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Abstract
The current study extends prior negotiation research on culture and verbal behavior by investigating the display of nonverbal behaviors associated with dominance by male and female Canadian and Chinese negotiators. We draw from existing literature on culture, gender, communication, and display rules to predict both culture and gender variation in negotiators’ display of three nonverbal behaviors typically associated with dominance: relaxed posture, use of space, and facial display of negative emotion. Participants engaged in a dyadic transactional negotiation simulation which we videotaped and coded for nonverbal expression. Our findings indicated that male Canadian negotiators engaged in more relaxed postures and displayed more negative emotion, while male Chinese negotiators occupied more space at the negotiation table. In addition, use of space and negative emotion partially mediated the relationship between culture and joint gains, as well as satisfaction with negotiation process. We discuss contributions to cross-cultural negotiation literature, implications for cross-cultural negotiation challenges, as well as future studies to address cultural variation in the interpretation of nonverbal cues.
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International business negotiators face a complex array of challenges including cultural differences in communication styles, strategic repertoires, and cognitive schemas. These differences often lead to a culture clash, due to negotiators either failing to adapt or over-adapting to their partner, which can cause a variety of
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misunderstandings, misattributions, and conflict (Adler and Graham 1989; Morris et al. 1998; Tinsley, Taylor, and Adair 2009). Thus, one goal of international negotiation research is to model and understand distinct intracultural negotiation processes so that we can anticipate and manage challenges that occur in intercultural negotiations. The current study takes a first step in investigating the challenges that intercultural negotiators may face from nonverbal communication clashes, by examining variation in the display of nonverbal behaviors associated with dominance in dyadic, intracultural Canadian and Chinese negotiations.

Prior research on cross-cultural negotiation processes has focused almost exclusively on cultural differences in verbal communication styles (Adair, et al. 2001; Giebels, De Dreu, and Van De Vliert 2000; Taylor and Thomas 2008; Tinsley 2001). Yet understanding cultural variation in negotiators’ nonverbal communication is also important since it is estimated that as much as 80% of communication is conveyed through nonverbal channels (Birdwhistell 1955; Lieberman and Rosenthal 2001; Mehrabian 1981). People use nonverbal cues to express messages that verbal communication cannot (Ting-Toomy 1999). In addition, given that nonverbal behavior is assumed to be unconscious, it is often trusted more than verbal messages, especially when these channels of communication are in conflict (Afifi 2007; Ting-Toomy 1999). Thus, nonverbal communication is an essential part of how negotiators search for information and try to understand the other party’s goals, intentions, and underlying interests (Thompson 2009).

Prior studies have documented cultural variation in both the display rules that influence the nonverbal cues people display and also how people interpret nonverbal behavior (Ekman and Friesen 1975; Matsumoto and Juang 2004; Ting-Toomy 1999). For example, in a study by Graham and Sano (1984), American managers assumed that silence from their Japanese counterparts signaled consent, when it actually did not. Within the negotiation context, silence may be used as a persuasive tactic to elicit concessions or as an indirect way of saying “no” by the Japanese negotiators (Graham 1985; Ueda 1974). This however, is not the case for North American negotiators who tend to be more verbose and uncomfortable with silence (Graham 1985). Cultural differences have also been reported in negotiators’ facial expressions. For example, Russian negotiators tend to start off with grim faces, but later in the interaction they smile and appear more relaxed, which is associated with relationship development (Richmond 1996; Ting-Toomy 1999). Americans in contrast, tend to start negotiation in a friendly manner with open smiles (Ting-Toomy 1999), something a Russian counterpart may interpret as ingenuine.

Cultural variation in the display and interpretation of nonverbal cues is also evident in eye contact. Previous studies illustrate that Japanese managers make less eye contact than American managers (Hawrysh and Zaichkowsky 1990). This has also been illustrated in the negotiation context, where eye contact and facial gazing (gazing at partner’s face) is less frequent amongst Japanese negotiators compared to American negotiators (Graham 1985). Western negotiators may
interpret this lack of eye contact as a knowledge deficiency and/or deceit (Argyle and Cook 1976; Collett 1971; McCarthy, Lee, Itakura, and Muir 2006). Furthermore, East Asian negotiators may interpret higher levels of eye contact by North American negotiators as a dominating and competitive stance. This in turn may foster a distributive negotiation, lowering potential for joint gains and integrative agreements (Hawrysh and Zaichkowsky 1990).

Our study extends this prior research by investigating cultural variation in nonverbal cues that convey dominance. Dominance is described as an action tendency that stems from emotion and involves asserting power over one’s counterpart (Davitz 1969; Kumar 2004). A dominant action tendency is associated with a competitive negotiation approach, which is characterized by a high concern for the self and a low concern for one’s partner (Pruitt and Rubin 1986). In addition, feelings of power and negative emotion may both prompt negotiators to display dominance (Butt and Choi 2010; Kumar, 2004). We are interested in how negotiators from different cultures express dominance nonverbally because 1) all negotiations involve some element of competition, which could elicit expression of dominance by negotiators (Lax and Sebenius 1986); 2) verbal expressions of dominance constitute a major threat to integrative negotiation (Brett, Shapiro, and Lytle 1998; Olekalns, Smith, and Walsh 1996), and 3) uncertainty, perceived dissimilarity, and cultural distance in cross-cultural negotiations are likely to elicit a negative affect that may prompt expressions of dominance (Kumar 2004).

In the realm of nonverbal communication, behaviors that signify dominance include a relaxed posture, for example sitting back in one’s chair, the use of space, for example spreading one’s work out all over the table, and the expression of negative emotion such as anger (Mehrabian 1972; Remland 2009). Based on existing literature on culture and communication, we develop hypotheses predicting culture and gender variation in the display of these nonverbal cues. Since nonverbal cues such as posture and facial expression can predict behavioral outcomes (Ambady and Rosenthal 1992), we also test whether such nonverbal displays impact negotiation outcome. Our article contributes to the international negotiation literature by illustrating cultural variation in negotiators’ display of nonverbal behaviors that significantly impact negotiation performance and negotiator satisfaction. We discuss implications for negotiation training, managing international negotiations, and future research on the interpretation of nonverbal cues.

