Negotiation Resilience:

A Framework for Understanding How Negotiators Respond to Adversity

Lukas Neville

Asper School of Business, University of Manitoba

Brianna Barker Caza

Asper School of Business, University of Manitoba

Mara Olekalns

Melbourne Business School, University of Melbourne

Author note: Lukas Neville, Department of Business Administration, Asper School of Business, University of Manitoba. ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8954-0457. Brianna Barker Caza, Department of Business Administration, Asper School of Business, University of Manitoba. ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0862-5537. Mara Olekalns, Melbourne Business School, University of Melbourne. ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2672-3998.

Correspondence concerning this article should be directed to Lukas Neville, 412 Drake Centre, 181 Freedman Crescent, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3T 5V4, lukas.neville@umanitoba.ca.

Abstract

Negotiations are a context in which adversity is expected and unavoidable. Adversity

is normal in negotiations in part because we are dependent on counterparts whose

goals, intentions, and behaviours cannot be predicted in advance or controlled in the

moment. Negotiations also frequently involve 'turning points' where changes in the

environment or process call the chances of settlement into question. In this chapter,

we begin by describing negotiation adversity and identifying some of its common

negative consequences. We then advance a theory of negotiation resilience as a

cognitive process at the level of the individual negotiator. Drawing on shift-and-

persist models of resilience, we focus on the idea of "shifting gears" (persisting as a

negotiator, but using adversity as a positive interruption that prompts flexibility and

adjustment). We argue that this pairing of persistence and flexibility is often in

service of creating a positive growth narrative that allows negotiators to protect their

sense of identity. Our chapter identifies key predictors of negotiation resilience,

focused on (1) the negotiator's need for a growth narrative; (2) the perceived costs or

benefits of persistence, and (3) characteristics that enable flexible thinking. We

describe potential consequences of resilience for negotiators and negotiations, and

conclude by suggesting directions for future research, including the development of

resilience-building interventions for negotiators.

  Keywords: Negotiation, adversity, resilience, turning points, shift-and-persist,

flexibility

Negotiation Resilience:

A Framework for Understanding How Negotiators Respond to Adversity

Negotiations are often punctuated by negative events, which can generate toxic emotions and cognitions (Coleman, 2004). These negative events are points of divergence for negotiators. At these junctures, negotiators can either dwell on the unexpected change, stalling or halting their progress. Or, they can persevere and adapt their negotiation strategies, ultimately recovering and moving forward. The implications of a negative event often extend far beyond the negotiation in which it occurred, as individuals' actions and even their feelings about prior negotiations spill over to contaminate subsequent ones (O'Connor, Arnold & Burris 2005).

Minimizing exposure to negative events is neither a realistic nor sustainable approach, especially in the negotiation context. Negative events cannot always be avoided or controlled, and frequently cannot be predicted. It is therefore critical for negotiators to learn to bounce back from negative events. Yet, despite its importance, negotiator resilience is understudied in the negotiation literature (Spector, 2006).

To address this oversight, this chapter develops a theoretical understanding of negotiator resilience, focusing on the individual negotiator as the unit of analysis. We begin by describing the sources of adversity in negotiations, arguing that negotiations are characterized by expected, normal adversity. Next, we briefly outline common counterproductive responses to adversity (exit and escalation of failing tactics). Then, we introduce negotiation resilience as a process where persistence and flexibility are paired in the service of building a personal growth narrative. We use the analogy of "switching gears" to describe this process. Fourth, we identify some of the individual

and situational factors that might trigger the process of negotiation resilience. Finally, we close by describing important directions for future research.

Adversity in Negotiation

Negotiation is ubiquitous in organizations: It occurs any time that people "cannot achieve their goals without the cooperation of others" (Thompson, Wang, & Gunia, 2010: 492). This means that negotiating is not limited to occasional formal, high-stakes contracts. Instead, most people negotiate on a regular basis, whenever there are resources to be allocated, tasks to be divided, or decisions to be made (Tasa, Whyte, & Leonardelli, 2013). Despite its ubiquity, however, negotiation remains an inherently challenging form of interaction.

There are a few reasons that negotiations are especially challenging forms of interpersonal interactions. First, because we cannot know counterparts' goals, intentions, and behaviors ahead of time, negotiations are inherently unpredictable. This unpredictability means that despite their planning and strategizing, negotiators must adapt, improvise, and change their strategies in the moment, responding dynamically to their counterpart's moves (Balachandra, Bordone, Menkel-Meadow, Ringstrom, & Sarath, 2005). The ability to improvise is especially important when negotiators experience "turning points" (Druckman & Olekalns, 2013). As we explain below, these moments are sensitive periods which may lead negotiators and their partners to doubt their ability to reach a satisfactory (or any) agreement. Taken together, the unpredictability, need for improvising, and emotional tumult of turning points create the perfect storm, within which perceptions of adversity are planted and often grow. While much of the prior literature on resilience is focused on single,

extreme and unforeseen critical events– for instance, crises, life altering events and organizational disasters—as forms of adversity (e.g., Bonanno, 2004; Powley, 2009; Williams, Gruber, Sutcliffe, Shepherd, & Zhao, 2017), negotiations may involve less intense, more mundane forms of adversity. Some rare negotiation episodes may be punctuated by extreme, acute adversity, but the day-to-day experience of negotiating involves routine and normal forms of adversity. As we describe below, facing adversity in negotiation is not an exception or aberration, but rather the expected, modal experience.

Negotiation adversity stems from both interpersonal and intrapsychic factors (Caza & Milton, 2012). Together, they lead to negotiation as a context in which adverse experiences are expected, mundane and regular—that is, negotiation as a context of *normal adversity*.

Situational Sources of Negotiation Adversity

In negotiation, adversity is often produced by turning points: Pivotal moments in the negotiation that alter the course and flow of negotiation, and which lead to either positive or negative "departures" from the negotiation's initial trajectory (Druckman, 2001; Druckman, Olekalns, & Smith, 2009), presaging patterns of escalation and de-escalation (Druckman, 2001), respectively. Negative turning points may create a perception that agreement may not be possible, or may contribute to a challenging or contentious tone that threatens the process or relationships between the negotiating parties.

