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Introduction

“We are not primarily self-contained individuals. We are social animals, not rational animals. We emerge out of relationships, and we are deeply interpenetrated, one with another.”

By this quote, New York Times journalist David Brooks summarizes the current insights about the human nature from various research fields including neuroscience, behavioral economy, psychology, and sociology (Brooks, 2011). Humans are indeed “social animals” as Aronson (1980) postulated, or even “ultra-social animals” since our social behavior repertoire is unique in the animal kingdom (Tomasello, 2014). What distinguishes us most is our cooperativeness, our constant urge to interact with others and to form social groups.

Our social nature is hard-wired into our brains. We possess specialized brain structures to recognize faces, to communicate with others, and to imitate and learn from others (McDonald & Crandall, 2015). Recent research even identified areas within the brain that are associated with people’s susceptibility to persuasive messages (Izuma, 2013). Other studies showed that conformity and adherence to social norms are associated with activity within the brain’s reward system (Germar, Schlemmer, Krug, Voss, & Mojzisch, 2014).

From an evolutionary perspective, these and other related mechanisms helped our ancestors to survive and reproduce since humans always lived in social formations (Sundie, Cialdini, Griskevicius, & Kenrick, 2012). A group’s support was often crucial for survival because groups were better able to protect their members from predators and allocate resources through shared efforts as compared to individuals left to their fate (Tindale & Kluwe, 2015). For instance, individuals in cooperative networks were able to accomplish tasks that would have been difficult or impossible alone (such as hunting large game) (Kenrick & Li, 2012).

Research on group performance supports these benefits also for our contemporaries. In many domains, groups outperform individuals. Groups tend to be more creative than individuals, they are better at problem-solving tasks, make more accurate decisions, excel in negotiations, and provide more precise forecasts (Tindale & Kluwe, 2015). In sum, individuals tend to achieve better outcomes when engaging in joint decision making. Unsurprisingly in light of these
advantages, decisions are often made within groups or have at least a social aspect. Individuals often discuss major decisions (e.g., a new job, a larger purchase, a medical treatment) with friends and family members. Moreover, many purchase decisions are made jointly within households. In the organizational context, joint decision making is also common. For instance, companies form buying centers to decide on purchases of products or services or send selling teams to negotiate with potential customers. To know how the joint setting affects individual behavior in these situations is crucial for practitioners since individuals likely behave differently in social contexts.

Indeed, an impressive amount of studies provides evidence that people are often heavily influenced by others in their cognitions and behaviors in various contexts. The research presented in this thesis investigates how social influences affect individuals purchase decisions with their partners (Manuscript I and II) and negotiation behavior when facing a team (Manuscript III). In both contexts, social influence is a pervasive issue. Consumer decisions are often made within households or have at least a social component. When deciding on a purchase jointly, individuals may try to impose their preferences on their partners or yield to their influence. Similarly, partners may decide jointly to buy specific products to enjoy together which they would not buy when shopping alone. In the business context, social influence may manifest itself through adherence to social norms which guide negotiators’ behavior. In a similar vein, when encountering groups the motivation to conform may be more pronounced as compared to encounters with single negotiators.

The present research will respond to these assumptions and demonstrate the effects of social influence in the consumer and business marketing context. Thereby, three questions need to be answered which are asked by the manuscripts titles:

1. “What do You Think, Darling?” or which characteristics are antecedents of the influence distribution (i.e., the share both partners have on the final decision) in joint purchase decision making.
2. “Minder or accomplice?” or how couples differ from individuals shopping alone concerning their preference for vice versus virtue products, and how this preference affects their willingness to pay.
3. “Can outnumbered negotiators succeed?” or which consequences occur for solo negotiators’ use of negotiation strategies and negotiation outcomes when facing a team with a different cultural background.

The next chapter lays the theoretical foundations of social influence in the consumer and business context. Subsequently, the three manuscripts investigating social influence processes will be presented and followed by a discussion. Finally, limitations and future research opportunities will be outlined.
1. Theoretical foundations

1.1 Social influence

The study of social influence has a long tradition in the social sciences. Several classical experiments in this field aroused great attention and made aware how tremendous others’ influence can be on the behavior of an individual. Social influence is defined as “any process whereby a person’s attitude, opinions, beliefs, or behaviour are altered or controlled by some form of social communication.” (Colman, 2015a) Researchers distinguish between two forms of social influence; compliance and conformity.

When a person yields to a persuasion attempt such as being asked for a favor or being instructed to do something, one speaks of compliance. In this case, the social communication altering an individual’s behavior is more or less explicit. In everyday life, people comply when, for example, answering an appeal to donate to charities, or helping friends with moving. The most extreme form of compliance, namely the obedience to authorities was impressively demonstrated by Milgram's classic experiments (1963): In a supposed teacher-student scenario, he asked participants to administer electric shocks to students for wrong answers. The intensity of the electric shocks had to be increased continuously for every wrong answer of the confederate student. The confederate supposedly punished by this treatment reacted with expressions of pain according to the intensity of the electric shocks. The experimenter encouraged the participant (teacher) to continue with the electric shocks in case of hesitation. The striking result of this study was that 65% of participants obeyed to the authority of the experimenter and continued to administer electric shocks up to the maximum intensity which would have been lethal.

In Milgram’s experiment, the influence on the individual was abundantly explicit. In turn, when a person yields to social forces without an explicit order or request from someone, one speaks of conformity (Colman, 2015b). In that case, the social communication provoking a change in an individual's behavior is implicit. This means that individuals are merely confronted with attitudes, opinions, beliefs or behaviors of others (Hewstone & Martin, 2014). This phenomenon is well documented in social psychology. At times, individuals even conform to an opinion even if it is apparently wrong. Asch (1951, 1956) demonstrated this effect impressively through his studies on line-judgments. In this famous experiment, each participant was assigned to a group of six to nine confederates. The group was presented with two cards. The first card (A)
contained three lines of different sizes, whereas the second card (B) contained one line. This line was of the same size as one of the lines from card (A). Participants were then asked to indicate which of the three lines from card (A) is of the same length as the single line from card (B). This procedure was repeated several times. The confederate group members had been instructed to consistently state wrong answers. Participants answered correctly in more than 99% of the cases when asked individually. However, when stating their answer within the group after having heard the wrong answers of their fellow group members, 36.8% of participants stated the wrong answer. Thus, Asch’s investigation is a notable example of conformity to majority influence.

Research on compliance and conformity is motivated by the urge to understand why individuals think and behave differently in the presence of others. It is deeply rooted in its historical context and pursuit to capture situational influences on people’s behavior. For instance, the idea behind Milgram’s experiments was to uncover why people obeyed to others’ orders in times of Holocaust (Burger, 2010). Since social influence is ubiquitous in every aspect of people’s life a large number of academic disciplines studied this important issue such as psychology, behavioral science, consumer behavior, and political science (Pratkanis, 2006). Taken as a whole, the study of social influence is concerned with the following issues (cf. Gibson & Smart, 2017): When the study of compliance is concerned researchers traditionally seek to answer the question of how others are and can be persuaded. Therefore they test the effectiveness of various compliance tactics as well as mediators and moderators of persuasion. In regard to conformity, scholars investigate under which circumstances people conform to the attitudes and behaviors of others, and how they can be made to conform to norms. Additionally, recent research is concerned with more subtle and indirect social influence processes and how those influences affect information processing and decision-making (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004).

But why do people comply with the requests of others, and conform to others even in the absence of an explicit instruction to do so? Deutsch and Gerard (1955) proposed an influential classification of the motives to comply with social influence. They argued that people agree with others for normative or informational reasons. The researchers define normative social influence as “an influence to conform with the positive expectations of another” (p. 629). Therefore, individuals behave in a way which would motivate social approval by others and decrease the chances of disapproval or rejection. The reason behind this motivation is to build and maintain
satisfying relationships with others. Informational social influence, in turn, is defined as “an influence to accept information obtained from another as evidence about reality (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955, p. 629). Individuals are motivated to form an accurate interpretation of reality and behave correctly (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004). That is why they turn towards judgments of others as a more or less trustworthy source of information about the objective reality especially in times of uncertainty (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955).

The theory of normative and informational social influence has been very influential and fueled the development of more precise concepts to explain people’s motives to adhere to social influence. For instance, Cialdini and Goldstein (2004) propose a more fine-grained account by describing three motivations to change ones’ attitudes or behavior as a result of social influence: First, people have the goal of accuracy; they want to act effectively and make accurate decisions. They strive to comprehend the reality as accurately as possible. Thus, if an agent (individual or group) seems to have a better understanding of the shared reality, people tend to conform to his/her/its point of view or action. Second, humans pursue the goal of affiliation, of building and maintaining social relationships. Conformity driven by this goal can, for instance, lead to behavioral mimicry, a phenomenon in which individuals unconsciously mimic their counterpart in posture, or facial expression (e.g., Chartrand & Bargh, 1999). It may also mislead individuals into doing things they would not usually do in order to be liked and accepted by others. Third, people have the goal of a positive self-concept by complying with their actions, statements, commitments, and beliefs (Cialdini & Trost 1998). Therefore, people may conform to others to enhance or repair their self-esteem. These motivations are goal-directed behaviors; however, this does not necessarily mean that people strive to achieve these goals consciously (Cialdini & Trost, 1998). The motives are internalized to such an extent that they drive our behavior even subconsciously.

