# The Editor's Desk

Finally, in what seems to be another milestone in a long pathway, the first issue of *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research* is now in your hands. As the official publication of the International Association for Conflict Management, the journal is closely tied to our goals as an organization, and represents the initiative and efforts of numerous individuals over the last few years, as well as the creativity and scholarly skill of our authors, and the dedication of our editors, editorial review board, and our mentors.

As you will see elsewhere in the journal, *NCMR* publishes fundamental research that focuses on theory and research on conflict and conflict management across levels, including organizational conflict, interpersonal conflict, and inter-group conflict, and across a range of domains including environmental conflict, crisis negotiations, political conflict, and cross-cultural conflict, as well as formal and informal third party intervention, including mediation and arbitration. The journal welcomes both full-length theory and empirical papers, as well as shorter "research notes," and diverse methods and approaches.

This first issue is one that exemplifies our focus, although necessarily limited in topics and methodology by constraints imposed by the number of papers that can appear in any one issue. This issue includes scenario studies as well as laboratory experiments, and represents a cross section of disciplinary approaches. Papers in this issue address negotiation, the teaching of negotiation skills, and also papers that fall under the broader rubric of conflict, focusing on important constructs such as trust, reputations, and envy. If there is a common theme for this issue, it may be in how we construct our realities and the implications that follow, through the use of social comparisons (Moran & Schweitzer), social norms (Krueger, Massey, & DiDonato), and folk lore (Gino & Moore; Sanchez-Burks, Neuman, Ybarra, Kopelman, Park, & Goh).

The well-crafted paper by Moran and Schweitzer, "When Better Is Worse: Envy and the Use of Deception" reports two complementary studies—a scenario study and a laboratory experiment—that explore the role of envy in motivating deception. As a construct, envy has received very little scholarly attention, and thus this paper is likely to inspire more research on this—perhaps the most human—of all emotions. Because the context of negotiation itself is one where it would be difficult, if not impossible, to avoid social comparisons, the implications are likely to be quite important. Quite simply, they found that social comparisons triggered envy which in turn promoted deception in negotiations. As one reviewer noted, this "…manuscript reports on (an) important departure in negotiation research; namely, investigating the relationships between a discrete emotion of envy and deception in negotiation and decision making." By providing a solid explanation of the underlying process through which this occurs, Moran and Schweitzer have put in place a solid foundation for the rest of us to join their party in the study of envy.

Volume 1, Number 1, Pages 1–2

Krueger, Massey, and DiDonato's paper, "A Matter of Trust: From Social Preferences to the Strategic Adherence to Social Norms," formally derives propositions based on the widely studied "trust game" and then empirically explores reactions of subjects. This is potentially a very powerful mode of analysis which requires serious reflection and hard work to provide the formal specification yet also incorporates the psychological realism of the model's underlying assumptions. Their results indicated that although self-interest certainly is a factor, people will adhere to social norms to the extent that it enhances their own self-image or their reputation as moral beings. The paper has much to commend it. It is interesting, innovative, and interdisciplinary in its approach.

In this issue, you also will find "Why Negotiators Should Reveal Their Deadlines: Disclosing Weaknesses Can Make You Stronger," a paper by Gino and Moore. Somewhat counterintuitively, the authors demonstrate that revealing one's time pressures can work *for* a negotiator, rather than having time pressure force them to a premature or suboptimal outcome in a negotiation. Using a laboratory study, these authors found that confirming tight deadlines sped concessions, resulting in higher outcomes. Yet perhaps the more important lesson from the paper is that this finding was very much counter to the logic of the participants themselves. Participants were quite sure that revealing their deadlines would damage their position, yet had they only attempted to walk in the shoes of their counterpart, perhaps they would have recognized this error.

The paper by Sanchez-Burks, Neuman, Ybarra, Kopelman, Park, and Goh also tackles folk wisdom, but in this case, the seemingly unshakable belief in some cultures (Americans) that relationship conflict will not hinder task performance. In "Folk Wisdom About the Effects of Relationship Conflict," the authors present a nice series of studies. Despite years of evidence that relationship conflict in teams does, in fact, detract from group performance, Americans simply appear to find the effect implausible, exhibiting what the authors refer to as an optimistic bias, relative to East Asians. This paper adds to our knowledge of cultural beliefs about conflict, and raises questions about how we can proactively improve task performance in culturally diverse groups.

In closing, I want to thank all of the people who helped to make this first issue a reality. Despite a few nights of what Roy Lewicki refers to as "white page fever," their efforts, enthusiasm, and support has been essential to the process of producing our first issue.

Judi McLean Parks
Editor