The use of hard tactics such as threats (Sinaceur & Neale, 2005), deception (Olekalns & Smith, 2007, 2009), time pressure (De Dreu, 2003), or impasse (Babcock & Loewenstein, 1997) can disrupt, compromise or halt negotiations. Behaviors like

displaying anger (Wang, Northcraft, & Van Kleef, 2012), interruptions, or out-of-keeping acts that break established patterns (McGinn, Lingo, & Ciano, 2004) may change the flow of the negotiation itself (Druckman et al., 2009) and may also create moments of adversity.

Situational adversity may also include new information, time pressure, or highly constrained bargaining zones (Lewis, Olekalns, Smith, & Caza, 2018) which tend to challenge negotiators or undermine planned strategies. Changes to the broader negotiation context during the course of a negotiation, like a shift in constituency pressures (Aaldering & Ten Velden, 2018) can also create turning points that create an experience of adversity. These kinds of shifts are commonplace—in other words, they are expected and normal forms of negotiation adversity.

Intrapsychic Sources of Negotiation Adversity

Even in situations where these negative events do not ultimately occur, the apprehension and anticipation of them can serve as its own source of negotiation adversity. Negotiations are motivated-performance tasks: They combine unpredictability, uncontrollability, and the prospect of social evaluation by others (O'Connor, Arnold, & Maurizio, 2010). Even experienced negotiators report ambivalence about the prospect of bargaining, tempering their optimism with concerns about the risks and unpredictability of negotiations (Wheeler, 2013). Before and during the negotiation, individuals might or experience concerns about saving face (White, Tynan, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2004), preserving relationships (Gelfand, Major, Raver, Nishii, & O'Brien, 2006), or avoiding losses (Shalvi, Reijseger, Handgraaf, et al., 2013). Women in particular might fear backlash (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010), In short, even when negotiations go (objectively)

well, the experience of planning, anticipating and setting expectations in an uncertain interdependent context may alone be a source of negotiation adversity.

Self-Reinforcing Dynamics

These two broad categories (situational adversity and intrapsychic adversity) are not mutually exclusive. On a more positive note, situational adversity may not be subjectively experienced as adverse due to habituation. But on the other hand, there may be negative interactions between situational and experienced adversity. Anxieties and concerns about one's negotiation efficacy can lead to actual adversity (as with inefficacious negotiators settling for worse offers; Brett, Pinkley, & Jackofsky, 1996), while structural features of the negotiation can create intrapsychic adversity (as with negative bargaining zones creating impasses, which then produce negative emotions, self-doubts and anxiety; O'Connor & Arnold, 2001). Lastly, there may be crossovers between negotiators: One negotiator's fears and concerns might trigger behaviors that themselves serve as a source of adversity for their counterpart(s).

In summary, decades of research on negotiation have demonstrated that no matter how well trained or prepared a negotiator is, he or she will face negotiation adversity. And how a negotiator responds to adversity can be the difference between setting in motion an increasingly contentious and unproductive course of action or a positive, constructive one. The ubiquity and impact of negotiation adversity underscores the need for understanding how individuals are able to positively adapt to this adversity. As a result, rather than thinking about how to prevent adversity, it is critical to understand what determines negotiators' responses to adversity, with a particular focus on those dynamics that culminate in "adversity adaptation" (Thompson & Ravlin, 2017: 144), or when a negotiator's response to adversity is

productive, protective, and adaptive. Before turning to these adaptive responses, we first consider two maladaptive responses to negotiation adversity, which we describe in terms of "digging in" or walking away.

Maladaptive Responses to Adversity

Digging In

One of the most common responses to adversity is to persist in or escalate a failing course of action. We use the analogy of "digging in" to describe this set of behaviors. When people feel threatened, they respond by restricting their information processing (Staw, Sandelands, & Dutton, 1981). They may respond with rigidity, falling back on well-worn routines and fail to adapt and learn (Griffin, Tesluk, & Jacobs, 1995). Or, they may double down on their approach, ignoring cooperative options (De Dreu & Nijstad, 2008). These dynamics can have destructive effects, including an escalation of commitment to failing strategies (Bazerman & Neale, 1992), self-fulfilling negative expectations (Rubin, Kim, & Peretz, 1990), and conflict escalation (Brett, Shapiro, & Lytle, 1998; Kim & Smith, 1993; Pruitt, 2005).

One of us recalls a student who, after a challenging negotiation in which the parties became caught in a contentious, distributive spiral, reflected afterwards that the negotiation would have gone better if only he had been even *tougher* and *more* intransigent! In short, challenges in negotiation can blind us to opportunities and find us digging ourselves deeper into failing strategies.

Walking Away

A second common response to adversity in negotiation is simply to walk away, exiting the negotiation prematurely, or shying away from future negotiations. Brooks and Schweitzer (2011) show that negotiators often (mis)manage their anxiety at the table by exiting negotiations earlier, setting more easily-met (and quickly-met) goals, and by responding faster to their counterparts' first offers. They might seek to pursue outside options instead, finding other negotiation partners (Giebels, De Dreu, & van de Vliert, 2003; Giebels, De Dreu, & Van de Vliert, 2000). Or, negotiators may conclude their present bargaining session but then resist initiating negotiations in the future (Volkema, 2009). These approaches are forms of avoidance coping (Moos & Schaefer, 1993), where the response to a negative experience is to withdraw in ways that protect individuals from having to deal directly with a stressor.

In negotiations, fleeing the table is often no more adaptive than digging in and escalating a fight. Walking away from the table or committing to a destructive course of action at the table serves only to destroy value, worsen individual and shared outcomes, and increase relational tension.

The Unfolding Process of Resilience in Negotiations

Adversity offers negotiators the opportunity to reconsider issues, options and strategies. These adaptations may halt or reverse patterns of negative reciprocity, and provide the basis for a renewed and improved relationship between negotiators. In this way, an adverse event can serve as a positive interruption and an opportunity to engage in sensemaking, reflection, and re-strategizing (Caza & Olekalns, 2014). Next, we describe how negotiation resilience, is characterized by both persistence and flexibility, and motivated by the desire to craft a growth narrative.