**Nonverbal Display of Dominance in Negotiation**

Negotiation is a process of social interaction by which parties interdependently make decisions about how to distribute resources and/or resolve conflicts (Thompson and Hastie 1990). Models of conflict management and negotiation styles
typically include a cooperative/competitive dichotomy (Deutsch 1973; Lax and Sebenius 1986), that is used to distinguish five strategic approaches including accommodating, avoiding, competing, compromising, and integrating (Pruitt and Carnevale 1993; Pruitt and Rubin 1986). In the “competing style” (high self-concern and low other-concern), a negotiator is assertive, dominant, and uncooperative (Kirkbride, Tang, and Westwood 1991; Morris et al. 1998). This style is typically measured by such verbal strategies and behaviors as demands, threats, and aggression (De Dreu, Weingart, and Kwon 2000; Pruitt 1981). However, negotiation researchers have yet to examine nonverbal behaviors that display dominance or a competitive stance.

In addition to competitive goals, interpersonal processes and emotion may elicit dominant displays by negotiators. Research on negotiation process has found that negotiators are likely to reciprocate distributive tactics and negative emotion (Brett et al. 1998; Van Kleef et al. 2004). Thus, negotiators who face a competitive partner or who experience negative affect may consciously or unconsciously reciprocate or mirror their partner’s displays of dominance (Thompson, Nadler, and Kim 1999). Models of emotion in negotiation also note that negative affect resulting from goal conflict or unmet expectations may elicit dominant action tendencies in negotiators (Barry and Oliver 1996; Butt, Choi, and Jaeger 2005; Kumar 1999). Dominance is generally associated with being forceful, assertive, and expressive (Burgoon and Dunbar 2000; Manusov 2005), the nonverbal display of which includes the use of space, relaxed posture, and emotion expressiveness, especially negative emotions (Mehrabian 1974; Remland 2009).

According to Remland (1981), powerful and dominant individuals tend to have more access to space and larger territories. Previous studies illustrate that when people expand themselves by occupying space, they are perceived as dominant, and postural expansion is more likely to occur amongst high status individuals (Argyle 1988; Aries, Gold, and Weigel 1983; Mehrabian 1972; Tiedens and Fragale 2003). Space is thus associated with a visible indication of status and power. Occupying space through body expansion can be achieved by moving one’s limbs (arms and legs) away from oneself (Tiedens and Fragale 2003). Hence, dominance may be expressed by occupying more physical space, by sitting in open body positions, and by using expansive gestures (Manusov and Pattersons 2006).

Interestingly, another indicator of dominance is the ability to be relaxed and poised (Manusov and Patterson 2006). Dominant personality dispositions have been shown to correlate with relaxed behavior, and dominant communicators tend to exhibit a relaxed, yet confident guise (Burgoon et al. 1990; Manusov 2005; Mehrabian 1972). In general, high status is associated with a relaxed, easy-going demeanor because a person who feels powerful is confident and more able to be relaxed in social interactions (Burgo 1999; Gifford 1994; Manusov and Patterson 2006; Remland 2009). Nonverbal cues associated with the confident side of dominance include relaxed and expansive postures (Manusov and Patter-
son 2006; Mehrabian 1972; Remland 2009). According to Mehrabian (1972), superiors are more likely to lean back in the chair, use an open-arms position, stretch out, and place their arms and legs in relaxed positions (Remland 2009).

A third nonverbal indicator of dominance is the expression of emotion, particularly negative emotion such as anger. Individuals with power and status have a tendency to disregard display rules and so, they may be more visibly expressive than those of lower status (Remland 2009). They may exhibit dominance by yelling, frowning, staring angrily, not joining in laughter, and engaging in other emotional expressiveness (Remland 2009). A person expressing anger is thought to be dominant, competent, smart, and persuasive (Clark, Parakil, and Carver 1996; Gallois 1993; Labott et al. 1991). Tiedens (2001) likewise reported that the expression of anger led to status conferral and maintenance of status. This prior research suggests that the display of negative emotion on one’s face is a nonverbal cue often associated with dominance.

As noted above, all negotiations inherently include some element of competition. Even negotiators with cooperative motives and a concern for the other party typically still want to get a good deal for themselves (Lax and Sebenius 1986). Thus, we expect all negotiators to display some form of dominance by occupying space, using expansive gestures, engaging in relaxed postures, and displaying negative emotions. Yet, we argue that the level and form of dominant nonverbals will vary depending on a negotiator’s culture and gender.

Culture and the Display of Dominant Nonverbal Behaviors in Negotiation

Culture can be defined as the unique nature of a social group with regards to values, norms, practices, and institutions (Lytle, Brett, Barness, Tinsley, and Janssens 1995). Culture influences individual behaviors as well as the mental models of how things work (Hofstede 1980). Within the negotiation context, culture has been shown to influence not only negotiation goals (Gelfand and Realo 1999; Tinsley and Pillutla 1998; Triandis et al. 1988), strategies (Adair, Weingart, and Brett 2006; Gelfand and Christakopoulou 1999), and cognitive schemas (Adair, Taylor, and Tinsley 2009; Gelfand and McCusker 2002), but also communication styles (Hall 1976; 1987) and normative behaviors (Ellsworth and Ludwig 1972; Matsumoto and Juang 2004).

We recognize that a negotiator’s nonverbal display of dominance may have multiple antecedents, including self-emotions, partner emotions, partner behaviors and strategic intent (Barry and Oliver 1996; Butt, Choi, and Jaeger 2005; Kopelman, Rosette, and Thompson 2006; Kumar 1997); as well as consequences, including reciprocal dominance, yielding, and a conflict spiral (Brett, Shpairo, and Lytle 1998; Butt et al. 2005; Van Kleef, De Dreu, and Manstead 2004). However, as the current study examines culture and gender as predictors of negotiators’ nonverbal displays of dominance, we reserve a look at the role of emotion in predicting nonverbal displays for future studies.
There are two reasons why we expect cultural differences in the display of dominant behaviors. First, prior research suggests that compared to North Americans, East Asians tend to be more cooperative when dealing with in-groups (Morris et al. 1998). Second, North Americans are more likely to vary their posture and display emotion compared to East Asians, who restrain their posture, and mask the display of negative emotion (Kudoh and Matsumoto 1985; Matsumoto and Kupperbusch 2001). While our study will compare samples of Canadian and Chinese negotiators, our literature review will cover research addressing North American and East Asian cultures more generally.