There are also other forms of social influence which are more subtle and operate without our conscious perception. For instance, when people are uncertain how to behave in a situation correctly, they may use social norms as guidelines. Social norms are rules and standards that are accepted by members of a group (Hewstone & Martin, 2014). They contain information about which behavior is approved and disapproved (injunctive norms) and how to behave in a specific situation (descriptive norms) (Cialdini, Kallgren, & Reno, 1991). Norms emerge out of
interaction with others and can be formed on the level of societies (cultural norms), companies (organizational norms), families or even newly formed groups (Cialdini & Trost, 1998).

From the discussion so far it is evident that conformity and compliance as well the more subtle forms of social influence are ubiquitous in people's lives. To capture all forms of social influence, Latané (1981) proposed a theory of social impact. The researcher defines social impact as “any of the great variety of changes in physiological states and subjective feelings, motives and emotions, cognitions and beliefs, values and behavior, that occur in an individual, human or animal, as a result of the real, implied, or imagined presence or actions of other individuals.” (p. 343). Social Impact Theory specifies social influence effects by expressing it as the following equation: \( T = f(SIN) \). Thereby, the magnitude of the impact, \( T \), is a function of the strength of the influence sources (\( S \)) (e.g., power, status, and importance), the immediacy of the influence sources (\( I \)) (e.g., closeness in space or time), and the number of influence sources (e.g., whether the influence source is an individual or a group) (\( N \)). This means that individuals will be more inclined to conform to the opinions and actions of a local numerical majority than by either the local numerical minority or less proximate persons (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004).

This theory guides the empirical work of this thesis. In each of the three manuscripts, one variable of the equation is studied. However, first, it shall be illustrated how the social aspect impacts behaviors within the scope of joint consumer and business decision making.

**1.2 Decision making under social influence**

Broadly speaking, when individuals engage in decision making they choose one option among a set of alternatives which differ in their attributes (Wolff & Moser, 2015). Decision making is a ubiquitous aspect of life. On average, people make 200 decisions a day only on what to eat and drink (Wansink & Sobal, 2007). Although often seen as individual decisions, most of them include a social or collective aspect (Tindale & Kluwe, 2015). Both consumer and business decisions are often made within groups such as the family or a bargaining team. Thus, many areas of marketing are concerned with relationships and social influence originating from it (Iacobucci & Hopkins, 1992). Thereby, a group decision making perspective is adopted which emphasizes the interactions and dynamics between multiple individuals (Raiffa, Richardson, & Metcalfe, 2002). Group decision making involves more complexity than individual decision
making. For instance, when assessing decision outcomes social influence and interdependence between parties need to be taken into account. Individuals are interdependent when the cognitions, affects or behaviors of one person are dependent on those of the other person (Rusbult & Van Lange, 2003) which is the case in both couple purchase decision making and business negotiations.

To structure the following discussion on social influence in decision making an input-process-outcome (IPO) framework is proposed. Therein, inputs are any relevant pre-decision cognition (e.g., psychological states such as beliefs, attitudes, motives, goals, emotions, personality traits or situational factors). Processes of decision making (e.g., evaluating the utility of alternatives, use of strategies) are mediating mechanisms between these inputs and the outcomes of the decision (Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro, 2001). IPO models have a long tradition and are applied in many research areas such as business administration, communication, and psychology (Pavitt, 2014). They are particularly established in team research (Ilgen, Hollenbeck, Johnson, & Jundt, 2005; Guzzo & Dickson, 1996; Hackman & Morris, 1975).

1.2.1 Joint purchase decisions

People are born into families, and the first social influence they are subject to is exerted by the family. However, the role of the family has undergone a severe change in the last decades: The model of the bourgeois family, with the family as a married couple with children is eroding. Fewer couples are getting married, about every third marriage is getting divorced, and new forms of families have evolved such as cohabiting couples, single households with or without children, and patchwork families (Peuckert, 2012). Still, the family remains a crucial subject for marketing and consumer researchers. For instance, in Germany, about 60% of private households are multi-person households, and often products which are considered to be bought by individuals, in fact, are purchased within households of at least two persons (Kroebert-Riel & Gröppel-Klein, 2013).

Input. Generally, an individual’s decision-making is a function of his or her personal norms. These norms comprise what an individual thinks he or she should do in a particular situation (Schwartz, 1977). They are formed primarily in accordance to an individual’s cultural background and his or her social role which is a bundle of behavioral expectations that others
turn towards the individual (Wolff & Moser, 2015). Individuals often act in a way that is consistent with the role expectations posed by others (Gleim & Lawson, 2014). Behaving according to social norms and social roles entails a subtle form of social influence. Most often, individuals are not adhering to this influence consciously, but they have incorporated the dos and don'ts of society in their behavioral repertoire already. This constitutes normative influence par excellence in the spirit of Deutsch & Gerard (1955) as discussed previously.

When making decisions within the household, the social role of being a husband or being a wife is often crucial. These roles are inherently associated with power and influence in decision making. According to role theory (Sarbin & Allen, 1968), the social role of the husband is that of a breadwinner, earning a living while working outside the home and providing for his family. On the contrary, a wife's role is typically associated with all chores related to the home, raising children, cooking, and maintaining the home. Thus, it is no surprise that when it comes to joint purchase decisions, overall, husbands seem to have more power and dominate most decisions (Marchand, 2014). As early as in 1960, Blood and Wolfe proposed the Resource Theory to explain husband’s superiority in decision making. They assumed that the person who possesses relatively more of relevant personal resources (e.g., income, education, and status) also has more power in decisions. These assumptions are congruent with research on small groups: Individuals tend to conform more readily to those of higher status and to those who are perceived to be more knowledgeable (Pavitt, 2014). Logically, in the “golden age of marriage” when research on family decision making was founded it was mainly the husband who was in possession of these resources (Peuckert, 2012, p. 11).

In the last few decades, society has undergone severe changes when it comes to family roles: Women participate in the workforce to a much greater extent and thus contribute to the household income more as women in previous generations (Peuckert, 2012). Traditional gender roles have been shifting towards a more egalitarian concept of family life and partnership even in traditional societies (Ruth & Commuri, 1998). Because of these changes, the insights of past research focusing on married couples and traditional gender roles within marriage may not be valid or meaningful anymore (Belch & Willis, 2002). Gender roles and their associated power within relationships are shifting in the sense that husbands are exerting greater influence in decisions in which the wife was historically dominant, and wives, in turn, are exerting greater
influence in areas that were traditionally the husband's domain (Belch & Willis, 2002). Ruth and Commuri (1998) demonstrated that macro-level factors influence family decision making. They report essential shifts in the influence distribution (mostly in favor of women) between partners within only seven years. The scholars attribute these changes to significant developments in society, such as the changing role of women. Although some studies have attempted to update previous findings (Webster & Reiss, 2001; Razzouk, Seitz, & Prodigalidad, 2007; Schneider, Schoenenberg, & Ferié, 2013), research on factors that determine who of the partners exerts more influence in decision making remains scattered.

Thus, an update of these input factors into joint decision making was needed. The present research (Manuscript I) provides insights into characteristics associated with influence in contemporary couples. Thereby, and in reference to Social Impact Theory the aspect of strength has been investigated: It has been studied how the resources of partners (such as education, income, expertise, and preference intensity) act as antecedents of influence in purchase decisions.

**Process.** People may be aware of the superiority of these characteristics but may fail to recognize their effect on the decision process (Balcetis & Granot, 2015). They may agree with opinions or actions of their counterpart because he or she possesses seemingly superior characteristics (or resources) (conformity). However, when individuals employ specific strategies to exert influence on their counterpart, the social influence is in its most obvious form (compliance). Interestingly, resources such as education and income are related to the use of influence strategies. For instance, partners who have fewer resources tend to make use of indirect strategies such as manipulation or hinting. In contrast, partners with more resources use unilateral strategies more often, i.e., they decide individually without consulting their partners (Webster & Reiss, 2001). Thus, it is obvious how inputs (i.e., characteristics or resources of partners) can affect the process of decision making.

**Outcome.** Although couples may engage in autonomic decisions at some point during a decision, final decisions are generally more syncretic, i.e., both partners have equal influence. This is often motivated by the risk of a poor decision that partners attempt to reduce by sharing responsibility (Davis & Rigaux, 1974). Purchase decisions are generally made under uncertainty since it is not
sure that the desired results can be obtained with the help of the chosen product (e.g., not every anti-wrinkle cream eliminates wrinkles) (Wolff & Moser, 2015). The higher the risk, the more partners engage in joint decision making (Sheth, 1974). This fact is also mirrored in the related research on the influence of purchase pals (i.e., situational interpersonal influencers; Mora & González, 2016). For instance, teens often shop together and adjust their purchase behavior to information and opinions of others which reduces both functional (i.e. product-related) and psycho-social risks (i.e. “fitting in” with the reference group and consistency with own self-concept) of the purchase (Kiecker & Hartman, 1993; Hoffmann & Broekhuizen, 2009).