Defining Negotiator Resilience

We define negotiator resilience as being the process through which an individual uses experiences of negotiation adversity as an opportunity to create a new, more positive trajectory for both the negotiation and the negotiators involved. In this conceptualization, we emphasize the important role of adversity as a catalyst for adaptation---to manifest resilience, negotiators need to not ignore their adverse experience, but instead to confront, adapt, and seek meaning from it.

This definition, consistent with recent developments in the study of resilience at work (Caza & Milton, 2012; Olekalns et al., 2019; Williams et al., 2017), which focuses on resilience as a process, with behaviors that characterize the unfolding of that process, and underlying psychological and relational factors that drive the process. In the section that follows, we examine these mechanisms in detail, describing the core behavioral expression of resilience, as well as the psychological and contextual underpinnings of this positive and adaptive post-adversity trajectory. We describe negotiator resilience as a process that unfolds at the level of the individual (though we consider the dyad and the negotiation episode as possible units of analysis for future research in the discussion).

We use the analogy of "switching gears" to describe how negotiators adapt to negotiation adversity by (1) continuing to move forward, persisting with the negotiation despite fear and uncertainty, while (2) adjusting flexibly in strategy and tactics, remaining open and flexible to new information and opportunities. Chen and Miller (2012) describe this pairing of adaptive strategies as a "shift and persist" model

of responses to adversity. We suggest that persistence and flexibility are used to frame the experience of adversity in terms of a broader growth narrative.

Persistence. Malhotra and Bazerman (2007: 78) urge negotiators to "stay at the table… stick around, and investigate further," even after a deal appears to have been lost. They share the example of a negotiator who made follow-up calls to a client after losing a deal, simply looking to better understand their choice. This persistence led to a conversation that reversed the lost sale.

Persistence in negotiation often is productive. At the minimum, persisting rather than walking away will usually lead to some additional information sharing, shedding light on each party's position. However, some forms of persistence are counterproductive: This is at the heart of the "digging in" response described earlier, where negotiators persist only in repeating failing behaviors (for instance, persisting in a set of arguments that does not move the dyad toward settlement; Hyder, Prietula, & Weingart, 2000). But good-faith persistence—staying at the table and making genuine efforts to move toward agreement--can be transformative in negotiation. Persistence has been shown to drive performance in negotiation (Bowles & Flynn, 2010) and greater parity in negotiator satisfaction (Patton & Balakrishnan, 2010).

Flexibility. While it is a necessary starting point, simply staying at the table is seldom enough to overcome negotiation adversity. A second feature of negotiator resilience is a form of positive adaptation: The ability to remain adaptable and flexible, shifting strategies and trying new approaches in response to adverse situations. Spector (2006) argues that resilient bargainers are capable of using creativity, change and flexibility to draw out opportunities from moments of deadlock, turning impasses at the table into ripe moments for conflict resolution.

As an example of negotiation flexibility, consider the case of the negotiations around an airport opening during the Bosnia-Herzegovina civil war of the 1990s (McRae, 2002). A carefully-negotiated deal to hand over an airport to peacekeepers' control came to a deadlock, though, as soon as the written terms were presented. The terms were to be signed by an entity the government refused to acknowledge. The deadlock was seemingly irreconcilable, as each side was unable to accept compromise. The UN negotiator, though, exhibited the kind of creativity and flexibility we associate with negotiator resilience: He improvised a new approach, suggesting two agreements instead of one, different only in the titles on the signature lines, each struck between one of the parties and the peacekeepers (McRae, 2002). The peacekeeper did not reframe the issues at hand, but rather reframed the cognitive representation of the relationships between the negotiating parties (Dewulf et al., 2009). The frame shift involved thinking of the interaction as two negotiations between each individual belligerent party and the peacekeepers, rather than one triadic negotiation between all the parties.

Importantly, we think of persistence and flexibility as *jointly* necessary to negotiator resilience. Without staying at the table, negotiators lack the time to explore options. But conversely, without a flexible, adaptable mindset, more time spent at the table may simply lead to escalating conflict.

Growth Narratives

We have focused on flexibility and persistence as key elements of the behavioral manifestation of negotiator resilience. These approaches can be purely instrumental: Negotiators persist and adjust to get better economic outcomes when

negotiating. But we think there are underlying psychological motives that may drive the process. In particular, the desire to craft a positive growth narrative about oneself as a negotiator may motivate individuals to engage in both persistence and flexibility in order to live out this desired story arc within the context of a negotiation. .

Research suggest that an important marker of psychological resilience is how people tell their own stories (Pals & McAdams, 2004; Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004), because these stories represent their internal sensemaking of the events and their responses to these events (Vough & Caza, 2017). Resilient narratives are reflexive (Neimeyer, Levitt, & Snyder, 2001), and focus on growth (Bauer & Park, 2010). Growth in one's personal narrative acknowledges adversity, rather than discounting or repressing it (McAdams, 2008), and uses the adversity as a resource for learning (Bauer & Park, 2010; Sonenshein, Dutton, Grant, Spreitzer, & Sutcliffe, 2013).

When our narratives about experiences of negotiation adversity are focused on growth and development, the nature of our negotiation trajectory is likely to tilt upward as a result because these narratives influence our interpretation and experience of future adversities. The stories we tell about our past have long term implications for how individuals think about our current potential (Maitlis, 2009). Stories of growth from past negotiation adversity shape how we see ourselves as negotiators, which in turn shapes our reactions to future challenges.

Some prior negotiation research has examined resilience as a trait, that is, an individual difference rather than as the process and set of behaviours that we describe here. Nonetheless, we see the role of narratives even in trait resilience: The resilient negotiator is described as being motivated to self-improve, and likely to ascribe meaning to adversity (Nelson, Shacham, & Ben-ari, 2016). Negotiators who build

growth narratives for themselves about persistence and flexibility in the face of setbacks are not downplaying or minimizing the experience of adversity, but rather using it to create a positive identity.

