A Research On The Differences Between Business Negotiation Styles Of Turkish And American Managers

Türk ve Amerikan Yöneticilerin İş Müzakere Tarzlarındaki Farklılıklar Üzerine Bir Araştırma

Özge DEMİRAL[1]

0000-0003-0165-2206

ABSTRACT

It is a well-proven evidence that national cultures of international business managers affect their negotiation styles. There are also cross-national studies suggesting that Turkish and American cultures have unique characteristics and differ in many ways. Combining these two premises, this research compares the key negotiation tendencies of 108 Turkish and American managers who have been somewhat involved in business negotiations on behalf of their organizations. Data was obtained through quantitative ranking style questionnaires and interviews administrated in the California State of America and major cities in Turkey. In the qualitative part, utilizing the mutual assessments of experienced Turkish negotiators on American negotiation styles and *vice versa*, the study gives insights into the debate on the determinants of cross-cultural business negotiations in the case of these two distinct cultures. Results from the independent-samples *t*-test which compared the means of quantitative scores reveal that although the negotiation styles of Turkish and American managers working for fully-domestic businesses differ significantly, both American and Turkish managers of multinational businesses tend to use similar negotiation styles. Coherently, some qualitative assessments were also found supporting the convergence trajectory towards culture-independent 'common' principles in international business and cooperation negotiations.

Keywords: Culture, negotiation, negotiation style, negotiation tendencies, Turkish managers, American managers.

ÖZET

Uluslararası işletme yöneticilerinin ulusal kültürlerinin onların iş müzakere tarzlarını etkilemesi ampirik olarak iyi desteklenen bir bulgudur. Ayrıca, kendine özgü özellikleri olan Türk ve Amerikan kültürlerinin birçok yönden farklı olduğunu ortaya koyan kültürler arası çalışmalar da bulunmaktadır. Bu araştırma, söz konusu iki önermeyi birleştirerek, kendi iş örgütlerini temsilen bir şekilde iş müzakerelerinde yer almış 108 Türk ve Amerikan yöneticinin temel müzakere eğilimlerini karşılaştırmaktadır. Veriler, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nin Kaliforniya eyaletinde ve Türkiye'nin büyük şehirlerinde yürütülen ve nicel sıralamaya dayalı anketler ve görüşmeler aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Çalışmanın nitel analiz kısmında, deneyimli Türk ve Amerikan müzakerecilerin birbirlerinin müzakere tarzlarına ilişkin karşılıklı değerlendirmeleri üzerinden, uluslararası iş müzakerelerinin belirleyicilerine ilişkin görüşler, genel olarak bu iki farklı kültür örneğinde tartışılmaktadır. Nicel skor ortalamalarını karşılaştıran bağımsız-örnekler *t*-testi sonuçları, tamamen yerli işletmelerde çalışan Türk ve Amerikan yöneticilerin müzakere tarzlarının anlamlı bir biçimde farklılaşma eğilimi göstermesine rağmen, çok uluslu işletmelerde çalışan Türk ve Amerikan yöneticilerin benzer müzakere tarzlarını kullandıklarını ortaya koymaktadır. Nicel analiz sonuçları ile uyumlu bir biçimde bazı nitel değerlendirmeler de uluslararası iş ve iş birliği müzakerelerinde kültürlerden bağımsız 'ortak' ilkelere doğru bir yakınsama yönelimini desteklemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kültür, müzakere, müzakere tarzı, müzakere eğilimleri, Türk yöneticiler, Amerikan yöneticiler.

[1]Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, Niğde Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi, odemiral@ohu.edu.tr

1. INTRODUCTION

The increasing international business alliance and collaboration practices have shown that inter-organizational relationships in global level are built up, developed, and sustained through face-to-face negotiations. As the proportion of globally to locally operating businesses increases in countries so does the frequency of business negotiations between business people from different cultures (Adler and Graham, 1989; Weiss and Stripp, 1998).

In today's rapidly integrating business world, there are two inevitable facts that business organizations, no matter they are operating globally or locally, need to be aware of. First, the increased global cooperation provides new opportunities for businesses to grow by getting access to foreign markets and by establishing new business networks where a growing number of negotiators take parts in multiple countries. Second, on the other hand, local characteristics bring many operational risks from different channels that force organizations to have skilled and experienced negotiators or business leaders who fully understand these channels in order to make their organizations ready to current differences and changes (Cox and Blake, 1991; Salacuse, 2006). Consequently, cultural differences have been taken a significant domain in management theories (Hofstede, 1993) where multiculturalism and diversity management have also introduced new necessities within organizations related to organizational behavior and human resource management (Edewor and Aluko, 2007).

In line with the globalization, physical distance, time differences, restrictive regulations and geographical constraints no longer seriously constrain the global business networks among organizations located in different countries. Dramatic increases in the global collaborations, beyond competition, have created an integrated business world. The acceleration of global business development is accompanied by a surge in cross-cultural research. On the other hand, cultural differences are acknowledged as an important determinant of building up, develop, and sustain global business operations where employees, teams, and organizations are increasingly operating in multi-cultural contexts. Therefore, cultural diversity has attracted a huge interest of both scholars in the international business and management literature and practitioners in the field (Adler and Graham, 1989; Cox and Blake, 1991; Weiss and Stripp, 1998; Volkema,

2004; Metcalf *et al.*, 2006; Edewor and Aluko, 2007; Tsui *et al.*, 2007; Gunkel *et al.,* 2016).

The great diversity of the world's cultures makes it impossible for international business negotiators, no matter how skilled and experienced they are, to understand fully all the cultures that they may encounter (Salacuse, 1998). Culture is frequently used to refer to the stable characteristics of a group that makes it unique (Tsui *et al.*, 2007). Even the cultures have seemed to be changing in a convergence process, its definitions still have unchanged aspects. Remained characteristics of culture consist of a set of shared values, beliefs, and expected behaviors. In fact, the influence of culture on people's beliefs and behaviors is likely to be more salient, particularly when they contact with others from different cultures as in the case of global negotiation where culture also affects the way people negotiate (Carnevale, 1995).

International business managers and leaders come to grips with not only legal setting but also, they need to be aware of cultural differences since culture shape how people think, communicate and behave. Salacuse (2003) suggests seven obstacles to global negotiations: i) negotiation environment, ii) ideology, iii) foreign organizations and bureaucracies, iv) foreign governments and laws, v) instability and sudden change, vi) moving money, and vii) culture. There are many studies examining these factors that encourage or discourage multinational business organizations to establish business networks.

After Hofstede first modeled (1980) and developed (Hofstede, 2001, 2011) the dimensions of national cultures, besides some critiques of the classification and its international comparison (Adler and Graham, 1989; Fang, 2003), the number of cross-national studies linking organizational culture and national culture (Schneider, 1988; Muijen and Koopman, 1994; Gerhart, 2008) have increased. However, Hofstede (1994), himself, emphasized that national culture differs from organizational culture where the first one is somewhat manageable while the latter is a given fact for management. Beyond the discussion about whether culture is a barrier or not to international business transactions, common organizational cultures across borders seem the be sticking multinational businesses together (Hofstede, 1994).