In a conflict setting, East Asians tend to be more cooperative with in-groups compared to North Americans (Wade-Benzoni, Okumura, Brett, Moore, Tenbrunsel, and Bazerman 2002). These cultural differences in conflict management styles have been explained by Hofstede’s (1980) cultural dimension of individualism-collectivism (Brett 2000; Oetzel and Ting-Toomey 2003). In individualistic cultures (e.g. Canada), autonomy, independence, and self-assertion is promoted, while in collectivistic cultures (e.g. China), interdependence, social obligation, and relationship harmony is promoted (Butler, Lee, and Gross 2007). According to Triandis (1988, 1989), compared to collectivists, individualists tend to give preference to their individual goals over group goals. Thus, cooperative behavior tends to be stronger amongst collectivists when interacting with an in-group, than individualists. In fact, several studies illustrate that compared to U.S. Americans; Japanese tend to be more cooperative and are likely to adopt an equal allocation distribution strategy when interacting with in-group members (Leung and Bond 1984; Wade-Benzoni et al. 2002).²

Given that for in-group interactions individualists are more self-interested and less cooperative than collectivists, they may employ more dominating conflict strategies (Oetzel and Ting-Toomey 2003; Ting-Toomey and Kurogi 1998). In a study by Ohbuchi et al. (1999), U.S. American students preferred direct confrontation more than avoidance in a conflict situation. Moreover, dominating styles are positively associated with independence, while avoiding and compromising styles are positively linked with interdependence (Oetzel 1998). So, we expect North American negotiators to engage in more dominant behaviors than East Asian negotiators.

We also expect cultural differences in negotiators’ display of dominant behaviors since research illustrates that people’s body postures and gestures are influenced by their culture (Kleinsmith, De Silva, and Berthouze 2006; Matsumoto and Kudoh 1987). Compared to North Americans, Japanese individuals tend to

² Please note that in some contexts (e.g. buyer-seller bargaining), Chinese negotiators have a more competitive bargaining style than North Americans since sellers are viewed as an out-group (Lee 2000). This bargaining style is, however, not applicable in our study since our negotiation simulation did not involve a buyer and seller. Instead, participants were asked to negotiate about different issues pertaining to opening a catering business.
use more restrained gestures in emotional situations. In communicating interpersonal positiveness (affiliation and liking), Kudoh and Matsumoto (1985) found that compared to Americans, who leaned forward, Japanese participants displayed more restrained postures by straightening their backs. Bond and Shiraishi (1974) also reported that compared to Westerners, the Japanese display far fewer gestures and use more simple postures. Accordingly, we expect North American negotiators will take up more physical space and display more relaxed postures than East Asian negotiators, who will exhibit more rigid and reserved postures.

Culture also affects the extent to which people display facial expressions. Western European cultural values, such as independence and self-assertion, promote open emotion expression (Butler at al. 2007). East Asian cultural values, such as interdependence and relationship harmony, promote emotion suppression, the active reduction of emotion-expressive behavior during emotional arousal (Gross and Levenson 1993, 1997). Previous studies illustrate that collectivists attenuate negative emotions and mask those emotions with smiles (Gross and John 1998; Matsumoto et al. 1997; Matsumoto and Kupperbusch 2001). In a study examining emotional expression in four cultures, Matsumoto et al. (1998) found that Americans scored significantly lower on controlling their expressions than Koreans and Japanese.\(^3\) Provided that East Asians are more reserved and mask their negative emotions, we expect that compared to North Americans, East Asians will display fewer negative emotions.

**Hypothesis 1:** Canadian negotiators will engage in more dominant nonverbal behaviors than Chinese negotiators. Hence, Canadians will use more physical space (H1a), exhibit more relaxed postures (H1b), and express more negative emotion (H1c) than Chinese negotiators.

**Gender Differences in the Display of Dominant Nonverbal Behaviors**

Aside from the display of nonverbal cues varying across cultures, nonverbal behaviors also vary across genders (Frances 1979). Gender refers to the psychological and behavioral characteristics cultures have developed based on sex differences (Matsumoto 2004). Gender roles refer to the degree to which a person adopts the gender specific behaviors ascribed by his or her culture (Matsumoto 2004). Based on gender role stereotypes, men are viewed as dominant, aggressive, and extroverted, whereas females are viewed as nurturing, adaptive, and agreeable (Matsumoto 2004).

---

\(^3\) Please note that these studies do not focus on the feelings that elicit emotional expression, but rather on cultural variation in display rules that encourage or inhibit the expression of emotion in general. An examination of the feelings that elicit emotional expression in various cultural contexts is beyond the scope of the current study.
The masculinity-femininity domain of cultural variability proposed by Hofstede (1980) captures the extent to which a culture promotes gender roles and fosters differences between males and females. In masculine cultures gender roles are distinct; men should be concerned with ego enhancement by being tough and assertive, while women should strive for ego-effacing by being tender and modest (Hofstede 1980; 1991). In feminine cultures, gender roles overlap; both men and women are encouraged to be modest and oriented toward quality of life (Hofstede 1991). Hence, compared to masculine cultures, feminine cultures promote flexible sex-role behaviors.

Some East Asian countries like Japan, China, and Philippines score higher on the masculinity dimension compared to Canada and some Western countries (Hofstede 1980; Matsumoto 2004). In these East Asian countries, females are encouraged to be passive, carry out domestic duties, raise children, and be “good” daughters-in-law. Men are raised to be aloof, unemotional, and authoritative (Sue 1998). In contrast, Western countries such as the Netherlands, Germany, and Finland, have less differentiation between males and females on various psychological characteristics, and gender differences within the country are relatively small (Williams and Best 1990). Given that China has a masculinity index of 66 and Canada has a masculinity index of 52 (Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov 2010), we should observe higher gender role differences amongst the Chinese than Canadians.

In summary, because dominant behavior is more characteristic of males than females, and gender role distinctions should be more prevalent in China than Canada, we predict that male negotiators will display more dominant nonverbal behavior than females, and this gender difference will be larger for Chinese negotiators than Canadian negotiators.

