Performance*, *19*, 305–325. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1904_1

Callister, R. R., Gray, B., Gibson, D. E., Schweitzer, M., & Tan, J. S. (2014). Anger at work: Examining organizational anger norms impact on anger expression outcomes. In O. B. Ayoko, N. M. Ashkanasy, & K. A. Jehn (Eds.), *Handbook of conflict management research* (pp. 270–287). London, U.K.: Edward Edgar Ltd.

Côté, S., Hideg, I., & van Kleef, G. A. (2013). The consequences of faking anger in negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *49*, 453–463. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.12.015

Curhan, J. R., Elfenbein, H. A., & Xu, H. (2006). What do people care about when they negotiate? Mapping the domain of subjective value in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 493–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.3.493

Daly, J. P. (1991). The effects of anger on negotiations over mergers and acquisitions. *Negotiation Journal*, *7*, 31–39. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1571-9979.1991.tb00600.x

Davidson, M. N., & Greenhalgh, L. (1999). The role of emotion in negotiation: The impact of anger and race. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, *7*, 3–26.

Dehghani, M., Carnevale, P. J., & Gratch, J. (2014). Interpersonal effects of expressed anger and sorrow in morally charged negotiation. *Judgment and Decision Making*, *9*, 104–113.

Denson, T. F., & Fabiansson, E. C. (2011). The effects of anger and anger regulation on negotiation. In J. P. Forgas, A. W. Kruglanski & K. D. Williams (Eds.), *The psychology of social conflict and aggression* (pp. 139–152). New York: Psychology Press.

Denson, T. F., Pedersen, W. C., Ronquillo, J., & Nandy, A. S. (2009). The angry brain: Neural correlates of anger, angry rumination, and aggressive personality. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *21*(4), 734–744. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2009.21051

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (2003). *Unmasking the face: A guide to recognizing emotions from facial clues*. Los Altos, CA: Ishk.

Filipowicz, A., Barsade, S., & Melwani, S. (2011). Understanding emotional transitions: The interpersonal consequences of changing emotions in negotiations. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *101*, 541–556. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023545

Fischer, H., & Evers, C. (2010). Anger in the context of gender. In M. Potegal, G. Stemmler, & C. Spielberger (Eds.), *International handbook of anger* (pp. 349–360). New York, NY: Springer.

Fisher, R. J., Grant, P. R., Hall, D. G., Keashly, L., & Kinzel, R. (1990). The development and testing of a strategic simulation of intergroup conflict. *Journal of Psychology*, *124*, 223–240. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1990.10543219

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

Fulmer, I. S., Barry, B., & Long, D. A. (2009). Lying and smiling: Informational and emotional deception in negotiation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *88*, 691–709. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9975-x

Geddes, D., & Callister, R. R. (2007). Crossing the line(s): A dual threshold model of anger in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*, 721–746. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2007.25275495

Geddes, D., & Stickney, L. T. (2011). The trouble with sanctions: Organizational responses to deviant anger displays at work. *Human Relations*, *64*(2), 201–230. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726710375482.

Geddes, D., & Stickney, L. T. (2012). Muted anger in the workplace: Changing the "sound" of employee emotion through social sharing. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. E. J. Hartel & W. J. Zerbe (Eds.), *Experiencing and managing emotions in the workplace: Research on emotion in organizations* (Vol. *8*, pp. 85–102). Bingley, U.K.: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Gibson, D. E., & Callister, R. R. (2010). Anger in organizations: Review and integration. *Journal of Management*, *36*(1), 66–93. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2002.tb00597.x

Gibson, D. E., Schweitzer, M. E., Callister, R. R., & Gray, B. (2009). The influence of anger expressions on outcomes in organizations. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *2*, 236–262. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-4716.2009.00039.x

Harinck, F., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2012). Be hard on the interests and soft on the values: Conflict issue moderates the effects of anger in negotiations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *51*(4), 741–752. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02089.x

Hess, U., Blairy, S., & Kleck, R. E. (1997). The intensity of emotional facial expressions and decoding accuracy. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *21*(4), 241–257. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024952730333

Ironson, G., Taylor, C. B., Boltwood, M., Bartzokis, T., Dennis, C., Chesney, M., et al. (1992). Effects of anger on left ventricular ejection fraction in coronary artery disease. *The American Journal of Cardiology*, *70*(3), 281–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-9149(92)90605-X

Izard, E. (1991). *The psychology of emotions*. New York, NY: Springer Science & Business Media.