In this context, the suggestion that international business people, especially negotiators need to be aware of the cultural diversity that can lead to

misunderstandings caused by different cultural backgrounds is one of the main conclusion of studies in the immense global literature (Parnell and Kedia, 1996; Manrai and Manrai, 2010; Adair *et al*., 2013). This huge interest has made the national culture-international negotiation nexus famous. However, given a growing number of negotiators conducting business in a wide range of countries need to get access to a systematic comparison of negotiating tendencies across of cultures, the relating empirical studies are seen yet insufficient. This negligence is more common for the interest on Turkish culture and Turkish negotiators. Again, there are only a few cross-cultural studies directly comparing American and Turkish negotiators in cultural context (*e.g.* Babayiğit, 2006; Metcalf *et al*., 2006, 2007; Özel, 2008) that would probably provide some answers to why the number organizational transactions and links between Turkish and American businesses are surprisingly low as well.

Aiming to address the shortcoming of the extant literature and suggesting that managers, in general, will prefer negotiation styles that are consistent with their cultural values, this study provides insights into the interactions between culture and international business negotiations comparing the negotiation tendencies and mutual systematic assessments of 48 managers from Turkey and 60 managers from the United States who have been somewhat involved in an international negotiation and/or taken part in a business negotiation team on behalf of their organizations. The study is built on the nexus between Hofstede's (1980, 2001) cultural dimensions (power distance, individualism/collectivism, masculinity/femininity, uncertainty avoidance, short/long-term orientations, indulgence/restraint) and Salacuse's (1998) ten ways that national cultures affect negotiating styles (goal, attitudes, personal styles, communications, time sensitivity, emotionalism, agreement form, agreement building, negotiating team organization, risk-taking). The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: The subsequent section 2 presents the conceptual framework of national culture and negotiation style interactions. Section 3 surveys the literature that consists of cross-cultural studies covering Turkey and the USA or both empirically together with those shedding light on our case conceptionally. After the methodology covering hypothesis, sample, and data collection process is introduced in section 4, results are presented and discussed in section 5. The study concludes with an overview of findings and future directions in the final section.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

There are numerous definitions of the term, national culture, that commonly indicate to enduring and shared meanings, ideas, feelings, thoughts, and values shaping the behaviors of a nation, society, ethnic and other groups or communities. Salacuse (1998) describes national culture as "*the socially transmitted behavior patterns, norms, beliefs, and values of a given community*". Hofstede's (2001, a newer version of 1980) pioneering study defines national culture as "*the collective programming of the mind distinguishing the members of one group or category of people from others*" and clusters the cultural dimensions as i) high or low power distance, ii) individualism versus collectivism, iii) masculinity versus femininity, iv) low or high uncertainty avoidance, v) short- or long-term orientations, and vi) indulgence versus restraint.

Even the magnitudes have changed over time and between/within countries, different derivations seem to be coherent with Hofstede's dimensions. For example, *conservatism* in Schwartz's (1994) comprehensive clusters is significantly and negatively correlated with Hofstede's individualism and positively correlated with power distance. Schwartz's *hierarchy* measure is negatively correlated with Hofstede's individualism while Schwartz's *mastery* dimension is positively correlated with Hofstede's masculinity dimension. Again, there are high correlations between Schwartz's *autonomy* gauge and Hofstede's individualism (positively) and power distance (negatively). In Hofstede's (1980, 2001) dimensions, Turkish culture is attributed to higher power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and long-term orientation whereas it is characterized by lower individualism, masculinity, and indulgence compared to American culture. Consistently, in Schwartz's (1994) derived depictions, Turkey has higher mean importance in conservatism, and hierarchy whereas lower scores in autonomy and mastery compared to the USA while they are similar in egalitarian commitment.

There are also considerable variations within the cultures stemming from the histories and global interaction of societies. Turkish culture, for example, is shaped by both Western/European and Eastern (Asian and Arabic) cultures since there have been longstanding interactions occurring between Turks and various cultures from Europeans and Middle-East

nations. Consistently, these interactions have brought an understanding that Turkey is a cultural bridge between the West and the Islamic world. In the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE, 2017) projects, Turkey is shown as a Middle-East country where Arabic culture, predominantly influenced by the Islamic religion, is pervasive. Globalization also seems to have caused a cross-cultural isomorphism and resemble that Ucer's (2009) study, for example, points out that Turkish culture has shifted toward Western principles and Dutch culture has shifted towards Asian principles over time. Likewise, Bergiel *et al*. (2012) showed drastic changes in the Hofstede's national culture classification over time and across societies. This evidence supports a strong trend towards a cross-cultural convergence.

As one of the most influenced and influential cultures in the world, the American culture is characterized by freedom, tolerance, rule of law, coolness, informality, easy-going, punctuality, outdoor, individualistic, law-guaranteed private property and high technology embracement. These are truer for Californians. Moreover, as indicated by Katz (2007), compared to the North-Eastern states, Californians are usually open to doing business with business people from different nations with different cultures. In GLOBE's (2017) current classification, the USA is among the 'Anglo' countries/cultures together with Australia, Canada, England, Ireland, New Zealand, and South Africa.

National culture, no doubt, affects organizational culture exposing a complex set of formal and informal practices to business organizations. Ravasi and Schultz (2006) broadly define organizational culture as "*a set of shared mental assumptions that guide interpretation and action in organizations by defining appropriate behavior for various situations*". If management practices are not consistent with the cultural values of employees, they feel dissatisfied and uncomfortable and are thus less motivated to perform well (Gunkel *et al*., 2016).

Composite interactions between national and organizational cultures shape negotiation styles. Basically, negotiation can be defined as "*a process of communication by which two or more people seek to advance their individual interests through joint action*" (Salacuse, 2003: 7), or emphasizing the bargaining more, negotiation phenomenon is "*a process in which explicit proposals are put forward ostensibly for the purpose of reaching an agreement on an exchange or*

the realization of a common interest where conflicting interests are present" (Weiss and Stripp, 1998: 56). Both definitions, in a cultural context, cover education, (verbal and non-verbal) communication, xenophobia and xenophilia, philosophical foundations, economic systems etc. (Akgunes and Culpepper, 2012) besides the culture-independent capabilities of negotiators (see Fisher *et al*., 1991).

There are three main negotiation models (Weiss and Stripp, 1998; Salacuse, 2003): i) In compromise-based negotiations, the two parties arrive at an agreement by a series of concessions that each is proceeded until reaching a solution that both can accept. ii) In domination-based negotiation, executives or leaders see the deal as a combat and try to dominate a business opponent. Finally, iii) negotiations as joint problem solving are based on an inclusive exercise in problem-solving. In this model, the negotiators view their task as resolving a problem that they both share.