Besides, people engage in joint purchasing as part of building a social relationship (Evans, Christiansen, & Gill, 1996). Due to the social value of joint shopping, consumers spend more time shopping and buy more products (Sommer, Wynes, & Brinkley, 1992). Shen, Radakrishnan, & Georganas (2002) even conclude that "shopping is an activity that is socially facilitated, meaning that when done in the company of others, people engage in it more” (p. 282). Moreover, joint shopping enhances a person’s enjoyment of the activity (Chebat, Haj-Salem, & Oliveira, 2014). Yim, Yoo, Sauer, and Seo (2014) demonstrate that enjoyment due to being in company increases impulsiveness and encourages consumers to stay longer in a store. Both mechanisms in concert increase consumer purchases.

In general, sharing hedonic activities enhances the experience by providing a feeling of belonging and boosting the confidence in one's judgments (Raghunathan & Corfman, 2006). Thus, it satisfies both individuals’ goal of affiliation and their goal of accuracy simultaneously. However, it is important that both partners be congruent in their opinions about a shared experience. In contrast, incongruence reduces enjoyment and decreases both individuals’ sense of belonging and the confidence in the accuracy of their views (Raghunathan & Corfman, 2006). Research on joint consumption supports this notion. For instance, Lowe and Haws (2014) demonstrate that consumers tend to match their decisions whether to indulge with the decision of their partners. They choose “coindulgence” or “coabstinence” depending on which behavior produces the greatest affiliation among partners (p. 489). When the consequences of indulgence are serious, consumers both resist the temptation; whereas when the consequences are relatively less severe, consumers jointly partner in “crime” (p. 490). Hence, matching behavior increases affiliation.
As illustrated, shopping with one’s partner has a certainty-enhancing function, and offers opportunities to bond through joint (congruent) consumption. The latter aspect requires appropriate products which would allow for joint experiences. Past research on joint decision making focused on big-ticket spending which may be of greater importance regarding time and money spent. However, this focus has been a limitation in revealing realistic day-to-day joint purchase decisions and opportunities for joint experiences (Cross & Gilly, 2014). Thus, research on joint purchase decision making lacks insights into which products are preferred for joint consumption when affiliation goals have priority and how the joint decision setting affects willingness to pay (WTP) for these preferred items. Research on WTP has considered only individual consumers by now. However, when couples are shopping together, they need to agree on a joint WTP. Indeed, WTP measurement would enrich the study of joint decision making since it both captures consumers’ preferences for a product and their uncertainty associated with the purchase: A recent concept to measure WTP proposes the consideration of two thresholds, the floor price (price below which consumers would definitely buy the product) and the ceiling price (price beyond consumers would no longer buy the product). The range in-between these thresholds is linked to consumers’ uncertainty whereby smaller ranges are associated with higher certainty (Wang, Venkatesh, & Chatterjee 2007). Thus, WTP ranges could validate the uncertainty reduction of a joint decision, whereas WTP means (as the average of floor and ceiling prices) could provide a measure of product preferences.

The second manuscript of this thesis addresses this issue. Moreover, referring to Social Impact Theory, the aspect of immediacy is studied. The focus of the investigation is on the effect of the presence of one’s partner on decision outcomes (WTP and preference for specific products) as compared to decisions where individuals engage in shopping on their own.

1.2.2 Negotiations
So far, only decisions in dyadic settings have been discussed. However, the broader context of the family is often similarly important for the understanding of consumer behavior. Thereby, further family members and their reciprocal influences may come into play such as parent-child, and sibling interaction (Epp & Price, 2008; Cotte & Wood, 2004; Beatty & Talpade, 1994). However, not only consumers but also organizations make purchasing decisions. Buying centers
are the equivalent of such decisions in the business marketing context (Iacobucci & Hopkins, 1992; Wind, 1976). Thereby relevant actors come together as members of an organizational buying process. However, their goals may not always be the same, and hence, they need to negotiate to agree on a purchase. Research in business marketing is not limited to the buyers’ side. When designing sales activities in the business-to-business context, personal sales negotiations are the focus of attention due to the high importance of direct sales and customized products (Homburg, Kuester, & Krohmer, 2009).

*Input.* Nowadays, economic activities are increasingly globalized, and it is common that trade crosses borders. Thus, the frequency of cross-cultural interactions in business increases and it is part of everyday life that sales negotiations are conducted internationally (Gunia, Brett, & Gelfand, 2016; Wilken, Jacob, & Prime, 2013). When people of different nationalities interact, their cultural background plays a major role: Culture shapes people's cognitions, beliefs, attitudes, and guides their behavior. It contains values and norms shared by the members of a group and defines appropriate and inappropriate behavior (Brett, 2000). When explaining cultural differences, the distinction between individualism versus collectivism is the most commonly applied construct in cross-cultural research (Fischer et al., 2009). In individualistic cultures, autonomy and individuality are fundamental, whereas, in collectivistic cultures, the importance of one’s interdependence with others is highlighted. The emphasis lies on the group rather than on the individual which has direct implications for behavior in negotiations (Gelfand & Christakopoulou, 1999).

*Process.* Generally, negotiators have limited information about their counterpart’s preferences which leads them to infer that the opposing party deems the same issues important (Neale & Bazerman, 1983). Such reasoning results in the fixed pie bias: Negotiators assume that their interests are directly opposing those of their counterpart and that they only can win when the other loses (Van Zant & Kray, 2015). In real-world negotiations, often issues exist on which priorities of both parties differ that could create a win-win situation for both (Thompson & Hastie, 1990). To discover integrative potential, both parties need to exchange information during the negotiation. Information exchange is part of an integrative negotiation strategy. Negotiators who engage in integrative strategy share information about their underlying interests and
priorities openly and early in the decision process. In contrast, negotiators employing distributive strategies use threats, persuasion, and usually do not articulate information about their preferences (Gunia, Brett, Nandkeolyar, & Kamdar, 2011). Distributive strategy refers to claiming as much value as possible whereas integrative strategy is associated with both creating value and claiming value (Brett & Thompson, 2016). Whether negotiators use integrative or distributive strategies depends on their concern about own and their counterpart’s outcomes. According to the dual-concern model, negotiators with high self-concern and low other-concern make use of distributive strategies more often. In contrast, those with a high self-concern and high other-concern engage in integrative strategies to a greater extent (Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992).

Interestingly, culture predetermines people’s preferred negotiation styles (Tse, Francis, & Walls, 1994). In individualistic cultures, the use of distributive strategies is more common, whereas collectivistic negotiators draw on integrative strategies to a greater extent (Brett & Okumura, 1998; Gelfand & Dyer, 2000). This culture-bound use of negotiation strategies is driven by the fact that attending to one’s interests and priorities prevents members of individualistic cultures from understanding their counterpart's interest in negotiation. By contrast, members of collectivistic cultures emphasize relationships to a greater extent and tend to take their counterpart’s concerns into account as well (Gelfand & Christakopoulou, 1999). Now, in intercultural negotiations, both approaches and their associated strategy use come to the table. Due to the differences, considerable potential for conflict exists. Consequently, the question arises how negotiators adapt to each other’s negotiation styles in these encounters. However, in practice, negotiators often encounter teams as negotiation parties. As mentioned previously, it is common to gather buying centers within an organization, and in the same vein, to send sales teams to clients (Ahearne, Mackenzie, Podsakoff, Mathieu, & Lam, 2010). Teams generally outperform individuals and achieve better negotiation outcomes (Thompson, Peterson, & Brodt, 1996). How facing a team will affect an individual's use of negotiation strategies in the intercultural context has not been studied so far and is subject of the third manuscript of this thesis. Hence, referring to Social Impact Theory, the manuscript focuses on the number of influencing agents (team vs. solo negotiator).
Outcome. Strategy use has also implications for negotiation outcomes. Generally, in intracultural negotiations, the use of integrative strategies fosters value creation ("expanding the pie" or joint profit), whereas the use of distributive strategies leads to value claiming ("slicing the pie" or individual profit) (Gunia et al., 2016; p.78). In particular, negotiators who seek information about other’s priorities achieve higher profits. In turn, the exchange of information is often reciprocated creating an upward positive spiral and increased gains for both sides (Drake, 2001). Since collectivistic negotiators are motivated to share information and make use of integrative strategies, they should also be more likely to achieve better outcomes than individualist negotiators focusing on distributive strategies. Moreover, in intercultural negotiation, negotiators with an individualistic cultural background tend to focus more on self-interested goals which may result in premature closure of negotiations and failing to make full use of the possibilities for gaining profit (Brett & Okumura, 1998).
2. Manuscripts

In the following, the three manuscripts of this dissertation will be introduced. Figure 1 integrates their theoretical context using a two-dimensional framework. The first dimension organizes the manuscripts according to the three variables of the Social Impact Theory (Latané, 1981): All three manuscripts follow the theory’s underlying assumption that social influence is a function of strength, immediacy, and number. Each manuscript deals with one of these aspects in depth. The second dimension organizes the manuscripts by its focus on different levels of the Input-Process-Outcome (IPO) framework. Additionally, Figure 2 gives an overview of the manuscripts, their contributions, methods, samples, publication status, and co-authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Impact Theory</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Immediacy</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPO-Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think, darling? Purchase decision making in couples and antecedents of influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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Figure 1. Integration of the manuscripts along a two-dimensional framework
The first manuscript, “What do you think, darling? Purchase decision making in couples and antecedents of influence”, investigates personal characteristics of partners as antecedents of their influence in joint purchase decisions. These antecedents can be conceptualized as inputs into the decision-making process since people possess these characteristics before any joint decision-making process. Moreover, in Social Impact Theory they belong to the factor strength of the influence sources.

