LISTENING: A DYADIC PHENOMENA AFFECTING NEGOTIATION, HUMILITY, WORK ATTITUDES, AND BOUNDED BY NEGATIVITY

Employees who listen well create endless benefits for both themselves and the organization they work for. Specifically, employees experiencing good listening from their leaders report higher job satisfaction, job loyalty, less job burnout, and objectively perform better and more creatively, to name a few. Moreover, good listeners are perceived as better leaders.

Unfortunately, listening research has many gaps both in understanding the rich array of outcomes it may affect, its moderators, and this literature is largely mute about the antecedents of good listening. Therefore, the goal of this symposium is to shed light on the antecedents that facilitate good listening in organizations, and expand its known consequences. First, we will show how listening affects creativity in negotiation. Specifically, to reach creative solutions in negotiation (Loewenstein), parties have to listen to and incorporate what they hear from their counterparts. We present two studies supporting this argument, highlighting the importance of listening in negotiation.

Second, we will discuss potential moderators for the benefits of listening in the work-place in a context of supervisor-subordinate interactions (Sela). Specifically, we will show that emphatic listening of a supervisor benefits employee's personal job outcomes largely when employees share positive experiences, but not when employees share negative experiences. We will elaborate on why encouraging employees to share successes could enhance their wellbeing at work.

Third, we will propose that good listening may increase state humility among employees (Lehmann). Humble people are perceived as better managers; they form good relationships, perform better, and are even considered more creative. Therefore, listening may serve as an effective intervention to spread humility in organizations.

Forth, we will present, "The listening circle", an effective intervention that facilitates high-quality-listening in organizations (Itzchakov). The listening circle involves people sitting in a circle where only one person talks at a time and the talking turns are

signaled by a talking object. In two studies we show that listening decreases social anxiety, which in turn increases self-awareness of pros and cons towards work related attitudes.

Finally, we will present a study suggesting that listening is actually a dyadic phenomenon, rather than an individual one (Kluger). That is, in two studies employing Social Relations Modeling we show that listening occurs in specific dyads and that only a minor portion of the variance in listening could be attributed to a listening trait.

In sum, our symposium offers a unique perspective on the antecedents and outcomes of listening in an organizational context -- a construct which is traditionally considered clinical, and only recently received attention from management scholars in a leading outlet (Van Quaquebeke & Felps, 2016). Specifically, our symposium shows that (a) listening increases the well-being, creativity, and humility in organizations; we propose that (b) listening may actually be a dyadic phenomenon; and we present (c) an intervention that can facilitate listening in organizations, and we show (d) that listening may backfire under certain conditions.

REFERENCES

Van Quaquebeke, N., & Felps, W. (2016). Respectful Inquiry: A motivational account of leading through asking open questions and listening. *Academy of Management Review*.

Negotiators can generate creative agreements (Carnevale, 2006), provided they listen to one another. Creative agreements follow from redefining the negotiation problem (Walton & McKersie, 1965) by reframing the issues under consideration (Gray, 2004; Putnam & Holmer, 1992). Creative agreements are more likely when parties consider hypothetical alternatives (i.e., counterfactual reasoning, Kray, Galinsky, & Markman, 2009) or delay making proposals (Sinaceur, Maddux, Vasiljevic, Nückel, & Galinsky, 2013). In contrast to most research on negotiation that emphasizes the choice to disclose information (Murnighan, Babcock, Thompson, & Pillutla, 1999), creative agreements almost certainly require more involved discussion. For example, a negotiation between teachers and a school board found that 65% of the issues changed from the initial proposal (Putnam, Wilson, Waltman & Turner, 1986). Coach salaries began as a discussion about equal pay and Title 9 rules against discrimination, shifted to a discussion of differential workloads for different teams, and resolved with agreements to transition towards equalizing workloads to equalize pay. To generate new possibilities to consider, parties have to listen to and incorporate what they hear from their counterparts.

Several studies provide support for this claim. The first study contrasted parties randomly assigned either to share important information or to ask about important information. Transcript analyses found that most parties in both conditions revealed information about their interests. However, in the asking condition, parties were notably more likely to form proposals incorporating information the other party shared—that is, they were more likely to listen. The end result was a greater proportion of creative agreements in the asking condition than the sharing condition and greater average gains to the parties as a result.

The second study contrasted parties randomly assigned either to be respectful and considerate to the other party or to refrain from being overly respectful and considerate to the other party. Analyses of what parties communicated showed that more respectful parties were more likely to listen to their counterparts, as indicated by incorporating what the other parties said in their own statements. Listening, in turn, was linked with forming creative proposals. Further studies have replicated the relationship between respect and

creative agreements as well as separated the effect of respect from the effect of trust on information exchange.