Growth narratives also provide a bridge between individual negotiation episodes, allowing individuals to see the experience with a longer-term perspective. A setback or defeat in one negotiation, for instance, can serve as a central part of a redemption story, or be cast as a necessary learning moment. In these narratives, a challenging or adverse negotiation is a part of a broader story about development, improvement, or maturation as a negotiator: Dealing with a tough counterpart, for instance, might provoke a resilient negotiator to develop or discover their capacity to remain resolute and resist pressure.

This psychology of growth-based story-telling can support the flexibility and persistence described earlier. We might stay at the table longer or experiment with different approaches, because we frame the negotiation as an opportunity to learn and develop rather than merely an attempt to pursue a single negotiated outcome.

Enabling Conditions for Negotiation Resilience

We have described what negotiator resilience looks like: A process characterized by persistent yet flexible responding to either psychological or situational adversity. We have argued that this process is triggered in part by negotiators' psychological tendency towards the development of a growth narrative to make positive sense of adversity. Yet while this psychological tendency may pre-dispose individuals towards the creation a growth story, there are also many complicating factors that suppress such a narrative. First, the realization of negotiator

resilience is effortful. The maladaptive strategies we described earlier (walking away and digging in) are likely less cognitively effortful. Further, the unpredictability of the negotiation context will often trigger defensive interpersonal responses that can throw the negotiation into a tit-for-tat downward spiral (Olekalns et al., 2019).

It is therefore critical to understand what leads negotiators to respond resiliently to adversity. Certainly, some negotiators may be simply more prone to resilience as an individual difference (i.e., trait negotiation resilience; Nelson, Shacham, & Ben-ari, 2016). However, we argue that there are cognitive processes and situational factors that can promote the emergence of resilience processes in negotiation. We divide these "resilience foundations" (Olekalns, Caza & Vogus, 2019) into three categories: (1) Factors that make the pursuit of growth narratives more salient; (2) Variables that reduce the perceived cost or increase the perceived benefit of persistence; (3) Characteristics that enable flexible thinking.

Role Identity Leads to the Pursuit of Growth Narratives

Individuals' self-definition of themselves as a negotiator may influence their need to create a growth narrative. The difference between *negotiating* and *being a negotiator* is that the option of exit and walking away is more costly when 'being a negotiator' is central to one's identity. When something is seen a central part of our identity, we will feel committed to creating and maintaining a positive view of ourselves in that identity (Dutton, Roberts, & Bednar, 2010). Those who see negotiating as a central part of their identity therefore are likely to look more carefully for opportunities to maintain the positive value of their negotiator identity. They do so by seeking out creative or novel solutions to adversity so that they can maintain a

positive view of themselves in the context of a valued identity. Similarly, the centrality of a *negotiator identity* may serve to promote the creation and maintenance of growth stories. When one is a *negotiator*, rather than someone who merely happens to negotiate, there is a motivation to grow and improve in order to foster a positive identity (Vough & Caza, 2017).

It is important, however, that the content of this identity is not defined by simply arriving at a deal every time. Having a narrow view of oneself as a negotiator who always gets the deal could actually be a barrier to resilience. For example, if negotiation is costly (e.g., transaction costs, time, etc.), and impasse certain, changing one's goals or walking away may be an important protective mechanism (Dunne, Wrosch, & Miller, 2011). As a result, it is critical that the content of one's role identification is broad enough to allow for a variety of different negotiator behaviors to be included as "in-role."

Factors Influencing the Costs and Benefits of Persistence

   Relational history and perceived relational future. Negotiators who recount a significant relational history or who perceive a long relational future with their partners are more likely to see the benefit of investing time and effort into cultivating positive adaption when they face adversity. Negotiators will persist in the negotiations, and increase the flexibility of their responses, to in order to preserve investments made in building a relationship with their negotiation counterparts. Impasse is relationally costly. The greater our investment in that relationship – for instance, when we have worked to build rapport and shared bonds – the greater our motive to respond resiliently. On the flipside, individuals who are forward-looking

and who perceive a lengthy relational future (or think of subsequent negotiations as nearer in the future; cf. Henderson, Trope & Carnevale, 2006) with their negotiation partners will also be more motivated to persist even when they face adversity.

Outcome expectations. Even if we lack the relational history or relational future to keep us at the table, research suggests that expectancies can be powerful motivators of persistence. Liberman, Anderson and Ross (2010) had negotiators engage in challenging bargaining with outgroup members. When they manipulated positive expectations, it motivated persistence and flexibility, allowing negotiators to break through deadlock. These positive expectations can be built at the level of negotiating dyads by routines that create a sense of possibility, including expressions of hope (Cohen-Chen, Crisp, & Halperin, 2017), humor (Forester, 2004), and third party interventions (Goldberg & Shaw, 2007).

Self-efficacy. The belief in one's competence as a negotiator is protective against the impulse to withdraw or concede early. If we think of ourselves as highly capable, we are less likely to spend the negotiation searching for an exit. Brett and colleagues show that self-efficacy can help mitigate the challenges that come from a lack of alternatives in a negotiation (Brett et al., 1996). But research on self-efficacy in negotiation suggests that it can also be protective against the 'digging in' problem. O'Connor and Arnold (2001) show that self-efficacy helps to insulate negotiators against distributive spirals (i.e., an escalating and self-reinforcing pattern of low information sharing and low cooperation). Self-efficacy matters most when it is about overall negotiation ability (rather than general self-efficacy or self-efficacy at the level of a single negotiation; Miles & Maurer, 2012).

Factors Increasing Negotiators' Capacity for Flexibility

Perspective-taking. We think that resilience depends on empathy's cognitive cousin, perspective-taking. Perspective-taking is the ability to understand and anticipate the perspectives, opinions, reactions, and preferences of others (Galinsky, Maddux, Gilin, & White, 2008). Research shows that perspective-taking (but not empathy) serves to promote the discovery of hidden tradeoffs or options (Galinsky et al., 2008). Perspective-taking allows for deeper understanding of a counterpart's needs and constraints, which can inform the search for solutions. We think of perspective-taking as a resource that enables flexibility.

