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Abstract

Purpose – This paper seeks to introduce a model of the initiation process in negotiations, and to describe a study of the effects of culture and personality on propensity to initiate and assertiveness in negotiations.

Design/methodology/approach – Using a survey research approach and hierarchical regression analyses, initiation propensity and assertiveness were regressed against two country cultures diverse with respect to perceived appropriateness of initiation (Brazil and the USA) and four measures of personality (self-efficacy, locus of control, risk propensity, Machiavellianism).

Findings – Regression analyses found three personality factors (risk propensity, self-efficacy, Machiavellianism) to be most significantly associated with initiation propensity/assertiveness, along with an interaction effect involving country culture and risk propensity.

Research limitations/implications – Future studies might benefit from a broader, more diverse subject pool (beyond the two countries studied). This would allow for separate analyses of cultural dimensions, rather than treating culture as a composite measure. In addition, future research might include measures of actual initiation behavior.

Practical implications – Initiation is a manageable process. Self-efficacy, for example, can be improved by observing others skilled in the initiation process, and through practicing initiation under more favorable conditions. Furthermore, an individual can follow a graduated approach to gain initiation confidence, beginning with simply engaging (without asking) and progressing to asking and optimizing.

Originality/value – This paper offers a model for understanding the dynamics of the initiation process in negotiations, which generally has been overlooked by negotiation researchers. The study examines two sets of factors that can influence initiation behavior that have not been investigated in total – culture and personality.
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Negotiation is an interpersonal decision-making process necessary whenever we cannot achieve our objectives single-handedly (Thompson, 2009). Due to its ubiquitous nature, the skills associated with negotiation are generally considered essential for both personal fulfillment and professional success (Greenhalgh, 2001; Lewicki et al., 2009; Mintzberg, 1973).
Like many interpersonal processes (e.g. group/team development, problem solving, decision making) (Bruner and Pomazal, 1988; Cowan, 1986), the early stages of the negotiation process often portend how succeeding stages will unfold and, ultimately, the outcome of the interaction (Buelens and Van Poucke, 2004; Curhan and Pentland, 2007; Magee et al., 2007; Patton and Balakrishnan, 2010; Wheeler, 2004). That is, these early stages lay the groundwork for the proposal, request, complaint, demand, suggestion, or favor that an individual hopes will satisfy the need, which prompted the interpersonal encounter.

For most individuals, however, initiating a negotiation (and asking for what one wants, in particular) is at least an occasional challenge, while for many others initiation is a chronic issue (Miles, 2010; Small et al., 2007). For example, studies of salary negotiations have shown that individuals often do not initiate compensation discussions, despite the fact that these discussions frequently produce higher salaries (Babcock and Laschever, 2003; Babcock et al., 2003; Bowles et al., 2007; Gerhart and Rynes, 1991). Furthermore, there are typically many additional opportunities for individuals to negotiate special deals once they have been hired by an organization (e.g. flexible work hours, international work assignments, specialized training), which they often fail to do (Rousseau, 2005). Interdepartmental negotiations (e.g. cross-functional team projects, reorganizations) and inter-organizational negotiations (e.g. mergers, trade agreements) also can suffer when one or more parties is reluctant to initiate.

Much of the research on negotiation has assumed that the parties will engage one another to discuss their wants and needs. Consequently, the focus of this research often has been on the tactical management of issues, proposals, and agreements to achieve a favorable or integrative outcome (Lewicki et al., 2009; Thompson, 2009). Yet failure to initiate can adversely affect all parties, limiting their understanding of immediate and extended issues while denying an outcome that is mutually beneficial. Organizations lose talented employees who fear asking for a raise, companies lose customers/clients who choose avoidance or withdrawal over initiation, etc. (Harvey et al., 2004; Huppertz, 2003).

The purpose of this paper is to examine the effects of two sets of factors on an individual’s propensity to initiate negotiations – attitude regarding behavioral appropriateness, and personality. Using a survey research approach, propriety (as a function of six cultural variables) and personality characteristics (risk propensity, locus of control, self-efficacy, Machiavellianism) were assessed, along with both general (e.g. assertiveness) and specific measures of propensity to initiate. Through regression analyzes, those factors most significantly related to these measures of propensity to initiate a negotiation were determined. The paper concludes with a discussion of the implications of these findings for negotiators and future research.

Understanding initiation intentionality and behavior

An individual’s behavior regarding initiation of a negotiation can involve several decisions and actions, including whether or not to physically engage a counterpart (versus re-directing or completely avoiding confrontation), to verbalize one’s request (versus waiting for the other party to raise the subject), and to optimize a request (as opposed to asking for less than is desired, and hoping that it will receive a more favorable response) (Volkema, 2009). As such, initiating a negotiation can require several stages or acts of assertiveness (Shell, 2001).
The process of deciding to initiate a negotiation (i.e. engage, request, optimize) represents a special case of planned behavior, a theory of deliberative action proposed by Ajzen and his colleagues (cf. Ajzen, 1988; Ajzen and Fishbein, 1969, 1972) that delineates the effects of attitudes or beliefs on intentions and behavior (for a review, see Kim and Hunter, 1993). This research has focused on a broad array of subjects (e.g. voting behavior, consumer spending, personal habits, ethics), generally finding that attitudes/beliefs affect intentions, which in turn are highly correlated with behavior. In addition, the links between attitudes, intentions, and behavior are affected by control factors that can impede behavioral performance.

