Get mad and get more than even: When and why anger expression is effective in negotiations
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Abstract

We hypothesized that anger expressions increase expressers’ ability to claim value in negotiations, but only when the recipients of these expressions have poor alternatives. This effect occurs because anger expression communicates toughness, and only recipients who have poor alternatives are affected by the toughness of their counterpart. In Experiment 1, participants read a scenario about a negotiator who either was angry or not. In Experiment 2, dyads negotiated face-to-face after one negotiator within each dyad was advised to show either anger or no emotion. In both studies, recipients of anger expressions who had poor alternatives conceded more. Experiment 2 also provided evidence that toughness ascribed to the expresser mediated the effect of anger expression on claiming value.
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“‘The way in which he made use … of anger contributed to make one feel what a mastery he had of the terrible game in which he was engaged…”’ (De Gaulle, 1954/1964, pp. 57–58).

In his memoirs, French President Charles De Gaulle recalled his impressions of Winston Churchill. De Gaulle says that Churchill was persuasive by conveying toughness. According to De Gaulle, one tactic Churchill used was the expression of anger. In this way, De Gaulle suggested that anger might be used strategically in negotiations and that its advantage might rest in its ability to create the perception that the expresser is tough. In this paper we examine De Gaulle’s claim by investigating whether people who express anger in a negotiation are effective in inducing more concessions in their negotiation partners.

Experienced emotions in negotiation

Most of the existing research on affect in negotiation has focused on emotional experience, rather than on emotional expression. That research has consistently found that experiencing positive emotions is beneficial to negotiators, but that experiencing negative emotions is not. For example, negotiators in a positive mood are less likely to adopt contentious behaviors, and more likely to propose alternatives, and suggest trade-offs than negotiators in a neutral mood. In turn, when negotiators feel good, negotiation outcomes are better (Carnevale & Isen, 1986; Forgas, 1998). Other research has demonstrated a negative impact of negative feelings in negotiation. Allred, Mallozzi, Matsui, and Raia (1997) found that negotiators who felt angry achieved fewer joint gains than did negotiators who had more positive feelings. Similarly, Pillutla and Murnighan’s (1996) participants who felt angry refused offers that served their economic interests.

Although the results from the literature on felt emotion in negotiations do not seem to support De Gaulle’s
observations about Churchill, they may be irrelevant to Churchill’s strategy. De Gaulle did not say that Churchill necessarily felt anger while being so persuasive, he merely indicated that he “used” it, which could mean that he expressed it without feeling the slightest bit angry. Research on emotional expression suggests that emotional expressions can occur independently from feelings (Fridlund, 1991; Tourangeau & Ellsworth, 1979) and can have independent effects (McCauley, Holmes, & Solomon, 1982). Thus, expressions of anger might have different effects than feelings of anger. In this paper, we argue that anger expressions are noticed and processed by negotiators and that the inferences people draw based on these expressions affect negotiation behavior.

Anger expressions and resulting inferences

People are quite adept at noticing and reading the emotion expressions of others. In fact, research has shown that people are very accurate when matching cues (from the face, the voice, or the body) to the emotional state of the expresser (Ekman, 1993; Scherer, 1986). Observers infer more than felt affect from such expressive cues; they also infer characteristics of the expresser. In particular, people believe that someone expressing anger is dominant (Knutson, 1996; Tiedens, 2001; Tiedens, Ellsworth, & Mesquita, 2000), strong, and tough (e.g., Clark, Pataki, & Carver, 1996; Karasawa, 2001; Knutson, 1996).

Although the effect of anger expressions on perceptions of toughness has not been demonstrated in the domain of negotiation, it seems likely that this effect would generalize, and that such perceptions could affect the outcome of the negotiation. In general, people concede more to negotiators they perceive as tough or dominant than to those they perceive as soft or submissive (e.g., Bacharach & Lawler, 1981; Komorita & Brenner, 1968; Pruitt, 1981; Yukl, 1974). If anger expressions lead to perceptions of toughness, and perceptions of toughness generally lead to concessions, it seems possible that anger expressions in negotiations would result in concessions.

