

negotiation].⁶ While there is still much more to be learned about the many personality dimensions that have the potential to influence your and others' approach to and behavior in negotiations, we will examine the following four dimensions:

- Locus of control
- Self-monitoring
- Data-gathering/thinking preferences
- Decision-making/doing preferences

In addition, we provide end-of-chapter exercises to help you determine your personal style or preferences that influence your approach to and behavior in negotiations.

Locus of Control

Originally developed by Rotter in the 1950s, locus of control is a personality trait that describes individuals' beliefs about the cause of or control over situations and events. Individuals can possess an *external* or an *internal* locus of control. Everyone knows people who tend to blame their failures on bad luck or other people, or those who would remark, "I would have gotten an A if my big brother didn't forget to wake me up early to study." These individuals are said to possess an *external* locus of control because they view environmental causes and situational factors as being more important than those which are internally controlled. **Externals** tend to view fate or luck rather than personal effort as the cause of their successes or failures. They are also likely to view themselves as the victim in any given situation.⁷

Individuals with an *internal* locus of control see themselves as responsible for the outcomes of their own actions. **Internals** believe that they have control over their actions—both positive and negative—and their destiny. You might hear an internal say something like, "I know if I put my mind to it, I can quit smoking." An external might view the same situation as "Why bother trying to quit? My parents both smoke, some of my friends smoke . . . the deck is stacked against me." A review of past research suggests that internals, who spend more time doing homework and studying, tend to outperform their external counterparts in educational or vocational realms.⁸

Past research has demonstrated relationships between locus of control and other variables. For example, early research found that externals are more alienated from the work environment than internals,⁹ and that internals have higher job satisfaction than externals.¹⁰ Another study found that internals show more cooperativeness and a greater ability to work with others than externals.¹¹ Other studies demonstrated that internal managers had a stronger task orientation¹² and did better in stressful situations than externals.¹³ For example, internal top managers were more likely to innovate and pursue new markets, while externals tended to stick with established practices and markets.¹⁴ This finding echoes Rotter's early research (in 1966), which found that as a group, entrepreneurs had the lowest (most internal) scores among the general population. A later study (in 1982)¹⁵ examining locus of control and strategy making among thirty-three Canadian firms representing a variety of industries found that the more internal the top executives, the more innovative the firm. In terms of the impact of locus of control on attitudes toward negotiation, two studies published by Bigoness are informative. In his earlier (1976) study of eighty student negotiating dyads participating in a simulated collecting bargaining game, Bigoness found that external pairs demanded smaller total opening bids, conceded a greater amount, and left fewer issues unresolved than internal dyads or mixed dyads.¹⁶ Similar findings emerged in his 1978 study, which showed that faculty members (at a university without a union—nor drives for creating one) who were external were more favorably disposed toward the role of collective bargaining than internals.¹⁷ Bigoness explained that because externals perceive their fate in the hands of others and beyond their control, they felt a greater need for a union than did internals who expect that their higher performance leads to greater rewards.

It's important to remember that having an internal or external locus of control isn't necessarily good or bad. Rather, this trait describes whether individuals see

outcomes of their actions as contingent on internal actions/control or external events, people, or situations. Because of its impact on individuals' motivation, expectations, self-esteem, and risk-taking behavior, locus of control has implications for our expectations of, approaches to, and behaviors during a negotiation. For an internal, preparation is key. Spending time researching options, developing contingency plans, and devising mutually beneficial options are all part of ensuring that there are few surprises. Success requires adequate preparation and planning, and internals are willing to do this because they see a connection between their efforts and the rewards such efforts bring. Externals might be less likely to prepare . . . or to prepare fully. After all, externals may believe that because of the strong role that fate plays in their lives, things don't always turn out as planned,¹⁸ and they may believe that preparation guarantees neither success nor failure. By clarifying negotiation goals, quantifying them based on relevant research and data gathering, and role playing the negotiation before the actual event, externals might be able to more clearly see the connection between their negotiation preparation and outcomes.

During a negotiation, this attribute may present itself in terms of confidence, self-efficacy, and approach to risk. Believing in their preparation and ability to succeed when efforts are invested, internals approach the negotiation with confidence and, as shown in prior research, make larger opening demands and smaller concessions. When negotiating with an external, internals would be wise to demonstrate support for their opinions and beliefs with hard data and logic, and then solicit externals' input on what would work best and why, thus building on what's comfortable as opposed to starting from a fresh—and thus untried—approach. Similarly, externals should prepare and ask their internal counterparts questions that require explanation of the data and objective criteria used in arriving at the opening demands and other values. (See Exercise 6.1 to determine your locus of control.)

Points to Ponder

1. What if you are an external and your negotiation opponent is an internal? What challenges will you likely face?
2. If you are an external, what steps could you take to approach the negotiation proactively, that is, assume that you can impact the outcome and prepare/take action accordingly?
3. If you are an internal, what blind spots might your predisposition create for you when it comes to preparing for and completing a negotiation? How would you overcome these?

Self-Monitoring

Self-monitoring is the tendency to adjust our behavior relative to the changing demands of social situations.¹⁹ According to self-monitoring theory, people vary in how likely they are to pay attention to and control what they say and do in public situations.²⁰ High self-monitors are those who seem preoccupied with what others think and are motivated to behave in ways that matches others' expectations. For example, a high self-monitoring female working in a male-dominated organization is likely to publicly downplay her emotions in a meeting to ensure that her male colleagues take her seriously. Low self-monitors seem uninterested in others' opinions, and may behave or speak without concern for others' approval or acceptance. Because of this, they are more consistent in their behavior, e.g., displaying their feelings and communicating their opinions, regardless of the situation or who is watching them.²¹ While being a high or low self-monitor isn't necessarily good or bad, it is important to know our self-monitoring tendencies and their advantages and disadvantages in organizational settings. By being aware of our natural tendency to self-monitor, we can assess our own behaviors and attitudes, acknowledge the elements we are satisfied with, and develop plans for addressing those aspects we want to change.

Researchers have studied how one's tendency to self-monitor impacts one's behavior in organizational settings and the resulting outcomes. Self-monitoring is related to cooperation, communication, and relationship building.²² Because they observe