For initiation behavior, the social influences that delineate appropriate-inappropriate behavior represent an individual’s normative attitudes/beliefs, and the individual’s general and specific motivations regarding initiating a negotiation are his/her behavioral beliefs (Bandura, 2001; Huppertz, 2003). The former – perceived appropriateness – is influenced by one’s culture (system of shared beliefs), while the latter – motivation – is affected by an individual’s personality (e.g. risk propensity, locus of control, self-efficacy, Machiavellianism) (Cho and Lee, 2006). Since negotiation involves one or more counterparts with their own motivations, there are also control (situational) factors that an individual will likely take into consideration during this deliberative process. The situational or contextual factors specific to initiation of a negotiation include, for example, the salience of the negotiation, the negotiating venue (public, private), a counterpart’s reputation/demeanor, and perceived alternatives, factors which can potentially influence an individual’s assertiveness and propensity to negotiate (i.e. desire to engage, verbalize, and optimize).

These three sets of characteristics/factors – culture, personality, situation/context – come into play during determination of intentionality to initiate a request or demand, with situational factors also affecting the transition from intentions to behavior and subsequent outcome (for example, as a counterpart’s demeanor is revealed during engagement) (Figure 1). For this reason, we might expect culture and personality/motivation to be associated with an individual’s chronic inability to initiate negotiations, while situational factors would more likely be associated with episodic reluctance to initiate. Since the former are more difficult to manipulate or change than the latter during a given negotiation, it is particularly important for a negotiator as well as his or her counterparts to understand the negotiator’s tendencies.

Over time, aspects of perceived appropriateness and motivation are influenced by the results of a negotiating experience (i.e. negotiating outcomes), as well as by the observed/vicarious negotiating experiences of others. Thus, to understand initiation intentions/behavior – particularly chronic versus episodic intentionality/behavior with respect to reluctance to initiate – requires an appreciation for the potential effects of attitudes (as determined by socialization or culture) and personality on intentionality. Specific dimensions of culture and personality, along with their corresponding relationships to initiation behavior, are discussed next[1].

**Culture**

As previously noted, negotiation is a process involving social engagement (Thompson, 2009), an endeavor that can produce anxiety for one or both parties (Miles, 2010; Volkema, 2009; Wheeler, 2004). In general, an individual will experience the greatest
A model of the initiation process in negotiation.
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Note: This model excludes the control variables in this study – gender and age
anxiety or dissonance when his/her behavior is counter-normative, voluntary, and public (Festinger and Carlsmith, 1959). Society or culture typically determines what is considered inappropriate or counter-normative behavior in a social encounter (recorded in memory as scripts or schema), which can cause individuals to hesitate or retreat in certain negotiable situations. Therefore, to understand reluctance to initiate a negotiation requires an appreciation for culture.

Culture has been defined as the patterned ways of thinking, feeling, and reacting, acquired and transmitted mainly through symbols. It constitutes the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts. The essential core of culture consists of traditional ideas (i.e. historically derived and selected) and especially their attached values (Kluckhohn, 1951).

Hofstede (1997, 2001) was among the first to quantify the dimensions of country culture, focusing on four dimensions:

1. Individualism-collectivism;
2. Uncertainty avoidance;
3. Masculinity-femininity; and
4. Power distance.

A subsequent study by House et al. (2004) of 62 countries identified overlapping dimensions, each of which has implications for perceived appropriateness and negotiation. Two other dimensions of culture – temporal orientation and cultural context – also can influence propriety with respect to initiation behavior (Volkema, 2011). Each of these six dimensions, and its relationship to initiation behavior, is discussed next, followed by a singular hypothesis combining these relationships.

**Individualism-collectivism.** An individualist culture is one in which individual rights, achievement, and recognition are valued, whereas in a collectivist culture it is the interests of the social unit (family, community, etc.) that are paramount. In general, people from more individualist cultures are inclined to view negotiations from a fixed-pie (distributive) perspective, which affects their perceptions of appropriate behavior. This can spur initiating behavior as well as the manner in which a request is made (e.g. open-entry negotiating, or cold-calling). Liu et al. (2001), for example, found that customers from higher individualist cultures were more likely to take action when they received poor service quality.

Individuals from collectivist cultures, on the other hand, are concerned with both self-face (i.e. self identity, respect) and other-face (i.e. a counterpart’s sense of self), the latter concern leading to more avoidance behavior (Oetzel et al., 2008; Oetzel and Ting-Toomey, 2003). In a study of Asians and Asian Americans (collectivist cultures) and European Americans (individualist culture), for example, Taylor et al. (2004) found the former cultures less likely than the latter culture to reach out for support during periods of stress due to possible relational ramifications such as disturbing group harmony, losing face, receiving criticism, and making the situation worse. Morrison et al. (2004), in a study of organizational newcomer behavior, found that newcomers from a collectivist culture (Hong Kong) were less likely than newcomers from an individualist culture (US) to rely on supervisor-focused feedback inquiries for reducing uncertainty and managing their performance.
Uncertainty avoidance. Uncertainty avoidance, a second dimension identified by Hofstede (1997) and House et al. (2004), is concerned with a society’s tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity. Individuals from low uncertainty avoidance cultures are more comfortable with unstructured situations, and more tolerant of risk taking (which negotiation entails, since it is by definition an interpersonal process involving imperfect information).

In cultures that are high in uncertainty avoidance, individuals are socialized to conform to policies, procedures, and rules, whereas in low uncertainty avoidance cultures these rules are seen as more symbolic than deterministic. Thus, in high uncertainty avoidance cultures, menus, sticker prices, and precedents are more likely to be viewed as implicit contracts that define the terms or conditions of a negotiation, while they are but a starting point for negotiations in low uncertainty avoidance cultures (Schuster and Copeland, 1996). This, of course, has implications for the perceived appropriateness that individuals are likely to place on initiating a negotiation, particularly in cases where the request might seem contrary to policy or practice, but also in unfamiliar situations (where it is assumed that there is probably a rule governing behavior).

