The Editor's Desk

In our last issue, the papers addressed the disconnect between empirical realities and folk wisdom. In that issue, we saw that individuals rely—apparently erroneously—on folk wisdom and base their negotiation strategies and conflict understandings on misinformation. This is one reason why it is so very important that we effectively translate our research into strategies and principles whereby we can more effectively teach individuals how to better negotiate, to better understand conflict situations, and how to recognize some of the myths of conflict resolution.

Helping us to make that translation, the bridge between our first issue and this one is performed admirably in the invited paper entitled ''Stretching the Effectiveness of Analogical Training in Negotiations: Teaching Diverse Principles for Creating Value.'' The bridge, of course, is the teaching of negotiation skills, in order to avoid a reliance on folk misinformation as the papers in our last issue highlighted and from this issue, how to avoid the perpetuation of past failures through the way they influence integrative negotiation outcomes and strategies, to understand the emergent and dynamic processes underlying the unfolding of a negotiation, and to understand the potential benefits and costs of behaving in a way that runs counter to gender stereotypes.

In their paper, Moran, Bereby-Meyer, and Bazerman demonstrate the superiority of learning very general negotiation principles by comparing a diverse set of strategies, as opposed to focusing on more narrow specific strategies. Regardless of whether or not learners had previous exposure to the broad principles, by learning broad concepts, performance was enhanced. Given the importance of conflict resolution skills in a wide variety of contexts, understanding better how those skills are effectively acquired is important. Certainly, this perspective on teaching negotiation skills can find some of these general negotiation principles in the collected papers of these two issues.

''Emergent Negotiations: Stability and Shifts in Negotiation Dynamics'' is not only thought provoking, but provides a strong theoretical platform to launch future research on negotiation dynamics. As the old adage goes, there is nothing like a good theory. In their well-argued paper, Olekalns and Weingart creatively integrate theory to focus on the dynamics of negotiations—how the dance between negotiators unfolds as they change their strategies in response to one another. The authors articulate three factors that drive this process, including the strategy sequencing, the specific phases of the negotiation, and the congruence of negotiator goals. Further, they argue the importance of the multiple levels where the negotiation dance takes place.

''The Effect of Past Performance on Expected Control and Risk Attitudes in Integrative Negotiations'' (Kray, Paddock, & Galinsky) addresses an interesting question: do individuals who have a history of unsuccessful negotiation negotiate and assess risks differently than those who have a history of successful negotiations? In their three studies, they find that the effect of performance priming from a past negotiation influences

integrative negotiation outcomes and strategies, such that past successes promote strategic risk taking (disclosure), while past failures promote contractual risk (e.g., contingent contracts). By acknowledging in their research that negotiations do not occur in a vacuum, these authors focus on how past successes and failures affect both the amount and type of risk which negotiators are willing to assume.

''Making a Positive Impression in a Negotiation: Gender Differences in Response to Impression Motivation'' (Curhan & Overbeck) stands to make a contribution to both the literature on negotiation and on stereotyping. The data provided by these authors suggest that the motivation to make a positive impression may lead to stereotype reactance—in other words, negotiators will attempt to act counter to stereotypic gender roles. The paper extends the literature on stereotype reactance, demonstrating that impression motivation as well as an awareness of stereotype content can also cause stereotype reactance. The data suggest that the results of counter-stereotypic actions are a mixed bag for negotiators. As the authors note, ''…women who occupy high-status positions can benefit instrumentally from impression motivation, but may pay relationally; whereas men in the same positions can benefit relationally, but pay instrumentally.'' Males' attempts to counter the instrumental masculine stereotype make a positive impression. But females' attempts to counter the ''softer'' feminine stereotype results in a negative evaluation. Sometimes life just is not fair.

The fifth and final paper in this issue is a reprint of the classic paper by Thomas Schelling, which first appeared half a century ago in the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. As a Lifetime Achievement Award Winner for the ''International Association for Conflict Management''—the journal's sponsoring association—we wanted to introduce young scholars to this landmark paper. Daniel Druckman (himself a Lifetime Achievement Award Winner) kindly agreed to write a preface to the paper summarizing key ideas that Schelling has contributed to the field. As Druckman notes, ''The shelf-life of an idea can only be assessed with the passage of time. It has been 50 years since Tom's *JCR* article appeared. In that time we have come to appreciate the way tacit bargaining has influenced a number of popular themes in our literature.…Yet, despite their influence, original ideas often surface in a different way or acquire new labels in later work. For this reason, we thought that the new generation of *NCMR* contributors and readers would benefit from its inclusion.'' Indeed, they will.

In closing, I want to thank all of our authors, reviewers, editors, and staff for their help in getting this, our second issue, out the door. I think that you will agree that the journal is off to a great start. Thank you all.

Judi McLean Parks
Editor