These studies are consistent with the possibility that listening is central to jointly fashioning creative solutions. If parties have to be creative to go beyond their initial proposals to incorporate new issues or modify existing issues, they need to listen to and incorporate information from their counterparts. Respecting the other side appears to make people particularly willing to listen. The result is more innovative and more valuable agreements.

REFERENCES

Carnevale, P. J. (2006). Creativity in the Outcomes of Conflict. In M. Deutsch, P. T. Coleman, & E. C. Marcus (Eds.), *Handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (second, pp. 414–435). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gray, B. 2004. Strong opposition: Frame-based resistance to collaboration. *Journal of Community and Applied Psychology*, 14(3): 166-176.

Follett, M. P. (1940). *Constructive conflict*. New York: Harper.

Kray, L. J., Galinsky, A. D., & Markman, K. D. (2009). Counterfactual structure and learning from experience in negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*(4), 979–982.

Murnighan, J. K., Keith Murnighan, J., Linda, B., Leigh, T., & Madan, P. (1999). The information dilemma in negotiations: Effects of experience, incentives, and integrative potential. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *10*(4), 313–339.

Pruitt, D. G., & Lewis, S. A. (1975). Development of integrative solutions in bilateral negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *31*(4), 621–633.

Putnam, L. L., & Holmer, M. (1992). *Framing, reframing, and issue development*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Putnam, L. L., Wilson, S. R., Waltman, M. S., & Turner, D. (1986). The Evolution of Case Arguments in Teachers' Bargaining. *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 23(2), 63-81.

Sinaceur, M., Maddux, W. W., Vasiljevic, D., Perez Nückel, R., & Galinsky, A. D. (2013). Good things come to those who wait: late first offers facilitate creative agreements in negotiation. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *39*(6), 814–825.

Walton, R. E., & McKersie, R. B. (1965). *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations: An Analysis of a Social Interaction System*. Cornell University Press.

LISTENING TO THE POWERFUL AND THE POWERFUL LISTENING: POWER-DIFFERENCES AS A MODERATOR OF THE EFFECTS OF LISTENING TO SUCCESSES (CAPITALIZATION) AND FAILURES (SOCIAL SUPPORT) ON INTIMACY AT WORKPLACE

Relationships are characterized by the level of intimacy and satisfaction partners feel towards each other. These feelings are affected, among other things, by responsiveness to sharing both positive (Feeney et al., 2013; Gable et al., 2006) and negative experiences (Schwarzer, & Knoll, 2007; Gurung et al., 2001), where high responsiveness results in capitalization and social support, respectively. While capitalization and social support were sometimes found to be beneficial for relationships, in other cases, they were found to cause negative outcomes (Gleason et al., 2008). These puzzling effects can be explained by sensitivity to change in power differences between partners (Magee, & Smith, 2013). While capitalization (sharing success with a responsive other) could enhance oneself and increase power, social support (sharing a failure with a responsive other) could decrease power. People who are mostly motivated by value of self-enhancement are more sensitive to change in power differences (Schwartz, 1992). Thus, I hypothesized that among people who are high in self-enhancement value, highest intimacy would be reported by subordinates who share successes (experience capitalization) with their supervisors, or by subordinates who provide social support to their supervisors (listen to their failures). I also hypothesized that supervisors would act with a similar mechanism and therefore results in opposite predictions. Therefore, supervisors would feel more intimate when experiencing social support or when providing capitalization to their subordinates.

To test these hypotheses two experimental-scenarios studies (152 and 192 participants respectively) and two experimental-recall studies (117 and 194 participants respectively) were conducted. In these studies, I manipulated power position of the speaker (supervisor vs. subordinate) and sharing process (capitalization vs social support). Two studies tested speakers' perspective, and two studies tested listeners' perspective. Following the manipulations, I measured intimacy with three indicators (emotional intimacy, feeling distant and willingness to share), and also individual measures of positive

and negative affect (PA/NA), self-efficacy, self-enchantment and self-transcendence values.

In all studies, a significant three-way interaction has emerged between self-enhancement values, power-position of speaker and sharing process, after controlling PA, NA and self-efficacy. Subordinates who were high in self-enhancement, reported higher intimacy when sharing success and experiencing capitalization in comparison to sharing failures and experiencing social support from their supervisors (aggregated Cohen's d of 0.50 (95% CI [0.20, 0.82] across four studies). On the other hand, supervisors who were high in self-enhancement, reported higher intimacy in the opposite conditions, as hypothesized (aggregated Cohen's d of -0.45 (95% CI [-0.14, -0.77] across four studies). The results suggest that listening in supervisor-subordinate dyads affects intimacy depending both on the topic (success versus failure) and power differences between partners.