In these models, Salacuse (2003: 22-27) suggests seven rules for global negotiators that they should: i) use pre-negotiation fully and effectively, ii) recognize that a long-term business deal is a continuing negotiation, iii) consider a role for mediation or conciliation in the deal, iv) agree on regular meetings and contacts during the transaction, v) be specific about their interests both inside and outside of a transaction and encourage the other side to do the same, vi) inform the other of its organizational culture, and vii) carefully define together how to deal will be executed. On the other hand, there are several individual (national culture, personality, motivations styles, educational background, *etc*.), organizational (obligations, roles, commitment, team, resources, objectives, procedures, *etc*.) and environmental (legislation and customs, political and social climate, economic conditions, *etc*.) factors binding and bordering a negotiator's capability (Weiss and Stripp, 1998). In fact, the related literature reflects the composite structures of culture, negotiations tendencies, and individual styles together with complex interactions among them.

3. RELATED LITERATURE

The extant research on national culture and negotiation styles interactions can be broadly grouped into two main strands: Culture-level and cross-cultural. First group studies conceptualize and investigate the negotiation styles of a particular culture like Turkish (*e.g.* Erkuş and Banai, 2011), Chinese (*e.g.* Miles, 2003)

etc. cultures or more broadly regional classification like European and Asian cultural aggregation (*e.g.* Low, 2010; Graf *et al.*, 2012) or religion-centered studies (*e.g.* Bachkirov and AlAbri, 2016). The second strand consists of comparative cross-cultural studies as in our case. This approach deals with the basic components, tactics, and styles in the negotiation process and how these negotiation tendencies reflect national culture characteristics (*e.g.* Metcalf *et al.*, 2007; Tinsley *et al.*, 2011).

Kozan and Ergin's (1998) experimental study investigated the preference of individuals from Turkey and the United States (hereafter the USA) for third-party help during a conflict by observing 60 students in Turkey and 60 students in the USA. The authors associated the intermediary and direct communication preferences of Turkish and American participants respectively within individualism-collectivism based cultural distinction.

Negotiators are in fact leaders. On the leadership and culture relationship, Ensari and Murphy (2003) examined the interactive effects of two alternative processes of leadership perceptions, namely recognition-based (leader's characteristics are linked with the prototype of a leader held in memory) and inference-based (leaders' characteristics are based on outcomes of prominent events) processes, on attributions of charisma comparing groups of participants from Turkey and the USA. Their results showed that the co-occurrence of these two processes had produced optimal attribution of charisma to the leader in both cultures. Additionally, leaders' prototypical characteristics were more effective in forming a leadership impression in an individualistic (American) culture, whereas collectivistic (Turkish) people made attributions based on the company performance outcome.

Analyzing a survey data of 475 college students from the Philippines, the USA, and Turkey Cukur *et al.*, (2004) explored some coherence with conventional wisdom between individualism/collectivism and value types, particularly for collectivism and conservative values. Moreover, religiosity was positively associated with conservative values and collectivism across all three cultures. The authors also found that individualism related to openness-to-change values.

Ucer's (2009) study compares the business negotiation styles of the Dutch and Turkish people that represent individualistic and collectivistic cultures,

respectively, based on both qualitative interviews and quantitative survey data from around 100 respondents including managers, international business experts and practitioners, and diplomatic representatives who have either Dutch and Turkish or dual citizenship. Results revealed that there were significant differences in the preferences for negotiation styles between Turkish and Dutch negotiators. In line with the national culture interactions, in Ucer's (2009) study there are some specific findings relative to our case: Opposing with national culture-based expectations, Turks scored significantly higher on the time sensitivity and monochronic tendency than Dutch respondents. As expected, relationship building was crucial in Turkey for doing business whereas it is not important at all in The Netherlands. Both Dutch and Turkish people tend to be direct in communications. Turkish people do not like critics when there is a conflict while Dutch people have a higher tolerance for critics within conflict situations. Win/win strategy was more Dutch and win/lose was more Turkish style as expected. Due to high hierarchy (versus egalitarian), Turkish people are expected to rely on one leader. This is supported by the qualitative part of her research that boss decides and subordinates never take initiatives or responsibilities, even if they are qualified. However, the quantitative analysis showed that Turks prefer consensus. Consistently with the conventional wisdom, Turkish respondents scored higher on specific agreement forms than Dutch people. However, opposing with the expectations, the share of Turkish respondents answered that they would probably take risks at the negotiation table was higher than that of Dutch respondents. Finally, compared to Dutch people, Turkish respondents scored relatively higher on emotionalism and formality.

Salacuse (2003) who used the surveys of 310 people of different countries including the USA, asked participants to rate their negotiating styles and found that in many instances, people from the same cultures tended to respond to the negotiating elements in a similar way. Starting from Salacuse's (1998, 2003, 2006) suggestions, Metcalf *et al.* (2006, 2007) compared the cultural tendencies in negotiation styles of Finland, India, Mexico, Turkey, and the USA. Based on the comparisons of general tendencies of 654 respondents consisting of business people and university students with business experience from Turkey and the USA (327 per each country) several findings can be inferred as follows: i) Turkish respondents prefer the negotiation ended up with a contract rather than

relationship while American negotiators tend to be neutral between contract and relationship. ii) Turkish respondents showed a strong preference for win-lose outcomes whereas Americans' preferences were win-win results. iii) The majority of Turkish respondents seemed to prefer the more formal style than Americans whose preferences between formality and informality were not that distinct. iv) Respondents from both countries largely prefer a direct communication style. v) The majority of respondents from both countries thought that punctuality was important in the business negotiation where the Turks seemed to be more time-sensitive compared to Americans. vi) Turkish participants tended to have lower emotionalism than Americans. vii) Despite the general preferences of both groups for the specific agreements to general ones, Turkish respondents' preferences towards more specific agreement seemed to be stronger than those of Americans. viii) Turkish respondents tended to accept top-down (deductive) approach in which the deal begins with the general principles then specific items are negotiated. However, Americans' preferences were not that stringent between top-down and bottom-up (inductive) approaches that in the latter one specific sections like product characteristics, amount, price, delivery time *etc*. are negotiated first. ix) Even both Turkish and American respondents reported a tendency towards a team negotiation based on consensus, the tendency of Turkish participants was relatively stronger. x) Turkish respondents were found exhibiting a higher risk-taking behavior than Americans. Most of these findings on Turkish and American managers are seen consistent with those of Özel (2008) and Tinsley *et al*. (2011).

Highlighting the importance of business negotiations at different cultures in international marketing, Babayiğit's (2006) study used 103 surveys of Turkish managers working for leading businesses in Turkey and found that bargaining in cooperative and easy-going styles were common among Turkish negotiators. Building a long-term friendship was important and forceful negotiation styles were not preferable. Moreover, Turkish managers were found prone to make an agreement at the end of the negotiation. Written and detailed agreements are preferable but verbal agreements are also binding the parties.

Based on a survey data of 102 upper level managers (51 from Germany and 51 from Turkey) working for small and medium-sized businesses in the automotive sectors Altintas's (2008) *t*-test results revealed that there was no difference between the universal values of Turkish and German managers whereas individual values shaped by the national cultures of managers varied across two countries. Carrying out several analysis methods on a survey-based data collected from 147 managers (79 from Turkey and 68 from America) Özel (2008) found some evidence indicating that Turkish managers tend to be more competitive and compromising and less defensive. As seen, Özel's study (2008) has results both confirming and contradicting the those of Salacuse's (1998, 2003, 2006) and Hofstede's (1980, 2001).