Johnson, N. A., & Cooper, R. B. (2015). Understanding the influence of instant messaging on ending concessions during negotiations. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *31*, 311–342. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2014.1001285

Johnson, N. A., Cooper, R. B., & Chin, W. W. (2009). Anger and flaming in computer-mediated negotiation among strangers. *Decision Support Systems*, *46*, 660–672. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2008.10.008

Laukka, P., Juslin, P., & Bresin, R. (2005). A dimensional approach to vocal expression of emotion. *Cognition & Emotion*, *19*(5), 633–653. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930441000445

Lelieveld, G. J., Van Dijk, E., Güroğlu, B., Van Beest, I., Van Kleef, G. A., Rombouts, S. A., et al. (2013). Behavioral and neural reactions to emotions of others in the distribution of resources. *Social neuroscience*, *8*(1), 52–62.

Lelieveld, G., Van Dijk, E., Van Beest, I., Steinel, W., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2011). Disappointed in you, angry about your offer: Distinct negative emotions induce concessions via different mechanisms. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*, 635–641. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.12.015

Lelieveld, G., Van Dijk, E., Van Beest, I., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2012). Why anger and disappointment affect other's bargaining behavior differently: The moderating role of power and the mediating role of reciprocal and complementary emotions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*, 1209–1221. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212446938

Lerner, J. S. (2005). Negotiating under the influence. *Negotiation Journal*, 3–5.

Liu, M. (2009). The intrapersonal and interpersonal effects of anger on negotiation strategies: A cross-cultural investigation. *Human Communication Research*, *35*, 148–169. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2008.01342.x

Liu, M. (2012). Same path, different experience: Culture's influence on attribution, emotion, and interaction goals in negotiation. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *22*, 97–119. https://doi.org/10.1075/japc.22.1.06liu

Liu, M., & Wang, C. (2010). Explaining the influence of anger and compassion on negotiators' interaction goals: An assessment of trust and distrust as two distinct mediators. *Communication Research*, *37*, 443–472. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650210362681

Lovell, H. G. (1952). The pressure lever in mediation. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, *6*, 20–30.

Martinovski, B. (2010). Emotion in negotiation. In D. M. Kilgour and C. Eden (Eds.), *Handbook of group decision and negotiation* (pp. 65–86). Netherlands: Springer.

Neale, M. A. (2005). Emotional strategy. *Negotiation Journal*, 3–5.

Nummenmaa, L., Hirvonen, J., Parkkola, R., & Hietanen, J. K. (2008). Is emotional contagion special? An fMRI study on neural systems for affective and cognitive empathy. *NeuroImage*, *43*(3), 571–580. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.08.014

O'Connor, K. M., & Arnold, J. A. (2001). Distributive spirals: Negotiation impasses and the moderating role of disputant self-efficacy. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *84*, 148–176. https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2000.2923

Olekalns, M., & Druckman, D. (2014). With feeling: How emotions shape negotiation. *Negotiation Journal*, *30*, 455–478.

