

CHAPTER FIVE

Enemies, Allies, and Emotions

The Power of Positive Emotions in Negotiation

Daniel L. Shapiro

In 1991, a man named Cyril Ramaphosa received an invitation from a friend to join him for a weekend of fly fishing. Cyril loves to fly fish. He readily agreed to the invitation. Three hours into their road trip, Cyril's host informed him that Roelf Meyer and his family would be joining them for lunch on Saturday.

These events would be of little interest to most people, if not for the fact that Cyril Ramaphosa was South Africa's chief negotiator for the African National Congress and Roelf Meyer was the Deputy Minister of Constitutional Affairs for the then-ruling National Party. Two weeks later, these two men would be negotiating some of the most contentious issues involved in the transition to a multiracial, democratic South Africa.

On that Saturday afternoon in 1991, however, Roelf asked Cyril to teach his sons and him how to fly fish. They were in the outback of South Africa, far away from the politics of everyday life. They had an enjoyable several hours until Roelf miscast. A hook stuck in his hand. He looked up at Cyril and asked, "What do you do now?"

"Let's go see my wife," Cyril said. "She's a nurse."

Cyril's wife attempted to disengage the hook, but without success.

Cyril knew what had to be done. He gave Roelf a big glass of brandy and said, "OK. Drink this. Look away, and trust me." He pushed the hook through Roelf's hand and got it out.

Approximately two weeks later, these two men found themselves on opposite sides of some key negotiation issues. Over the years, the National Party had imprisoned a number of political resisters to apartheid, including African National Congress leader Nelson Mandela and many of his colleagues. By 1991, many of those prisoners were released—but not all of them.

The National Party was willing to release the political prisoners in return for an explicit end to the African National Congress's armed struggle. The African National Congress wanted the prisoners released, but refused to consent to a *quid pro quo*. The purpose of its armed struggle was to have the political prisoners released, and it would not cease that struggle until the prisoners were, in fact, released. Essentially, the African National Congress's message was: Once political prisoners are released, then we will cease our armed struggle.

The National Party was faced with a choice: Should it cease negotiating with the African National Congress and face continued armed resistance? Or should it release the prisoners and trust that the African National Congress would live up to its word and stop its armed struggle?

Roelf leaned forward over a table and whispered in Cyril's ear, "I hear you saying, 'Trust me.'"

"Exactly," Cyril replied.

Roelf ordered release of the prisoners, and one week later the African National Congress announced an end to its armed struggle.¹

Whether in negotiation of large-scale political issues or of everyday conflicts between colleagues or spouses, emotions have the potential to impede or facilitate a wise agreement. Tension like that between the pro-apartheid government and the anti-apartheid African National Congress can act as a major barrier to agreement. Distrust, fear, and suspicion may create a climate of animosity and paranoia. Yet the emotions that bond people—such as the friendly affection and enthusiasm between Cyril Ramaphosa and Roelf Meyer—can help facilitate peaceful agreement between divided individuals or groups.

In this chapter, I argue that negotiators neither can get rid of emotions nor should they try. I describe two important negotiating goals: *affective satisfaction* (the extent to which negotiators are happy with how they felt in a negotiation) and *instrumental satisfaction* (the extent to which negotiators believe their substantive goals and desires are met in a negotiation). I then review evidence suggesting that emotions can be used to reach each of these negotiating goals. Finally, I describe *how* a negotiator can act constructively on *relational identity concerns*,² thus stimulating positive emotions in a negotiation and, in turn, bringing one closer to one's negotiating goals.

WHAT IS AN EMOTION?

Although people often have a good sense of what emotions are, defining them is not as easy.³ Researchers and philosophers have proposed hundreds of definitions.⁴ For purposes of this paper, I define an emotion not as a distinct biological entity but rather as an "emotional syndrome," a constellation of common characteristics with none defining its essence.⁵ Symptoms of an emotion that often occur

together include a distinct facial expression, a unique subjective feeling, a pattern of physiological arousal, and a readiness to act in ways that promote one's well-being.⁶ For example, the emotion of anger may include a hostile glare, an "explosive" feeling in one's body, heightened physiological arousal, and a readiness to attack the person perceived to be blameworthy for an offense.⁷

GET RID OF EMOTIONS? WE CAN'T

Imagine you are working late one night at the office. A junior colleague knocks on your door. You invite him in. He looks nervous.

"What's on your mind?" you ask.

"I need your advice."

"Sure. What's up?"

"Tomorrow morning, for the first time, I'm going to be the lead negotiator for our team. I'm really nervous about this. It's a complicated case, and I've prepped for weeks now. But I'm not sure how to deal with the emotions in the negotiation—mine or theirs. What's your advice?"

I sometimes pose this hypothetical question to groups I am training in negotiation. I ask the workshop participants to take a moment and write down what advice they would give to this young colleague. Whether the participants are diplomats, politicians, lawyers, or business people, a majority of participants typically respond, "I'd tell my young colleague: 'Don't get emotional,'" or something similar. They explain that the young colleague should not worry. Rather than get emotional, he should keep a straight face and stay "rational." He should focus on the substantive issues. Participants in my workshops tend to see emotions as an impediment to good negotiating.