Perceived alternatives moderate responses to toughness

People’s perception of their alternatives dramatically influences concession making. Better alternatives increase one’s walk away point, reduce one’s perceived dependence on the counterpart, and thus decrease concessions (Bacharach & Lawler, 1980; Kelley, Beckman, & Fischer, 1967; Mannix, Thompson, & Bazer, 1989; Pinkley, Neale, & Bennett, 1994). In fact, people’s perception of their alternatives may affect their behavior more strongly than any other kind of information (White, Valley, Bazer, Neale, & Peck, 1994). One advantage of having good alternatives is that it makes the negotiator less susceptible to the tactics of the opponent (Lawler & Bacharach, 1979; Tedeschi, Lindschold, Horai, & Gahtagan, 1969; Yukl, 1974), particularly tactics that involve creating the perception of toughness. When recipients have good alternatives tough tactics might result in impasses or the unwillingness to compromise but as Yukl (1974) showed, a strategy relying on tough moves was effective at inducing concessions from recipients who did not have any alternatives. Similarly, Komorita and Barnes (1969) found that negotiators who had unattractive alternatives conceded a lot when they were confronted with tough behavior from their counterparts, whereas negotiators with an acceptable alternative were unaffected. Thus, if anger communicates toughness, it should function like other strategies that rely on conveying toughness, and only affect those who perceive themselves as having unattractive alternatives.

Experiment 1

Method

Participants

One-hundred-fifty-seven undergraduates (68 female, 89 male) at a large U.S. University participated in the study for $10 payment. They were recruited from an electronic mailing list that advertises opportunities to participate in studies. This study was conducted in conjunction with other studies presented in a random order during a mass-testing session.

Materials

All participants read a negotiation vignette in which they were asked to imagine that they were playing the role of a negotiator who was finalizing a deal about the sale of technical equipment (see Appendix A for full text). The vignette informed participants that they were negotiating the terms of the warranty, which involved three issues: liability coverage; time needed for possible repair; and a discount for spare parts. The negotiation dialogue was comprised of eleven statements made alternately by the participants’ character and their counterpart. The only aspects of the vignette that varied across conditions were (a) the participants’ character’s alternatives and (b) the emotional tone of the counterpart’s last four statements.

Alternatives manipulation. The alternatives manipulation consisted of information given prior to the dialogue. It read as follows, with the poor perceived alternatives wording in parentheses:

You are (are not) working on many other deals right now. Business is prosperous (rare). It will be easy (difficult) to find another
deal if the one with this customer does not work out. Therefore, it will not (will) be such () a problem if you lose this customer. You have (do not have) many alternatives in this negotiation. Your bargaining power is quite high (low).

Approximately half of the participants ($N=78$) read the good alternatives version and the other half ($N=79$) read the poor alternatives version in which the words in parentheses replaced the prior word.

**Emotion manipulation.** The last four statements made by the counterpart in the dialog were presented either with the phrase “He, in an angry way:” (anger condition, $N=80$) or “He, without being angry:” (no anger condition, $N=77$) displayed right before the statement. The dialogue itself did not vary.

**Dependent variables.** Participants were instructed to consider what terms they would agree to for the warranty. The liability component was measured as follows: “What liability coverage would you grant? Please indicate any number between 0.1 million and 15 million. 0.1 million is the smallest concession possible, 15 million is the biggest concession possible.” The repair time was measured as follows: “What repair time would you grant? Please indicate any number between 10% and 60%. Ten percent is the smallest concession possible, 60% is the biggest concession possible.” The repair time variable was reversed. Since each variable was on a different scale, we standardized them, and then we added them together to create a total concessions score.

**Concessions**

A total concessions variable was created. For liability and discount, a higher score indicated that participants made a bigger concession on those issues. However, for repair time, a lower score indicated that participants made a bigger concession on that issue. Thus, the repair time variable was reversed. Since each variable was on a different scale, we standardized them, and then we added them together to create a total concessions score.

**Results**

**Manipulation checks**

A 2 (Emotion Expression: Angry vs. Not Angry) × 2 (Participants’ Alternatives: Poor vs. Good) ANOVA on the anger manipulation check showed that participants in the anger expression condition thought that their counterpart expressed more anger ($M=5.01, SD=.97$) than participants in the no anger expression condition ($M=2.21, SD=1.25$; $F(3,147)=235.17, p<.001$). There were no main or interaction effects on perceived anger expression due to the alternatives factor. Another 2 (Emotion Expression) × 2 (Participants’ Alternatives) ANOVA on the alternatives manipulation check showed that participants in the poor alternatives condition felt that they had fewer attractive alternatives to the negotiation ($M=2.90, SD=1.11$) than participants in the good alternatives condition ($M=4.24, SD=1.20$; $F(3,147)=50.34, p<.001$). There were no main or interaction effects on perceived alternatives due to the emotion expression factor.
Discussion

This study provides evidence for the combined effect of anger expression and recipients' perception of their alternatives on concessions. Specifically, recipients with poor alternatives made more concessions to counterparts expressing anger than to non-angry counterparts.