Incremental beliefs. Incremental beliefs drive flexibility, allowing negotiators to consider other possible courses of actions and outcomes (Wong, Haselhuhn, & Kray, 2012). This provides the cognitive foundation for broad, flexible repertoires of action. Incremental beliefs about one's counterpart are similarly central to persistence: Haselhuhn, Schweitzer and Wood (2010), for example, show that those with incremental beliefs more readily recover from trust breaches, since they are more likely to see their partner's behavior as changeable between situations instead of fixed by an unchangeable moral character. Seeing negotiation behavior (one's own and others') as malleable rather than fixed can help to promote flexibility.

Dynamic Outcomes of Negotiator Resilience

Next, we consider what outcomes might occur when negotiators adaptively "switch gears". Our view is that processes of negotiator resilience contributes to virtuous cycles, strengthening outcomes both within and across negotiation episodes.

We describe these as consequences of resilience, but not a part of the negotiation resilience construct itself.

Outcomes Within Negotiations

      Objective value. The simplest likely outcome of resilience may be high-quality deals. Those who stay at the table and respond with flexibility are more likely to discover previously hidden options or solutions. However, we are careful to note that not all resilient negotiators will (or should) settle, and that agreement alone is not necessarily a marker of resilience. Negotiators are often vulnerable to a 'getting to yes bias', or impasse aversion, and will acquiesce to settlements worse than their alternatives (Tuncel, Mislin, Kesebir, & Pinkley, 2016). We think of growth narratives as protective against this possibility: If we think of the benefits of a negotiation beyond the simple material value of a deal (for instance, as a learning experience, a chance to build or strengthen relationships, or a starting point for personal improvement), the value of the negotiation is more easily separable from the outcome. In short, we think that negotiator resilience will lead to both more and fewer settlements: More deals overall, but fewer deals produced by agreement bias.

      Subjective value. Recent work has focused on subjective value as a marker of 'bouncing back' from adversity. Lewis and colleagues (2018), for instance, draw on the subjective value framework (Curhan, Elfenbein, & Xu, 2006), focusing on negotiators' feelings about the process, relationship, instrumental outcome, and about themselves as negotiators. Their findings suggest that resilient negotiators are not necessarily Pollyannas, simply glossing over a negative experience. They found no difference in how negotiators appraised the value of the negotiated deal itself. Instead,

resilient negotiators reported higher subjective relationship and process satisfaction. We think of finding sources of value (beyond the deal) in difficult negotiations as a consequence of resilience.

Outcomes Across Negotiations

Initiation. One of the guiding concerns that shapes people's willingness to initiate a negotiation is a concern about protecting their image and 'face' (Miles, 2010). We think of resilience, and in particular the development of growth narratives, as a powerful force in driving people to negotiate, even after experiencing adversity. Initiating a negotiation provides the opportunity to enact the narrative of growth across negotiations. And, in addition, a growth-oriented approach (in which negotiations provide the basis for personal development) reduces the perceived risks of face loss from initiating negotiations. Resilient negotiators anticipate challenge, conceive of it as a resource for learning and improvement, and actively seek it out by initiating negotiations.

As an example, Volkema and Kapoutsis' (2016) Restaurant Negotiation, asks students to initiate an uncomfortable negotiation about ordering off-menu at a restaurant. They report students linking the experienced challenge of the exercise with their willingness to negotiate in other settings. The process of building a growth narrative as a negotiator naturally lends itself to initiating future negotiations. Adverse negotiations begin a story; initiation provides the opportunity for negotiators to write a continuation of that story.

Strengthened efficacy. Earlier, we considered how negotiation self-efficacy (O'Connor & Arnold, 2001) might encourage resilient negotiation. However, we can

equally easily see self-efficacy as an outcome of resilience. The persistence, flexibility and growth narratives that mark resilience both benefit from self-efficacy *and* contribute to it, in a positive feedback loop. Those who maintain flexibility and persist, especially in the service of building a growth narrative, are likely to emerge with a greater sense of agency and ability from having experienced adversity.

Future Directions

We see the study of negotiator resilience as a ripe area for theoretical and empirical work. We know very little about the content of negotiators' growth narratives, for instance, despite the centrality of the idea to our conception of resilience. The predictors and outcomes we describe, including the potential for virtuous cycles and positive feedback loops, merit empirical testing.

Our theory is also largely cognitive: It focuses on perceptions, chosen strategies and tactics, and the cognitive work of crafting narratives. However, negotiation is inherently affective, and the experience of setbacks and adversity can be emotional. We choose this approach because we know that emotion can be cognitively controlled (Ochsner & Gross, 2005), and a cognitive approach brings us closer to workable interventions and training for negotiators. Future work, however, may want to consider these resilience processes with greater consideration to the affective processes involved (emotion, emotion regulation, etc.).

In the section that follows, we identify two opportunities arising from this integration of resilience and negotiation. The first is to emphasize the suitability of negotiation as a context for studying everyday adversity and resilience. The second is to consider how resilience can be built, especially among those who lack self-

efficacy, face confrontational counterparts, or struggle with the social emotions we describe as predictive of resilience.

Negotiation as a Laboratory for Resilience Research

As we have argued, negotiation provides a context where adversity is expected, routine, and even unavoidable. It offers a way of studying the everyday forms of adversity that may be less well represented in the resilience literature, focused on the subjective experience of adversity rather than the externally observable moment of crisis. Most negotiations lack the extremity of crises, emergencies and disasters, making it an excellent context to study 'normal adversity' and resilience in quotidian life. We position this chapter as a contribution to negotiation resilience, but many of the dynamics described here could also be applied to responses to adversity in other mundane social contexts.

Negotiation researchers have developed a well-honed experimental paradigm with exercises, manipulations and measures that allow for generalizable insights from student negotiators in the laboratory (Buelens, Van De Woestyne, Mestdagh, & Bouckenooghe, 2008; Herbst & Schwarz, 2011), which suggests a productive path forward for incrementally building and refining empirical insights into resilience.