Fu et al. (2004), in fact, found that individuals from high uncertainty avoidance cultures were less likely to perceive that a persuasive strategy would be effective. There also was less experimentation and innovation, along with less rational argumentation, since it was assumed that one’s counterpart in a high uncertainty avoidance culture could adequately determine whether or not a request was legitimate. Instead, individuals from a high uncertainty avoidance culture were more likely to endorse a relationship-oriented strategy (rapport building, gift giving) than an assertive strategy. This is generally consistent with the investigations of Liu et al. (2001), who found that individuals from a high uncertainty avoidance culture were less likely than individuals from a low uncertainty avoidance culture to take action when they experienced poor service quality.

Masculinity-femininity. A third dimension of culture Hofstede labeled masculinity-femininity. Hofstede found that the roles of men and women differed substantially in some country cultures (which he labeled masculine cultures), while showing much less variability in other cultures (which he called feminine cultures). In masculine cultures, men are generally expected to be assertive, competitive, achievement-oriented, and focused on material success, while women are typically more modest, tender-hearted, and concerned with quality of life issues. In the US, for example, a country with moderately high masculinity, women have been found to be more apprehensive about negotiations than have men and, consequently, they appear less likely to initiate a negotiation. And when they do negotiate, women have been found to ask for and receive considerably less than have men (e.g. in salary negotiations) (Babcock et al., 2006; Babcock and Laschever, 2003; Barron, 2003).

In a feminine culture, on the other hand, the gender roles tend to overlap, with both men and women showing more concern for relational issues than task-centered activities and accomplishments (Bergeron and Schneider, 2005). Individuals with strong relational or affiliation interests typically avoid confrontational approaches in interpersonal conflicts, preferring to accommodate the other party (Schneer and Chanin, 1987). This concern or orientation would likely manifest itself during the initiation process as well, limiting engagement, asking, and certainly optimizing.
Power distance. A fourth dimension of culture – power distance – refers to the presumed status of some individuals within a culture based on age, gender, family background, social class, etc. (Marsland and Beer, 1983). It is typical for countries with high power distance to have unequal distributions of wealth, and to some extent these differences have come to be accepted by individuals (Hofstede, 1997; House et al., 2004).

Cultures with high power distance generally are comfortable with hierarchical structures, clear lines of authority, and the right to use power with discretion. Power generally is not delegated to lower levels, so an individual in a high power distance culture may not have the authority to make a decision (i.e. they need to check with a superior). This can influence their willingness to initiate a request, and most certainly their ability to grant a favor. Morrison et al. (2004), for example, found that newcomers within a low power distance culture (US) tend to be more likely than newcomers from a high power distance culture (Hong Kong) to initiate feedback inquiries from their supervisors.

Because individuals in high power distance cultures are more likely to respond positively to hierarchical structures and the use of power or authority, an individual may be less inclined to pursue a negative response from a counterpart, particularly if that counterpart is seen to be a legitimate authority.

Temporal orientation. Subsequent to his original research, Hofstede added a fifth dimension referred to as long-term versus short-term orientation. For cultures with a long-term orientation (including many Asian cultures), relationships, personal adaptability, and perseverance are important. Rather than initiating a special request, which could threaten a relationship, individuals from long-term oriented cultures are more inclined to react to a personal need by deferring action to another time (that is, thinking longer-term, bigger picture), and making the necessary changes personally to adapt to the situation (Cooper-Chen and Tanaka, 2008). These adaptations might include deferring engagement, or engaging but waiting for the other party to broach the subject/request of interest (Volkema, 2011).

While cultures with a long-term orientation are more focused on traditions and long-term commitments, which would likely support the status quo and impede change, cultures with a short-term orientation are more focused on the present, with an emphasis on the bottom line and quick results (Hofstede, 2001). For these individuals, a disproportionate weight is often placed on immediate outcomes, as the value of a delayed action is discounted (Weber and Chapman, 2005). This suggests a greater desire within short-term oriented cultures to satisfy one's immediate needs by engaging a prospective counterpart and making a demand or request (if not optimizing that request).

Cultural context. Finally, cultures have been characterized as having high or low cultural context, which also has implications for initiation behavior (Hall, 1976). In high-context cultures, individuals are generally very familiar with one another as a consequence of having shared similar experiences and expectations. Communication in a high-context culture is often more implicit than explicit (i.e. based on context, relational development, and nonverbal cues).

In contrast, a country that has a low-context culture typically has more diversity and, consequently, less reliance on situational familiarity to communicate. As a result of the greater diversity, communication in a low-context culture is often more precise, direct, and verbal than in a high-context culture (Adair et al., 2001). Thus, negotiators
from low-context cultures (e.g. the US) may be more inclined to make direct statements of their preferences or priorities, while individuals from high-context cultures (e.g. Japan) might be more inclined to use offers as a means of gathering information about a counterpart (Adair et al., 2007).

In general, individuals from low-context cultures are likely to be less concerned about the social implications of initiating a negotiation (engaging a counterpart, making a request, and optimizing that request) than individuals from a high-context culture. In a study of North American (low-context culture) and Filipino (high-context culture) industrial exporters, Mintu-Wimsatt (2002) found that the high-context variable enhanced cooperation (which suggests a focus on relational concerns rather than self-interests).