Their advice is neither helpful nor humanly possible. Emotions are unavoidable. As human beings, we cannot extract emotions from our interactions. We are in a state of "perpetual emotion,"⁸ always experiencing some affective state or another. We may feel any of a long list of emotions, whether boredom, excitement, fear, sadness, surprise, disgust, confusion, interest, or nostalgia. The causes and effects of emotions are often unavoidable.

Causes of Emotions in a Negotiator

Emotions can be stimulated in a multitude of ways. There are, of course, neurological, biological, and genetic factors that contribute to the excitation of emotions.⁹ People with bipolar disorder, for example, find that their mood fluctuates between episodes of extreme excitement and extreme depression. It is likely that a combination of genes, acting together, contribute to this disorder.¹⁰

During a negotiation, there are a limited number of actions we can take to reduce the negative impact of neurological, biological, and genetic triggers on

our behavior. If we know that our mood sours when we are hungry or tired, we can be sure to eat and get a good night's rest before negotiating. But these actions cannot redress moment-to-moment obstacles that arise in the negotiation, and we usually do not have control over these variables in the other negotiator. We can suggest when to break for lunch or quit working for the day. But we cannot force our counterpart to eat or sleep at our command. Therefore, it is advantageous to consider three "social variables" that stimulate emotions. We can affect these variables in the moment and independent of the other party, and such action can affect the emotions of each party.

The *context* surrounding negotiators elicits emotions. The junior negotiator charged with leadership of his team may feel a surge of anxiety upon walking into the other team's office. The context of negotiating in the other team's office may heighten his feelings of insecurity. If the actual meeting becomes tense, he may suggest that they continue conversation in a more informal context such as over lunch, or he may call for a short coffee break to reduce rising tensions.

Emotions also may be stimulated by *our own thoughts and feelings*. We may think, "I forgot to prepare the financial reports for today's meeting!" Anxiety then appears in full force. To calm such emotions, we can "talk back" to ourselves, telling ourselves, "Forgetting to do the memo is not the end of the world. Just let everyone know it won't happen again."

A final, related trigger of emotions is how we *interpret the actions of the other negotiator* toward us. If, for example, the other says to us, "Oh, I thought you went to private school instead of to a relatively unremarkable state institution," we may take offense—and feel emotions such as anger or frustration. A simple reinterpretation of the situation can change our emotions, such as if we hypothesize that he or she feels insecure in status and is trying to "prove" his or her competence.

Effects of Emotions on a Negotiator

Emotions have an impact on us in four ways. First, emotions affect our *physiology*. When we are angry, our heart rate increases and we sweat more than when we are calm. If we are fearful, blood rushes to our arms and legs, an evolutionary response that can help us escape from a potentially dangerous situation. When impassioned, our heart rate increases and we may sweat. Harrer and Harrer monitored the heart rate of the famous conductor Herbert von Karajan. On landing his private jet at Salzburg Airport, his heart rate rose. It increased further when he was instructed to make an emergency takeoff just after landing. And it rose even more while he conducted passages of Beethoven's "Leonora Overture No. 3."¹¹

Second, emotions affect our *cognition*. When we are frustrated, we tend to think negative thoughts.¹² When we are happy, we are more likely to think positive thoughts. Strong emotions also tend to narrow the scope of our thinking.

When we are angry at someone, it is hard to think about anything or anyone other than that person. We experience tunnel vision.

Third, emotions have an associated *action tendency*.¹³ An action tendency is a proclivity to behave in a particular kind of way. An emotion readies us for changes in the way we interact with our environment.¹⁴ When angry, we may want to attack the other person, whether through words or action. When embarrassed, we may want to hide our faces and ourselves from others. In this sense, an action tendency does not “cause” us to act in any one way or another. Rather, it prepares us for a particular activity. If a negotiator demeans you and you feel angry, you may experience an action tendency to attack the other person or insult her or him back. Though your action tendency prepares you to strike out at the other, you may decide not to act on it.

Fourth, emotions affect a negotiator’s *subjective feeling*. Each of us experiences the sensation of emotions in a unique way. For some of us, the feeling of anxiety may be experienced as a “knot in the stomach,” while for others it may be “butterflies” or a feeling of tightness in the shoulders. The subjective experience is our personal, physical feeling of the emotion.

The Two-Way Interaction Between Effects and Causes of Emotions

Each of the four effects of emotion—physiology, cognition, action tendency, and subjective feeling—is also a possible cause of emotion. The more you think negative thoughts, the more likely you will feel sad.¹⁵ The happier you feel, the more positive your thoughts will be.¹⁶ Thus, each effect of emotion is also a possible stimulant of emotion and a part of the actual emotional experience.