There are always questions about the degree to which people's self-reported behavioral intentions in response to a scenario capture the actual behavior people would engage in if they encountered a similar situation (e.g., Cook & Campbell, 1979; but see Robinson & Clore, 2002). Self-report is subject to stereotypes or beliefs about the ways in which social interactions tend to play out, and the explicit nature of the emotion manipulation may have heightened this problem. Therefore, we thought it was important to examine the effect of anger expression in negotiation with a procedure that would allow us to measure concession behavior. This was one goal of Experiment 2.

In Experiment 2 we also wanted to explore the effect of anger expression in a variable-sum negotiation. The outcomes of many negotiations are determined not only by recipients' concessions but also by the capacity of the negotiating dyad to find integrative agreements (Neale & Bazerman, 1991). And, anger expressions might decrease the cooperative behaviors necessary for creating value (Allred, 1999). If so, the damage of anger expressions might outweigh the benefits, making anger a dangerous tactic in negotiations. Thus, in Experiment 2 we also examined the impact of anger expression on value creation.

The effect demonstrated in Experiment 1 is consistent with the idea that anger can be considered a tough strategy since previous literature has shown that other strategies relying on toughness lead to concessions only in people who perceive themselves to have poor alternatives. In Experiment 2 we further tested this proposed mechanism by examining whether perceptions of toughness mediated the effect of anger on people with poor perceived alternatives.

Experiment 2

Method

Participants

Sixty-eight students (30 female, 38 male) at a large French “Grande Ecole” and 80 students (46 female, 34 male) at a large Moroccan “Grande Ecole” participated in the experiment for course credit. A total of 142 (72 female, 70 male) participants were organized into 71 same-sex dyads (36 female, 35 male). There were no main or interaction effects due to gender or national context on any of the variables, so these factors are not discussed further.

Materials and procedure

Negotiation exercise. All participants role-played a job contract negotiation. Participants were randomly assigned to either the role of a candidate or of a recruiter. Pairs of candidates and recruiters negotiated over the terms of a prospective employment situation. Participants were provided with information about the context of the negotiation and their preferences for it. The materials were in French, which is a native language for both Moroccans and French. Participants were told that they could not show their counterpart any of their materials.

The negotiation was comprised of four issues: salary, vacation, location, and equipment provided by the company. Participants were given a payoff schedule along with their role information. As in other negotiation tasks used by researchers (e.g., Thompson, 1991), it was emphasized that the point values specified in the payoff schedules were to determine their negotiation strategy.

The payoff structures were created such that salary was a distributive issue (i.e., a higher point value for the candidate translated into a lower point value for the recruiter). Vacation and equipment were integrative issues in that participants could optimize their joint gain by combining the two issues. Specifically, the vacation issue was worth more to the recruiter, while the equipment issue was worth more to the candidate. This difference in valuation made trading-off possible by conceding on the issue worth less to gain on the issue worth more (Neale & Bazerman, 1991). Location was a congruent issue as candidates and recruiters had the same preferences on that issue (Thompson & Hastie, 1990).

Emotion manipulation. After reading their role instructions, participants were given a set of negotiation recommendations, which were adapted from Kopelman, Rosette, and Thompson (2005). To create consistency across the two conditions, participants in both the neutral and anger conditions were told they needed to use their emotions to demonstrate their strength and power. And, all participants were told that they should follow the advice of experts. However, the two conditions varied in terms of what these experts recommended. In the neutral condition (N = 34) participants were told that experts advised to hide their emotions. They were given a set of recommendations about how to control their emotions, such as staying calm, keeping a poker face, and keeping their voice steady.
in the anger condition ($N = 37$) were advised to express anger. They were given a set of recommendations about expressing anger such as using facial expressions (e.g., frowning), physical expressions (e.g., banging their fist on the table), and to use aggressive sentences (e.g., “This negotiation really makes me angry,” “You’re beginning to get on my nerves”). Participants in the candidate role were not given any emotion instructions.

**Alternatives.** Since the effect of anger expression on concession only occurs among people who perceive themselves as having poor alternatives, it was only among those people that we wanted to examine the mediating role of perceived toughness. Thus, we told all candidates that they had poor alternatives. Specifically, candidates read:

> As a Candidate, you have no other job offer. The job market is not good. It is difficult to find a job. Therefore, you do not think that you will have other offers.... In short, it will be a problem if you do not come to an agreement with the Recruiter. You do not have many alternatives to this negotiation. Your bargaining power is relatively low.