Given these collective arguments and findings, we would expect the following as regards these six dimensions of culture:

**H1.** An individual from a high individualist, low uncertainty avoidance, high masculinity, low power distance, short-term oriented, low-context culture will be more likely to initiate a negotiation than will someone from a high collectivist, high uncertainty avoidance, high femininity, high power distance, long-term oriented, high-context culture.

**Personality**

Beyond the role of socialization and culture in defining propriety in initiation behavior, an individual’s personality will affect intentionality and, consequently, behavior. Based on prior research, four characteristics of personality, in particular, are likely to play a role in one’s decision to initiate a request: risk propensity, locus of control, self-efficacy, and Machiavellianism[2].

**Risk propensity.** The first of these personality characteristics, risk propensity, refers to an individual’s tendency to take or avoid risk in a decision-making situation (Sitkin and Pablo, 1992). The decision to engage another party in a negotiation involves several types of risks, including possible threats to social identity and self-confidence in a public venue as well as opportunity costs that might be incurred. The former can manifest itself through hearing (or in anticipation of hearing) the other party say “no” to a request (Fisher and Shapiro, 2005; Rudman et al., 2007; Ury, 1991), a consequence that becomes more probable as a negotiator moves from simple engagement to making a formal request to optimizing that request.

According to Taylor (1974), risk is a function of two factors – uncertainty of the outcome, and significance of the consequences – which are evident in any negotiation. The former is generally lowered by acquiring more information, while the latter is addressed by reducing one’s stakes (Taylor, 1974). In terms of a negotiation, for example, an individual might seek to lower uncertainty by attempting to learn more about his/her counterpart (wants/needs, alternatives, style) and to reduce the stakes by limiting one’s request (i.e. sub-optimizing).

In a study of consumer behavior, Cho and Lee (2006) found that subjects’ risk propensity influenced their risk perceptions, with higher risk propensity leading to perceptions of lower risk. An individual’s lower risk perceptions, in turn, were associated with a lesser likelihood of pursuing risk-reducing strategies such as information search (which suggests deferring immediate engagement) and a lesser
likelihood of reducing one’s investment (i.e. a greater likelihood of optimizing one’s request).

Thus,

\[ H2. \] An individual with high risk propensity will be more likely to initiate a negotiation than will an individual with low risk propensity.

**Locus of control.** Locus of control refers to the extent to which individuals believe that they can control the events that affect them (Rotter, 1966). Typically, individuals are described as having a locus of control that ranges from a high internal locus of control to a high external locus of control. Individuals with a high internal locus of control believe that it is primarily their own behavior and actions that determine the events in their lives, while individuals with a high external locus of control believe that it is external forces (e.g. chance, fate, other people) that determine events.

Individuals with a high internal locus of control are generally thought to have better control of their behavior, to exhibit more political behavior, and to be more likely to attempt to influence other people than individuals with a high external locus of control. They are more active in seeking information and knowledge concerning their situation than are externals. Overall, individuals with a high internal locus of control are more assertive than individuals with an external locus of control (Cooley and Nowicki, 1974; Hartwig *et al.*, 1980), speaking longer and more frequently during encounters (Campbell *et al.*, 1990).

Research on bargaining and negotiation also suggests a potential relationship between locus of control and initiation behavior. Specifically, individuals with a high internal locus of control versus a high external locus of control have been found to be more competitive (Ford, 1983), to demand more in their opening offers (Bigoness, 1976), and to reach better agreements (Stolte, 1983). In addition, a recent study by Shalvi *et al.* (2010) found that negotiators with a high internal locus of control were more likely to overcome the influence of receiving a non-favorable initial offer.

Overall, these studies suggest a greater likelihood of an individual with a high internal locus of control initiating a negotiation – engaging (an act of assertiveness, competitiveness), requesting (due to their general assertiveness, but also their speaking proclivity), and optimizing (related to their own initial offer demands, and their willingness to overcome the non-favorable demands of others).

Therefore,

\[ H3. \] An individual with a high internal locus of control will be more likely to initiate a negotiation than will an individual with a high external locus of control.

**Self-efficacy.** A third personality characteristic that could predict initiation behavior is self-efficacy, the belief that one is capable of performing in a certain manner or attaining certain goals. It differs from locus of control in that an individual may believe that personal effort will lead to a desirable outcome (high internal locus of control) but that he or she is not capable of putting forth the necessary effort (a low sense of self-efficacy).

Self-efficacy has been described as a measure of personality (Judge *et al.*, 2002) but also a function of personal experience, vicarious experience, social persuasions, and physiological factors (Bandura, 1997, 2001). Since negotiation is a skill, it can be
acquired through personal experience or practice. Individuals also can become more confident in asking for what they want through vicarious experience (i.e. observing the behavior of skilled others) (Nadler et al., 2003). Social persuasion in the form of support and encouragement from colleagues and other confederates can affect confidence and performance generally, and initiation behavior more specifically (Bluen and Jubiler-Lurie, 1990; London et al., 1999).

Self-efficacy can be viewed in general terms as well as within the context of a specific task (Yeo and Neal, 2006). In either case, the stronger an individual’s belief in his/her ability to accomplish a goal (e.g. a negotiated outcome), the less risk the individual is likely to perceive in taking action. Indeed, Cho and Lee (2006) found that, in addition to risk propensity, self-efficacy influences an individual’s risk perceptions, which in turn can affect his/her likelihood of reducing risk through information search or reduction of stakes/investment. An individual with high self-efficacy was more likely to view a situation as low in risk, and to eschew risk-reducing strategies such as information search and investment reduction.