**Hypothesis 2:** Male negotiators will display more dominant nonverbal behaviors than female negotiators (H2a) and this difference will be greater for Chinese negotiators than for Canadian negotiators (H2b).

**Dominant Nonverbal Behaviors and Negotiation Outcome**

As previously mentioned, negotiators employing a competing style tend to be more dominant and assertive. These negotiators tend to be highly concerned with their own outcome in a conflict, and are motivated to win or defeat their opponent (Thomas and Kilmann 1974; Walters et al. 1998). Negotiators with this style typically make large demands and use distributive tactics (Walters et al. 1998). These negotiators may assume that their opponent has opposite interests and preferences, blinding them to common interests and potential value creation opportunities (De Dreu et al. 2000; Pinkley, Griffith, and Northcraft 1995). This
in effect may result in fewer integrative agreements and lower joint gains (Carnevale, Pruitt, and Seilheimer 1981).

Since individualists tend to engage in direct confrontation of conflict, and employ more dominating conflict tactics than collectivists (Ohbuchi et al. 1999; Ting-Toomey and Kurogi 1998; Oetzel and Ting-Toomey 2003); we expect North American negotiators to display more dominant behaviors, which will consequently lower their joint gains. Also, given that dominance tends to be associated with males rather than females, and that the promotion of sex-role stereotypes is higher in China than Canada, we expect males to display more dominant behaviors than females, which will in turn explain their lower joint gains. In other words, we predict that dominant nonverbal behavior will mediate the relationship between culture, gender, and joint gains such that more dominant nonverbal behaviors will lead to lower joint gains.

Prior research on negotiation illustrates that when power is unbalanced, negotiators with more power tend to gain more profits, make fewer concessions, and be more satisfied with the negotiation process and outcomes (Dwyer and Walker 1981; Ganesan 1993; McAlister Bazerman, and Fader 1986; Neslin and Greenhalgh 1983). Hence, dominance is positively related to individual outcome (Bottger 1984; Butt et al. 2005; Littlepage, Schmidt, Whisler, and Frost 1995). A study by Van Kleef and colleagues illustrates one possible mechanism in that they found in a computer-mediated negotiation task, participants were more likely to engage in cooperative behavior and concede when faced with an angry opponent (opponent exhibiting dominance) (Van Kleef, et al. 2004). Thus, dominant behaviors should mediate the relationship between culture, gender, and individual gain, where higher displays of dominant nonverbal cues should lead to higher individual gain.

**Hypothesis 3:** Dominant nonverbal behaviors will mediate the relationship between culture, gender, and negotiation outcome. The relationship with joint gains will be inversely related, such that the higher the dominant behavior, the lower the joint gains (H3a). Dominant nonverbal behaviors will also mediate the relationship between culture, gender, and individual gain and this relationship will be positive. The higher the dominant behavior, the higher the individual gain (H3b).

Considering the prevalence of fixed-pie bias, whereby parties assume negotiations are distributive, many negotiators believe that negotiation is mostly about competition (Bazerman and Neale 1983). When these negotiators display dominant behavior that matches their competitive negotiation schema, they should experience satisfaction because they are enacting a consistent negotiation script. According to previous research, people like to behave in ways that are consistent with their beliefs (Aronson 1968; Greenwald and Ronis 1978). When people experience inconsistency between their behavior and cognition, they experience cognitive
dissonance, in which a person feels tension and discomfort (Festinger 1957). If negotiators believe that negotiation is competitive, they may behave more dominantly to be consistent with their cognitions. This in turn may increase their satisfaction with the negotiation process. Thus, we predict that dominant behavior will mediate the relationship between culture, gender, and negotiator satisfaction such that dominant behaviors will lead to greater negotiator satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 4:** Dominant nonverbal behaviors will mediate the relationship between culture, gender, and negotiator satisfaction such that negotiators who display more dominant nonverbal behavior will report more satisfaction with the negotiation process.

**Method**

**Participants**

All East Asian participants were Chinese, and all North American participants were Canadian-Caucasians. Eighty-two Chinese (44 females and 38 males) and eighty-four Canadian (42 females and 42 males) undergraduate students from a Canadian University participated in a study on “Decision Making,” in exchange for 1 course participation credit or $10. All Chinese students were born in China, Hong Kong, or Taiwan, had been in Canada for less than ten years, and identified primarily with the Chinese culture. When asked with what culture they identified most (1 = Chinese, 2 = Canadian), Chinese participants reported strong identification with the Chinese culture ($M = 1.05, SD = .23$) and Canadian participants reported strong identification with the Canadian culture ($M = 1.99, SD = .11$).

**Design**

The study employed a $2 \times 2$ factorial design with two levels of culture (Canadian/Chinese) and two levels of gender (male/female). Participants engaged in a dyadic intracultural negotiation and were assigned a partner of their own gender.

---

4) Chinese participants who identified with the Canadian culture ($N = 5$) were excluded from the data analysis.

5) Although there are some differences in values and practices amongst sub-regions of Greater China (e.g. People’s Republic of China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan) (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman and Gupta 2004), such as propensity to initiate negotiation (Volkema 2011), we expect similar displays of dominant nonverbal behaviors amongst members of these regions, since prior research illustrate that East Asians (from various regions) are more likely to restrain their posture, and mask the display of negative emotion compared to North Americans (Kudoh and Matsumoto 1985).
Procedure

Participants arrived in pairs at the laboratory and were seated at a table across from each other. Participants were presented with confidential role instructions for “At Your Service,” a negotiation case involving a chef and an entrepreneur negotiating about opening a new catering business (Brett and Gelfand 2008). Participants were given 15 minutes to prepare individually, and were informed that their goal was to maximize their own points and reach agreement on all four issues. Participants were not provided with a negotiation deadline; however, dyads that spent more than 30 minutes were instructed to end the negotiation within 5 minutes. Once an agreement was reached, both parties recorded their agreement and calculated their individual and joint gains. Then, participants individually completed surveys measuring satisfaction and demographics.

The negotiation sessions were videotaped without the awareness of participants because knowledge of the video cameras might have affected nonverbal behavior displays. Upon the completion of the study, all participants were thanked, compensated, and debriefed about the purpose of the study and were informed of the video recording. Participants were then asked to read and sign a second consent form allowing researchers to examine the video recordings.