In their study examining the impacts of individualism-collectivism, trust, and ethical ideology on ethically questionable negotiation tactics, such as pretending, deceiving and lying in Turkey, Erkuş and Banai (2011) found that Turkish negotiators who scored high on horizontal individualism tended to score highly on pretending and deceiving and less on lying. They determined a negative relationship between those tactics and idealism. Moreover, trust was found unrelated to any of these negotiation tactics.

Whenever individuals interact with others during a negotiation, interpersonal conflicts may arise (Carnevale, 1995; Gunkel *et al*., 2016). These conflicts can also be within the organizations. One example is that of Cortina and Wasti's (2005) study which examines the cultural implications of coping with sexual harassment in the USA and Turkey. Their results exhibited that Anglo-American women, representing less patriarchal and collectivistic culture, were more likely to use detached coping, trying to forget the stressor or make no coping efforts, whereas Turkish women, representing more patriarchal and collectivistic cultures, were more likely to use avoidant-negotiating coping, trying to avoid seeing the harasser. Turkish women also tended to negotiate with harasser which may be seen as odds with the harmony-seeking, conflict-avoiding attributes of collectivism but can be explained by the attempt to let him know she didn't like what he was doing. Authors link these tendencies of Turkish women to the Turkish culture where for example, men are rewarded but women are condemned for early initiation into sexual life, numerous sex partners, and extramarital relationships. As a result, Turkish women may consider men's sexual aggression to be normal and thus less worthy of reporting. They may also fear damage to personal and family reputations, as their patriarchal societies tend to blame women more than men for sexual

violence. Consequently, Turkish women tend to seek less formal advocacy, compared to Anglo-Americans. Using a data collected by surveying 244 managerial employees from both public and private organizations in Turkey, Ma *et al*. (2010) found that Turkish people were more likely to use collaborating style, instead of compromising or avoiding as expected from a collectivistic culture. Further, different aspects of collectivism have different effects on Turkish conflict management styles: the importance of competitive success leads to preferences for competition style; the value of working alone leads to less collaboration; the norms of subordination of personal needs to group interest are positively related to more collaborating and accommodating, and the beliefs of the effects of personal pursuit of group productivity are positively related to more compromising.

One of the most important requirements for negotiators is the high capability in embracing of current technology. On the technology acceptance and national culture nexus, Abbasi *et al*. (2015) examined the impact of individualism and collectivism over the individual's technology acceptance behavior conducting a multi-group (from low to high collectivists) analysis on Pakistan and Turkey that they characterize as high and moderate collectivist societies, respectively. Likewise, based on a dataset collected from senior and middle managers at private sector organizations in Turkey and Canada, Arpaci e*t al*. (2015) investigated the impact of cultural differences on adoption of smartphones. Considering connection with our case, it can be inferred from the overall results of both studies that national cultures have significant effects on technology adoption behaviors. More specifically, individualistic societies (*i.e.* the USA and Canada) more tend to accept and adopt recent technologies whereas in collectivist societies (*i.e.* Turkey and Pakistan) environmental characteristics such as competitive pressure together with partner and customer expectations have significant influences and thus individuals with collectivist culture may need managerial support like training and education in technology embracement.

There are different negotiation tactics with strategic goals. An important one is the 'black-hat and white-hat strategy' in which two people who work as a team in a negotiation against an adversary. The first person, the black hat, takes a competitive stance towards the adversary; the second one, the white hat, takes a more cooperative stance. The presumed effect

is success in eliciting concessions from the adversary and reaching agreement (Hilty and Carnevale, 1993). However, this tactic may be seen appropriate with only American culture, since Turkish negotiators widely rely on a consensus in a high hierarchy (low egalitarian) and acknowledge that disagreeing and arguing in front of adversary counterparts may conclude with failure.

4. METHODOLOGY

The research has two empirical parts: First, in a quantitative approach, the differences in negotiation styles between Turkish and native-American managers are tried to be explored. In the second part, with a qualitative approach, mutual experiences and observations of business leaders who had been in a negotiation between Turkish and Americans are evaluated which also enables us to crosscheck the consistency of self-reports and reciprocal assessments.

4.1. Research Hypothesis and Propositions

Considering cultural origins and the evidence from extant studies like Salacuse (1998), Weiss and Stripp (1998), Hofstede (2001) Metcalf *et al*. (2006), Ucer (2009) and Katz (2007) together with the general responses of the participants in our study, Turkey and the USA can be compared in terms of main negotiation styles. Specifically, in hypothesis construction, we integrated 12 negotiating tendencies proposed by Weiss and Stripp (1998) into Salacuse's (1998) 10 ways that national cultures affect negotiation styles. Although Weiss and Stripp (1998) showed 'trust bases' and 'negotiator selection' separately, they are included in 'negotiation goal' and 'team organization', respectively, in Salacuse's (1998) clusters. As the main motivation sources of this study, these propositions based on the national culture and negotiation styles interactions together with antecedents and consequences are hypothesized as "*negotiation styles of American and Turkish business negotiators are significantly different*". This research hypothesis is tested by comparing negotiation tendencies of American and Turkish managers with regard to each one of Salacuse's (1998) 10 ways that national cultures affect negotiation styles. Therefore, we acknowledge that Turkish and American cultures are distinctly dissimilar by counting on the Hofstede's (1980, 2001) cultural dimensions. In this negotiation styles-national cultures nexus, the research hypothesis is built on ten propositions shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Negotiation tendencies and related propositions

Aspects of negotiation tendencies	*Propositions based on the expectations about cultural tendencies*
	(extracted from Salacuse, 1998; Weiss and Stripp, 1998; Hofstede, 1980; 2001; Babayiğit, 2006; Metcalf *et al.* 2006; Ucer, 2009 Katz, 2007; Özel, 2008; Tinsley *et al.,* 2011; Salmon *et al.,* 2016).
1. Negotiation goal	Building a trust-based relationship is more important for Turkish negotiators while the contract is more favored by American managers.
2. Attitude	As a business negotiation strategy, win-lose (distributive) and win-win (bargaining) strategies are embraced by Turkish and American negotiators, respectively.
3. Personal style	Formal interactions are more favored by Turkish negotiators while Americans prefer informal interactions within business negotiations. Therefore, the degree of bureaucracy in reaching a formal business contract is higher in Turkish way than in American way.
4. Communication style	Turkish negotiators prefer indirect communication more than the American negotiators who prefer direct communication.
5. Time sensitivity	Compared to Turkish ones, American negotiators more consider the time as a scarce resource that needs to be used efficiently. Therefore, Americans adopt monochronic work style and paces of negotiation proceed faster than those of Turkish managers who are polychronic.
6. Emotionalism	Decisions of Turkish negotiators are more based on emotional factors compared to Americans whose decision are generally based on objective facts.
7. Agreement form	General and plain contracts are favored by Turkish business negotiators more than those by Americans that prefer more specific and detailed contracts.
8. Agreement building process	Turkish business negotiators prefer top-down decision-making process whereas American counterparts embrace the bottom-up process.
9. Team organization	As in a collectivistic culture, Turkish negotiators favor consensus style of decision making whereas Americans, holding individualistic culture, a representative leader tends to make the decision on behalf of her/his business organizations.
10. Risk-taking behavior	Turkish negotiators are more risk-averse than Americans while negotiating business.