In terms of assertive behavior, Arisohn et al. (1988), building on the work of Lee (1984) and others, found that individuals reporting positive outcome expectancies were more assertive. Since initiation involves engagement and requesting, two forms of social assertiveness, we might expect a similar relationship between self-efficacy and the likelihood of initiating a negotiation.

Specifically:

**H4.** An individual with high self-efficacy will be more likely to initiate a negotiation than will an individual with low self-efficacy.

**Machiavellianism.** Machiavellianism refers to an individual’s tendency to deceive and manipulate others for personal gain (Mudrack, 1990). High Machiavellians generally do not believe that integrative outcomes are easily achieved and, consequently, they tend to eschew collaborative approaches in favor of distributive strategies (Amanatullah et al., 2008).

Since the achievement of one’s objective via negotiation requires initiation (engaging a counterpart at the very least, if not making a verbal request), the goal orientation of an individual can significantly affect this process. Several scholars have reported high Machiavellians as being particularly goal oriented: motivated to succeed (Reimers and Barbuto, 2002), showing a strong commitment to self-set goals (Huber and Neale, 1986), and willing to use their influence over others to achieve their goals (Lau and Shaffer, 1999).

Given high Machiavellians’ apparent orientation towards personal goals and achievement, we might expect these individuals to be assertive with other parties in pursuit of their desires. Barbuto and Moss (2006), for example, in a meta-analysis of 11 studies of Machiavellianism and influence tactics, found a positive correlation between Machiavellianism and assertiveness. Sakalaki et al.’s (2007) contention that high Machiavellians are concerned with maximizing their own profits suggests a potential for optimization of requests as well.

Therefore:

**H5.** An individual with high Machiavellianism will be more likely to initiate a negotiation than will an individual with low Machiavellianism.
The study

Participants

The participants in this study were individuals taking graduate business courses in their home countries of Brazil and the US, countries that are diverse with respect to the six dimensions of culture discussed above[3]. Questionnaires were administered in English (the language of the courses) in these two countries. Participants were asked to list their nationality, and only those participants indicating a single country (Brazil or the US) were included in the study. A total of 77 usable sets of questionnaires were obtained (40 from Brazil, 37 from the US). If these participants, 45 (58.4 percent) were males, and the final sample had a mean age of 27.5 years (sd = 5.5) with a mean of 5.2 years (sd = 5.0) of work experience.

Procedure

Each participant was asked to complete a set of questionnaires which focused on personality and assertiveness/initiation propensity, as well as to provide demographic information (age, gender, work experience, nationality). The series of questionnaires focused on risk propensity (employing three questions used by Cho and Lee, 2006), locus of control (using Mueller and Thomas’, 2001, ten questions adapted from Rotter, 1966), and self-efficacy (four questions, adapted from Cho and Lee, 2006, to have a negotiation focus). The Cronbach alphas for these three questionnaires were 0.71, 0.78, and 0.66, respectively. Machiavellianism was measured using the Mach IV questionnaire (Christie and Geis, 1970), a questionnaire that had been used in prior negotiation research (cf. Amanatullah et al., 2008). The Cronbach alpha was 0.67 for this questionnaire.

Since there is not, as of yet, a single universally accepted measure of initiation behavior, multiple dependent measures were employed in this study. The first consisted of 12 questions that assessed three dimensions of propensity to initiate negotiations (Babcock et al., 2006):

1. recognition of negotiable situations;
2. apprehension upon initiating a negotiation; and
3. entitlement of a favorable outcome.

Each of the 12 items – four for recognition (α = 0.64), five for apprehension (α = 0.86), and three for entitlement (α = 0.49) – was rated by participants on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). An overall propensity to initiate score also was calculated by averaging the ratings for the recognition questions, the apprehension questions, and the entitlement questions (reverse coded) (α = 0.69)[4].

According to Ames (2009), assertiveness is a characterization of how a person responds in a negotiation, as the individual attempts to answer the question: How hard should I push? The behavioral response to this question can range from avoidance and passivity at one extreme to aggression and hostility at the other. Thus, assertiveness might be viewed as a proxy for negotiation initiation. Therefore, the second dependent measure employed in this study was the Rathus’ Assertiveness Schedule (RAS; Rathus, 1973), a 30-item questionnaire that employs a six-point scale. Initiation by definition involves several forms of assertiveness (e.g. engaging, asking). The RAS has been used in a number of studies, and generally has evidenced acceptable validity (with respect to
other self-report and observational measures of assertiveness) as well as test-retest and split half reliabilities (Elliott and Gramling, 1990; Quillen et al., 1977). For the data provided by participants in this study, the Cronbach alpha was 0.86.

The third measure consisted of three scenarios employed by Ames (2008), each scenario presenting three alternatives to the participants. The scenarios consisted of a salary negotiation (in which one can propose different salary counteroffers), a request for assistance while under a deadline (with choices ranging from using one’s leverage to avoiding confrontation altogether), and a disagreement during a team meeting (in which one’s behavior can vary from vocal disagreement to quiet contemplation). (Scenario texts are available in Ames, 2008.) The alternatives, presented in counterbalanced order, represented high, medium, and low assertive behaviors (rated 3, 2, and 1 in value, respectively, with 3 representing the maximum response with respect to assertiveness). Participants were asked to rank the alternatives for each scenario, with the value of the alternative ranked first in each scenario being used in this analysis.