REFERENCES

Feeney, B. C., Collins, N. L., Van Vleet, M., & Tomlinson, J. M. (2013). Motivations for providing a secure base: Links with attachment orientation and secure base support behavior. *Attachment & human development, 15*(3), 261-280 .

Gable, S. L., Gonzaga, G. C., & Strachman, A.. (2006). Will you be there for me when things go right? Supportive responses to positive event disclosures. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 91*(5), 904 .

Gleason, M., EJ, Iida, M., Shrout, P. E, & Bolger, N. (2008). Receiving support as a mixed blessing: evidence for dual effects of support on psychological outcomes. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 94*(5), 824-838 .

Gurung, R. A., Sarason, B. R., & Sarason, I. G. (2001). Predicting relationship quality and emotional reactions to stress from significant-other-concept clarity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(10), 1267-1276.

Magee, J. C., & Smith, P. K. (2013). The social distance theory of power. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 17(2), 158-186.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In MP Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol ,25 .pp. 1-65). New York: Academic Press.

Schwarzer, R., & Knoll, N. (2007). Functional roles of social support within the stress and coping process: A theoretical and empirical overview. *International Journal of Psychology, 42*(4), 243-252.

CAN LISTENING LEAD YOU TO "KNOW THYSELF"? THE EFFECTS OF LISTENING ON HUMILITY

Humble people create multiple organizational benefits (e.g., Ou, Waldman, & Peterson, 2015). For example, humility predicts job performance (Ou et al., 2015; Owens & Hekman, 2016), employee's job engagement, and learning goal orientation (Owens, Johnson, & Mitchell, 2013). These findings beg the question of how humility is elicited. The research on the antecedents of humility is lacking in both theory and experimental evidence. I propose a theoretical account of how humility is elicited by listening.

According to Rogers (1951), listening creates a process of internal introspection, which increases internal clarity and discovery of self-contradictions. In addition, listening was hypothesized and found to reduce social anxiety and defensive processes, which, in turn, increase awareness of internal contradictions regarding a specific issue (objective attitude ambivalence) (Itzchakov, Kluger, & Castro, 2017). This means that listening affects the ability to view both internal contradictions of the self (Rogers) and internal contradictions towards an external matter (objective-attitude ambivalence)—both of these contradictions are parts of the construct of humility. Thus, I suggest that good listening increases humility within the speaker (H1). In addition, I propose that feeling of psychological safety within the speaker mediates the relationship between listening and humility (H2).

I found a hint for potential support for my hypotheses in a laboratory experiment manipulating listening (N = 98). Specifically, speakers' humility was higher when the speaker was paired with a good listener relative to a distracted listener. However, this result was not significant, d = .15, p = .44. Yet, consistent with H1, the quality of the listening reported by the speaker was significantly correlated with speaker's state humility, r = .24, p < .05. Similarly, the quality of the listening reported by the listener was also positively correlated with speaker's state humility, r = .20, p < .05. Furthermore, consistent with H2, a mediation test of the effect of listening on humility through psychological safety was marginally significant, β= .05, 95% CI = [-0.006, 0.144], p = .08, whereas the direct effect of listening on humility was not significant, β= .02, 95% CI = [-0.16, 0.23], p = .78. These results provide initial evidence that listening may serve as an effective tool to

increase humility within organizations. I expect to have results of at least one more laboratory experiment with stronger statistical power and stronger manipulation of listening by the time of the conference.

REFERENCES

Itzchakov, G., Kluger, A. N., & Castro, D. R. (2017). I am aware of my inconsistencies but can tolerate them: The effect of high quality listening on speakers' attitude ambivalence. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 43(1), 105–120. doi:10.1177/0146167216675339

Ou, A. Y., Waldman, D. A., & Peterson, S. J. (2015). Do Humble CEOs Matter? An Examination of CEO Humility and Firm Outcomes. Journal of Management. doi:10.1177/0149206315604187

Owens, B. P., & Hekman, D. R. (2016). How does leader humility influence team performance? Exploring the mechanisms of contagion and collective promotion focus. Academy of Management Journal, 59(3), 1088-1111. doi:10.5465/amj.2013.0660

Owens, B. P., Johnson, M. D., & Mitchell, T. R. (2013). Expressed Humility in Organizations: Implications for Performance, Teams, and Leadership. Organization Science, 24(5), 1517-1538. doi:10.1287/orsc.1120.0795

Rogers, C. R. (1951). Client-centered therapy, its current practice, implications, and theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

