Methodology

1.1.Participants selection

Organizational teams were approached to participate in the study. A survey was conducted with the team members to determine how they differentiate successful and wise negotiators. Then, they were asked to select a team member they believed was a wise negotiator. Precousor is that the team members interact with each other in daily meetings and know each other at least as professionals. Thus, they are familiar with each other's negotiation styles. Independent variables

1.2.Independent variables

There were four independent variables as follows:

a. Gender- men or women
b. Emotional state- emotional or nonemotional
c. Archetypes- competent jerk, lovable fools, incompetent jerk, lovable star
d. Reciprocity- giver, taker, matcher

1.3.Dependent variable

Negotiation outcome is measured in terms of points given to the opponents in the negotiation task.

1.4.Experimental design

It was a mixed-method design with four independent variables, with a 4X3X2X2 design. Archetypes had four levels (competent jerks, lovable stars, incompetent jerks, lovable fools), reciprocity had three levels (giver, taker, and matcher), emotional state had two levels (emotional and nonemotional), and gender had two levels (women and men). Archetypes, reciprocity, and emotional states were measured repeatedly, whereas gender was randomly arranged.

1.5.Procedure

We approached organizations to provide their teams with it. Team members were approached individually, and a survey was done to find how they differentiate wise negotiation from successful negotiation. Later, they were asked to provide the name of an individual they

consider a wise negotiator within their team. These wise negotiators were approached and asked to play the game as a negotiation task.

1.6.Negotiation task

Participants were presented with 24 situations in random order. They were asked to read each situation and had to play the give-and-take game against the said person in the situation.

A variant of the trust game or investment game by Berg et al. (1995) was used for the task. Player one was a fictitious player already designed within the game. However, participants were told that player one is real and plays in real time. Participants in the task were instructed to play as player two. There were six trials. Both player one and player two had 100 points each for all six trials. In the First step, player one would give away certain points from its 100 points to player two. In reply to this, player two would give away certain points to player one. The same process would be repeated for six trials with each situation. For each trial, the minimum investment was zero, and the maximum investment they could make depended on the amount they had in their account for that trial. Like the original investment game, participants were given some token of points that they could give their opponents in return for what the other player gave them. However, unlike in the original game, the amount given was not tripled in any case.

1.7.Questionnaires used:

Wisdom Scale: SAWS, Wise Reasoning: Situated Wise Reasoning Scale, Perspective-taking and empathetic concern scale, Dialectical Self Scale, Comprehensive intellectual humility scale, Adaptive performance scale, HEXACO, and Emotional management

1.8.Analysis

Descriptive statistics- mean and standard deviation

Inferential Statistics- paired t-test, two-way ANOVA, two-way ANCOVA