EMOTIONS CAN HELP US REACH NEGOTIATION GOALS

For a negotiator, emotions can be a source of strength or vulnerability. They affect our ability to reach two important goals: affective satisfaction and instrumental satisfaction. Negotiators who deal effectively with emotions increase their ability to reach each of these goals.

Two Goals of a Negotiation

The first goal, *affective satisfaction*, focuses on your general level of satisfaction with the emotions you experience during the negotiation.¹⁷ To what extent do you feel satisfied with your emotional experience during the negotiation? Affective satisfaction is a measure of your meta-emotions, which are your feelings about your feelings.¹⁸ If the other party insults you to such a degree that you boil with anger and storm out of the room, you may later admit that the interaction left you feeling affective dissatisfaction. If, conversely, the other party

treated you with due deference, you may have negotiated with enthusiasm and later recognized your sense of affective satisfaction.

When a third party is involved—whether an agent, mediator, or facilitator— affective satisfaction is perhaps most important for the principal parties, who are responsible for committing to and sustaining the terms of agreement. However, affective satisfaction is also important for the agent, because positive emotions can facilitate creative thinking, a good working relationship, and other factors that are helpful for joint problem solving.¹⁹

The second goal, *instrumental satisfaction*, measures the extent to which substantive work requirements are fulfilled.²⁰ If South African negotiators Cyril Ramaphosa and Roelf Meyer walked away from their negotiations with buckets of good feelings but few new ideas about how to deal effectively with their issues, the meeting might be considered an affective success but an instrumental failure.

'Til Death Do Us Part: Positive Emotions Aid Affective Satisfaction

The valence of an emotion—whether it is positive or negative—has an impact on the extent to which a negotiator reaches his or her goals. Positive emotions are those that feel pleasant, whereas negative emotions are those that feel unpleasant.²¹ Positive emotions often help us feel more affective satisfaction than do negative ones.

Negative Emotions Reduce Affective Satisfaction. How we deal with emotions can have a tremendous impact on our affective satisfaction in a negotiation. For evidence that this is true, one needs look no further than to the research of John Gottman, a professor from the University of Washington in Seattle. He studies some of the most challenging negotiations on earth—those between a husband and wife.

Couples enter his “love lab,” where they are asked to discuss a topic of chronic conflict, such as family finances, the distribution of household chores, divergences over drinking or smoking habits, or relations with in-laws. While the couple interacts, sensors monitor their heart rate and blood pressure. A video camera records their facial expressions, noting the slightest grimace or smirk. After the interaction, a researcher meets privately with each spouse, and they view the video of the marital interaction. The spouse then discloses his or her personal thoughts and feelings experienced during the interaction.

Through a sophisticated method of statistical analysis, Gottman can take fifteen minutes of the interaction between husband and wife and predict, with more than 90 percent accuracy, which couples will remain married and which will divorce within a few years.²² Gottman has found that four ineffective behaviors are predictive of divorce:²³

- *Criticism* of the other's character (for example, "You're late again. Why do you only think of yourself?")
- Expressions of *contempt* (for example, rolling one's eyes while the other speaks)
- *Counterattack* (for example, "I may not always get to the house chores on time, but I'm not nearly as lazy as you!")
- *Stonewalling* (for example, hiding behind the newspaper while ignoring the other's bid to talk)

Each of these four behaviors stimulates negative emotions. Over time, these negative emotions can accumulate into a general sense of affective dissatisfaction with the relationship, which can motivate divorce.

Another line of research looks into the question of whether or not *expressing* negative emotions leads to affective satisfaction. Is venting a good thing? One school of thought argues that venting helps us overcome negative emotions. It suggests that people are like a boiling kettle: we need to let out steam before our emotions get too hot. Otherwise we will explode, yelling at colleagues, displacing anger onto innocent family members, or doing something else that we later will regret. In contrast, a second school of thought argues that venting reinforces our current negative emotions. According to this school, as we spill out our hatred about "that jerk" or "that crabby coworker," we harden our negative feelings about the other person, sometimes to the extent that we feel self-righteous. As a result, we become *more* distressed, not less.

There is evidence that each school of thought has some truth. The confusion stems from the fact that the expression of negative emotions is both a *sign of distress* and a *possible means of coping with that distress*.²⁴ Expressing negative emotions is adaptive to the degree that it helps deal with the distress. At one end of the spectrum, imagine a situation in which a negotiator decides not to make a big deal out of her counterpart's demeaning remarks toward her, but to ensure that her resentment does not spill into her future interactions with the counterpart, she discusses her anger in private with a colleague. She comes to some sense of understanding that her counterpart may not have meant harm by his statements. Contrast that with a situation in which a negotiator rants and raves at another negotiator who says something disrespectful.²⁵ The negotiator may intend to get things "out into the open" in order to "clear the air," but such venting heightens relational tension. Thus, expressing negative emotions, if not done carefully, runs a serious risk of reducing our affective satisfaction and that of the other.