Olekalns, M., & Smith, P. L. (2009). Mutually dependent: Power, trust, affect and the use of deception in negotiation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *85*, 347–365. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9774-4

Overbeck, J. R., Neale, M. A., & Govan, C. L. (2010). I feel, therefore you act: Intrapersonal and interpersonal effects of emotion on negotiation as a function of social power. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, *112*, 126–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.02.004

Pennebaker, J. W., Francis, M. E., & Booth, R. J. (2001). *Linguistic inquiry and word count: LIWC 2001* (p. 71). Mahway: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pennebaker, J. W., Mehl, M. R., & Niederhoffer, K. G. (2003). Psychological aspects of natural language use: Our words, our selves. *Annual review of psychology*, *54*, 547–577. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145041

Pietroni, D., Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. W., & Pagliaro, S. (2008). Emotions as strategic information: Effects of other's emotional expressions on fixed-pie perception, demands, and integrative behavior in negotiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*, 1444–1454. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.06.007

Pietroni, D., Van Kleef, G. A., Rubaltelli, E., & Rumiati, R. (2009). When happiness pays in negotiation. *Mind & Society*, *8*, 77–92. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11299-008-0047-9

Pietroni, D., Van Kleef, G. A., Steinel, W., & Rumiati, R. (2008). Chiudo la porta e m'arrabbio! Gli effetti interpersonali delle emozioni nelle trattative pubbliche e private. *Psicologia Sociale*, *3*, 409–424.

Pillutla, M. M., & Murnighan, J. (1996). Unfairness, anger, and spite: Emotional rejections of ultimatum offers. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, *68*, 208–224. https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1996.0100

Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, *10*, 173–220. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60357-3

Russell, J. A., & Fehr, B. (1994). Fuzzy concepts in a fuzzy hierarchy: Varieties of anger. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 186.

Ruz, M., & Tudela, P. (2011). Emotional conflict in interpersonal interactions. *NeuroImage*, *54*(2), 1685–1691. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.08.039

Schieman, S. (2010). The sociological study of anger: Basic social patterns and contexts. In M. Potegal, G. Stemmler, & C. Spielberger (Eds.), *International handbook of anger* (pp. 329–348). New York, NY: Springer.

Shao, B., Wang, L., Cheng, D., & Doucet, L. (2015). Anger suppression in negotiations: The roles of attentional focus and anger source. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *30*, 747–758. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-014-9392-3

Shu, L., & Roloff, M. E. (2006). Strategic emotion in negotiation: cognition, emotion, culture. In G. Riva, M. T. Anguera, B. K. Weiderhold & F. Mantovani (Eds.), *From communication to presence: Cognition, emotions and culture towards the ultimate communicative experience* (pp. 169–188). Amsterdam: IOS Press.

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. https://doi.org/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. https://doi.org/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. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023896

Stein, N. L., & Albro, E. R. (2001). The origins and nature of arguments: Studies in conflict understanding, emotion, and negotiation. *Discourse Processes*, *32*, 113–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2001.9651594

Steinel, W., Van Kleef, G. A., & Harinck, F. (2008). Are you talking to me?! Separating the people from the problem when expressing emotions in negotiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*, 362–369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2006.12.002

Stickney, L. T., & Geddes, D. (2014). Positive, proactive, and committed: The surprising connection between good citizens and expressed (vs. suppressed) anger at work. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *7*, 243–264. https://doi.org/10.1111/ncmr.12040

Stickney, L. T., & Geddes, D. (2016). More than just "blowing off steam": The roles of anger and advocacy in promoting positive outcomes at work. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *9*, 141–157. https://doi.org/10.1111/ncmr.12071

Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Linnabery, E. (2013). Gender and negotiation: A social role analysis. In M. Olekalns & W. L. Adair (Eds.), *Handbook of research on negotiation* (p. 221). Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Tamir, M., & Ford, B. Q. (2012). When feeling bad is expected to be good: Emotion regulation and outcome expectancies in social conflicts. *Emotion*, *12*, 807–816. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024443

Tamir, M., Ford, B. Q., & Gilliam, M. (2013). Evidence for utilitarian motives in emotion regulation. *Cognition & Emotion*, *27*, 483–491. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2012.715079

Thompson, L., Medvec, V. H., Seiden, V., & Kopelman, S. (2001). Poker face, smiley face, and rant 'n' rave: Myths and realities about emotion in negotiation. In M. A. Hogg & S. Tindale (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Group processes* (pp. 139–163). U.S.: Blackwell Publishers.