CAN HOLDING A STICK IMPROVE LISTENING AT WORK? THE EFFECT OF LISTENING CIRCLES ON EMPLOYEES' EMOTIONS AND COGNITIONS

Employees spend much of their day listening to their managers, colleagues and costumers. When employees listen well, they create a myriad of benefits both for themselves and for their interlocutors such as increased job satisfaction (Brownell, 1990), relational satisfaction (Canlas, Miller, Busby, & Carroll, 2015),customer loyalty (Román, 2014), objective measures of performance (Bergeron & Laroche, 2009), and job commitment. Not surprisingly, practitioners continually point out the importance of listening skills at the workplace and recommend developing listening skills for both employees and managers (Brink & Costigan, 2015). However, despite these recommendations and the benefits described above, listening has received relatively little attention in the field of organizational behavior.

In this presentation I present the Listening Circle as a method for improving listening in organizations. The listening circle involves people sitting in a circle where only one person talks at a time and the talking turns are signaled by a talking object. Although there are several reports regarding the effectiveness of the Listening Circle, most are based on case studies, or confounded with another intervention, and do not use theory to predict the outcomes of the improvement in listening. I predicted, based on Carl Rogers's theory (Rogers, 1980), that listening decreases employees' levels of social anxiety, which allows them to engage in deeper introspection. The deeper introspection yields awareness of pros and cons towards various work-related attitudes, reflected in attitudes that are more objectively-ambivalent and not as extreme. Moreover, I hypothesized that experiencing good listening will enable speakers to tolerate their contradictions without the evaluate conflict which is usually associated with it (subjective-attitude ambivalence). I found support our hypotheses in two quasi-experiments, N's = 31, 66, where I compared the effects of a listening Circle workshop with a self-enhancement workshop (Study 1 and Study 2), and a conflict-management workshop (Study 2). The results suggest that the Listening Circle is an effective tool that can benefit organizations.

REFERENCES

Bergeron, J., & Laroche, M. (2009). The effects of perceived salesperson listening effectiveness in the financial industry. Journal of Financial Services Marketing, 14(1), 6-25.

Brink, K. E., & Costigan, R. D. (2015). Oral communication skills: Are the priorities of the workplace and AACSB-accredited business programs aligned? Academy of Management Learning & Education, 14(2), 205-221.

Brownell, J. (1990). Perceptions of effective listeners: A management study. The Journal of Business Communication (1973), 27(4), 401-415.

Canlas, J. M., Miller, R. B., Busby, D. M., & Carroll, J. S. (2015). Same-Race and Interracial Asian-White Couples: Relational and Social Contexts and Relationship Outcomes. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 307-328.

Rogers, C. (1980). A Way of Being. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Román, S. (2014). Salesperson's listening in buyer–seller service relationships. The Service Industries Journal, 34(7), 630-644.

SOCIAL RELATIONS MODELING OF LISTENING

Good listeners create a myriad of benefits both for themselves (e.g., they perform better) and their interlocutors (e.g., they increase the wellbeing of the speaker). Less is known, however, about whether good listening reflects traits of the listener, the speaker, or states that promote listening. We propose that because listening, as dancing the tango, takes at least two cooperating partners, it is an inherently dyadic phenomenon. Furthermore, we hypothesized that listening is correlated with intimacy, especially at the dyadic level. To test these hypotheses, we employed the social relations model (SRM; Malloy & Albright, 2001; Malloy & Kenny, 1986; Warner, Kenny, & Stoto, 1979). In Study 1, we obtained data from unacquainted students who conversed with each of three partners for six minutes and then rated listening quality and intimacy (N = 176 individuals in 44 round-robins groups producing 528 dyadic ratings). In Study 2, we obtained data from acquainted teammates in various organizations who rated listening quality and intimacy (N = 108 individuals in 27 round-robins groups producing 324 dyadic ratings). In both studies, we found that high or poor listening quality occurs primarily in specific dyads. Moreover, only among acquainted teammates was there evidence that listening is, partly, a trait. That is, good or poor listening is largely an emergent property of the dyadic interaction of specific people. Moreover, listening and intimacy are correlated most strongly at the dyadic level. Thus, listening research could be advanced by asking what makes a good listening dyad.

REFERENCES

Malloy, T. E., & Albright, L. (2001). Multiple and single interaction dyadic research designs: Conceptual and analytic issues. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 23(1): 1-19.

Malloy, T. E., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The Social Relations Model: An integrative method for personality research. *Journal of Personality*, 54(1): 199-225.

Warner, R. M., Kenny, D. A., & Stoto, M. (1979). New round robin analysis of variance for social-interaction data. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(10): 1742-1757.