Positive Emotions Generate Affective Satisfaction. The flipside of Gottman's findings on divorce is that enlisting positive emotions into a negotiation can contribute to affective satisfaction. In fact, Gottman has been able to quantify

the ratio that differentiates happy couples from unhappy ones. A couple is more likely to divorce if the ratio of their positive to negative interactions dips below five to one. That means that even in stable, happy relationships, people still complain. Yet for every criticism or negative comment, there are at least five appreciative statements. Over time, these positive interactions create a reservoir of positive emotions, which offsets the negative impact of hurt feelings.

Positive Emotions Tend to Aid Instrumental Goals

For most of us, we do not negotiate just to feel good. We have substantive interests, and we want to have them satisfied. Emotions can help us reach our instrumental goals. But should we try to stimulate positive or negative emotions? While there is a useful place for both, the scales tip toward the positive.

Negative Emotions: For One-Time, Distributive Deals. You want to sell your 1993 Toyota. It has been a part of your “family” for many years, but you are ready for a new car. A man responds to the ad you placed in the local paper: “1993 Toyota for sale. \$2000.” The man arrives at your home, examines the car, and offers you \$200, one-tenth of your asking price. Will expressing outrage at his offer scare him into giving you a concession, or will it harden him against your interests? If three conditions are met, the strong expression of negative emotions—whether anger, guilt, embarrassment, or the like—can enhance a negotiator’s outcomes.

First, strongly expressing negative emotions can enhance an outcome if a good relationship with the other side is unimportant to reaching your instrumental and affective goals. In terms of instrumental satisfaction, intimidating or threatening another may improve your substantive interests if you have no need or interest in a positive long-term relationship with the other side. In the markets of Morocco, for example, a traveler might act outraged at the seller’s high price for a candle. Anger can let the other know the gravity of your demands and your genuine willingness to walk away from the agreement. However, scaring or “guilt-ing” the other to make concessions can affect an ongoing relationship. If others feel mistreated by you, they will be less motivated to work with you. And when cooperation is necessary, it may be given begrudgingly, if at all.

A negotiator’s affective satisfaction must also be unaffected by the relationship quality. If a negotiator’s own values, morals, or ethics are inconsistent with the action of coercion, the negotiated outcome may be instrumentally satisfying but not affectively rewarding. For example, coercing the other party may help you reach your monetary goals, but at a cost to your own emotional well-being. Thus, when judging the importance of a relationship, a negotiator should consider both the instrumental and affective consequences of disregarding the relationship quality.

The second condition upon which emotional coercion can be a workable strategy is if the negotiated issues are zero-sum. For example, anger can be an effective strategy in persuading others to concede to your demands *if* the issues at hand are purely distributive in nature. More for one party means less for the other. In this circumstance, strategic advantage rests with the party who is better able to cause the other to feel fear, impotency, or indebtedness.

Research offers evidence to support the short-term benefits of anger expression in a zero-sum, one-time negotiation. In a recent study, participants acted as sellers who bargained via computer simulation with a buyer over the price, warranty, and service contract of a cell phone.²⁶ Participants were unaware that, in reality, there was no buyer, but rather a computer program that made offers and counteroffers. After some of the rounds, the buyers received information about the sellers' emotions, such as "This offer makes me really angry" or "I am happy with this offer." Participants evaluated the seller's offer and intentions, then adjusted their demands to try to reach an agreement. Results of the study confirmed that bargainers make lower demands and larger concessions with an angry customer than with a happy one.

The design of this buyer-seller study arguably met each of the basic conditions within which expressing strong negative emotions yields higher instrumental gains. The phone deal was assumedly a one-time transaction, so the seller presumably had little reason to care about the long-term relationship with the other party. The transaction occurred without any face-to-face contact, further reducing either's care for a long-term relationship. And each of the two issues was quantifiable and zero-sum. A better price or longer warranty for one comes at a greater cost for the other.

The third condition upon which emotional coercion can be a workable strategy is if the other negotiator has a weak BATNA (Best Alternative To a Negotiated Agreement).²⁷ It is much more effective for you to influence another when you and they both know that their BATNA is weak. The two of you share a clear understanding that, if agreement is not reached, the cost for them is high. Moreover, if you have a strong BATNA, that further advances your negotiating power.

Positive Emotions: Because There's Usually More to a Negotiation Than Just Distribution. Positive emotions, just like negative ones, can be used to reach instrumental goals. However, the circumstances for their optimal use are different. Positive emotions are best stimulated when two conditions are met:

1. *The Relationship Is Important.* Many negotiators undervalue the importance of relationships in a negotiation. With a good relationship, two negotiators may feel freer to share information, trust one another, communicate their interests, understand the interests of the other, and brainstorm about possible agreements for mutual gain.²⁸

Furthermore, in an ongoing relationship, how you treat the other *now* may affect their decision about how to treat *you* in the future.²⁹ If you deceive them

and they find out, they may be less likely to trust your word in the future. Perhaps more troubling, they may assume that you have established a norm that deception is acceptable—and follow your lead.