The second manuscript, “Minder or accomplice? Couples shopping together and its effects on willingness-to-pay for vice and virtue products”, investigates how couples differ from individual shoppers in their purchase decisions concerning vice and virtue food products and their willingness-to-pay (WTP) for these products. In short, vices are products that offer immediate pleasures (e.g., chocolate cake), but have potential adverse long-term outcomes (e.g., future weight gain and health problems). Virtues are less pleasurable in the short term but are a more reasonable choice when it comes to long-term consequences (Van Doorn & Verhoef, 2011). The consumption of vice food would offer couples the opportunity to indulge over matched choices. In this manuscript, the outcome of a joint decision making and the immediacy of the influence source are studied by comparing dyadic with individual decisions.

Whereas the first two manuscripts deal with decisions relevant to consumer marketing, the third manuscript, “Can outnumbered negotiators succeed? The case of intercultural business negotiations”, is located in the business marketing arena. It is investigated how a team's cultural background and hence its culture-bound use of negotiation strategies affect a solo counterpart's use of negotiation strategies. This work focuses hence on the process of the decision making and varies the number of influencing agents (team versus solo negotiators).

It has to be noted that the classification in Table 1 represents only a simplification of the present research on social influence in consumer and business marketing. Specifically, although each manuscript focuses on one level of the IPO framework the levels are not isolated but closely interconnected: Concerning the study of social influence in the consumer marketing context, focusing on the input, i.e., antecedents of influence (Manuscript I) clearly affects the process, i.e., the influence distribution which is studied. Likewise the outcome, i.e., WTP and preference for vice versus virtue products is the consequence of the process, i.e., joint shopping (Manuscript II). Thus, although the process is not explicitly studied, it is logically included in the two research
works. Similarly, when focusing on the process of social influence in the context of business marketing, i.e., use of negotiation strategies, the input, i.e., cultural background of team and solo negotiators is included as well. In the same way, the outcome of the process, i.e., joint and individual gains, is subject of the investigation. The mapping onto the framework in Table 1 therefore allows painting a comprehensive picture of social influence in consumer and business marketing context. Moreover, the choice of variables pertaining to the social impact equation follows a theoretical reasoning: To study the social impact in joint purchase decision making (Manuscript I and II), only strength and immediacy can be varied. The third variable, the number of influencing agents can be included only when investigating families, e.g., by adding children as a source of influence in decisions. Since the present research focused on dyads this variable could not be subject of the investigations. In contrast, social influence in the business marketing context (Manuscript III) can very well vary in number of influence sources. However, to isolate this variable strength and immediacy need to be kept constant.

The interdependence between decision-making parties characterizes all three manuscripts: In the consumer context, interaction partners are tied through the relationship context. The decisions made jointly are located among a series of other social interactions of the couple and depend on various relationship factors. In the context of business negotiations, sellers and buyers are linked through the coupled business processes of their organizations and the common long-term orientation of customer relationships (Homburg et al., 2009). In both contexts, parties engage in negotiations to reconcile opposing preferences and goals.

Moreover, all manuscripts make use of online methods. In the first manuscript, an online survey is employed. However, it is challenging to portray dyadic real-life purchase situations by surveying one partner (Schneider et al., 2013). Therefore, the second manuscript extends the scope of this work and observes real dyadic purchase behavior through the use of an online retailer website where couples can chat and interact. The third manuscript draws on a similar approach by enabling online chat-based business-to-business negotiations. Moreover, the last two manuscripts have in common that both employ an experimental methodology. Experiments' primary asset is the ability to control and manipulate variables of interest systematically which allows concluding causal relationships (Leung, Bhagat, Buchan, Erez, & Gibson, 2005).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Co-Authors</th>
<th>Publication status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you think, darling? Purchase decision making in couples and antecedents of influence</td>
<td>Analysis of antecedents of influence in purchase decision making among couples</td>
<td>Online questionnaire</td>
<td>Participants of an online panel (N=141)</td>
<td>R. Wilken</td>
<td>Published in: Marketing ZFP, 39(4), pp. 47-58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minder or accomplice? Couples shopping together and its effects on willingness-to-pay for vice and virtue products</td>
<td>Analysis of effects of joint shopping on consumers’ WTP and preference for vice versus virtue products</td>
<td>Shopping simulation via online retailer</td>
<td>Visitors to Christmas market (N=150, thereof dyadic data from 35 couples)</td>
<td>R. Wilken</td>
<td>Under review in: Marketing Letters (submitted May 18, 2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Overview of the manuscripts
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The case of intercultural business negotiations.
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3. Discussion

3.1 Findings

The research conducted in the preceding manuscripts deals with social influence in the consumer and business marketing context. Figure 3 provides an overview of the results obtained from the studies as well their implications and limitations. The combined results of this research lend support to Social Impact Theory (Latané, 1981). In each study, one aspect of social impact was studied:

The first manuscript demonstrated how the increased strength of social impact affects the influence distribution among couples. Evidently, higher income, greater expertise, and preference intensity are associated with greater influence in decisions. However, it was also found that these antecedents of influence are linked to the gender of decision making parties. Women and men have higher expertise and preferences for products that are inherently associated with their gender, namely the product category of groceries for women, and the TV sets for men. However, this research also provided surprising insights: The role of education as a relevant antecedent of the influence distribution among couples in joint decisions was insignificant as compared to prior research on this topic (e.g., Rosen & Granbois, 1983). In line with this, it was suspected that income would not act as an antecedent in contemporary couples as well. In the historical context in which earlier work was conducted, resources of power such as income and education were unevenly distributed due to gender and marital roles of the man/husband as breadwinner and the women/wife as the unemployed housewife (Queen, Berg, & Lowrance, 2015). Nowadays, most people choose a partner with the same level of education. For instance, in Germany, 60% of couples have the same or similar educational qualifications. Thus, the educational constellation that corresponds to the classical role model in which the man is more educated than the woman becomes increasingly obsolete (Krack-Roberg, Rübenach, Sommer, & Weinmann, 2016). Since both partners are equally educated, it was expected that both contribute comparable amounts to the household incomes. However, in our study men still earn more than women despite similar educational levels. Thus, the uneven distribution of income as a resource causes it to be a relevant antecedent of the influence distribution. Overall, this research work contributes to the general research on social influence by demonstrating that personal – and potentially unrelated – characteristics of an individual can enhance his or her propensity to influence a decision. These
characteristics are able make others comply with his or her influence attempt or conform to his or her decisions. In the parlance of Social Impact Theory, this means, that all things being equal, the greater the strength of an influence source, the greater will be his or her social impact.

The second manuscript compared couples engaging in joint purchase decisions (high \textit{immediacy}) with individuals shopping alone but for products designated for joint consumption with their partners (low \textit{immediacy}). Couples shopping together chose relatively more indulgent products and were willing to pay more for their choice as compared to individual shoppers. Interestingly, both partners of the couple adjusted their indications even before engaging in the joint decision. Hence, they agree a priori on joining in indulgence by choosing vice products. This “a priori adjustment” of both partners of the couple was the most surprising result of this work. The premise of joint decision-making research is that in most cases, couples engage in a “muddle through” process when making purchases jointly since on the way to agreement they encounter differing preferences and priorities which may result in conflict (Park, 1982). In the course of the purchase process, couples try to learn about each other’s preferences and adapt their behavior accordingly (Barlés-Arizón, Fraj-Andrés, & Martínez-Salinas, 2013). In the present research, the adaptation took place even before partners interacted and could align their preferences. For the study of social influence this means that not only explicit influence attempts and negotiations need to be considered. In accordance with Social Impact Theory, people are not only subject to real but also to subtle, implied, and imagined social presence of their partners (Latané, 1981). This means, that social influence does not only operate when people encounter and engage in joint decisions but even the expectation of this encounter can take on this task.

The third manuscript showed how the social impact of teams evokes behavioral adaptation of an opposing solo negotiator. By varying the \textit{number} of a negotiation party, it could be demonstrated that teams establish behavioral dominance over solo negotiators which leads the latter to abandon their culture-bound negotiation styles and adapt to the team’s use of negotiation strategies. This social impact has also implications for the individual’s negotiation outcomes: Adapting to the team leads to better results, but only if the team is collectivistic. This way, the solo negotiator increasingly made use of integrative strategies despite the fact that due to his or her more individualistic background the use of distributive strategies should prevail instead. However, negotiating as a team is still more beneficial concerning individual outcomes.
Surprisingly, this finding is restricted to the buying side. Moreover, the relationship between strategies and individual outcomes emerged also only for single buyers’ interaction with selling teams. These results can be attributed to differences for sellers and buyers to obtain comparable results due to restrictions inherent in the assignment to roles. This is an interesting aspect for the general study of social influence. Hence, when being in an unfavorable position, i.e., being outnumbered and having greater difficulties obtaining desired results, conformity may help counter these disadvantages. In sum, social interactions inherent in joint purchase decisions and business negotiations shape people's behavior and drive them to act in a way they would presumably not do on their own accord.