Dependent and Mediating Measures: Dominant Behaviors

We tested dominant nonverbal behaviors as both dependent (H1&2) and mediating (H3&4) measures. We created these measures by coding videos of the negotiation interaction. Seven independent raters of East Asian and North American cultural backgrounds were trained to reliably identify all the behaviors examined in this study. Raters coded two practice sessions, and for each session, inter-rater reliability was assessed using bivariate correlation. The mean alpha was 0.77, indicating a good inter-rater reliability (Portney and Watkins 2009). Then, two of the seven raters coded every session, recording and rating the frequency of dominant nonverbal behaviors, and we averaged their ratings.

Raters watched each session three times without volume. The first time they were asked to get an overall impression of the interaction. The second and third time, coders were asked to focus on one participant at a time and examine that negotiator’s nonverbal cues (See Appendix A). For some of the behaviors, raters counted the number of times those behaviors were displayed. Thus, to measure negotiators’ relaxed posture, we summed frequency counts of “leaning sideways” and “leaning back,” where negotiators leaned against their chair in a relaxed manner. For other behaviors, coders made judgments on a 5 point rating scale (1 = behavior did not occur; 5 = behavior was displayed very often). To capture the

---

6) Though we recognize that the meaning of nonverbal behavior is often tied to verbal speech (Guerrero 1996), our approach is to objectively measure the display of dominant nonverbal cues without inter-
extent to which negotiators used physical space, we averaged coder’s ratings of each negotiator’s “usage of space,” “hands on table,” and “movement of hands.”

For display of negative emotion, we asked coders to rate how often negotiators displayed all of the negative emotions included in the widely used PANAS scale (Watson, Clark, and Tellegen 1988). Prior researchers have categorized negative emotions into self-induced (e.g. shame, regret) and other induced (e.g. anger, outrage) categories (Butt et al. 2005; Weiner 1986). The self-induced negative emotions on the PANAS scale are less easily associated with dominance (e.g. scared, nervous, ashamed, and sad). However, our original coding scheme did not allow us to separate out these negative emotions from the other-induced emotions that are more closely associated with dominance. Thus, we later asked coders to recall the overall display of anger, disgust, irritability, and hostility versus all other PANAS negative emotions in all the videos they coded. Overall, coders reported observing more negative emotions communicating dominance (e.g. anger, disgust, irritable, and hostile) ($M = 1.8$, $SD = .4$), compared to the other negative emotions (e.g. scared, nervous, ashamed, and sad), ($M = 1.5$, $SD = .4$, $t (6) = 2.29$, $p = .06$).

**Dependent Measures: Joint Gains, Individual Gains, and Negotiator Satisfaction**

The objective negotiation outcomes, individual and joint gains, were dependent measures. Individual gain was computed by adding the points a negotiator received for each issue according to the settlement contract. For joint gains, we added the individual gains for both parties in each dyad. Participants’ satisfaction with negotiation was measured using the Subjective Value Inventory (SVI) questionnaire (Curhan, Elfenbein, and Xu 2006). SVI taps into four components of negotiation satisfaction: feelings about the instrumental outcome, feelings about the self, feelings about the process, and feelings about the relationship. We utilized the subscale for satisfaction with negotiation process.

**Results**

**Cultural Comparison of Dominant Nonverbal Behaviors**

Hypothesis 1 predicted that Canadian negotiators would exhibit more dominant nonverbal behaviors than Chinese negotiators. We conducted univariate general linear model analyses to examine main effects of culture on the dominant nonverbal behaviors (see Table 1) as well as culture by gender interactions. Since some of interpreting the meaning of the behavior. A more subjective approach, where observers make inferences about the intentions of negotiators’ behaviors or negotiators themselves interpret their behaviors is discussed below under future directions (Burgoon and Dunbar 2000; Manusov 2005).
our measures were frequency counts, we controlled for time spent negotiating, because negotiators who spent longer time negotiating would have had more opportunity to display nonverbal cues.

Results indicate that the use of space was higher for the Chinese participants ($M = 3.37$, $SE = 0.05$) than Canadian participants ($M = 3.23$, $SE = 0.05$), ($F(1, 161) = 4.12$, $p < .05$), a finding that was the opposite of our prediction (H1a). There were no significant cultural differences in relaxed postures ($F(1, 161) = .97$, $p > .05$), so H1b was also not supported. However, Canadian negotiators displayed more negative emotion ($M = 1.64$, $SE = 0.06$) than Chinese negotiators ($M = 1.39$, $SE = 0.06$), ($F(1, 161) = 9$, $p < .05$), supporting our final prediction (H1c).

Hypothesis 2 predicted that male negotiators of both Canadian and Chinese cultures would exhibit more dominant nonverbal behaviors than female negotiators, and this would be particularly evident for Chinese negotiators. To test this claim, we examined the main effect of gender and the interaction between gender and culture. We did not find a significant main effect of gender on any of our nonverbal measures: use of space ($F(1, 163) = .045$, $p > .05$), relaxed posture ($F(1, 163) = .001$, $p > .05$), or negative emotion ($F(1, 163) = .82$, $p > .05$). Thus, contrary to H2a, male negotiators in general did not engage in more dominant behaviors compared to female negotiators. However, H2b received partial support (Table 2). We found a marginally significant Culture X Gender interaction for use of space ($F(1, 161) = 2.84$, $p = .09$), where Chinese males used space the most, while Canadian males used space the least. The amount of space used by females did not vary across culture. A significant interaction emerged for relaxed postures ($F(1, 161) = 4.79$, $p < .05$). Again, the extent to which female negotiators exhibited relaxed posture was not significant across culture. However, overall Chinese male negotiators scored the lowest on relaxed posture whereas Canadian males scored the highest on this category. We did not find a significant interaction on the expression of negative emotion.