One of the weaknesses of relevant studies is the use of nationalities as proxies of cultures (Tsui *et al.,* 2007). This approach seems to be unable to capture the real impacts of the culture. This problem becomes more important in the USA case since many business people in the USA, especially in the California state, have dual citizenship. In order to eliminate this problem, American managers participated in the study are not only those who have the USA citizenship but also those who were born in the California state and grown in native-born families holding the native American cultural characteristics. Therefore, in our case, the terms Americans and Californians are used interchangeably.

4.2. Sample and Data Collection

The sample universe of the research is managers working for medium-and large-sized businesses in Turkey and the USA. The sample businesses have been confined to those that have involved in an international business negotiation with a counterpart from a different country/culture. The final sample covers 108 managers from Turkey (48) and the USA (60) who somewhat involved in international negotiation on behalf of their organizations. First, within a quantitative approach, by utilizing and conducting Salacuse's (1998, 2003, 2006) approach, participants were asked to personally and generally rank the importance of the traits from 1 to 7 listed in Table 2 while they are in a business negotiation, especially with those from different cultures.

The surveys were administrated through e-mail and face-to-face interviews during January-May 2016 in the California State of the USA, and October 2016-January 2017 in Turkey.

Table 2: Negotiation styles and traits asked respondents to rank

Aspects	Business Negotiation Tendencies									
1. Goal	contract	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	relationship
2. Attitudes	win/lose	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	win/win
3. Personal Styles	informal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	formal
4. Communications	direct	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	indirect
5. Time Sensitivity	high	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	low
6. Emotionalism	high	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	low
7. Agreement Form	specific	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	general
8. Agreement Building	bottom-up	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	top-down
9. Negotiating Team Organization	one leader	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	consensus
10. Risk-taking	high	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	low

Note: Both oral and written explanations on the aspects were provided to the respondents when required.

Since the hypothesis, in fact, has mutual interactions and overlapping domains bordered by national cultures they may have multi-meaning in Turkish and American cultures. Thus, some supplementary interviews were conducted to support and check the consistency.

Secondly, with a qualitative approach, in the light of mutual experiences and observations of 16 business leaders (7 from Turkey and 9 from the USA) who had been in a negotiation between Turkish and Americans were asked to reassess the concepts considering their experiences with Turkish/American negotiations. Because of the limited numbers of both participants and their businesses, the variations over demographics are not taken into account in the study. However, in order to make it possible to capture convergence process, we grouped businesses by ownership, namely 100% domestic and 100% foreign (or multinational businesses-MNBs). For Turkey (and for California), the sample covered 43 (52) businesses that 18 (16) and 8 (15) of them were 100% domestic and MNBs respectively. The other 17 (21) businesses were with at least 20% foreign ownership. Ownership information was based on the statements of the top managers surveyed in companies. We excluded businesses involved in any kind of state ownership or governmental management or direct intervention. The majority of the business sample was operating in manufacturing and services sectors. Usually, only one manager was surveyed per companies but in several large companies, two managers were covered though.

5. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

5.1. Findings from the Quantitative Analysis

In the quantitative part, we compared the mean scores of the Turkish and American groups and in order to affirm whether the means of these two independent groups are significantly different, the independent group *t-test* was applied. The results are reported in an order of ownership structures of businesses that the managers working for, namely all businesses (Table 3), fully domestic-owned businesses (Table 4) and fully foreign-owned multinational businesses (Table 5), respectively.

Results seen in Table 3 reveal that, compared to Americans, Turkish negotiators have stronger negotiation tendencies towards relationship goal, formal personal style, high emotionalism, general agreement forms, top-down agreement building, and consensus-led team organization. Differences in the other aspects are not statistically significant (p>0.10). Moreover, both Turkish and American negotiators are seen neutral in risk-taking behavior. Therefore, the support for the hypothesis is found partial with some unexpected findings contradicting conventional wisdom. In order to control for convergence process that can explain these unclear differences, we also compared the scores of managers distinguished between ownership status of the businesses they work for in Table 4.

Table 3: Negotiation styles of all Turkish and American managers: Mean scores comparison

Aspects	Negotiation Tendencies (All managers, N:108)					
	Turkish managers (48)			American managers (60)		
Goal*	contract	<5.2>	relationship	contract	<3.8>	relationship
Attitudes	win/lose	<4.3>	win/win	win/lose	<4.6>	win/win
Personal Styles*	informal	<5.5>	formal	informal	<4.9>	formal
Communications	direct	<5.3>	indirect	direct	<5.5>	indirect
Time Sensitivity	high	<5.1>	low	high	<4.9>	low
Emotionalism*	high	<3.2>	low	high	<5.3>	low
Agreement Form*	specific	<5.6>	general	specific	<3.2>	general
Agreement Building*	bottom-up	<5.7>	top-down	bottom-up	<4.3>	top-down
Team Organization*	one leader	<6.0>	consensus	one leader	<2.2>	consensus
Risk-taking	high	<4.0>	low	high	<4.2>	low

Note: The scores range between 1 and 7, figures around 4 (3.5 and 4.5) are considered neutral. * The *t*-test indicates that mean differences are statistically significant at 10% level.

Table 4: Negotiation styles of Turkish and American managers only working for fully domestic businesses: Mean scores comparison

Aspects	Negotiation Tendencies (Managers working for 100% domestic businesses, n:38)					
	Turkish managers (18)			American managers (20)		
Goal*	contract	6.1↑	relationship	contract	4.0↑	relationship
Attitudes	win/lose	4.0↓	win/win	win/lose	4.2↓	win/win
Personal Styles*	informal	5.8↑	formal	informal	5.0↑	formal
Communications	direct	5.0↓	indirect	direct	5.1↓	indirect
Time Sensitivity*	high	5.6↑	low	high	4.5↓	low
Emotionalism*	high	3.0↓	low	high	5.0↓	low
Agreement Form*	specific	5.5↓	general	specific	4.0↑	general
Agreement Building*	bottom-up	5.9↑	top-down	bottom-up	4.5↑	top-down
Team Organization*	one leader	6.2↑	consensus	one leader	3.0↑	consensus
Risk-Taking	high	4.7↑	low	high	5.0↑	low

Note: The scores around 4 are considered neutral perception. ↓ and ↑ symbols respectively refer to decrease and increase in the average scores of the managers (n:38) working for fully domestic businesses compared to all managers (N:108).
* The *t*-test indicates that mean differences are statistically significant at 10% level.

Figures in Table 4 demonstrate that negotiation tendencies of managers working in 100% domestic businesses seem to be reflecting national cultures better and thus supporting the hypothesis more. In order to crosscheck this evidence, in Table 5 we also compared the scores of American and Turkish managers employed in fully foreign-owned businesses called MNBs.