On a more general note, referring to the two-dimensional framework introduced previously (p. 15), the three manuscripts complement each other concerning the social impact equation proposed by Latané (1981) as well as the phases of the decision making process depicted by the IPO-Framework: Manuscript I focused on the strength of the input into the joint decision which had implications for the process of a joint decision. However, how the input (mediated by the process) affected the outcome remained unknown. As a meaningful continuation of this work, Manuscript II focused on the outcome of joint decisions which naturally resulted from the process of the decision. Thereby, Manuscript II broadens the scope of the first work also by observing real behavior and detecting subtle influence forces that lead to adjustment of partners. In a similar vein, Manuscript III extends these observations to the study of business negotiations by detecting behavioral adaptation of solo negotiators to their team counterparts. In both contexts, influence is not made explicit but develops due to the social impact of “the other”, be it one’s relationship partner or the opposing negotiation party and provoking processes of adaptation or adjustment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What do You Think, Darling? Revisiting Knowledge on Purchase Decisions of Couples within Households</td>
<td>Product category-unrelated (education and income), product category-related (knowledge and preference intensity), and contextual (product category and gender) antecedents of relative influence in joint decisions</td>
<td>Relative influence in joint decisions in four product categories: vacations, television sets, groceries, and dining out</td>
<td>-Income, knowledge, and preference intensity affect the relative influence of partners. -Education is similar among both partners and does not affect the relative influence distribution. -Women (men) are more knowledgeable and have more intense preferences concerning groceries (TV sets). -Concerning dining out and vacations, decisions are made jointly, and both partners are equally involved.</td>
<td>- Antecedents of influence should not be investigated in isolation but with regard to the specific product category and its potential gender associations. - Increasing similarity of both partners’ characteristics contributes to a more balanced influence distribution among partners - As long as the gender pay gap exists researchers of couple decision making need to take this antecedent into account.</td>
<td>- Other antecedents may impact the influence distribution as well - Only “traditional living arrangements” considered - Data only from one partner of a couple - Retrospective accounts rather than real behavior studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Minder or accomplice? Couples shopping together and its effects on willingness-to-pay for vice and virtue products</td>
<td>Joint (dyadic) shopping setting versus individuals shopping on their own</td>
<td>Amount of vice and virtue products chosen for joint consumption, Willingness-to-pay ranges and means</td>
<td>- Couples choose more (regular) vice products and are willing to pay more for vice products than individuals. -Joint shopping reduces uncertainty observed by smaller WTP ranges as compared to individuals shopping alone. -“A priori adjustment” between both partners of a couple: They indicate similar WTP ranges and means even before engaging in joint decisions.</td>
<td>- WTP measurement is subject to social influence and can be altered by the joint shopping context - Convergence and adaptation processes need to be taken into account - “A priori adjustment” need to be taken into account.</td>
<td>- Specific product category: consequences of joint indulgence are rather mild - Generalization to offline settings may be limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Can outnumbered negotiators succeed? The case of intercultural business negotiations.</td>
<td>Asymmetric (solo-team) versus symmetric (solo-solo) negotiations; individualism versus collectivism of team and solo negotiators</td>
<td>Use of integrative and distributive negotiation strategies, joint and individual negotiation outcomes</td>
<td>- In team–solo negotiations, individuals abandon their culture-bound negotiation style and adapt to their team counterpart’s use of negotiation strategies. -Behavioral adaptation is not present in solo-solo negotiations. -Adaptation to the increased use of integrative strategies results in higher individual profits only if the opposing teams have high levels of collectivism. - Buying teams achieve higher individual profits than single buyers.</td>
<td>- Use of negotiation strategies is not only influenced by culture but culture interacts with social influence exerted by the team: “culture-as-main-effect view” need to be abandoned - Cooperation may help overcome inferior position when solo negotiators are dominated by a team</td>
<td>- French and German negotiators are not endpoints on any individualism-collectivism dimension - Only one cultural dimension, namely collectivism, measured - Small sample size - Student sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Overview of manuscript results, implications, and limitations
3.2 Implications

In the following theoretical, methodical and managerial implications will be discussed that were not sufficiently addressed in the three manuscripts but are important to the study of social influence in consumer and business marketing context.

3.2.1 Theoretical implications

Generally, both research in consumer decisions and business negotiations underappreciates the effect of social influence. In consumer decision making literature, the focus still lies predominantly on the individual: It is assumed that most purchase decisions are made by individuals and that they are merely a function of the individual’s cognitions, preferences, and desires (Simpson, Griskevicius, & Rothman, 2012). In fact, many purchase decisions are made jointly, and research needs to overcome the individual perspective to gain an understanding of these decisions. Negotiation research considers the social component to a greater extent since it is naturally concerned with social interactions. However, also here when studying intercultural negotiations culture is assigned a dominant role and the social influence exerted by the parties fades from the spotlight. As a whole, the findings of the present research suggest that social influences should be considered to a much greater extent than it is currently the case.

For research on social influence in joint decision making insights from Manuscript I suggest that antecedents of influence should not be investigated in isolation but with regard to the specific product category and its potential gender associations. However, it should be kept in mind that the similar partners’ characteristics become the more balanced the influence distribution among them will probably be (Webster & Reiss, 2001). In the last century, traditional gender roles started to erode owing to women's gains in labor force, education and public life (Inglehart & Norris, 2003). Major societal changes on the macro-level promote gender equality and empowerment (Kabeer, 2005). For instance, today, younger couples have been raised with a different understanding of gender roles than previous generations and therefore generally exhibit less gender stereotypical behavior in decisions (Queen et al., 2015). However, some changes evolve slowly, and some inequalities are persistent. As the present research demonstrates income as an antecedent of influence is still decisive. As long as the gender pay gap, the extent to which
men outearn women (Blau & Kahn, 2003), exists researchers of couple decision making need to take this antecedent into account.

Moreover, the present research (Manuscript II) points to the importance of consumers’ relationship as a moderator of preference for products which needs to be considered when studying joint decisions. It has to be taken into account that what applies to individual consumers is even more valid for couples engaged in joint shopping: Both do not correspond to the idea of a rational and utility maximizing economic actor but are influenced by various social aspects in the consumption context (Luce, 2015). Since consumers often engage in joint purchase decisions with others this is particularly relevant to research that investigates topics such as consumption motives or product preferences. Additionally, the present research enriches the study of joint decision making by introducing WTP as a measure of both preference for products and the uncertainty reducing effect of being in company by one’s partner. Previously, WTP research focused exclusively on the individual. In light of the findings of this research, this focus should be extended by the inclusion of joint decision contexts. In such contexts, an individual’s WTP indication may be just the starting point and be subsequently subject to interpersonal influences in the course of the purchase process. Therefore, it may be modified as a result of the social impact exerted by the joint decision setting.

Unique to the study of joint decisions, it was demonstrated that even the anticipation of a joint decision alters consumers’ behavior. Hence, in the study of joint decision making not only explicit influence attempts during the decision need to be considered but also tacit convergence and adaptation processes taking place even before partners come together to the table to discuss their consumer choices.

If already dyadic settings contain numerous pitfalls, then researchers should pay particular attention to the social context when teams are involved in decision making. The present research (Manuscript III) supports the literature on the superior performance of teams in business negotiations as compared to individual bargainers. However, the aspect of social influence exerted by teams should be considered in more detail when studying intercultural team-solo negotiations. Cross-cultural negotiation researchers usually suggest that the use of negotiation is predetermined by the cultural background of the negotiators (e.g., Gelfand & Dyer, 2000). However, although culture has admittedly an enormous effect on negotiators’ cognitions through
its values and norms that guide its members’ behavior in general, and in negotiations in particular (George, Jones, & Gonzalez, 1998), the social aspect appears to be even more decisive in shaping negotiators’ behavior. Specifically, the present research points to the fact that consequences of behavioral adaptation need to be differentiated. Whereas adapting to the use of integrative strategies yields positive results for outnumbered negotiators, adapting to the use of distributive strategies does not. Generally, the reciprocating distributive behavior is detrimental to negotiation performance since it is linked to adverse affect and competition (Weingart, Thompson, Bazerman, & Carroll, 1990).

3.2.2 Methodical implications

The present research was conducted with the help of online methods, be it an online survey tool (Manuscript I), an online retailer website where couples could shop online and interact (Manuscript II), or an online chat tool where parties could conduct their negotiation (Manuscript III).

When studying interactive processes, it is not sufficient to rely on survey data only. Although survey research is the most dominant data collection process in the study of joint decision making it is not possible to re-create a real-life purchase environment this way (Commuri & Gentry, 2000, Schneider et al., 2013). Furthermore, most work in joint decision making is based on retrospective accounts and subjective assessments from one partner of the couple which possibly limits the reliability of obtained findings (Queen et al., 2015). Olson and Rabunsky (1972) ascertain that self-reports are useful in learning about partners’ “subjective reality” but not about the “objective reality” (p. 231). To learn about the objective reality, it is necessary to observe a couple's interaction in reality or an experimental setting (Rojas-de Gracia & Alarcón-Urbistondo, 2016).