One specific way that experimental negotiation research can provide a more nuanced understanding of the process of resilience in organizations is by shedding light on dyadic resilience processes. To do so, research will need to move beyond an understanding of *negotiator* resilience and toward a theory of *negotiation* resilience as jointly created by negotiators in a dyad or group. We have highlighted the importance of relationships, but a range of other collective resilience-promoting routines are

possible. Vogus and Sutcliffe (2007), for instance, considering organizational resilience, argue that resilient collectives "treat success lightly", anticipating the unexpected and assuming that there are unseen risks always at play. This raises concerns about rapport alone: One can easily imagine negotiators reaching agreement too easily, saying yes where they ought to say no (Wheeler, 1997). So, future work needs to examine how negotiating dyads and groups blend the rapport that motivates resilience with the vigilance and adaptability that comes from expecting setbacks and anticipating the need for change and flexibility. As a future direction, this approach may reveal the potential for positive crossovers in negotiator resilience. The experience of negotiating with a resilient partner may strengthen one's own resilience.

Interventions and Training to Build Negotiation Resilience

What remains unanswered is how to build the capacity for resilience where it does not naturally occur. We have identified how negotiators' traits or strong relationships between negotiators might enhance resilience, but this is an unsatisfying conclusion: We also need to study how resilience is created in situations where it is least likely (e.g., among inefficacious negotiators and in confrontational dyads).

One intervention approach might consider post-negotiation reflection, going beyond previous work on learning and knowledge transfer (Bereby-Meyer, Moran, & Sattler, 2010; Loewenstein, Thompson, & Gentner, 2003) to consider how negotiators cope with the psychological cost of earlier adverse negotiations. Cognitive reframing suggests that post-negotiation reappraisals may be one avenue through which resilience can be promoted (Helgeson, Reynolds, & Tomich, 2006). Benefit-finding is a process by which negotiators are encouraged to actively revisit and interrogate their

negotiation experience in order to draw out growth, meaning, and positive

consequences from their moments of adversity. One study (Lewis et al., 2018) shows

that this approach may promote subjective value from negotiation. Future research

should also explore other resilience-building interventions in negotiations, including

reflection as a means of bolstering individual and dyadic resilience in negotiations.

References

Aaldering, H., & Ten Velden, F.S. (2018). How representatives with a dovish constituency reach higher individual and joint outcomes in integrative negotiations. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *21*(1), 111–126.

Amanatullah, E.T., & Morris, M.W. (2010). Negotiating gender roles: Gender differences in assertive negotiating are mediated by women's fear of backlash and attenuated when negotiating on behalf of others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *98*(2), 256.

Babcock, L., & Loewenstein, G. (1997). Explaining bargaining impasse: The role of self-serving biases. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *11*(1), 109–126.

Balachandra, L., Bordone, R.C., Menkel-Meadow, C., Ringstrom, P., & Sarath, E. (2005). Improvisation and negotiation: Expecting the unexpected. *Negotiation Journal*, *21*(4), 415–423.

Bauer, J.J., & Park, S.W. (2010). Growth is not just for the young: Growth narratives, eudaimonic resilience, and the aging self. In. P.S. Fry & C.L.M. Keyes (Eds.), *New Frontiers in Resilient Aging: Life-Strengths and Well-Being in Late Life*, (pp. 60–89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Bazerman, M., & Neale, M. (1992). Nonrational escalation of commitment in negotiation. *European Management Journal*, *10*(2), 163–168.

Bereby-Meyer, Y., Moran, S., & Sattler, L. (2010). The effects of achievement motivational goals and of debriefing on the transfer of skills in integrative negotiations. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *3*(1), 64–86.

Bonanno, G.A. (2004). Loss, trauma, and human resilience: have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events? *American*

Psychologist, *59*(1), 20.

Bowles, H.R., & Flynn, F. (2010). Gender and persistence in negotiation: A dyadic

perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(4), 769–787.

Brett, J.F., Pinkley, R.L., & Jackofsky, E.F. (1996). Alternatives to having a BATNA

in dyadic negotiation: The influence of goals, self-efficacy, and alternatives on

negotiated outcomes. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *7*(2), 121–

138.

Brett, J.M., Shapiro, D.L., & Lytle, A.L. (1998). Breaking the bonds of reciprocity in

negotiations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*(4), 410–424.

Brooks, A.W., & Schweitzer, M.E. (2011). Can Nervous Nelly negotiate? How

anxiety causes negotiators to make low first offers, exit early, and earn less

profit. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *115*(1), 43–54.

Buelens, M., Van De Woestyne, M., Mestdagh, S., & Bouckenooghe, D. (2008).

Methodological issues in negotiation research: A state-of-the-art-review. *Group

Decision and Negotiation*, *17*(4), 321–345.

Caza, B., & Milton, L.P. 2012. Resilience at work: Building capacity in the face of

adversity. In K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of

Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 895–908). Oxford: Oxford University

Press.

Chen, E., & Miller, G.E. (2012). "Shift-and-persist" strategies: Why low

socioeconomic status isn't always bad for health. *Perspectives on Psychological

Science*, *7*(2), 135–158.

Cohen-Chen, S., Crisp, R.J., & Halperin, E. (2017). Hope comes in many forms: Out-

group expressions of hope override low support and promote reconciliation in

conflicts. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8(2), 153–161.

Coleman, P.T. (2004). Paradigmatic framing of protracted, intractable conflict:

Toward the development of a meta-framework. *Peace and Conflict*, *10*(3), 197–

235.

Curhan, J.R., Elfenbein, H.A., & Xu, H. (2006). What do people value when they

negotiate? Mapping the domain of subjective value in negotiation. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, *91*(3), 493-512.

De Dreu, C.K.W. (2003). Time pressure and closing of the mind in negotiation.

Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, *91*(2), 280–295.

De Dreu, C.K.W., & Nijstad, B.A. (2008). Mental set and creative thought in social

conflict: Threat rigidity versus motivated focus. *Journal of Personality and*

Social Psychology, *95*(3), 648-661.