To examine the interactions more closely, we plotted the means. The figures illustrate that Chinese men scored highest in use of space ($M = 3.43$, $SE = .07$), while Canadian men scored the lowest ($M = 3.17$, $SE = .07$) (see Fig. 1). However, where Canadian men varied their posture the most ($M = 6.41$, $SE = .90$),
Table 2. Culture by Gender Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonverbal Behaviors</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese M (S.E.)</td>
<td>Canadian M (S.E.)</td>
<td>Chinese M (S.E.)</td>
<td>Canadian M (S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Space †</td>
<td>3.43 (.07)</td>
<td>3.17 (.07)</td>
<td>3.31 (.07)</td>
<td>3.28 (.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed Posture *</td>
<td>3.54 (1)</td>
<td>6.41 (.9)</td>
<td>5.62 (.9)</td>
<td>4.59 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotion</td>
<td>1.29 (.08)</td>
<td>1.64 (.08)</td>
<td>1.5 (.08)</td>
<td>1.63 (.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05.
† p ≤ .10.

Fig. 1. Culture by gender interaction: use of space.

Fig. 2. Culture by gender interaction: relaxed postures.
Chinese men varied their posture the least \((M = 3.54, SE = 1.00)\) (see Fig. 2). The scores of Canadian and Chinese women on these dimensions was fairly similar (Can \(M = 4.59, SE = .92\)), (Chin \(M = 5.62, SE = .90\)), and it was not always less than the male negotiators.

**Dominant Behaviors as Mediators of Joint and Individual Gains and Negotiator Satisfaction**

To test whether the effects of culture and gender on joint gains and negotiation satisfaction were mediated by dominant nonverbal behaviors, we conducted a series of hierarchical regressions. Culture and gender were each dummy coded \((0, 1)\) since they were categorical predictor variables. We transformed our nonverbal behavior scores prior to conducting mediation analysis to control for the fact that some dyads spent more time negotiating than others. For frequency count of nonverbal behaviors, we divided each individual’s total count by the number of minutes the dyad negotiated, resulting in a proportion score capturing behaviors per minute (Adair et al. 2001). Negative emotion was rated on a 1–5 scale, which we also transformed using the number of minutes spent negotiating. We used this transformation because we wanted to weight negative emotion more heavily for dyads that spent less time negotiating. Research on negotiation and time shows that negotiators are likely to posture and compete early on, which is offset by later cooperative behaviors (Pruitt 1981; Putnam and Jones 1982). If negotiators only spent 10 minutes negotiating, rather than the maximum of 30 minutes, the expression of negative emotion should have a stronger effect than if negotiations lasted longer and reached the cooperative stages.

H3a predicted that dominant behaviors would mediate the relationship between culture, gender and joint gains (see Table 3); such that the more dominant behavior is displayed, the lower the joint gains. To examine this relationship, we employed the sequential regression technique and reporting procedures (Keith 2006; MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West, and Sheets 2002; Wade-Benzoni et al. 2002) using the dyad as our unit of analysis. We initially ran a moderated mediation model; however, the interaction (Culture x Gender) was not significantly related to joint gains. So, for the remaining mediation analyses, we included both culture and gender as our predictors. In step 1 of the model, we examined whether the predictor variables, culture and gender, were significantly related to our dependent measure, joint gains. The results indicate a significant negative relationship between culture, \(\beta = -.23\), gender, \(\beta = -.24\), and joint gains, \((F(2, 70) = 3.88, p < .05)\), where Canadians had lower joint gains than Chinese negotiators, and females had lower joint gains than male negotiators. Step 2 of our model examined whether the mediators, dominant behaviors, significantly predicted joint gains. Both use of space, \(\beta = -.33\), \((F(1, 71) = 8.46, p < .05)\), and negative emotion, \(\beta = -.31\), \((F(1, 71) = 7.3, p < .05)\), were inversely related to
joint gains such that higher scores on these behaviors, lowered joint outcomes. We did not find a significant relationship between relaxed postures and joint gains. The full mediation was tested in the final step of our model. After including the predictor and mediating variables, culture was no longer significant and gender was less significant. Use of space, $\beta = -.33$, ($F(3, 69) = 5.22, p < .05$), and negative emotion, $\beta = -.25$, ($F(3, 69) = 4.33, p < .05$), were still significant, indicating that these dominant behaviors partially mediate the relationship between culture, gender and joint outcomes. Thus, H3a was partially supported.

We conducted similar analysis to test whether dominant nonverbal cues mediated the relationship between culture, gender, and individual gains. H3b predicted a positive relationship such that the more a negotiator employs dominant behaviors, the higher his or her negotiation outcome will be. Each participant, rather than the dyad, was our unit of analysis, and we controlled for partner’s negotiation outcome when examining the relationship of culture, gender, and dominant behaviors with individual gain. Overall, we did not find a significant relationship between culture and gender with individual outcome. Yet, the Culture × Gender interaction was significantly related to individual gain. We found a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>df for $F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>3.88*</td>
<td>(2, 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Space</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>8.46**</td>
<td>(1, 71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-.2</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>5.22**</td>
<td>(3, 69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Space</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>3.88*</td>
<td>(2, 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotion</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>7.3*</td>
<td>(1, 71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>4.33*</td>
<td>(3, 69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotion</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p \leq .05$.
** $p \leq .01$. 

Table 3. Mediation Analysis Predicting Joint Gains
negative relationship between Culture x Gender interaction, $\beta = -0.24$, and individual gain ($F(3, 145) = 2.9, p < .05$), where Canadians had lower individual gains than Chinese negotiators, especially Canadian females. So, we ran a moderated mediation model to examine nonverbal behaviors as mediators. In our analyses, none of the dominant behaviors mediated the relationship between culture x gender, and individual gain, thus H3b was not supported.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that dominant nonverbals would mediate the relationship between culture, gender, and satisfaction with negotiation process (see Table 4). SVI scores on satisfaction with process were calculated and standardized to z-scores to normalize distribution. Similar to the previous mediation analyses, step 1 of the model explored the relationship of the predictor variables, culture and gender, and our dependent measure, satisfaction with process. The results indicated a significant positive relationship between culture, $\beta = 0.16$, and satisfaction with process, ($F(1, 144) = 3.86, p < .05$), where Canadians reported higher level of satisfaction than Chinese negotiators. The relationship between satisfaction with process and gender was not significant, so we did not proceed to analyze gender as a predictor in the mediation model. In step 2, we examined whether the mediators, dominant behaviors, significantly predict satisfaction with negotiation. Use of space, $\beta = 0.22$, ($F(1, 144) = 7.45), p < .05$, and displays of negative emotion, $\beta = 0.20$, ($F(1, 144) = 5.84, p < .05$), were related to negotiator satisfaction such that a higher use of these behaviors led to higher satisfaction. Once more, we did not find a significant relationship between relaxed postures and negotiator satisfaction and thus did not proceed with mediation analysis for relaxed posture. In step 3, we tested the full mediation. Culture was no longer significant while use of space, $\beta = 0.21$, ($F(2, 144) = 5.21, p < .05$), and displays of negative emotion, $\beta = 0.17$, ($F(2, 144) = 3.93, p < .05$), were still significant, indicating that these behaviors partially mediate the relationship between culture and joint outcomes. Accordingly, H4 was partially supported.