After the negotiation, participants were asked to indicate whether they reached an agreement or not, and, if there was an agreement, what the outcome on each of the four negotiation issues was. Following the negotiation, they completed a questionnaire. Finally, they were debriefed.

**Measures**

**Emotion manipulation checks.** To check the effectiveness of the anger expression manipulation, participants were asked to rate how much their counterpart expressed anger on a 6-point scale that ranged from 1 = “Not at all” to 6 = “Extremely.”

**Perception of alternatives.** Participants’ perception of their alternatives was measured with the question, “Did you feel that you had many attractive alternatives to this negotiation?” This question could be answered by either “Yes” or “No.”

**Outcome variables.** Participants were asked to indicate the agreement, if any, reached for each of the four issues they had negotiated. If no agreement was given for any of the issues, the outcome was considered as an impasse. The total number of points was computed according to the payoff schedules.

**Perception of toughness.** Participants rated the extent to which the adjective “tough” described their counterpart. This rating was made on a 6-point scale that ranged from 1 = “Not at all” to 6 = “Extremely.”

### Results

**Manipulation checks**

**Confidentiality of the instructions**

Three dyads had members who showed their instructions to their opponent. Two of these were in the neutral condition, and one was in the anger expression condition. These dyads were removed from the subsequent analyses.

**Emotion expression**

Recipients (candidates) in the anger expression condition rated their counterpart (recruiter) as expressing more anger ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.67$) than did recipients in the emotion neutral condition ($M = 1.90$, $SD = 1.27$; $F(1,63) = 20.65$, $p < .001$).

**Alternatives**

Four participants who played the role of the recipient (candidate) did not answer the perception of alternatives item. Two of them were in the anger expression condition; the other two were in the emotion neutral condition. These participants could not be included in analyses in which alternatives perception was a variable, but were included in all other analyses. Among the remaining participants playing the role of recipients, 43 (67.2%) said that they had few attractive alternatives; the remaining 21 (32.8%) said that they had many attractive alternatives ($\chi^2(1, N = 64) = 7.56$, $p < .01$). We also examined the relationship of anger expression to recipients’ perception of their alternatives; they were not related ($\chi^2(1, N = 64) = 97$, $ns$), suggesting that recipients’ perception of having good alternatives and their perceptions of their counterpart’s emotional expression were independent.

The majority of participants perceived their alternatives as we intended, however a sizable number of them did not. We are not sure why our instructions allowed for such variance. It may be that some participants did not pay attention to the alternatives component of the instructions, it may be that the negotiation itself influenced perception of alternatives, or it might be that since the participants would soon be job candidates themselves, some projected their desires for the future onto this role play. Whatever the reason, we saw this unintended consequence as potentially fortuitous in that it allowed us to once again examine whether differences in perceptions on alternatives interacted with anger expressions. However, we began our analyses as we had originally planned by comparing the angry condition to the neutral condition. Then, we performed supplemental analyses that took advantage of the variation in subjective perception of alternatives to further test our hypotheses.
Impasses

There were three impasses. Two of them occurred in the anger expression condition; the other occurred in the emotion neutral condition.

Value claiming

Value claiming was operationalized as the percentage of the total points that the expresser got. A one-way (Emotion Expression: Anger Expression vs. Neutral Expression) ANOVA on claiming value yielded a significant effect. Angry expressers claimed more value ($M_{\text{anger}} = 61.50\%$, $SD_{\text{anger}} = 9.24\%$) than did neutral expressers ($M_{\text{neutral}} = 56.60\%$, $SD_{\text{neutral}} = 10.40\%$, $F(1, 63) = 4.05$, $p < .05$).

Value creation

Value creation was measured by the total points earned by the dyad (possible range = 9200–18,000). A one-way Emotion Expression ANOVA showed no effect of anger expression on creating value ($F(1, 63) = .04$, $ns$; $M_{\text{anger}} = 16,076$; $M_{\text{neutral}} = 16,013$).