Dewulf, A., Gray, B., Putnam, L., Lewicki, R., Aarts, N., Bouwen, R., & Van

Woerkum, C. (2009). Disentangling approaches to framing in conflict and

negotiation research: A meta-paradigmatic perspective. *Human Relations*, *62*(2),

155–193.

Druckman, D. (2001). Turning points in international negotiation: A comparative

analysis. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *45*(4), 519–544.

Druckman, D., & Olekalns, M. (2013). Punctuated negotiations: transitions,

interruptions, and turning points. In M. Olekalns & W. L. Adair (Eds.),

Handbook of Research on Negotiation (pp. 336–356). Cheltenham: Edward

Elgar.

Druckman, D., Olekalns, M., & Smith, P.L. (2009). Interpretive filters: Social

cognition and the impact of turning points in negotiation. *Negotiation Journal*,

25(1), 13–40.

Dunne, E., Wrosch, C., & Miller, G.E. (2011). Goal disengagement, functional

disability, and depressive symptoms in old age. *Health Psychology*, *30*(6), 763.

Dutton, J.E., Roberts, L.M., & Bednar, J. (2010). Pathways for positive identity

construction at work: Four types of positive identity and the building of social

resources. *Academy of Management Review*, *35*(2), 265–293.

Forester, J. (2004). Responding to critical moments with humor, recognition, and

hope. *Negotiation Journal*, *20*(2), 221–237.

Galinsky, A.D., Maddux, W.W., Gilin, D., & White, J.B. (2008). Why it pays to get

inside the head of your opponent: The differential effects of perspective taking

and empathy in negotiations. *Psychological Science*, *19*(4), 378–384.

Gelfand, M.J., Major, V.S., Raver, J.L., Nishii, L.H., & O'Brien, K. (2006).

Negotiating relationally: The dynamics of the relational self in negotiations.

Academy of Management Review, *31*(2), 427–451.

Giebels, E., De Dreu, C.K.W., & van de Vliert, E. (2003). No way out or swallow the

bait of two-sided exit options in negotiation: the influence of social motives and

interpersonal trust. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *6*(4), 369–386.

Giebels, E., De Dreu, C.K.W., & Van de Vliert, E. (2000). Interdependence in

negotiation: Effects of exit options and social motive on distributive and

integrative negotiation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *30*(2), 255–272.

Goldberg, S.B., & Shaw, M.L. (2007). The secrets of successful (and unsuccessful)

mediators continued: Studies two and three. *Negotiation Journal*, *23*(4), 393–

418.

Griffin, M.A., Tesluk, P.E., & Jacobs, R.R. (1995). Bargaining cycles and work-

related attitudes: Evidence for threat-rigidity effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(6), 1709–1725.

Haselhuhn, M.P., Schweitzer, M.E., & Wood, A.M. (2010). How implicit beliefs influence trust recovery. *Psychological Science*, *21*(5), 645–648.

Helgeson, V.S., Reynolds, K.A., & Tomich, P.L. (2006). A meta-analytic review of benefit finding and growth. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *74*(5), 797.

Henderson, M.D., Trope, Y., & Carnevale, P.J. (2006). Negotiation from a near and distant time perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*(4), 712.

Herbst, U., & Schwarz, S. (2011). How valid is negotiation research based on student sample groups? New insights into a long-standing controversy. *Negotiation Journal*, *27*(2), 147–170.

Hyder, E.B., Prietula, M.J., & Weingart, L.R. (2000). Getting to best: Efficiency versus optimality in negotiation. *Cognitive Science*, *24*(2), 169–204.

Kim, S.H., & Smith, R.H. (1993). Revenge and conflict escalation. *Negotiation Journal*, *9*(1), 37–43.

Lewis, B., Olekalns, M., Smith, P.L., & Caza, B. (2018). See the benefit: Adversity appraisal and subjective value in negotiation. *Negotiation Journal*, *34*(4), 379–400.

Liberman, V., Anderson, N.R., & Ross, L. (2010). Achieving difficult agreements: Effects of positive expectations on negotiation processes and outcomes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(3), 494–504.

Loewenstein, J., Thompson, L., & Gentner, D. (2003). Analogical learning in

negotiation teams: Comparing cases promotes learning and transfer. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *2*(2), 119–127.

Maitlis, S. (2009). Who am I now? Sensemaking and identity in posttraumatic growth. In I.M. Roberts & J.E. Dutton (Eds.), *Exploring Positive Identities and Organizations* (pp. 47–76). New York: Psychology Press.

Malhotra, D., & Bazerman, M.H. (2007). Investigative negotiation. *Harvard Business Review*, *85*(9), 72.

McAdams, D.P. (2008). Personal narratives and the life story. In L. Pervin & O. John (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (pp. 478–500). New York: Guilford Press.

McGinn, K.L., Lingo, E.L., & Ciano, K. (2004). Transitions through out-of-keeping acts. *Negotiation Journal*, *20*(2), 171–184.

McRae, B. (2002). Breaking the impasse: Negotiation and mediation strategies. In D. Goodwin & M. Midlane (Eds.), *Negotiation in International Conflict: Understanding Persuasion* (pp. 31–44). London: Frank Cass.

Miles, E.W. (2010). The role of face in the decision not to negotiate. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *21*(4), 400–414.

Miles, E.W., & Maurer, T.J. (2012). Advancing validity of self-efficacy in negotiation through focusing at the domain level. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *85*(1), 23–41.

Moos, R.H., & Schaefer, J.A. (1993). Coping resources and processes: Current concepts and measures. In L. Goldberger & S. Breznitz (Eds.), *Handbook of Stress: Theoretical and Clinical Aspects* (pp. 234-257). New York, NY, US: Free Press.

Neimeyer, R.A., Levitt, H., & Snyder, C. (2001). Coping and coherence: A narrative perspective on resilience. In C.R. Snyder (ed.), *Coping with Stress: Effective People and Processes* (pp. 47–67). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nelson, N., Shacham, R., & Ben-ari, R. (2016). Trait negotiation resilience: a measurable construct of resilience in challenging mixed-interest interactions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *88*, 209–218.