The present research responds to these limitations and focuses on couples as the unit of analysis in the study of joint purchase decision making. In the past, the biggest difficulty to apply this approach was the infeasibility and high cost of data collection at the group level (Aribarg, Arora, & Kang, 2010). Hence it was made use of online methods to counter these hurdles. This way, it was possible to collect data from shopping dyads and provide insights beyond the subjective reality of each partner.
In sum, online methods are versatile and cost-efficient. They not only reduce investments in money and time but also align with participants' everyday use of Internet-based services such as online shopping or chat-based communication. An advantage in chat-based interactions is the elimination of social cues such as mimic, facial expression, or intonation. Thus, it is possible to establish test conditions which are free of social interferences other than those studied. In the present research social impact exerted by one's partner and by negotiating with a team could be detected in this environment. Hence, it is evident that social influences are powerful even in the absence of visible social cues which would undoubtedly add to the effects.

3.2.3 Managerial implications

The present research underlines the importance of considering social influences in the consumer as well as the business marketing contexts:

In consumer marketing practice the focus on the individual consumer is often too shortsighted since many purchase decisions are made in the context of relationships. Hence, the study of joint purchase decisions has many benefits for marketers: First, knowledge on inputs of decision making is relevant for targeting purposes: It is essential to know whether one partner dominates a decision and on the basis of which characteristics to identify him or her. This way marketers can identify the proper respondent, create the appropriate advertising message, choose the right advertising media, and adapt the products to appeal to the person who is more influential (Davis, 1976; Su, Fern, & Ye, 2003; Simpson et al., 2012). The present research (Manuscript I) suggests that several product categories are still associated with gender and that the partner who contributes to the household income is more influential which usually is the man. These insights can be valuable to marketers for targeting purposes when they merchandise products associated with either gender. However, these insights need to be treated with caution since negative associations with gender-based marketing could backfire. Consumers may react against marketing activities that overemphasize gender stereotypes. Still, marketers need to be aware that some aspects of these stereotypes might be persistent.

Second, conflicts as a result of differing opinions and preferences can lead to the delay or deferral of the purchase decision which limits sales opportunities. When the processes that accompany joint purchases are well understood, potential problems can be addressed to facilitate
the decision and help the couple reach an agreement (Hempel, 1974). The present research (Manuscript II) points to the fact that conflict might not always be present. Under certain circumstances, couples may be in agreement even before deciding on a purchase. Marketers should identify these conditions in order to profit from this a priori agreement.

Furthermore, knowledge on the outcome of joint decisions, namely which products are preferred when engaging in joint decision making as opposed to purchasing products on one’s own, is valuable to marketers. They can adapt product offerings and create environments which support joint shopping. The present research (Manuscript II) identified that in a context in which indulgence is legitimate couples choose vice products to a greater extent than single shoppers. Hence, marketers of comparable products or experiences are wise to enable consumers to bring their partners.

Finally, it is relevant how a joint setting translates into monetary outcomes. More specifically, knowledge on consumers’ WTP in a joint shopping setting can provide a basis for pricing decisions. Marketers should be aware that an individual’s WTP is in some circumstances only part of the picture. When consumers are in company of their partners, their WTP may differ to a greater extent as compared to purchasing products on their own (Manuscript II).

The present research also bears several insights for business marketing practitioners: Focusing solely on cultural influences in intercultural negotiations is not enough, especially when solo negotiators are facing negotiating teams. Budget-conscious companies may prefer sending only one representative to intercultural business negotiations. This saving, however, may negatively affect the outcome of the negotiation. The present research (Manuscript III) suggests that teams outperform individuals in negotiations in terms of individual outcomes. Thus, companies should reassess the costs and potential benefits of sending individuals versus teams to negotiate.

In case companies still favor individual negotiators, the present research provides guidance for this constellation: When negotiating with collectivistic teams individuals should make an effort to reciprocate integrative behavior (e.g., exchange of information, cooperative behaviors). This should definitely be paramount in these encounters since negotiators only achieve higher individual profits engaging in integrative bargaining. However, practitioners should keep in mind that this leads to success only when individuals are negotiating with a
collectivistic team. Both parties need to be willing to engage in integrative negotiations to compensate a solo negotiators' unfavorable position.

Nevertheless, reciprocity is not a panacea: The present research demonstrates, that solo bargainers involuntarily adapt to the team's use of negotiation strategies. Social influence is hence powerful in these situations. For instance, individualistic teams tend to make use of distributive strategies more often, and their solo counterparts adapt to this behavior even when their collectivistic background would dictate the opposite. However, adapting to distributive behaviors of teams does not yield favorable results for the individual negotiator. Negotiators should be made aware of this force and potential consequences of adapting to the behavior of their counterpart when it is a team. Adapting to the use of integrative strategies should be promoted while negotiator should refrain from reciprocating distribute behavior in intercultural negotiations.
4. Limitations and future research

4.1 Studying joint purchase decisions

Both studies in the consumer marketing context (Manuscript I and II) were conducted with German participants. Therefore, generalizations to other cultural contexts should be made with caution. Role models and consumption patterns might be different for couples in different countries. For instance, despite major societal changes, in more conservative countries with a more traditional role allocation, the influence distribution among couples is likely to be more skewed in favor of the man/husband. Thus, it would be useful to study joint purchase decisions including more cultural backgrounds and provide insights of cross-cultural differences. Likewise, insights in joint purchase decision research are exclusively focused on the study of mono-cultural couples. However, in times of globalization, multi-cultural relationships are increasingly common. For instance, in Germany, 30% of all families with children are bicultural (Krack-Roberg et al., 2016). How the cultural context interacts with antecedents of influence is an utterly unexplored venue for future research.

In a similar vein, decision-making research is heavily influenced by marital decision roles and the focus of married, heterosexual couples. The present research likewise studies exclusively heterosexual couples. However, as societies change other forms of relationships and families, such as patchwork families, cohabiting couples, and homosexual relationships become increasingly common. Established insights gained over last decades may not be valid in these cases. For instance, Razzouk et al. (2007) show that cohabiting couples decide more syncretically than married couples. Schneider et al. (2013) demonstrate that male homosexual couples behave in a highly egalitarian way when making purchase decisions. Still, research in this area is in its infancy and thus offers a range of opportunities for future research. Moreover, longitudinal data would be welcomed to account for macro- and micro-level changes. On the one hand, it needs to be studied how societal changes affect decision roles and the associated influence distribution. On the other hand, the life cycle of relationships or families needs to be taken into account. For instance, research suggests that the birth of the first children is often critical and leads couples to more traditional role allocation and decision roles (Peuckert, 2012).

Additionally, the present research (Manuscript II) operated in a context in which the consequences of indulging in vice products are rather mild. Enjoyment of Christmas sweets can
be justified and attributed to the festive context of the season. In contexts where the consequences are more severe, partners might engage in coabstinence as recent research suggests (cf. Lowe & Hawks, 2014). However, it is unclear how this convergent behavior would affect product preference and WTP. Furthermore, the products chosen by the consumers were meant for joint consumption and likely associated with pleasurable joint experiences. In contrast, Sommer et al. (1992) propose that the purchase of products associated with solitary experience may be subject to social inhibition when done in the company of others. Relevant to the study of consumers’ WTP, previous studies suggest that social support reduces “spending pain” (i.e., negative emotions associated with spending money) (Xu, Zhou, Ye, & Zhou, 2015, p. 219). When consumers feel socially supported, they no longer experience negative emotional states while shopping and spending. However, this pain-buffering effect was stronger for the purchases of hedonic as compared to utilitarian products. Possibly, similar effects operated also in the present research. Higher WTP for vice (more hedonic) but not for virtue (comparable to utilitarian) products were observed. Furthermore, Raghunathan and Corfman (2006) demonstrate that when sharing hedonic experiences incongruence of opinions between partners reduces the enjoyment of the shared experience. This phenomenon was also studied in the context of co-shopping (Borges, Chebat, & Babin, 2010): Generally, co-shoppers enhance the shopping experience. However, when a focal shopper is profoundly attached to the shopping location (e.g., mall), co-shoppers may interfere with the shopping experience when they do not have the same enthusiasm about the mall. Hence future research should include further product categories which are more controversial and bear potential for greater disagreement, and vary consumption contexts to generalize the current findings to different consumer domains. Furthermore, the inclusion of potential mediating variables such as the pain of spending money should be included in future studies of joint purchase decision making.

In the present research (Manuscript II), both consumer groups had the same task, namely to choose products for joint consumption. Gorlin and Dhar (2012) propose a typology of consumer decisions in which they distinguish whether the decision stage occurs jointly or singly and whether the consumption stage occurs jointly or individually. They propose three kinds of joint decisions in accordance to these two factors: (1) Partners make the decision jointly and consume the product jointly, (2) they make the decision jointly but consume the product
individually, or (3) they decide individually but consume jointly. In the present research, constellations (1) and (3) were studied. Studying situations (2) would provide insights into whether joint decision for individual consumption result in different or comparable outcomes as those in which consumption takes place jointly. Especially, it is of interest whether such situations would support indulgence or refrain. In joint consumption situations indulgence fosters affiliation (c.f. Dzhogleva & Lamberton, 2014), but in individual consumption, this motive would not be applicable. However, consumers may both decide and consume individually which corresponds to individual decisions usually studied in consumer behavior research (Gorlin & Dhar, 2012). However, it has to be noted that also in these kinds of consumer decisions social influence may be present (Simpson et al., 2012): Consumers may take their partners’ preferences or consumption goals into account when deciding on own purchases. For instance, individuals choosing a dish for lunch may remember that their partners prefer them to eat healthily and choose accordingly. Future research faces the task of understanding these subtle and sometimes unconscious social influences to provide a comprehensive picture of consumer behavior.