Analysis
The hypotheses were tested using hierarchical regression analyzes, including as independent variables each of the factors shown in the five hypotheses – cultural propriety or appropriateness (1 = Brazil, 2 = US), risk propensity, internal locus of control, self-efficacy, and Machiavellianism. Interaction effects were included for country culture and each of the four personality variables. The analyzes controlled for gender and age, which has been found to be related to assertiveness and initiation behavior (cf. Babcock et al., 2006; Rizzo and Mendez, 1988; Small et al., 2007; Thomas and Thomas, 2008). Separate analyzes were run for each of the dependent variables: propensity to initiate a negotiation (i.e. recognition of negotiable situations, entitlement of a favorable outcome, and apprehension upon initiating a negotiation), Rathus’ assertiveness, and assertiveness as determined by the average value for the three scenarios.

Results
Table I shows the means, standard deviations, and correlations for the independent variables and dependent variables in this study. Each of the four personality variables (risk propensity, internal locus of control, self-efficacy, and Machiavellianism) was significantly correlated with at least one of the primary dependent variables. Country (Brazil vs US), on the other hand, was only significantly correlated with a single dimension of one of the primary dependent variables – a positive correlation with recognizing a negotiable situation.

As shown in Table I, none of the three dimensions of propensity to initiate – recognition of negotiable situations, apprehension regarding initiating a negotiation, and entitlement of a favorable outcome – was significantly correlated with each other. However, there was some correspondence between the primary dependent measures. Rathus’ Assertiveness Schedule was significantly correlated with overall propensity to initiate negotiations ($r = 0.57$, $p < 0.001$), as well as with two of the dimensions of propensity to initiate: recognition ($r = 0.44$, $p < 0.001$) and apprehension ($r = -0.44$, $p < 0.001$). Rathus’ Assertiveness Schedule and overall propensity to initiate also were
Table I.
Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for country, personality, and assertiveness/initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Country&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Risk propensity</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Locus of control (int.)</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>(0.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-efficacy</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Machiavellianism</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Propensity to initiate</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negotiations (PIN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. PIN – opportunity</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.59****</td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PIN – apprehension</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>-0.33***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.66****</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. PIN – entitlement</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.50****</td>
<td>0.61****</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Assertiveness (Rathus)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.57****</td>
<td>-0.44****</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Assertiveness scenarios</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.42****</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $n = 77$. *$p < 0.10$, **$p < 0.05$, ***$p < 0.01$, ****$p < 0.001$. <sup>a</sup>Male = 1, Female = 2  <sup>b</sup>Brazil = 1, United States = 2
significantly correlated with the assertiveness measures of the three scenarios ($r = 0.33, p < 0.01$ and $r = 0.23, p < 0.10$, respectively).

The first regression analyzes focused on propensity to negotiate. In terms of the overall measure, there were four significant findings, two of which involved stated hypotheses (Table II). Self-efficacy ($\beta = 0.28, p < 0.05$) and Machiavellianism ($\beta = 0.24, p < 0.05$) were positively associated with overall propensity to initiate a negotiation, consistent with $H4$ and $H5$, respectively. Thus, the greater one’s self-efficacy and Machiavellianism, the greater his/her propensity to initiate negotiations. The interaction effect for country culture and risk propensity ($\beta = 0.22, p < 0.05$): Individuals from the US with a high risk propensity had a higher overall propensity to initiate than individuals from Brazil with a low risk propensity. This would be consistent with $H1$ and $H2$. Finally, age was negatively associated with propensity to initiate ($\beta = -0.19, p < 0.10$), suggesting that younger participants had a greater propensity towards initiating negotiations than did older participants.

Separate regression analyzes were conducted for each of the three dimensions of propensity to initiate. For the first of these dimensions – recognition of negotiable opportunities – the regression analysis revealed one significant finding: The interaction effect for country culture and risk propensity was statistically significant ($\beta = 0.33, p < 0.01$). As with overall propensity to initiate, individuals from the US with a high-risk propensity had a higher recognition of negotiable opportunities than did individuals from Brazil with a low risk propensity, consistent with $H1$ and $H2$. In addition, age was negatively associated with recognition of opportunities ($\beta = -0.20, p < 0.10$), suggesting that younger participants were better than older participants at perceiving situations to be negotiable.

For the second dimension of propensity to initiate – apprehension regarding initiating a negotiation – there was a single significant factor. Self-efficacy was negatively associated with apprehension ($\beta = -0.32, p < 0.01$), consistent with $H4$. Thus, the greater an individual’s self-efficacy (i.e. belief that one is capable of performing in a certain manner or attaining certain goals), the less apprehensive he/she was expected to be regarding initiating a negotiation.

For the third dimension of propensity to initiate – entitlement of a favorable outcome – there were two significant findings. The more significant of these concerned Machiavellianism ($\beta = 0.52, p < 0.001$), followed by risk propensity ($\beta = 0.25, p < 0.05$). The positive association for Machiavellianism was consistent with $H5$, while the positive association for risk propensity was consistent with $H2$.

Regressing the independent and control variables against assertiveness as measured by the Rathus’ Assertiveness Schedule revealed one significant finding: Self-efficacy was positively associated with Rathus’ assertiveness measure ($\beta = 0.31, p < 0.05$). That is, the greater an individual’s self-efficacy, the more assertive the individual indicated he/she would be. This result is consistent with $H4$.