Toughness as a mediator

Next, we examined whether recipients’ perception of the expresser’s toughness mediated the effect of anger expression on claiming value. We followed the approach of Baron and Kenny (1986) and the results of the regression analyses are presented in Fig. 2, Panel 1. As shown in Fig. 2, regression analyses found that anger expression predicted both value claiming and perceptions of toughness, that perceptions of toughness predicted value claiming, and that when anger expression and toughness simultaneously predicted value claiming, only toughness remained a significant predictor. The Sobel test indicates whether the mediator significantly reduces the effect of the independent variable. This test showed that indeed the effect of anger expression was significantly reduced when toughness was a simultaneous predictor ($z = 2.02$, $p < .05$).

Supplementary analysis

Since a number of participants perceived themselves as having good alternatives we used this variation to further test our model by examining differences between dyads in which the recipients perceived themselves to have poor alternatives and those who perceived themselves to have good alternatives. These analyses must be interpreted with caution since alternatives was not a randomly assigned variable. Nonetheless, they provide another lens with which to examine the hypotheses.

We re-conducted the analyses with a design with two factors: Emotion Expression and Recipients’ perception of their alternatives (poor vs. good). A 2 (Emotion Expression) x 2 (Recipients’ perception of their alternatives) ANOVA was conducted. Categories were: poor alternatives vs. good alternatives. A significant main effect of Recipients’ perception of alternatives was found ($F(1, 63) = 4.99$, $p < .05$). A significant interaction effect was found between Emotion Expression and Recipients’ perception of their alternatives ($F(1, 63) = 4.00$, $p < .05$). The analyses of simple main effects revealed that anger expression predicted value claiming in dyads in which the recipients perceived themselves to have poor alternatives ($F(1, 63) = 4.99$, $p < .05$). The analyses of simple main effects also revealed that anger expression predicted value claiming in dyads in which the recipients perceived themselves to have good alternatives ($F(1, 63) = 4.00$, $p < .05$).
Expression) × 2 (Recipients’ perception of their alternatives) ANOVA was conducted on perceived anger expression. As before, recipients in the anger condition thought that their counterpart expressed more anger (M = 3.48, SD = 1.68) than recipients in the neutral condition (M = 1.81, SD = 1.28), F(3, 57) = 16.45, p < .001. There were no main or interaction effects on perceived anger expression due to the perception of alternatives factor. Then, a 2 (Emotion Expression) × 2 (Recipients’ perception of their alternatives) ANOVA was conducted on claiming value. There was a main effect for emotional expression (F(3, 57) = 5.32, p < .05), because angry expressers successfully claimed more value than neutral expressers. There was also a main effect of recipients’ perception of their alternatives (F(3, 57) = 4.94, p < .05), because expressers claimed more value when recipients perceived themselves as having poor alternatives (M = 60.72%, SD = 9.79%) than when recipients perceived themselves as having good alternatives (M = 55.31%, SD = 9.29%). These main effects were qualified by a marginal interaction (F(3, 57) = 3.37, p = .07). The means are displayed in Fig. 3.

In probing the interaction, we found that when recipients felt they had poor alternatives, there was a significant difference in the means (t(57) = 3.67, p < .001), since angry expressers claimed more value (M = 65.77%, SD = 8.81%; N = 20) than neutral expressers (M = 55.68%, SD = 8.10%; N = 21). However, when recipients felt they had good alternatives, there was no difference in the means (angry M = 55.88%, N = 12; neutral M = 54.73%, N = 8; t(57) = .29, ns). Tukey, post hoc multiple comparisons tests showed that the only significant difference was between the anger expression—poor perceived alternatives cell and the other three cells.

Finally, we examined whether recipients’ perception of the expresser’s toughness mediated the effect of anger expression on claiming value among those recipients who felt they had poor alternatives. The results are provided in Panel 2 of Fig. 2, and as can be seen, the perception of toughness mediated the effect that anger expression had on claiming value among those recipients who felt they had poor alternatives. A Sobel test showed that the effect of anger expression was significantly reduced when toughness was a simultaneous predictor (z = 2.32, p < .05).

**General discussion**

These studies examined whether anger expression increases the expresser’s value claiming in negotiations. Experiment 1 showed that participants intended to concede more to an angry counterpart than to a non-angry counterpart when they perceived having poor alternatives. Experiment 2 extended this finding to a face-to-face interaction, using a negotiation task where there was potential for integrative agreements. It provided further support for the posited effect of anger expression on claiming value when recipients perceived having poor alternatives. Since alternatives was not randomly assigned, we cannot be certain about causality in that study, yet the results closely mirrored those from the first study. Study 2 further showed that recipients’ perception of the expresser’s toughness mediated this effect. And, anger did not diminish value creation.