2. *The Issues Involve Opportunities to Create and Distribute Value.* Positive emotions are most helpful when a situation involves not only distributive issues but also the potential for creating options that meet each side's interests. Compared to those in a neutral mood, negotiators in a positive mood reach more optimally integrative outcomes and use less aggressive tactics.³⁰ Positive emotions elicit problem solving, creative brainstorming of ideas, and empathy for the perspective of the other parties.³¹

Whereas a zero-sum negotiation excludes creative thinking, more complex circumstances allow parties to think about ways of addressing their quantitative and qualitative interests. Rather than assuming that issues such as security and status are purely distributive, a negotiator in a positive mood is more likely to realize that such issues can be enhanced for each party.³² Two neighboring, disputing countries need not argue over security as though more for one means less for the other. Through creative problem solving, they may be able to create ways for both countries to have a high degree of security.

Positive emotions can improve parties' ability to distribute value in the negotiation. Parties can work side-by-side in designing a process that each deems fair for distributing the value that has been created. Hence, each party has some control over the process for distributing the value that has been jointly created.

On Balance, Negative Emotions Are Risky Business

While negative emotions can help a negotiator reach his or her goals, the risks involved preclude their use as a wise general strategy.

Negative Emotions Can Get in the Way of Clear Thinking. Stimulating negative emotions can come at a heavy price.³³ Anger and other negative emotions are linked to inaccurate judgments and reduced concern for the other parties' preferences.³⁴ Negative emotions may lead us to act in ways that are counter to our own instrumental goals. We may reject an ultimatum that is superior to our alternatives,³⁵ or we may replace our original instrumental goals with new goals focused on attacking the person who triggered our anger.³⁶ For example, two companies meet for months and discuss the details of merging. Only weeks before the merger is to happen, Nancy and John, the chief executive officers, meet to discuss details. John senses that Nancy does not value the culture of his organization. He feels insulted, because *he* spent the last five years of his life primarily building his company's culture. Nancy does not back down from her critique, which angers John to the extent that he calls off the whole deal, despite the financial benefits to each company.

Furthermore, if we stimulate negative emotions in the other, we put ourselves at risk of "catching" those negative emotions, just as one can catch a cold from being

around a sneezing friend. Emotions are contagious, especially when intense. Our mood may deteriorate to the point that we become emotionally hijacked.³⁷ Thinking takes a backseat to emotions, and we risk engaging in behavior we will later regret.

Positive emotions rarely run these same risks. While we want to check that we are not being manipulated by positive emotions, few negotiators complain that their negotiations are being sidetracked because people are “too happy.” Nevertheless, before committing to a decision, we do want to draw on information supplied by our reasoning and our emotions. Otherwise, negotiators risk making an inefficient exchange of items due to their affinity for one another and consequently failing to maximize value-creating opportunities.³⁸

Most Negotiations Involve Conditions Aided by Positive Emotions, Not Negative Ones. Good relations between colleagues are increasingly important in many contexts. Diplomats, politicians, lawyers, academics, and organizational workers often interact with a small, stable network of colleagues.³⁹ Whereas organizations traditionally have been hierarchically structured, many are now introducing team-based work. Employees increasingly negotiate with colleagues rather than having decisions made by superordinates. By building good relationships, employees improve their ability to deal well with interpersonal differences.⁴⁰

Negotiators easily can fall for the trap of thinking that a negotiation is a one-time, zero-sum interaction, even when there are possibilities for value creation and relationship building.⁴¹ For example, let us return to the study of the participants acting as sellers of the price, warranty, and service contract of a cell phone.⁴² The external validity of the study can be called into question. In a real-life transaction, the buyer and seller would be wise to recognize their shared strategic incentive to care about their long-term relationship. What happens, for example, if the phone breaks? A strong relationship between the buyer and seller might improve the efficiency with which the problem is dealt. Rather than each party threatening the other, they may be able to efficiently and amicably problem-solve their differences, perhaps by having the buyer’s phone replaced with a new or refurbished one. The buyer gets a functional phone, and the seller’s reputation and customer relations are enhanced.

Given the risks of negative emotions and the benefits of positive ones, the best general advice for a negotiator is to stimulate positive emotions in oneself and in those with whom one negotiates.

To Stimulate Positive Emotions, Focus on Relational Identity Concerns

Some people assume that emotions “happen to them.” They are passive recipients of the internal ebbs and flows of their emotions. They have no control over whether they feel happy, sad, nervous, or enthusiastic.

This assumption is wrong.

You Can Stimulate Emotions in Yourself and Others. While it is true that emotions can result from biological or physiological changes in our bodies, scientific research now makes it clear that *we* have a great deal of power to affect the emotions we feel. We can induce emotions in ourselves and in others.⁴³

The successful car salesperson has known about the power of emotions for a long time. You walk to the car lot, and immediately he builds rapport with you, tells you a joke, and tries to personalize the conversation. He is trying to *get you in a good mood*. He is a mood inducer. Without being aware of what is happening, you may be the victim of his emotional manipulation.