The present research focused mainly on the inputs (Manuscript I) and the outcome (Manuscript II) of joint decision making. Although the inputs clearly affect the process of the decision, namely the influence distribution among partners, future research should study this process in more detail. Applying the dual-concern model to joint decision making, the use of strategies should be a function of the concern for one’s outcomes and concern for one’s partner’s outcomes (Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992). Generally, in relationships concern for the partner is high. In line with this, couples are more willing to exchange information as compared to other groups (De Palma, Picard, & Ziegelmeyer, 2011). However, researchers need to take other relevant factors into account which might moderate this relationship. For instance, relationship scientists stress the importance of attachment orientations of partners. Attachment orientations evolve as a result of how individuals have been treated by significant others in their lives (e.g., parents, partners) and they are the foundation of how people behave in relationships as adults (Simpson et al., 2012). Attachment orientations can be defined along two dimensions, anxiety and avoidance: Anxiously attached individuals seek emotional closeness and security within their relationships. They fear to be abandoned by their relationship partners. Hence, they try to accommodate and please their partners. By contrast, avoidantly attached individuals tend to be independent and
avoid closeness with other people (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2009). It is conceivable that anxiously attached individuals tend to have a higher concern for their partner and a lower concern for the self which leads them to yielding and concession making in joint decisions. In contrast, avoidantly attached individuals may be less concerned with their partners’ outcomes but more with their benefit which may result in the use of contentious tactics (Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992).

Furthermore, although it was attempted to create a realistic shopping experience with the help of the online retail website implemented to study joint decision making (Manuscript II) the present research did not employ real purchases. Participants indicated their hypothetical WTP and thus were possibly more likely to fall prey to the hypothetical bias. This error of judgment occurs when respondents state a willingness to pay that is higher compared with the amount they would pay using their own money (Loomis, 2011). However, hypothetical bias has been detected in valuations of point-based measures of WTP. The present research employed WTP as a range; hence, consumers had to provide two prices (floor and ceiling) and thus had the opportunity to express their uncertainty concerning this valuation indirectly. Nevertheless, future research should employ incentive-aligned settings including real purchases to add external validity to the findings.

Finally, one limitation of the present research is the potentially limited generalization of the results obtained in the online shopping context to retail settings. For instance, Hyughe, Verstraeten, Geuens, and Van Kerckhove (2017) found that consumers choose fewer vice products online than in a retail setting. The authors explain this phenomenon considering the fact that online channels present products symbolically, while (offline) stores present them physically and more vividly. Consumers’ desire for instant gratification is more operant in retail setting since the time lag between purchase and consumption is negligible which is different for online ordering. However, the present research still illustrates clear differences in the purchase of vice products although online purchases were observed. Hence, these differences should be even more pronounced in the retail setting which is an exciting venue for future research.

4.2 Studying negotiations
The present research studied negotiations between French (more collectivistic) and German (less collectivistic) negotiators. Clearly, some countries differ more on the individualism-collectivism
dimension. Most Asian countries are more collectivistic than Western European or North American countries. For instance, China (India) scores 20 (48) on Hofstede’s (2001) individualism dimension, whereas United States score 91, and Canada 80. As the cultural distance between these countries is rather high, they differ not only in terms of individualism, and that is why also other factors come into play to moderate the relationship between culture and the use of negotiation strategies. For instance, Gunia et al. (2011) demonstrate that compared to negotiators from the United States Indian negotiators have lower levels of trust towards their counterpart which results in less information sharing and value creation. Generally, negotiators with high trust engage in information exchange more often, whereas those with low trust make use of persuasion and offer-making to a greater extent (Gunia et al., 2016). In a similar vein, Chinese negotiators adopted more competitive goals and thus less information sharing as compared to American negotiators. They used more distributive strategies such as persuasion which reduced their counterpart’s as well as their profits (Liu & Wilson, 2011). This result contradicts the notion that collectivists make use of integrative strategies more often. However, collectivism may manifest itself differently in high collectivistic countries. For instance, people with an individualistic background are more universalistic, i.e., they apply the same value standards to everybody, be it members of their ingroup or outgroup. In contrast, people with a collectivistic background are more particularistic; they apply different value standards to their ingroup and their outgroup (Gudykunst, Yoon, & Nishida, 1987). Negotiators from the United States are possibly perceived as outgroup members due to the high cultural distance to the Chinese. Hence, they do not enjoy the same treatment as members of the ingroup. By contrast, in the present research, French negotiators possibly viewed their German counterparts as culturally closer and thus engaged in integrative behavior just as they would when faced with a French counterpart. To substantiate this assumption, future research should include other relevant factors and additional cultural dimensions to the study of intercultural negotiations. In particular, cultural distance as a moderator between culture and the use of negotiation strategies needs to be studied.

Furthermore, the individualism–collectivism dimension was defined as a societal/cultural level construct in the present research (cf. Marcus & Le, 2013). However, there is undoubtedly a great variance within cultures on the individual level. Environmental influences or personal differences account for variations between individuals of the same cultural background (Triandis,
In a similar vein, organizational cultures can differ on the individualism-collectivism dimension: Some organizations place priority upon individual’s goals and achievements as well as those which highlight collectivistic values and reward joint contributions (Marcus & Le, 2013). However, as globalization advances and negotiators become increasingly familiar with the intercultural context, a shared understanding of international encounters emerges. Adair, Tinsley, and Taylor (2006) refer to this phenomenon as third culture; which is defined as “a special form of culture that arises when people from different national cultures interact” (p. 208). Third culture includes team norms that develop as the sum of the parties’ cultural backgrounds and prior experiences. In the present research negotiation participants were graduate students from an international business school who are generally aware of the dos and don’ts of intercultural interactions. This context may equalize cultural differences in favor of a shared understanding of the situation. However, in the present research cultural differences were still present which would be probably even more pronounced for those not as familiar with the intercultural arena. Future research should study the influence of intercultural knowledge as a moderator of negotiation strategy use and include individual-level cultural differences as well as characteristics of organizational culture to paint a comprehensive picture of the role of culture in negotiations.

The present research studied negotiations in a laboratory setting which simulated a one-shot encounter between negotiating parties and focused on economic outcomes. However, especially in the business-to-business context, negotiations are oriented towards long-term connections. Beyond economic outcomes, negotiators derive subjective value from the negotiation which depends on the relationship created between the parties and the perceptions both parties form about themselves, their counterparts and the negotiation process (Van Zant & Kray, 2015). These relational outcomes may sometimes be even more critical than economic outcomes: Research using a longitudinal design demonstrates that subjective value of negotiations predicted satisfaction one year later whereas economic outcomes did not (Curhan, Elfenbein, & Kilduff, 2009). Relatedly, satisfaction with the negotiation may be affected both by the use of strategies and the gender of the negotiators. Generally, men tend to be more competitive, whereas women tend to be more relationship-oriented (Thompson, 1990). Fisher and Grégoire (2006) show that in mixed-gender dyads, men’s decision satisfaction depends more on
whether they were successful in pushing through their preferences or not. In contrast, the only factor affecting women’s satisfaction is the extent to which both parties behave cooperatively.

Furthermore, when parties anticipate future interactions, they may also be motivated to leave a positive impression so that their counterpart behaves more favorable in the next encounter. Similarly, when negotiators focus on long-term relations building trust is of great importance. Generally, building trust is facilitated in face-to-face interaction through process of behavioral mimicry. Maddux, Mullen, and Galinsky (2008) demonstrate that negotiators mimicking their counterpart were able to better uncover integrative potential in negotiations, and achieved both higher individual and joint outcomes as compared to those who did not engage in mimicking. In the present research negotiation parties communicated virtually. Here, most context and nonverbal cues were eliminated which would usually account for 90% of the impact of communication (Griffin, 2008). Thus, in the present research, there was no possibility of engaging in behavioral mimicry. Interestingly, it was still possible to establish behavioral adaptation effects in this cue reduced environment. This gives an insight into how powerful the social impact of the opposing team is. In consequence, if cues through mimic and facial expression are added social impact is likely to increase even more. Future research is encouraged to engage in longitudinal research to provide insights of factors relevant to ongoing negotiations and consider gender as a potentially moderating factor both of negotiation strategy use and satisfaction with negotiation outcomes. Lastly, a fruitful venue in the light of increased use of online media for communication is the study of differences between virtual and face-to-face negotiations.

Finally, it is of interest whether behavioral adaptation observed in the present research is limited to the specific negotiation or has more long-lasting effects. Social influence researchers distinguish between public compliance and private acceptance (or conversion) when it comes to changes in behavior due to conformity (Izuma, 2013). Public compliance is the demonstration of conformity while one’s true attitude or behavior is not changed. By contrast, private acceptance implies a change in one’s attitude or behavior. The question for future researchers is thus whether solo negotiators would use the same negotiation strategies after having adapted those of their team counterpart in further negotiations with the same team or even with other negotiation parties which would equal a spillover effect of adaptation.
4.3 Conformity motives and individual differences

An intriguing issue is why individuals yield to the social influence presented in this research. Drawing on the broader context of social influence presented at the beginning of this thesis, the motives for compliance and conformity in each case should be discussed.