**Discussion**

The current study investigated the effect of culture and gender on intracultural negotiators’ display of nonverbal behaviors typically associated with dominance. We predicted differences based on culture, since East Asians are more reserved and less competitive (when interacting with in-groups) than North Americans (Kudoh and Matsumoto 1985; Morris et al. 1998), and gender, since gender role distinctions are stronger in China than in Canada (Hofstede, 1980; Williams Best 1990). Our findings indicate that while Canadian negotiators were more likely to have a relaxed body posture and display negative emotion on their face, Chinese negotiators were more likely to use space at the negotiation table. These results suggest cultural differences in negotiators’ tendencies to display cues
typically associated with dominance and offer important implications for both future research and practical advice to negotiators. In addition, we found that the display of negative emotion and the use of space significantly mediated the effect of culture on joint gains and negotiator satisfaction. Thus, our study confirms cultural variation in nonverbal displays of dominance that has implications for negotiation outcome.

Our findings on cultural differences in negotiators’ nonverbal behaviors are consistent with prior research in other contexts, where Canadians displayed more relaxed posture and negative emotion than Chinese negotiators (Butler, Lee, and Gross 2007; Matsumoto et al. 1998). Also, similar to cultural effects in previous studies (Bond and Shiraishi 1974; Matsumoto et al. 1997), our Chinese negotiators had more restrained and rigid posture and fewer displays of negative emotion than Canadian negotiators. Our results add to prior research not only by replicating the effects in a negotiation context, but also because we found that along with a reserved and rigid posture, Chinese male negotiators took up more space than Canadian negotiators. Based on Western nonverbal behavior research, taking up space is a sign of dominance (Remland 1981). It seems reasonable that if social norms constrain Chinese male negotiators from expressing dominance with a free and relaxed posture, they may instead reveal it through spreading their things out and taking up space. Similar to the way in which Japanese negotiators seat the most senior executive at the head of the table, facing the door (Hodson, Sano and Sano

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Δ R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df for F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Culture</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>3.86*</td>
<td>(1, 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 Use of Space</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>7.45**</td>
<td>(1, 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 Culture Use of Space</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>5.21**</td>
<td>(2, 144)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05.  
** p ≤ .01.
Graham 2008), Chinese negotiators may express dominance through the manipulation of their environment, rather than their body.

Prior studies on culture and verbal communication have found that East Asian negotiators use more power tactics than North American negotiators (Adair et al. 2004). But North American negotiators tend to have high independence and individualist values that go along with a self-focus and competitive strategy (Brett and Okumura 1998; Gelfand and Christakopoulou 1999; Gelfand and McCusker 2002; Gelfand and Realo 1999). Thus, both East Asian and North American negotiators are likely to display dominance nonverbally. Our study captures how negotiators from Canada and China may display dominance in distinct, culturally-normative ways.

The current study measured the frequency of nonverbal displays, but not the target’s intended meaning or the partner’s interpretation of the nonverbal cue. Future research should test the emotions and strategic intent of Canadian negotiators who use a relaxed posture and display negative emotion, and Chinese negotiators who use a lot of space. Our results suggest potential areas of miscommunication to be studied further in Canadian-Chinese intercultural negotiations. If cross-cultural negotiators display dominance in different ways, negotiators may misinterpret the other party’s approach. For example, a Chinese negotiator may associate a Canadian counterpart’s relaxed posture as disinterest, or the display of emotion as weakness. The Chinese negotiator may walk away or use a conciliatory strategy when a more effective approach may be reciprocal dominance or yielding (Butt et al. 2005; Van Kleeck et al. 2004). There may be a missed opportunity to deflect and redirect dominance, a strategy advocated by Brett and colleagues (1998) because it was not noticed or was not correctly interpreted.

Our results also revealed that the greatest cultural differences were exhibited by male negotiators, with female negotiators displaying more moderate and similar dominant nonverbal behaviors. In other words, our results support culture and gender role expectations more for male than female negotiators. One reason why we did not find the behaviors associated with traditional female gender roles (i.e. low expression of dominant nonverbal behaviors) may be the context of our study. Negotiation tends to be a more male-dominated field, and so women who engage in negotiation may also try to exhibit more masculine, dominant behaviors (Kray, Thompson, and Galinsky 2001). Also, given that women negotiated with other women, it may have been relatively easy for them to display dominant behaviors as there are fewer social risks (e.g. negative reactions in displaying dominant, masculine behavior by a woman) than negotiating with men (Carli 1990; Deaux and Major 1987; Ridgeway and Berger 1986). This may not have been the case if women negotiated with men. Instead, they may have displayed more traditional female role stereotypes.

We found that the use of space and display of negative emotion mediated the relationship between culture and joint gains, such that the more a negotiator
employed these behaviors, the lower the dyad’s joint gains. Given that Chinese negotiators used more space and Canadian negotiators displayed more negative emotions, our data suggest that negative emotion may be a nonverbal associated with dominance for Canadian negotiators and use of space may be a nonverbal associated with dominance for Chinese negotiators. This inference is based on previous literature that shows that negotiators employing distributive tactics tend to be more competitive and assertive (Walters et al. 1998) and are thus more likely to display dominance in negotiation. However, since we did not directly measure interpretation of nonverbal cues in this study, linking negotiators’ “use of space” to feelings of dominance in China and “negative emotion” to feelings of dominance in Canada is an empirical one to be tested in future studies.