One striking observation in Table 5 is a strong convergence process between Turkish and Amer-

ican managers working for fully foreign-owned businesses in their countries. This can be interpreted that as businesses become more multinational and/or international, the differences between their managers' negotiation styles slow down. Moreover, this convergence does not lean to a specific culture but tend to go a common trajectory where two cultures come close to.

Table 5: Negotiation styles of Turkish and American managers only working for fully foreign businesses: Mean scores comparison

Aspects	Negotiation Tendencies					
	(Managers working for 100% foreign businesses-MNBs, n:27)					
	Turkish managers (10)			American managers (17)		
Goal*	contract	5.0↓	relationship	contract	3.7↓	relationship
Attitudes	win/lose	4.8↑	win/win	win/lose	4.8↑	win/win
Personal Styles	informal	5.2↓	formal	informal	5.0↑	formal
Communications	direct	5.0↓	indirect	direct	5.4↓	indirect
Time Sensitivity*	high	4.2↓	low	high	4.8↓	low
Emotionalism *	high	3.5↑	low	high	5.2↓	low
Agreement Form*	specific	5.2↓	general	specific	3.6↑	general
Agreement Building*	bottom-up	5.1↓	top-down	bottom-up	4.6↑	top-down
Team Organization*	one leader	5.6↓	consensus	one leader	3.0↑	consensus
Risk-taking*	high	4.2↑	low	high	5.0↑	low

Note: The scores around 4 are considered neutral perception. ↓ and ↑ symbols respectively refer to decrease and increase in the score of managers (n:27) working for fully foreign businesses compared to all managers (N:108).
* The *t*-test indicates that mean differences are statistically significant at 10% level.

5.2. Findings from the Qualitative Approach

In the last part, we present the assessments of 7 Turkish managers on American negotiation styles and the assessments 9 American managers on Turkish negotiation styles. These voluntary managers are those who declared they had known the other group's tendencies well enough since they had sometimes and somewhat come together in a business dealing process no matter they had reached an agreement or not.

Table 6: Mutual assessments of Turkish and the American managers on negotiation styles of each other: Mean scores comparison

Aspects	Negotiation Tendencies					
	Turkish managers			American managers		
	(American managers' (n:9) evaluations)			(Turkish managers' (n:7) evaluations)		
Goal*	contract	6.2	relationship	contract	4.0	relationship
Attitudes*	win/lose	4.0	win/win	win/lose	4.8	win/win
Personal Styles*	informal	5.5	formal	informal	2.2	formal
Communications*	direct	6.0	indirect	direct	3.8	indirect
Time Sensitivity*	high	5.0	low	high	4.0	low
Emotionalism*	high	2.5	low	high	4.5	low
Agreement Form*	specific	5.5	general	specific	4.0	general
Agreement Building*	bottom-up	6.0	top-down	bottom-up	4.0	top-down
Team Organization*	one leader	6.4	consensus	one leader	2.5	consensus
Risk-taking	high	6.0	low	high	5.6	low

Note: The scores around 4 are considered neutral perception. * The *t*-test indicates that the mean differences are statistically significant at 10% level.

Mutual responses in Table 6 demonstrate that, in general self-reports of the Turkish participants are coherent with those of the assessments of American managers towards Turkish managers, and *vice versa*. However, there are several significant differences that, for example, on the team organization, Americans think that Turkish managers tend to make a decision in a consensus with a 6.4 average score which is higher than that of self-report of Turkish managers with an average score of 6. An American manager working for an international informatics company in California said that: "*While dealing with a Turkish manager, he never said 'yes' surely. After we offered something he was going out and had a phone talk to, I think, his boss. Actually, we were not sure who we had been dealing with*". Similarly, on the risk-taking behavior, even Turkish managers define themselves as neutral with an average score of 4 in risk-taking behavior, American managers, in general, think that Turkish managers do not want to take the risk with an average score 6.

A Turkish manager working for a fully-domestic company which is globally operating in construction supply sector said that "*American negotiators do not like bargaining. I always felt forced to offer the last price*". The same Turkish manager underlined that "*we, Turkish leaders, usually think that inner information provides bargaining advantage and therefore, we are reluctant to share privileged information and we do not easily rely on the outside information that everybody can get access*". Another American manager, who said he had been in Turkey several times for business connection stated that "*Turkish people and Turkish negotiators, generally, are doing several things at the same time (*polychronic work style*). Moreover, in every stage of negotiation, Turks evaluate all alternatives, no matter we closed that session or not, which causes a crawling negotiation process*".

Many businesses located in Turkey but operated globally are still owned or controlled by only several families. Therefore, many business negotiators can also be relatives of the owners. When building a business relationship with out-group partners, they can consider they let their business partners join the family and therefore they need to trust on who they collaborate with. One Turkish professional manager said that '*Turkish negotiators do not trust easily on their counterparts, no matter domestic or international. Therefore, building a trust is about the experiences and it takes time and so do the negotiations*'. One

other Turkish managers who defined himself as conservative and traditional said that "*our customers', employees' and bosses' satisfaction is very important for us. Because they give 'bread' to us. Therefore, while negotiating with foreign counterparts I also take their preferences into consideration. I am not independent*".

Individually, Turkish people are proud of family reputation that must not be embarrassed by any member. Likewise, business leaders/managers are also proud of their career regarding education and where and with whom they have worked. Reflecting these tendencies, Turkish negotiators first think to save their reputation and name. Likewise, they also want to save their family reputations. Because Turkish businesses that involve in international businesses have good reputation, the negotiators fight for also their companies' fames at the negotiations and never let the reputation be tarnished in their customers', owners' and all people's perceptions. Differently, when we asked this sense to a Californian manager she said "*we (Americans) do what we are supposed to. We usually negotiate following our well-defined and compromised agenda. In fact, I personally care about my career. I have never met with the owners. But I know my business and colleagues well. Even we are friends, we treat professionally, and this brings personal success which helps the owners/top managers know who contributes more to the company and who really deserve the benefits that the company provides*".

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the pre-1970s period, global business cooperation and transactions were seemingly restricted to those within Western countries with similar cultures that are characterized by mainly 'Anglo' and 'European' principles. After the 1970s, Asian businesses have started integrating into the global business networks those have been followed by others from different countries including Turkey. Consistently, a growing number of international negotiators have started to seek for new markets on one hand and they need to deal with the issues that cultural differences have posed on the other hand. Given the scarcity of cross-cultural empirical comparison of negotiation tendencies, utilizing the theoretical explanations and findings of the earlier studies, this research aimed to identify the extent to which the negotiation tendencies of Turkish and American managers differ. In this context, first, based on the self-quantitative ranking style assessments of 48 managers from Turkey and 60

managers from the USA, we compared Turkish and American negotiation tendencies in terms of widely accepted 10 negotiation tendencies with a special interest in the cultural origins. In the qualitative part, utilizing the mutual assessments and experiences of 7 volunteer Turkish managers on American negotiation styles and the assessments 9 volunteer American managers on Turkish negotiation styles, we also crosschecked the extent of differences between self-reported and other-reported evaluations. For both the quantitative and qualitative analyses we compared the means of scores ranging from 1 to 7 and carried out independent group *t*-test. Responses demonstrate that self-reports of the participants, in general, are coherent with those of the assessments of others towards them. Moreover, multidimensional and multigroup comparisons reveal a convergence that both American and Turkish managers of multinationals tend to use similar negotiation styles. The qualitative analysis also supports the convergence trajectory towards culture-independent common principles in cross-cultural business negotiations. However, this convergence does not seem to be totally denying the conventional wisdom suggesting that national cultures of international business managers affect their negotiation styles.