“You have kids?” he asks.

“Yes,” you answer.

“Me, too. This is a great car for the kids. Comfortable. Safe.”

If you do not stay aware of your emotions, you may feel unduly persuaded by the salesperson’s opinion. He has kids, and so do you. You assume that you must share the same incentive: to protect the safety of children. But it also may be the case that the salesperson has an incentive to sell the car as quickly as possible to make room for next year’s models. You would be wise to consider upon what objective data his opinion is based. How does the safety or comfort of this car compare statistically with that of other similar cars? With awareness of your emotions and his incentives, you can listen to the opinion of the car salesperson, use what information he offers as data, and search out additional data from which to make a wise decision.

The Power of Relational Identity Concerns. Emotions are not simply reactions to a particular behavior or situation. They often serve a forward-looking communicative function: they give others (and ourselves) a signal about our likely intentions. A negotiator who expresses anger may be communicating the message “Take my concerns seriously or else I’m walking away from this negotiation—even if it’s to my substantive detriment!” The look of fear on a colleague’s face may signal “Help me! Protect me from being crushed by the other party!”⁴⁴

During a negotiation, many of our concerns are about our perceived identity in relation to the other party. Is the other treating us the way we expect or desire to be treated? I refer to this category of concerns as *relational identity concerns*.⁴⁵ They are “concerns” because we experience a felt desire to have them satisfied. They are “identity concerns” because the concerns focus on our desire to maintain a positive sense of self. And they are “relational identity concerns” because in different relationships, the degree of satisfaction required to address these concerns varies. For example, a negotiator may have little need to “have things my way” in marital decisions. At work, that same negotiator may desire a great deal of autonomy over decisions being made, asserting his or her opinion strongly on virtually every issue.

Two factors have consistently converged as essential to understanding and measuring interpersonal behavior.⁴⁶ While these concerns are known by many different names with subtly different meanings,⁴⁷ I term these two dimensions “autonomy” and “affiliation.”⁴⁸

Autonomy is the freedom to act without the imposition of others. Negotiators’ behavior can be considered autonomous when they act in accordance with internalized, personally accepted principles and not in response to coercion or pressure from others.⁴⁹

A negotiator’s initial concern for autonomy often arises early in the negotiation process. Who proposes the agenda? Who initiates conversation? Who listens, who talks, and who interrupts? To what extent does each party consult the other before making decisions?

Affiliation is the interpersonal closeness or distance that one party feels toward another. To what extent do parties feel a sense of connection, bonding, and “us-ness”? Do parties work side-by-side as a team, or do they sit across the table from one another as adversaries? Who feels included? Who does not?

You can stimulate positive emotions from the outset of a negotiation by constructively addressing people’s relational identity concerns. If you respect these relational identity concerns—ensuring that you and others receive an appropriate degree of autonomy and affiliation—then positive emotions can result.

For example, rather than *telling* the other party your demands, you may respect the party’s autonomy by asking his or her advice on the issues facing each of you.⁵⁰ You might build affiliation with your counterpart by getting his or her recommendations on how the two of you could work jointly to deal with your differences. These types of actions will tend to stimulate enthusiasm and cooperation in you and in others. Joint work will become more efficient, more effective, and more amicable than if you haggle as adversaries over the issues facing each of you.⁵¹

APPLYING THE RELATIONAL IDENTITY CONCERNS FRAMEWORK: BACK TO SOUTH AFRICA

With the relational identity concerns framework in mind, let us revisit the situation between Cyril Ramaphosa and Roelf Meyer, the leaders who helped to negotiate many of the contentious issues regarding transition to a multiracial, democratic South Africa. During their meeting in the outback of South Africa, only two weeks prior to their negotiations, what did they say and do to address each other’s relational identity concerns, thereby enlisting positive emotions?

They built affiliation in several ways. First, Cyril and Roelf jointly engaged in the activity of fly fishing. Their shared experience of trying to catch fish became a basis

for their assumption that they could function well as a team. Second, their meeting took place in the outback of South Africa, far away from the eyes and ears of constituents who might disapprove of these two men meeting under such cordial circumstances. They could converse candidly without fear of ostracizing themselves from their constituents. Thus, each man got to know the other on a personal level and could assess the other's integrity and trustworthiness. Third, Cyril treated Roelf like family. After Roelf got the hook stuck in his hand, Cyril called his wife for support. This action demonstrated Cyril's care for Roelf. Cyril did not want to see Roelf in pain. Cyril's action enhanced the felt affiliation between the two of them.

Each man also respected the autonomy of the other. There was no presumption that, because Roelf was white or a member of the ruling party, Cyril *must* teach him how to fly fish. He did not demand that Cyril teach him. The request came in the form of a friendly inquiry. Roelf *asked* Cyril to teach him how to fly fish, thus allowing each man to preserve his autonomy.