Use of space and negative emotion also emerged as significant mediators between culture and satisfaction with the negotiation process. Our logic behind this relationship was derived from past literature indicating that people like to behave in a manner that is consistent with their cognition and beliefs (Aronson 1968; Greenwald and Ronis 1978). Given that most people tend to have a fixed-pie belief about negotiations, they may use and display dominant behavior which is congruous with their beliefs and assumptions. This should increase their satisfaction with negotiation process since their behavior matches their expectations and intentions. Although we did not test this congruence mechanism directly, our results support this assumption where the more dominant behavior (space and negative emotion) was displayed, the more satisfied that negotiator was with the negotiation process.

Overall, our findings are largely consistent with theories of culture and communication. According to researchers, cultures can communicate the same message in different ways. Low context cultures, typically in the West, engage in explicit, direct information exchange, and are more likely to say things in words and express emotion. In contrast, high context cultures, typically in the East, engage in implicit information exchange such as storytelling and inference making; and tend to rely on indirect communication and suppress the display of emotion (Hall 1987; Holtgraves 1997; Matsumoto and Juang 2004). Given these cultural differences in verbal communication and information exchange, it may be that Chinese negotiators communicate dominance in a more subtle manner (by taking up space) rather than being more explicit like the Canadians (displaying negative emotion and relaxed posture).

7) Of course, negative emotion as a nonverbal cue is important for both Chinese and Canadians. However, given cultural differences in display rules, Chinese negotiators are less likely to express negative emotions nonverbally (Butler, Lee, and Gross 2007; Matsumoto et al. 1998) due to loss of face (Graham and Lam 2003).
Limitations and Future Directions

One limitation of our study is that we operationalized measures of dominant behaviors based on research conducted in the West. And since we wanted to observe negotiators as naturally as possible, we did not interrupt them or ask them for intent or interpretation of nonverbal behavior. For example, some studies illustrate that negative emotions such as anger can be beneficial if expressed in a culturally appropriate manner (Adam, Shirako, and Maddux 2010; Liu 2009; Liu, and Wang 2010). However, since we did not explicitly measure anger (e.g. have negotiators rate their emotions), and have not manipulated anger, we cannot say for sure what the influence of this particular emotion is on negotiation process and outcome. Thus, while we can draw conclusions about the display of “dominant” nonverbal cues, we are not able to say for sure if the behaviors displayed by our Eastern negotiators signaled dominance. This can be examined further in future research examining how negotiators from different cultures interpret nonverbal cues. Another limitation of our study is that our negotiators were undergraduate students in a laboratory setting. Despite efforts for experimental realism, some natural nonverbal expressiveness may have been hampered by the artificial setting. It may be expected that our results are on the conservative side, and we may see more evidence of nonverbal expression (or suppression) in videotaped real world negotiations.

Since our study represents an early look at negotiators’ nonverbal displays, we examined nonverbal displays of dominance with the broadest possible lens. Because negotiation is a dynamic process, negotiators’ goals, strategies, and emotions can change over time (Adair and Brett 2005; Barry and Oliver 1996; Kumar 1999; Morris and Keltner 2000; Olekalns Smith, and Walsh 1996). Future work should examine nonverbal displays of dominance at different negotiation stages, for example during early periods of posturing or later stages of information exchange. Future work should also investigate interpersonal within-dyad processes such as contagion and mirroring of nonverbal displays (Thompson et al. 1999).

In this study, we have not yet tested the many possible antecedents (e.g. emotions, strategic intent) and consequences (e.g. yielding, conflict spiral) of negotiators’ displays of dominance. There are quite a number of studies examining the influence of anger on negotiation and decision making (Adam et al. 2010; Gibson, Schweitzer, Callister, and Gray 2009; Liu and Wang 2010; Sinaceur and Tiedens 2006; Van Kleef, De Dreu, Pietroni, and Manstead 2006). These studies, however, illustrate mixed results on negotiation outcomes. For instance, Gibson et al. (2009) suggest that when anger expressions are low on intensity, and are expressed verbally rather than non-verbally, they can result in better outcomes. However, given that some cultures (e.g. East Asia) prefer indirect communication (Hall 1976); verbal expression of anger may not yield positive results. Also, other
emotions such as anxiety and tension may be typical in a negotiation context and may influence negotiation outcomes (Graham and Lam 2003; Lee, Yang, and Graham 2006). Moreover, research illustrates different types of negative emotions (Higgins 1987; 2000), and that the type of negative emotion promoted varies across cultures (Kumar 2004; Lee, Aaker, and Gardner 2000). Future research can examine some of these variables by manipulating negotiator emotion and measuring nonverbal displays, or by manipulating nonverbal displays and measuring behavioral consequences.

We also hope future research will explore other kinds of nonverbal displays in cross-cultural negotiations. For example, displays of active involvement, happiness, or empathy could vary by culture and cause misunderstanding and misattribution by cross-cultural negotiators. A closer lens could also be employed to examine cultural variation in how negotiators display different kinds of negative affect nonverbally, for example ego-focused versus other-focused negative emotions (Markus and Kitayama 1991) or negative emotions associated with a prevention versus promotion focus (Higgins 2000).

By examining nonverbal cues within same-gender, intracultural Chinese and Canadian dyads, we are able to begin constructing a topology of culturally normative nonverbal behaviors in negotiation. Given that 80% of communication is conveyed nonverbally (Lieberman and Rosenthal 2001), by understanding cultural differences in nonverbal communication, we can develop a clearer picture of why and how communication problems arise in cross-cultural negotiation. Moreover, research findings can be used to train cross-cultural negotiators in the recognition, interpretation, and display of culturally normative nonverbal expression to enhance effective communication and maximize integrative outcomes in intercultural negotiations.
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Appendix A. Categories of Dominant Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Nonverbal Behaviors and Descriptions</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Space</td>
<td>Space (spreading of arms across table and air)</td>
<td>Scale rating (1 = behavior did not occur; 5 = behavior was displayed very often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hands on table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moved hands (gesturing when speaking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed Posture</td>
<td>Leaned sideways (posture leaning to left or right)</td>
<td>Frequency count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaned back (posture leaning back in chair)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Body seems relaxed and at ease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotion</td>
<td>Angry, nervous, scared, disgusted, ashamed, sad, irritable, hostile</td>
<td>Scale rating (1 = behavior did not occur; 5 = behavior was displayed very often)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>