Finally, there were three significant findings related to assertiveness as measured by the three scenarios. In terms of the hypotheses, internal locus of control ($\beta = 0.23, p < 0.10$) and risk propensity ($\beta = 0.22, p < 0.10$) were positively associated with assertiveness in the scenarios, consistent with $H3$ and $H2$, respectively. The greater one’s internal locus of control (i.e. belief that one’s own behavior and actions determine life’s events) and one’s risk propensity, the more assertive the individual was expected
### Table II.
Results of hierarchical regression analyses of assertiveness/initiation behavior on country and personality factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Apprehension</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Rathus’ assertiveness schedule</th>
<th>Assertiveness (scenarios)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk propensity</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal locus of control</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.32****</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.52*****</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country x risk propensity</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country x internal locus of control</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country x self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country x Machiavellianism</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>3.96**</td>
<td>3.94**</td>
<td>7.92*****</td>
<td>4.62****</td>
<td>2.76**</td>
<td>2.42*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** $n = 77$. Standardized coefficients are shown for control variables (Age, Gender), main effects, and interaction effects. *$p < 0.10$, **$p < 0.05$, ***$p < 0.01$, ****$p < 0.001$. <sup>a</sup>Male = 1, Female = 2; <sup>b</sup>Brazil = 1, United States = 2.
to be in these three situations. In addition, younger participants indicated that they would be more assertive than older participants ($\beta = -0.20$, $p < 0.10$).

**Discussion**

For many individuals, initiation is one of the most difficult aspects of negotiation. Since it is both a voluntary and public act in many cases, “asking” can bring on considerable angst, even if the outcome is favorable. Unfortunately, asking is generally one of the things a negotiator must do if he/she hopes to get something that is needed or desired (Wheeler, 2004). And failing to ask not only can adversely affect the initiator, but his or her counterpart as well (e.g. the exceptional employee who chooses to pursue another job opportunity rather than ask for a raise, the company representative who chooses not to propose a joint venture, etc.).

Most of us have had years of experience negotiating in a variety of personal and professional situations. Those experiences, and the lessons taken from them, are captured in the cognitive scripts stored in memory (Miles, 2010). While the vast majority of these scripts may serve us well, some can limit our ability to ask for what we want in pursuit of otherwise highly-achievable goals. And even effective scripts are of little value if our emotions limit their accessibility (Fisher and Shapiro, 2005; Morse, 2006).

To manage initiation or asking in negotiations, it is important to understand the factors that influence an individual’s decision making in this stage of the process. This paper introduced a model (Figure 1) that sought to delineate the initiation process, with particular focus on six cultural dimensions (individualism-collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, power distance, temporal orientation, cultural context) and four personality factors (risk propensity, locus of control, self-efficacy, Machiavellianism) that can influence intentionality and behavior. Using a set of established questionnaires, individuals from two culturally diverse countries were surveyed to determine which of these factors are related to initiation likelihood or propensity.

The analyzes found that personality factors were the more significant factors associated with initiation propensity/assertiveness. Self-efficacy, for example, was positively associated with overall propensity to initiate (and negatively associated with apprehension regarding initiation behavior), as well as positively associated with assertiveness as measured by Rathus’ Assertiveness Schedule. Thus, the more an individual believes that he/she is capable of performing in a certain manner or attaining certain goals, the less apprehensive and more assertive that individual will be with respect to negotiation.

This has potential implications for practitioners, since self-efficacy can be affected by personal and vicarious experience (Bandura, 2001): The more positive consequences an individual observes or experiences relative to goal/task achievement, the more confident he/she becomes (Nadler et al., 2003). This would suggest that first observing others skilled in the art of social engagement and asking, followed by trying to replicate the observed behavior under favorable circumstances (e.g. with counterparts who are familiar and/or known to be accommodating, and in situations where achieving the desired outcome is not critical) could improve a negotiator’s initiation propensity.
Machiavellianism also was found to be positively associated with the overall measure of propensity to initiate. More specifically, Machiavellianism was positively correlated with the entitlement dimension of propensity to initiate. Risk propensity also was positively correlated with entitlement (as well as with the level of assertiveness of the behavioral options selected in the three scenarios). The relationship between these two personality dimensions and entitlement is worth further comment. The three dimensions of propensity to initiate – recognition, apprehension, and entitlement – can be viewed as related to a logical sequencing of the initiation process. Once an individual recognizes a negotiable situation, he/she must overcome any natural apprehension about engaging the counterpart and verbalizing a request. Entitlement, conceivably, allows the individual to push beyond any perceived resistance (verbal or nonverbal) encountered during the engagement or requesting phases of initiation. The significant positive correlations between Machiavellianism and entitlement and between risk propensity and entitlement suggest that individuals with these personality characteristics might be more inclined to overcome perceived resistance from a counterpart. In contrast, individuals with low risk propensity might be more inclined to lower their uncertainty by attempting to learn more about a counterpart (wants/needs, alternatives, style) or reducing the stakes (e.g. sub-optimizing one’s request). Knowing both one’s own personality in this regard, as well as the style (reputation) and demeanor of a prospective counterpart, can be important in gauging how a particular initiation is likely to unfold and end.

For individuals whose characteristics or profiles indicate that they could have difficulty initiating negotiations, a graduated approach to improving initiation confidence and skills might be considered. That is, rather than seeking to engage, request, and optimize, even with a favorable counterpart, a negotiator might simply engage a counterpart (without asking) as a first step, and progress to making a request over a series of negotiations. While situational factors were held constant in this study, these also should be managed carefully to increase the likelihood of a positive experience (e.g. choosing a private location for initiating a negotiation).