Ochsner, K.N. & Gross, J.J. (2005) The cognitive control of emotion. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 9(5), 242-249.

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*(1), 148–176.

O'Connor, K.M., Arnold, J.A., & Burris, E.R. (2005). Negotiators' bargaining histories and their effects on future negotiation performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(2), 350–362.

O'Connor, K.M., Arnold, J.A., & Maurizio, A.M. (2010). The prospect of negotiating: Stress, cognitive appraisal, and performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(5), 729–735.

Olekalns, M., Caza, B.B., & Vogus, T. (2019). Gradual drifts, abrupt shocks: From relationship fractures to relational resilience. *Academy of Management Annals*. Online ahead of print. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2017.0111

Olekalns, M., & Druckman, D. (2015). With feeling: How emotions shape negotiation. In B. Martinovsky (Ed.), *Emotion in Group Decision and Negotiation* (pp. 33–50). Dordrecht: Springer.

Olekalns, M., & Smith, P.L. (2007). Loose with the truth: Predicting deception in

negotiation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *76*(2), 225–238.

Olekalns, M., & Smith, P.L. (2009). Mutually dependent: Power, trust, affect and the

use of deception in negotiation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *85*(3), 347–365.

Pals, J. L., & McAdams, D.P. (2004). The transformed self: A narrative

understanding of posttraumatic growth. *Psychological Inquiry*, 65–69.

Patton, C., & Balakrishnan, P.V.S. (2010). The impact of expectation of future

negotiation interaction on bargaining processes and outcomes. *Journal of*

Business Research, *63*(8), 809–816.

Powley, E.H. (2009). Reclaiming resilience and safety: Resilience activation in the

critical period of crisis. *Human Relations*, *62*(9), 1289–1326.

Pruitt, D.G. (2005). Escalation, readiness for negotiation, and third-party functions. In

J. Blaustein, I.W. Zartman & G.O. Faure (Eds.), *Escalation and Negotiation in*

International Conflicts, 251–270. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Rubin, J.Z., Kim, S.H., & Peretz, N.M. (1990). Expectancy effects and negotiation.

Journal of Social Issues, *46*(2), 125–139.

Shalvi, S., Reijseger, G., Handgraaf, M.J.J., Appelt, K. C., Femke, S., Giacomantonio,

M., & De Dreu, C.K.W. (2013). Pay to walk away: Prevention buyers prefer to

avoid negotiation. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *38*, 40–49.

Sinaceur, M., & Neale, M.A. (2005). Not all threats are created equal: How

implicitness and timing affect the effectiveness of threats in negotiations. *Group*

Decision and Negotiation, *14*(1), 63–85.

Sonenshein, S., Dutton, J.E., Grant, A.M., Spreitzer, G.M., & Sutcliffe, K.M. (2013).

Growing at work: Employees' interpretations of progressive self-change in

organizations. *Organization Science*, *24*(2), 552–570.

Spector, B. (2006). Resiliency in negotiation: Bouncing back from impasse. *International Negotiation*, *11*(2), 273–286.

Staw, B.M., Sandelands, L.E., & Dutton, J.E. (1981). Threat rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multilevel analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 501–524.

Tasa, K., Whyte, G., & Leonardelli, G.J. (2013). Goals and Negotiation. In E.A. Locke & G.P. Latham (Eds.), *New developments in Goal Setting and Task Performance* (pp. 421–438). Routledge.

Tedeschi, R.G., & Calhoun, L.G. (2004). Posttraumatic growth: Conceptual foundations and empirical evidence. *Psychological Inquiry*, *15*(1), 1–18.

Thompson, B., & Ravlin, E. (2017). Protective factors and risk factors: Shaping the emergence of dyadic resilience at work. *Organizational Psychology Review*, *7*(2), 143–170.

Thompson, L.L., Wang, J., & Gunia, B.C. (2010). Negotiation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *61*(1), 491–515.

Tuncel, E., Mislin, A., Kesebir, S., & Pinkley, R.L. (2016). Agreement attraction and impasse aversion: reasons for selecting a poor deal over no deal at all. *Psychological Science*, *27*(3), 312–321.

Vogus, T.J., & Sutcliffe, K.M. (2007). Organizational resilience: towards a theory and research agenda. In *Proceedings of the 2007 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics* (pp. 3418-3422). Montréal, Canada: IEEE.

Volkema, R.J. (2009). Why Dick and Jane don't ask: getting past initiation barriers in negotiations. *Business Horizons*, *52*(6), 595–604.

Volkema, R.J., & Kapoutsis, I. (2016). From restaurants to board rooms: How

initiating negotiations teaches management principles and theory. *Journal of Management Education*, *40*(1), 76–101.

Vough, H.C., & Caza, B.B. (2017). Where do I go from here? Sensemaking and the construction of growth-based stories in the wake of denied promotions. *Academy of Management Review*, *42*(1), 103–128.

Wang, L., Northcraft, G.B., & Van Kleef, G.A. (2012). Beyond negotiated outcomes: The hidden costs of anger expression in dyadic negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *119*(1), 54–63.

Wheeler, M. (1997). Getting to No. *Negotiation Journal*, *13*(3), 227–233.

Wheeler, M. (2013). *The Art of Negotiation: How to Improvise Agreement in a Chaotic World*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

White, J.B., Tynan, R., Galinsky, A.D., & Thompson, L. (2004). Face threat sensitivity in negotiation: Roadblock to agreement and joint gain. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *94*(2), 102–124.

Williams, T.A., Gruber, D.A., Sutcliffe, K.M., Shepherd, D.A., & Zhao, E.Y. (2017). Organizational response to adversity: Fusing crisis management and resilience research streams. *Academy of Management Annals*, *11*(2), 733–769.

Wong, E.M., Haselhuhn, M.P., & Kray, L.J. (2012). Improving the future by considering the past: The impact of upward counterfactual reflection and implicit beliefs on negotiation performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(1), 403–406.