Roelf and Cyril also enlisted positive emotions in one another by relinquishing some of their own autonomy to the other. This was a courageous move of trust and vulnerability. For example, Roelf willingly relinquished some of his autonomy by allowing Cyril to force the fish hook through his hand. Roelf trusted that Cyril would not abuse his expanded autonomy, and Cyril did not let him down. It was this same dynamic of trust that Roelf and Cyril replicated at the negotiation table during their critical negotiations. Roelf had to decide whether or not to release African National Congress prisoners in hope that the African National Congress would stop its armed struggle a week later. Roelf whispered in Cyril's ear, "I hear you saying, 'Trust me.'" Cyril and Roelf had an implicit understanding that each would stand true to his word and would not impinge upon the other's autonomy. The prisoners were released one week later.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, I proposed that emotions are an essential, irreplaceable ingredient in any negotiation. Getting rid of emotions is not possible and not desirable. Positive emotions can be used to help us reach our instrumental and affective goals in a negotiation. We can stimulate positive emotions in negotiators by dealing constructively with people's relational identity concerns, specifically for autonomy and affiliation.

Notes

1. This story was told by Cyril Ramaphosa to Bruce Patton at a workshop given by the Harvard Negotiation Project in 1991, available at the Harvard Negotiation Project Website, forthcoming.
2. See D. L. Shapiro, "Negotiating Emotions," *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 2002, 20(1), 67-82.

3. See B. Fehr and J. A. Russell, "Concept of Emotion Viewed from a Prototype Perspective," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 1984, 113, 464-486.
4. For a recent set of definitions, see J. Van Brakel, "Emotions: A Cross-Cultural Perspective on Forms of Life," in W. M. Wentworth and J. Ryan (eds.), *Social Perspectives on Emotion*, Vol. 2 (Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1994).
5. See J. R. Averill, "Emotions Unbecoming and Becoming," in P. Ekman and R. J. Davidson (eds.), *The Nature of Emotions: Fundamental Questions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).
6. See R. R. Cornelius, *The Science of Emotion: Research and Tradition in the Psychology of Emotions* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1996); and N. H. Frijda, *The Emotions* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
7. See R. S. Lazarus, *Emotion and Adaptation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).
8. See D. L. Shapiro, "Negotiation Residuals: The Impact of Affective Satisfaction on Long-Term Relationship Quality," *Program on Negotiation Papers*, no. 00-3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Program on Negotiation Books, 2000).
9. See N. R. Carlson, *Physiology of Behavior* (8th ed.) (Boston: Pearson, 2004).
10. See S. E. Hymen, "Introduction to the Complex Genetics of Mental Disorders," *Biological Psychiatry*, 1999, 45(5), 518-521.
11. See G. Harrer and H. Harrer, "Music, Emotion, and Autonomic Function." In M. Critchley and R. A. Henson (eds.), *Music and the Brain* (London, U.K.: Heinemann, 1977), pp. 202-215.
12. See A. Ellis, "Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy," in R. Corsini and D. Wedding (eds.), *Current Psychotherapies* (6th ed.) (Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 2000).
13. See Frijda, *The Emotions*, 1986.
14. See N. H. Frijda, "Emotions and Hedonic Experience," in D. Kahneman, E. Diener, and N. Schwarz, *Well-Being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1999), p. 197.
15. See Ellis, "Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy," 2000.
16. See Ellis, "Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy," 2000.
17. See Shapiro, *Negotiation Residuals*, 2000. The concepts of affective and instrumental satisfaction are similar to the concepts of procedural and distributive justice; see N. A. Welsh, "Perceptions of Fairness in Negotiation," *Marquette Law Review*, 2004, 87, 753-767.
18. See J. M. Gottman, L. F. Katz, and C. Hooven, *Meta-Emotion: How Families Communicate Emotionally* (Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1997).
19. See A. N. Isen, "Positive Affect and Decision Making," in J. M. Haviland-Jones and A. G. Johnson (eds.), *Handbook of Emotions* (New York: Guilford Press, 2000).
20. See Shapiro, *Negotiation Residuals*, 2000.
21. See D. Watson and A. Tellegen, "Toward a Consensual Structure of Mood," *Psychological Bulletin*, 1985, 98, 219-235.