Besides these general findings, overall results from both quantitative and qualitative analyses together with the interviews provide some specific evidence that noteworthy ones can be summarized as follows: i) For Turkish managers, it is important to establish relationships before negotiating. The contract is not a big deal to build a trust between parties. For Americans, establishing a relationship is not a 'must', but sometimes can be necessary to move to negotiating. ii) For Turkish managers, one side can take advantage of the other side which possibly loses. Negotiation is a zero-sum strategic game and a competitive process in which one party's gains are the other's losses while Americans tend to believe that negotiation is a positive-sum strategic game benefitting both sides. iii) Even friendliness is important, formal procedures signal the seriousness of the business intentions for Turkish managers but (in)formality is not a deal affecting the negotiation for Americans. iv) Turkish managers tend to use indirect communication styles in those they commonly use the words 'maybe', 'possible', 'hope so', 'if', *etc.* compared to those of Americans who prefer direct communication and frequently use the word 'yes', 'no', 'surely', 'certainly', 'not at all', *etc.* v) For Turkish managers, time is important but not vital.

Prearranged plans and paces can be changed if necessary. They need to take their time before concluding. Even a session finishes, they can go and back while dealing with a further issue (polychronic negotiation) at the negotiation table. They appreciate punctuality, but not consider while deciding. Americans make other parties feel that 'time is money'. Negotiation needs to be well organized. Tasks should be done in a sequential order with deadlines (monochronic negotiation). They want to see what is proceeded in the assigned time. Americans do not tolerate repetitive delays. vi) Turkish managers show their emotions openly and their decisions can embody subjective feelings. Turkish negotiators cannot be defined as a 'poker face' that the other party can easily understand from their face that something is going bad and they concern about something. Nevertheless, Americans sometimes show subjective feelings at negotiations but these emotions 'never' affect their final decisions. Their mimics and gestures do not betray their feelings and intentions. vii) Turkish managers tend to add only necessary items on the contract, they think the other details can be arranged by talking. In this context, oral promise and building trust are also important. Americans prefer detailed and specific contracts instructing everything about the negotiations. They handle many papers to be read. They tend to put everything talked at the negotiation table on the contract. When some circumstances are changed they revise and re-write the contract to cover the new situation. Moreover, they want to add possible changes in the future, regardless how possibly it can happen. viii) Turkish negotiators build the agreement from top to down that they start dealing with general principle (deductive approach). If they agree with them, they proceed to specific topics. When they think something is not aggregable in general principles they do not go further for the specific issues. American managers, however, need to agree on specific issues first and then go to general principles (bottom-up style). They focus on their main aim and when they do not approve something on this aim, no matter how good the others go well, they can leave the table. ix) Turkish negotiators not only deal as a team but also make the final decision together. Moreover, they also expect more than one counterpart. They consider consensus is important and appreciate an inclusive negotiation. Specifically, they provide and expect many signs of responsible people on the contract. American negotiators work as a team but always with a representative on behalf of their business organization: These lead-

ers seem to have been empowered and authorized by someone that makes the leader behave like an owner. x) Since Turkish leaders put a considerable trust on the relationship they can sometimes go risky. If they trust they do not need to know the capability of counterparts' organizations. Even Americans seem to be able to take the risk as well, they usually do not go risky. Americans probably search counterpart's organizations, at least by googling, to know whether counterpart's organizations can accomplish the responsibilities that the contract obligates.

The study has an important limitation that both Turkish and American cultures are not racially or culturally homogenous. This heterogenicity is more remarkable for Californians. The California State is one of the most multi-cultural states of the USA. The state has all types of religions and many languages from all over the world. Therefore, it has some insufficiency for representing the overall American managers. Even we chose specific participants who were born in the USA and have Anglo-American culture, a considerable number of the participants had been working all around the world for the same/or different business organizations that can make these negotiators multicultural. Furthermore, this research was built on common evidence and theoretical explanations of the earlier studies in distinguishing between Turkish and American cultures. Since we did not measure the cultural scales, results must be interpreted cautiously while linking negotiation tendencies and national cultures. Another factor limiting the generalizability of the results of the study is sample size which is unable to capture all the managers who have somewhat involved in an international negotiation in their career. This is true for both countries. Therefore, future studies are recommended to not restrict their sample to managers only. More expanded sample towards to more states and countries may yield a better cross-cultural comparison.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Abbasi, M. S., Tarhini, A., Elyas, T. and Shah, F. (2015) "Impact of Individualism and Collectivism Over the Individual's Technology Acceptance Behaviour: A Multi-Group Analysis Between Pakistan And Turkey" *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 28(6): 747-768.

Adair, W. L., Taylor, M., Chu, J., Ethier, N., Xiong, T., Okumura, T. and Brett, J. (2013) "Effective Influence in Negotiation: The Role of Culture and Framing" *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 43(4): 6-25.

Adler, N. J. and Graham, J. L. (1989) "Cross-Cultural Interaction: The International Comparison Fallacy?" *Journal of International Business Studies*, 20(3): 515-537.

Akgunes, A. and Culpepper, R. (2012) "Negotiations Between Chinese and Americans: Examining the Cultural Context and Salient Factors" *The Journal of International Management Studies*, 7(1): 191-200.

Altintas, F. Ç. (2008) "A Comparative Analysis of Turkish and German Managers' Personal Values" *Ankara University SBF Journal*, 63(4): 65-87.

Arpaci, I., Cetin, Y. Y., Turetken, O. (2015) "A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Smartphone Adoption by Canadian and Turkish Organizations" *Journal of Global Information Technology Management*, 18(3): 214-238.

Babayiğit, S. (2006) *Business Negotiations at Different Cultures in International Marketing and An Application*, (written in Turkish), Unpublished PhD Thesis, Erciyes University, Institute of Social Sciences, Kayseri, Turkey.

Bachkirov, A. A. and AlAbri, S. (2016) "Islamic Values and Negotiator Behaviour" *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*, 9(3): 333-345.

Bergiel, E. B., Bergiel, B. J. and Upson, J. W. (2012) "Revisiting Hofstede's Dimensions: Examining the

Cultural Convergence of the United States and Japan" *American Journal of Management*, 12(1): 69-79.

Carnevale, P. J. (1995) "Property, Culture, and Negotiation" R. M. Kramer and D. M. Messick (Eds.) *Negotiation as A Social Process*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp.309-323.

Cortina, L. M. and Wasti, S. A. (2005) "Profiles in Coping: Responses to Sexual Harassment Across Persons, Organizations, and Cultures" *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1): 182-192.