People have an inherent “need to belong”: They strive to form and maintain strong, stable interpersonal relationships (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). When people feel strong ties to others, they feel valued, whereas when their need for affiliation is threatened, they feel bad. Thus, they are highly sensitive to signs of social exclusion (Karremans & Finkenauer, 2014). Hence, when making joint decisions as a couple, the goal of affiliation is vital (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004). For instance, conforming to the influence exerted by the partner may be rewarded with affection, whereas non-conformity may be sanctioned with a denial of affection (Manuscript I). In a similar vein, conflict may threaten the need to belong of both partners. Therefore, they strive to avoid conflict and incorporate each other’s preferences and be congruent in their decisions to enhance mutual affiliation (Manuscript II).

However, conforming to a partner’s superior knowledge in a joint decision may be an expression of the goal of accuracy as well. Since individuals strive to comprehend the reality, they are likely to attend to the judgments of a person who, in their opinion, has a better understanding of this reality (Cialdini & Trost, 1998). Especially, for major purchases, people should be motivated to make accurate decisions. Products have an inherent risk of underperformance; therefore individuals may seek to reduce the uncertainty associated with the purchase by conforming to the more knowledgeable partner (Manuscript I).

Generally, romantic relationships are categorized as communal relationships (Clark & Mills, 1979): Therein, partners exchange benefits according to their partners’ needs without expecting anything in return. Usually, relationship partners are more altruistic as compared to other groups (De Palma et al., 2011). In contrast, in the business context, exchange relationships prevail: Hereby, people give benefits to their partners only when it is likely that they will receive a similar benefit in return (Clark & Mills, 1979). However, also in the business context, the goal of affiliation may drive conformity through the need of social approval since not fitting in the group is a threatening prospect for individuals in every aspect of life (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004). For instance, Williams, Cheung, and Choi (2000) demonstrate that participants who were
ignored in a virtual ball toss game reported lower self-esteem and a greater need for belongingness. Most interestingly, in a later unrelated task they conformed more often to group judgments. This conformity obviously satisfied their goal of a positive self-concept as well. By conforming to others, people feel part of the group and can restore their sense of belonging and self-esteem this way. It is conceivable that these mechanisms may also drive solo negotiators’ adaptation of the use of negotiation strategies of the opposing teams as observed by the present research (Manuscript III).

However, these reflections are merely of hypothetical nature. Future research should substantiate these assumptions by studying these goals directly. For instance, to study the goal of affiliation, researchers could survey individuals’ need to belong, interpersonal closeness, and feelings of exclusion. To study the goal of accuracy, participants could be asked about the certainty about their judgments, and their knowledge of the subject in question. To study the pursuit of the goal of a positive self-concept measures of self-esteem may be used.

Finally, important to the general study of social influence effects are individual differences. For instance, individuals’ susceptibility to interpersonal influence, i.e., the extent to which social information influences individuals’ decision making, makes them more or less prone to conform to others (Hoffmann & Broekhuizen, 2009). Individuals highly susceptible to interpersonal influence are more influenced by others, are more willing to accept information from other people in decision making, pay attention to the opinions of others, and are receptive to others’ judgments of their behavior (Cheng, Chuang, Wang, & Kuo, 2013). In the consumer context, highly susceptible individuals may conform to the opinion of their partner more readily and choose products in accordance with this influence source. In line with this assumption, Cheng et al. (2013) show that highly susceptible consumers are more likely to purchase products on impulse when accompanied by a co-shopper while those low in this trait are not. In the business context, those susceptible to social influence may adapt to their negotiation counterpart more strongly. However, this relationship has not been tested yet. Thus, future research should study the role of susceptibility to social influence in negotiations and its role in behavioral adaptation. Additionally, researchers may incorporate the preference for consistency as a moderator of social influence processes into their work (Guadagno & Cialdini, 2010). Individuals who score low on this trait prefer change and spontaneity. In contrast, those who score high try to
be consistent with their prior attitudes, behaviors, and commitments. These differences influence people’s susceptibility to persuasion such that those who prefer consistency are more likely to comply with the foot-in-the-door technique. Applying this tactic an influencing agent first asks for a small favor, e.g., signing a petition for a charity. In case the agent achieves agreement her or she makes a related greater request, e.g., ask for donation. If receivers of influence strive to be consistent they will agree with the second request more readily when they already agreed to the first. Hence, in both the consumer and business contexts preference for consistency can intensify or weaken the social impact of others. Therefore, incorporating person variables to the study of social influence allows identifying boundary conditions and catalysts for social influence (Burger, 2010).
Conclusion

This thesis studied the social impact on individuals in the consumer and business context. The findings obtained from research illustrated in the three manuscripts lend support to the pervasive issue of social influence in various contexts of people’s lives. Referring to the theory of social impact (Latané, 1981) the present research goes along the notion that an individual is more likely to conform to others the higher the strength (antecedents of influence as an input in joint purchase decision making; Manuscript I), immediacy (presence of one’s partner during shopping versus no presence and its effect on the outcomes of joint decision making, namely WTP and preference for vice versus virtue products; Manuscript II); and number of people (adaptation to the strategy use of negotiation counterpart which is a team versus a solo negotiator and its effects on negotiation outcomes; Manuscript III) in question.

In this sense, the manuscripts also contribute to the broader study of social influence: Concerning insights into the topic of compliance the present research identifies characteristics of the influencing agent that moderate the recipient’s readiness to give in to influencing attempts (Manuscript I). These results are in line with the notion that individual differences play a role in the study of social influence effects. For the study of conformity, the present research finds a boundary condition for attending to social influence. Individuals are more likely to conform to the behavior of others when that other is superior in terms of number (Manuscript III). In classical social influence literature, group number as a conformity enhancing factor is mostly studied in respect to attitude formation and judgement. Behavioral adaptation is a rather novel and exciting finding. Adding to more recent research in the social influence arena, the present work also demonstrates that social influence inherent in the situation (purchasing products jointly versus alone) impacts outcomes of decision-making (Manuscript II). This finding joins the literature on the kind of social influence which is not necessarily actively exercised but implied in the situation. In sum, the results of the present research as a whole can be well embedded in existing research and also provide valuable extensions.

This thesis aimed to combine the effects of social influence from two distinct areas of marketing in which social interaction is essential, namely the research on joint purchase decisions and negotiation research. In this case it is worth asking whether results obtained from both contexts are comparable. Indeed, couples differ in many aspects from other groups. Close
(romantic) relationships are generally characterized by “strong, frequent, and diverse interdependence that lasts over a considerable period of time” (Kelley; Berscheid, Christensen, Harvey, & Huston. 1983, p. 38). Relationship partners are attracted to each other, their bond is based on voluntariness, and they usually have common goals (Karremans & Finkenauer, 2014). Moreover, what distinguishes couples from other groups is also their considerable degree of altruism and the willingness to compromise (De Palma et al., 2011). However, naturally, ties in business contexts are not as strong. In the case of negotiations they are also limited in time to the negotiation episode (although future interactions are very well common in the business-to-business context). Still, interdependence between parties is prominent here and the basic concept of joint decision making as depicted by the IPO-Framework as well as the theoretical underpinning of Social Impact Theory holds for this context in the same way. For instance, insights into antecedents of influence as described in Manuscript I can be readily applied to the negotiation context, notwithstanding with modifications. In this sense, research shows that status is also a relevant antecedent of influence in negotiations which can well be grounded in expertise or competence (Galinsky, Schaer, & Magee, 2017). As another example, giving in to the party that is superior in numbers (cf. Manuscript III) can be observed in the purchase decisions of families as well. Kwai-Choi Lee and Collins (2000) suggest that when children form coalitions with a parent this team will have more influence in a decision than the solo parent. In sum, although the research underlying this thesis pertains to rather specific issues in the context of marketing, in total, the results fit well with the versatile and multidisciplinary study of social influence.

Furthermore, it has to be noted that the three manuscripts advance the study of their respective field to varying extents. In Manuscript I, as the title suggests, research on antecedents of influence is revisited. Whereas this was essential due to societal changes that threatened the validity of previously obtained results of the field, the degree of novelty in the follow-up work of Manuscript II was admittedly greater. Here, research on joint decisions was enriched by the introduction and connection to research on WTP. Moreover, the observation of real behavior and gathering of dyadic data – the lack of which was a tremendous limitation of prior studies – contributes to the research field. Research of Manuscript III can be rated as similarly advanced
since it combines the study of negotiation strategies in intercultural negotiations with social influence research to demonstrate differential effects of behavioral adaptation.

As a final issue, three questions remain to be answered as mentioned in the introduction of this thesis:

1. “What do You Think, Darling?”

This question is less likely to be asked by individuals who are more knowledgeable and have more intense preferences concerning a product category than their partners. In the case of grocery shopping this will usually be a woman; in the purchase of television sets probably a man. Hence, what one’s darling thinks is decisive in many purchase decisions.

2. “Minder or accomplice?”

When couples choose to shop jointly, they probably act as accomplices by partnering in crime. Their affiliation goals are satisfied by joint indulgence which manifests in higher preferences and willingness to pay for vice products as compared to individuals choosing products on their own.

3. “Can outnumbered negotiators succeed?”

Yes, they can! Solo negotiators negotiating with a team would be wise to use integrative strategies. This is especially beneficial if their opposing team has high levels of collectivism. In this case, their adaptation to the team’s negotiation style also yields higher individual profits.
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