Taken together, these studies provide converging evidence that anger expressions increase expressers’ ability to claim value in negotiations, when, but only when, the recipients of these expressions believe they have poor alternatives. Experiment 1 had strong internal validity since everything in the negotiation scenario was kept constant except participants’ alternatives and their counterpart’s emotional expression. Experiment 2 was lower in internal validity since there was likely variation across dyads, but by observing people behaving in negotiations it provides more external validity. In this study we gave some negotiators advice based on the results of our first study (the anger condition), whereas others got advice that is perhaps more consistent with folk-theories of emotion expression in negotiation (Thompson, Medvec, Seiden, & Kopelman, 2001). In both conditions, participants were told to get the other party to concede, but participants who received the anger expression advice were able to claim more value than those who kept a poker face. Specifically, expressions of anger create the perception that the expresser is tough in negotiations. Recipients who perceive themselves as having poor alternatives respond to the expresser’s toughness by conceding.

The current studies thus suggest that the existing findings on the effects of negative emotional experience do not extend to the effects of anger expression. Whereas feeling angry has been shown to lead to bad negotiation outcomes, we showed that expressing anger can lead to good negotiation outcomes. This suggests that anger expressions can be used as a distributive strategy in negotiations, but one that should be used with caution. After all, some research has shown that expressing an emotion can result in feeling the
emotion (Levenson, Heider, Ekman, & Friesen, 1992; Strack, Martin, & Stepper, 1988) and so one possible downside of the strategic expression of anger is that it could produce the experience of anger. Although that did not appear to be a problem in Study 2, expressing anger for a longer period of time could have that effect. Another possible risk involved with the expression of anger is that it could result in negotiation partners avoiding future negotiations. As such, the expression of anger may be a strategy best suited for relatively short single-shot negotiations. But, in that context, expressions of anger appear to be a powerful strategy for claiming value.

Appendix A

You work for a company that designs, manufactures, and sells technical equipment. You have a final negotiation meeting with one of your clients today.

[Alternatives manipulation goes here]

Your counterpart and you have agreed on the majority of the issues relating to the deal, but there is still a warranty to be negotiated. You do not see any point in including a warranty in the deal because it is well-known in the industry that your products are highly reliable. Still, your counterpart keeps insisting on it.

He wants a warranty and he wants the warranty to include agreements about: (a) the amount of liability coverage in case of a breakdown; (b) the time needed for repairing the equipment, in case of a breakdown; (c) and a discount applicable to the purchase of spare parts.

Your company has provided you information about what kind of deal would be acceptable. In general, the company wants the lowest amount of liability coverage, the most amount of time available for fixing repairs, and the lowest discount for spare parts. At the same time, your company set maximum conditions for you. Your company will accept 15 million dollars liability at most, at least 12 h needed for repairing any damaged equipment, and a 60% discount for spare parts at most. Again, this corresponds to the maximum conditions you can afford so that the profit on the deal remains positive for your company, but would not be considered ideal.

Here is how the negotiation proceeds:

He: “How about a warranty for the material. If there are problems, we want you to give us damages, at least 5 million dollars in damages.”

You: “Our reputation for the quality of this technical equipment is almost unmet in the industry... The technology we developed has been well-tried and is highly safe.”

He: “Good. Then you won’t mind formally including the three warranty items in the agreement.”

You: “We have never encountered any failure problem with this equipment. It is highly reliable. You can check our clients references as well as the quality tests.”

He, (without being angry) in an angry way: “We cannot afford to have your equipment decreasing or stopping the production in our factory even for a day. We cannot play with the production rates.”

You: “We have never failed our clients. We care a lot about the relationships with our clients. Our maintenance engineers are experts in their field. And our after-sales service is very efficient and reacts instantly. We would repair the equipment within 36 h.”

He, (without being angry) in an angry way: “We don’t want to put the production at that much risk. A 20-h repair time is the most I can agree to. I also need to have no less than a 50% discount when purchasing the needed spare parts. I want those in addition to the 5 million dollars in damages I mentioned earlier.”

You: “But what you’re asking for now was not in the original agreement.”

He, (without being angry) in an angry way: “You talked about quality and services, and now you do not want to put them in the agreement.”

You: “We cannot be held responsible for every failure that would occur. For instance, if there’s a power cut…”

He, (without being angry) in an angry way: “You are not serious people.”

Note: Emotion manipulation appears in the last four statements made by the counterpart. In the anger expression condition the prefix read “He, in an angry way” and in the No anger expression condition the prefix read “He, without being angry.”
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