Cox, T. H. and Blake, S. (1991) "Managing Cultural Diversity: Implications for Organizational Competitiveness" *Academy of Management Executive*, 5(3): 45-56.

Cukur, C. S., De Guzman, M. R. T. and Carlo, Gustavo (2004) "Religiosity, Values, and Horizontal and Vertical Individualism-Collectivism: A Study of Turkey, the United States, and the Philippines" *The Journal Social Psychology*, 144(6): 613-634.

Edewor, P. A. and Aluko, Y. A. (2007) "Diversity Management, Challenges and Opportunities in Multicultural Organizations" *The International Journal of Diversity in Organizations, Communities and Nations*, 6(6): 189-196.

Ensari, N. and Murphy, S. E. (2003) "Cross-Cultural Variations in Leadership Perceptions and Attribution of Charisma to The Leader" *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 92 (1-2): 52-66.

Erkuş, A. and Banai, M. (2011) "Attitudes Towards Questionable Negotiation Tactics in Turkey" *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 22(3): 239-263.

Fang, T. (2003) "A Critique of Hofstede's Fifth National Culture Dimension" *International Journal of Cross Cultural* Management, 3(3): 347-368.

Fisher, R., Ury, W. and Patton, B. (1991) *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*, 2nd Edition, New York: Penguin Books.

Gerhart, B. (2008) "How Much Does National Culture Constrain Organizational Culture?" *Management and Organization Review*, 5(2): 241-259.

GLOBE-Global Leadership & Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (2017). <http://globeproject.com/>.

Graf, A., Koeszegi, S. T., Pesendorfer, E. M. (2012) "Cross-Cultural Negotiations and Power Distance: Strategies Applied by Asian and European Buyers and Sellers in Electronic Negotiations" *Nankai Business Review International*, 3(3): 242-256.

Gunkel, M., Schlaegel, C. and Taras, V. (2016) "Cultural Values, Emotional Intelligence, and Conflict Handling Styles: A Global Study" *Journal of World Business,* 51(4): 568-585.

Hilty, J. A. and Carnevale, P. J. (1993) "Black-Hat/White-Hat Strategy in Bilateral Negotiation" *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55(3): 444-469.

Hofstede, G. (1980) *Culture's Consequences*, Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1993) "Cultural Constraints in Management Theories" *Academy of Management Executive*, 7(1): 81-94.

Hofstede, G. (1994) "The Business of International Business is Culture" *International Business Review*, 3(1): 1-14.

Hofstede, G. (2001) *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*, 2nd Edition, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (2011) "Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context" *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1): 1-26.

Katz, L. (2007) *Negotiating International Business: The Negotiator's Reference Guide to 50 Countries Around the World*, 2nd Edition, Charleston: BookSurge Publishing.

Kozan, M. K. and Ergin, C. (1998) "Preference for Third Party Help in Conflict Management in the United States and Turkey: An Experimental Study" *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29(4): 525-539.

Low, P. K. C. (2010) *Successfully Negotiating in Asia*, New York: Springer-Verlag.

Ma, Z., Erkuş, A. and Tabak, A. (2010) "Explore the Impact of Collectivism on Conflict Management Styles: A Turkish Study" *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 21(2):169-185.

Manrai, L. A. and Manrai, A. K. (2010) "The Influence of Culture in International Business Negotiations: A New Conceptual Framework and Managerial Implications" *Journal of Transnational Management*, 14(1): 69-100.

Metcalf, L. E., Bird, A., Shankarmahesh, M., Aycan, Z., Larimo, J. and Valdelamar, D. D. (2006) "Cultural Tendencies in Negotiation: A Comparison of Finland, India, Mexico, Turkey, and the United States" *Journal of World Business*, 41(4): 382-394.

Metcalf, L. E., Shankarmahesh, M., Bird, A., Lituchy, T. R. and Peterson, M. F. (2007) "Cultural Influences in Negotiations: A Four Country Comparative Analysis" *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 7(2): 147-168.

Miles, M. (2003) "Negotiating with the Chinese: Lessons from the Field" *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 39(4): 453-472.

Muijen, J. J. V. and Koopman, P. L. (1994) "The Influence of National Culture on Organizational Culture: A Comparative Study Between 10 Countries" *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 4(4): 367-380.

Özel, E. (2008) *Managers' Negotiation Styles from Different Cultures: Comparison of Turkish and American*, (written in Turkish), Unpublished MBA Thesis, Marmara University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul, Turkey.

Parnell, J. A. and Kedia, B. L. (1996) "The Impact of National Culture on Negotiating Behaviors Across Borders" *International Journal of Value-Based Management*, 9(1): 45-61.

Ravasi, D. and Schultz, M. (2006) "Responding to Organizational Identity Threats: Exploring the Role of Organizational Culture" *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3), 433-458.

Salacuse, J. W. (1998) "Ten Ways that Culture Affects Negotiating Style: Some Survey Results" *Negotiation Journal*, 14(3): 221-235.

Salacuse, J. W. (2003) *The Global Negotiator: Making, Managing and Mending Deals Around the World in the Twenty-First Century*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Salacuse, J. W. (2006) *Leading Leaders: How to Manage Smart, Talented, Rich, and Powerful People*, New York: American Management Association.

Salmon, E. D., Gelfand, M. J., Ting, H., Kraus, S., Gal, Y. and Fulmer, C. A. (2016) "When Time Is Not Money: Why Americans May Lose Out at The Negotiation Table" *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 2(4), 349-367.

Schneider, S. C. (1988) "National vs. Corporate Culture: Implications for Human Resource Management" *Human Resource Management*, 27(2): 231-246.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994) "Beyond Individualism/Collectivism: New Cultural Dimensions of Values" U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, C.S. Choi and G. Yoon (Eds.) *Individualism and Collectivism*: *Theory, Method and Applications*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 85-119

Tinsley, C. H., Turan, N., Aslani, S. and Weingart, L. R. (2011) "The Interplay between Culturally- and Situationally-based Mental Models of Intercultural Dispute Resolution: West Meets Middle East" *International Negotiation*, 16(3): 481-510.

Tsui, A. S., Nifadkar, S.S. and Ou, A.Y. (2007) "Cross-National, Cross-Cultural Organizational Behavior Research: Advances, Gaps, and Recommendations" *Journal of Management*, 33(3): 426-478.

Ucer, M. (2009) *Dutch-Turkish Business Cooperation: An Effective Way of Dealing with Cultural Differences, Which Influence Business Co-Operation Between Dutch and Turkish Companies*, Master Thesis, International Management at the University of Twente, <http://essay.utwente.nl/60254/1/MSc_Meltem_Ucer.pdf>.

Volkema, R. J. (2004) "Demographic, Cultural, and Economic Predictors of Perceived Ethicality of Negotiation Behavior: A Nine-Country Analysis" *Journal of Business Research*, 57(1): 69-78.

Weiss, S. E. and Stripp, W. (1998) "Negotiating with Foreign Businesspersons: An Introduction for Americans with Propositions on Six Cultures" S. Niemeier, C.P. Campbell and R. Dirven (Eds) *The Cultural Context in Business Communication*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp.51-118.