Thompson, L. L., Wang, J., & Gunia, B. C. (2010). Negotiation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *61*, 491–515.

Tng, H. Y., & Au, A. K. (2014). Strategic display of anger and happiness in negotiation: The moderating role of perceived authenticity. *Negotiation Journal*, *30*, 301–327.

Van Beest, I., & Scheepers, D. (2013). Challenge and threat responses to anger communication in coalition formation. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *38*, 50–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2012.10.005

Van Beest, I., Van Kleef, G. A., & Van Dijk, E. (2008). Get angry, get out: The interpersonal effects of anger communication in multiparty negotiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*, 993–1002. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.02.008

Van Dijk, E., Van Kleef, G. A., Steinel, W., & Van Beest, I. (2008). A social functional approach to emotions in bargaining: When communicating anger pays and when it backfires. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*, 600–614.

Van Kleef, G. A. (2010). Don't worry, be angry? Effects of anger on feelings, thoughts, and actions in conflict and negotiation. In M. Potegal, G. Stemmler, & C. Spielberger (Eds.), *International handbook of anger* (pp. 545–559). New York, NY: Springer.

Van Kleef, G. A. (2014). Understanding the positive and negative effects of emotional expressions in organizations: EASI does it. *Human Relations*, *67*, 1145–1164.

Van Kleef, G. A., & Côté, S. (2007). Expressing anger in conflict: When it helps and when it hurts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 1557–1569. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1557

Van Kleef, G. A., & De Dreu, C. W. (2010). Longer-term consequences of anger expression in negotiation: Retaliation or spillover? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*, 753–760. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.03.013

Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. W., & Manstead, A. R. (2004a). The interpersonal effects of anger and happiness in negotiations. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *86*, 57–76. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.86.1.57

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

Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. W., Pietroni, D., & Manstead, A. S. (2006). Power and emotion in negotiation: Power moderates the interpersonal effects of anger and happiness on concession making. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *36*, 557–581.

Van Kleef, G. A., & Sinaceur, M. (2013). The demise of the 'rational' negotiator: Emotional forces in conflict and negotiation. In M. Olekalns & W. L. Adair (Eds.), *Handbook of research on negotiation* (pp. 103–131). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Van Kleef, G. A., van Dijk, E., Steinel, W., Harinck, F., & van Beest, I. (2008). Anger in social conflict: Cross-situational comparisons and suggestions for the future. *Group Decision & Negotiation*, *17*, 13–30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10726-007-9092-8

Wang, L., Northcraft, G. B., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2012). Beyond negotiated outcomes: The hidden costs of anger expression in dyadic negotiation. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, *119*, 54–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2012.05.002

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, *92*, 548–573.

Weiner, B. (2000). Intrapersonal and interpersonal theories of motivation from an attributional perspective. *Educational Psychology Review*, *12*, 1–14.

Whalen, P. J., Shin, L. M., McInerney, S. C., Fischer, H., Wright, C. I., & Rauch, S. L. (2001). A functional MRI study of human amygdala responses to facial expressions of fear versus anger. *Emotion*, *1*, 70–83.

White, R. K. (1977). Misperception in the Arab-Israeli conflict. *Journal of Social Issues*, *33*, 190–221. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1977.tb01875.x

Yip, J. A., & Schweinsberg, M. (2017). Infuriating impasses: Angry expressions increase exiting behavior in negotiations. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550616683021

Zhang, Q., Ting-Toomey, S., & Oetzel, J. G. (2014). Linking emotion to the conflict face-negotiation theory: A U.S.–China investigation of the mediating effects of anger, compassion, and guilt in interpersonal conflict. *Human Communication Research*, *40*, 373–395. https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12029

David A. Hunsaker is a PhD Candidate in the David Eccles School of Business at the University of Utah. Much of his work focuses on both the inter- and intra-personal effects of anger expression in negotiation, paying particular attention to how anger influences both objective and subjective negotiation outcomes. He also has work on ethics, moral emotions, and impression management.