As indicated in Table I, country was positively correlated with recognition of negotiable opportunities, but this was not found to be the case when regressing opportunity recognition on all the independent variables. Furthermore, country (Brazil vs US) was not found to be significant as a main effect in any of the hierarchical regression analyzes. There was, however, a significant interaction effect involving country and risk propensity: Individuals from the US who reported high risk propensity indicated a higher likelihood of initiating a negotiation (and also a higher likelihood of recognizing a negotiable situation) than did individuals from Brazil who reported a low risk propensity. This suggests that in a culture where, relatively speaking, initiation is seen as an appropriate behavior, individuals with a propensity to take risks will recognize more opportunities for initiating a negotiation, while the combination of cultural inappropriateness and low risk propensity significantly reduces the likelihood of seeing a situation as negotiable. In most cases, recognition is critical to getting the initiation process started (unless one’s counterpart perceives a situation as such and takes the lead). As with self-efficacy, risk propensity can change over time with experiences of success. However, an individual’s culture is not so quickly altered, which suggests a potentially strong impediment to initiation for individuals from cultures that do not encourage initiation. This applies not only to
individuals who would seek to begin a negotiation for their own purposes, but those who would benefit from knowing the initiation limitations of a counterpart with ideas that might be valuable to both parties.

One explanation of these findings is that personality factors simply have a greater influence than do cultural factors on propensity to initiate negotiations/assertiveness. Taras et al.’s (2010) meta-analysis, in fact, found the relative predictive power of cultural values, personality, and demographics to vary for different outcomes. Another possibility is that the “globalization” process (i.e. the internet, cable television) has reduced some level of cultural distinctiveness among countries. In terms of business education, many of the textbooks and cases used in Brazil, particularly those written in English, are authored by North American scholars and based on research conducted in the US. Further, it is more and more common for students to spend some weeks or months studying in other countries. It is also possible that masters-level business students share a set of values that supersede values found in a larger social entity (e.g. country).

As a next step in this line of research, follow-up studies might include a broader, more diverse sample of subjects (i.e. additional countries, cultures). While Brazil ranks medium-low overall for the six cultural dimensions identified in this paper, it might be worthwhile to examine one or more Asian countries (e.g. China, Japan), which have even lower rankings than Brazil (Volkema, 2011). Likewise, while the US ranks medium-high overall for these six dimensions, other countries with similar rankings such as Great Britain and Germany might also be worth examining.

In addition, although we chose to treat culture as a single variable, it is conceivable that separate measures for each of the six cultural variables might be examined. This would require a considerably larger and still diverse sample of countries, but it would allow for another level of analysis with respect to the role of culture in determining initiation behavior. It might also allow certain cultural variables to be examined through scenario modifications (for example, varying the relative power of the parties to examine the nuances of power distance, or varying the in-group versus out-group relationship of the parties for the individualism-collectivism variable).

In addition, laboratory studies would be appropriate for testing the effects of culture and personality factors on actual behavior. That is, future studies might put individuals in situations where initiation constitutes a viable yet uncomfortable opportunity and measure actual behavior. Since negotiations often consist of a number of opportunities to initiate a request or demand, even near final-stage closure (Lewicki et al., 2009; Thompson, 2009), there might be multiple opportunities for measurement and analysis.

The significant correlations between all the dependent variables – propensity to initiate negotiations, Rathus’ Assertiveness Schedule, and the assertiveness scenarios – lends some validity to these measures. At the same time, it also suggests that future studies may not need to employ all measures. The modest Cronbach alpha for entitlement, which was based on only three statements, suggests some additional development work might be conducted on this dimension of propensity to initiate.

Another change in these dependent measures that might also be considered in future research is to further modify Ames’ scenarios so that the options reflect the specific levels of the initiation process rather than just varying levels of assertiveness. That is, the choices for each scenario could include:

Understanding propensity
non-engagement of a prospective counterpart;

- engagement of a counterpart but without making a request;
- engagement of a counterpart with a sub-optimal request; and
- engagement of a counterpart with an optimal request.

This would allow for more accurate pinpointing of the levels of initiation comfort and resistance, as well as the contributions of each personality factor to overcoming these points of resistance.

As with many interpersonal processes (e.g. group/team development, problem solving), the early stages of the negotiation process can have a profound influence on how succeeding stages will unfold and, ultimately, the outcome of an encounter. When one or more parties fail in the initiation process, there is a good chance that opportunities will be lost. By better understanding the factors that can influence the initiation stage of negotiation, we can expect to improve the effectiveness of the process and, potentially, the satisfaction of the parties as well.

Notes
1. Situational or contextual factors are included in the model shown in Figure 1 for the purpose of completeness. However, these factors were held constant in this study, and therefore were not included in any measures or analyses.

2. The Big Five personality measures also were considered for this study. However, Hofstede and McCrae (2004) found significant relationships between each of the Big Five personality variables and one or more of Hofstede’s four cultural dimensions – individualism-collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and power distance. Therefore, we chose not to include these measures in our analyses.

3. Using normalized (0-100 scale) country values from Hofstede (2001) for individualism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity, power distance, and short-term orientation, and normalized values for cultural context reported in VanEverdingen and Waarts (2003), Volkema (2011) calculated propensity to initiate indices for various countries, including Brazil and the United States. For the six cultural dimensions listed in Hypothesis 1, the indices for Brazil and the US are 37.3 and 76.3, respectively (mean values for the six dimensions). These indices are among the lowest (Brazil) and highest (the US) for the countries examined by Hofstede, and therefore represent significantly different cultures with respect to propensity to initiate negotiations.

4. Babcock et al. (2006) list the statements employed for each dimension. They report comparable though slightly higher reliability measures for recognition ($\alpha = 0.73$), apprehension ($\alpha = 0.92$), and entitlement ($\alpha = 0.55$).
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