22. See J. Gottman and N. Silver, *Why Marriages Succeed or Fail: What You Can Learn from the Breakthrough Research to Make Your Marriage Last* (New York: Fireside, 1994); and J. M. Gottman and R. W. Levenson, "The Timing of Divorce: Predicting When a Couple Will Divorce over a 14-Year Period," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 2000, 62, 737-745.
23. See Gottman and Silver, *Why Marriages Succeed or Fail*, 1994.
24. See E. Kennedy-Moore and J. C. Watson, *Expressing Emotion* (New York: Guilford Press, 1999).
25. See L. Thompson, V. H. Medvec, V. Seiden, and S. Kopelman, "Poker Face, Smiley Face, and Rant 'n' Rave: Myths and Realities About Emotion in Negotiation," in M. Hogg and S. Tinsdale (eds.), *Blackwell Handbook in Social Psychology, Vol. 3: Group Processes* (Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 2000).
26. See G. A. van Kleef, C.K.W. De Dreu, and A.S.R. Manstead, "The Interpersonal Effects of Anger and Happiness in Negotiations," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2004, 86(1), 57-76.
27. See R. Fisher, W. Ury, and B. Patton, *Getting to YES: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In* (2nd ed.) (Boston: Penguin, 1991).
28. See R. Fisher and S. Brown, *Getting Together: Building Relationships as We Negotiate* (Boston: Penguin, 1988).
29. See R. M. Axelrod, *The Evolution of Cooperation* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).
30. See P. J. Carnevale and A. M. Isen, "The Influence of Positive Affect and Visual Access on the Discovery of Integrative Solutions in Bilateral Negotiation," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 1986, 37(1), 1-13.
31. See Isen, "Positive Affect and Decision Making," 2000.
32. See B. L. Frederickson, "The Role of Positive Emotions in Positive Psychology: The Broaden-and-Build Theory of Positive Emotions," *American Psychologist*, 2001, 56, 218-226.
33. Shapiro, "Negotiating Emotions," 2002, p. 70.
34. See K. G. Allred, J. S. Mallozzi, F. Matsui, and C. P. Raia, "The Influence of Anger and Compassion on Negotiation Performance," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 1997, 70(3), 175-187.
35. See M. H. Bazerman, J. Curhan, and D. Moore, "The Death and Rebirth of the Social Psychology of Negotiations," in G. Fletcher and M. Clark (eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology* (Cambridge, U.K.: Blackwell, 2000); and M. M. Pillutla and J. K. Murnighan, "Unfairness, Anger, and Spite: Emotional Rejections of Ultimatum Offers," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 1997, 68(3), 208-224.
36. See J. P. Daly, "The Effects of Anger on Negotiations over Mergers and Acquisitions," *Negotiation Journal*, 1997, 7(1), 31-39.
37. See D. Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence* (New York: Bantam Books, 1995).

38. See J. R. Curhan, M. A. Neale, L. D. Ross, and J. Rosencranz-Engelmann, "The O. Henry Effect: The Impact of Relational Norms on Negotiation Outcomes," AoM Conflict Management Division 2002 Mtgs. No. 14092, 2004, available at [<http://ssrn.com/abstract=321448>].
39. See Shapiro, "Negotiating Emotions," 2002.
40. See Fisher and Brown, *Getting Together*, 1988.
41. See M. H. Bazerman and M. A. Neale, *Negotiating Rationally* (New York: Free Press, 1985).
42. See van Kleef, De Dreu, and Manstead, "The Interpersonal Effects of Anger and Happiness in Negotiations," 2004.
43. See A. M. Isen, T. Shalcker, M. Clark, and L. Karp, "Affect Accessibility of Material in Memory and Behavior: A Cognitive Loop?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1978, 36, 1-12; K. Kraiger, R. S. Billings, and A. M. Isen, "The Influence of Positive Affective States on Task Perceptions and Satisfaction," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 1989, 44, 12-25; and Carnevale and Isen, "The Influence of Positive Affect and Visual Access on the Discovery of Integrative Solutions in Bilateral Negotiation," 1986.
44. See B. Parkinson, *Ideas and Realities of Emotion* (New York: Routledge, 1995).
45. See Shapiro, "Negotiating Emotions," 2002.
46. See J. S. Wiggins, "Agency and Communion as Conceptual Coordinates for the Understanding and Measurement of Interpersonal Behavior," in W. M. Grove and D. Cicchetti, *Thinking Clearly About Psychology: Personality and Psychopathology*, Vol. 2 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991).
47. See A. Angyal, *Foundations for a Science of Personality* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1941); D. Bakan, *The Duality of Human Existence: Isolation and Communion in Western Man* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966); S. L. Bem, "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1974, 42, 155-162; J. Benjafield and E. Carson, "A Historico-developmental Analysis of the Circumplex Model of Trait Descriptive Terms," *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 1986, 17(4), 339-345; E. L. Deci and R. M. Ryan, *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior* (New York: Plenum Press, 1985); C. Gilligan, *In a Different Voice* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982); and Wiggins, "Agency and Communion as Conceptual Coordinates for the Understanding and Measurement of Interpersonal Behavior," 1991.
48. See Shapiro, "Negotiating Emotions," 2002.
49. See J. R. Averill and E. P. Nunley, *Voyages of the Heart: Living an Emotionally Creative Life* (New York: Free Press, 1992).
50. See Fisher and Brown, *Getting Together*, 1988.
51. See Fisher, Ury, and Patton, *Getting to YES*, 1991; and A. Schneider, "Shattering Negotiation Myths: Empirical Evidence on the Effectiveness of Negotiation Style," *Harvard Negotiation Law Review*, 2002, 7, 143-233.