UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

Comparison of business negotiation styles between China and Sweden

Author(s): Chenyun Qiu
Xue Wang
Supervisor(s): Bilyana Martinovski
Svante Leijon

Abstract:

Different cultures have different business communication behaviors. With the acceleration of globalization in business, understanding and accommodating activities in inter-cultural contexts become more regular. Do people from different cultures keep the same style of communication in mono-cultural and intercultural negotiations? Do their behaviors change in intercultural negotiations and how? This Magistrate thesis searches answers to these questions through video recording of experimental role play. It finds accommodation of different aspects of communicative patterns between Chinese and Swedish business negotiators in intercultural contexts. Chinese tends to adapt their verbal patterns like accent and phonological features while Swedish accommodate to nonverbal behaviors like nodding and laughter.

Key words: Chinese business negotiation, Swedish business negotiation, accommodation, inter-culture, communication management, coding.

Table Content

I Introduction

Intercultural business communication proved to be a challenge. A good example of that is the so called China fever during which 66% of acquisitions with foreign companies failed (http://learning.sohu.com/2004/07/08/51/article220905181.shtml). Nowadays, as Sweden and China have more and more contacts and connections with each other business negotiations gain importance. However, our knowledge about the negotiation behavior in these two cultures is based on cross-cultural studies. Can we assume that these behaviors will be the same in intercultural settings or would they change? What changes of behavior occur if any in intercultural negotiations between Sweden and Chinese?

The best expectation of business negotiation is to balance both sides' benefits and achieve a win-win result. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1999:515) According to Japanese folk-knowledge, the essence of negotiation is the 'compromise' that is to be achieved through the persistent interchange of statements with subtle nuances and implications such as roundabout speaking, euphemism, respecting the other's face, and so on.(Tong fang, 1996:34) Even though, considering the simplest negotiation between two individuals, P and Q, and both of them are pursuing profit, but P's gain may entail Q's loss, it is unusual that P simply requires something and Q gives it without hesitation. Bargaining is the typical patterns of negotiation most frequently encountered in every society.   In order to get the "balanced reciprocity", negotiators tend to accommodate each other's acts consciously or unconsciously.

The accommodation patterns can cover a wide range of linguistic-prosodic-nonverbal features including speech rate, pause phenomena and utterance length, smiling, gaze and so on. The level of accommodation as well as the emphasize area are relied on different business cases and role that negotiator plays.

There are many studies on Chinese and Swedish business negotiation. There are also studies about international business negotiation based on national cultures. We are interested to see the interactions between these two cultures when comes across international business negotiation process. According to Giles' accommodation theory, during face-to fact talk, people will start to mirror each other's behaviors especially when one or both of them want to reach a cooperation goal. However, is it true when comes to inter-culture environment? What does a negotiator behave when he or she plays the same role in monoculture and inter-culture situation? Will there be any differences? With these questions, an experimental role play is designed. Since both of the authors are Chinese students studying Sweden, we seek to explore what are the communication patterns Chinese and Swedish used during business negotiation and whether they change at the same negotiation table.

1.1 Purpose and Research question

The purpose of the paper is to see if communicative behavior in the same activity changes in Inter-cultural context. In the end, try to provide practical opinions about the business cooperation and organizational management in the terms of business negotiation between Chinese-Swedish companies. The research questions are:

1 What are the patterns of communication in business negotiation in monocultural context from Chinese and Swedish cultures?

2 Do these patterns change during intercultural negotiation? Are there any differences?

3 Do they accommodate to each other's patterns?

II Background

In this section, some useful theories definitions, namely, communication patterns as well as accommodation theory are introduced. These form the foundations and main methods for our research. Our hypothesis is also based on these two theories. Moreover, information about international business negotiations, especially negotiation style in China and Sweden are highlighted. Last, some current research related to communication accommodation will be introduced in this part.

2.1 Communicative Patterns

Allwood (1999) claims that there are communicative patterns specific for swedish culture. He defines communicative patterns as (ibid.) traits and aspects of communication of the members of a certain social or cultural group. These form of communication is related to most sides of cultural life, i.e., to the thoughts, behavior, and artefacts (artificially made objects) which are characteristic of the lifestyle of a certain group of people. Regularities and patterns in communication can be found when it concerns all these three main aspects of cultural life and the relation between them. Allwood(1999) introduces the following important features can be used to describe Swedish patterns of communication.

Purpose: Determine the nature of an activity and the communication within it.

*Roles:*It is partly determined by the purpose of the activity. The roles are connected with certain rights and duties, also when it comes to communication.

Overall structures and procedures: There are some types of overall patterns concerning the interaction between speaker and listener, which are typical for the communication within the activity. They can concern the following:

Typical sequences of events: initial, medial, final.

Turntaking

Feedback

Spatial arrangements

Topics or what is talk about

The communication behavior

Interpretation and understanding

Sometimes, there are many hidden information behind a verbal communication. Therefore, it is very important to draw in inferences and connect what is being communicated with presupposed information which one already has available. Usually, a major part of this information consists of culture specific background information and lack of possible culture knowledge can lead to communication misunderstandings. However, it is not clear that these factors above can be applied to specific activities such as business negotiation. In this research we test the relevance and usefulness of these patterns for activities of negotiation.

2.2 International Business Negotiations

International business negotiations are an essential form of communication between both companies and executives. Misunderstandings in communication might be easier to come across in such a setting, which can affect the goal of a business relationship. A successful negotiation not only relies on an in-depth knowledge of the business in question, but also on the cultural habits and the related communication strategies chosen by the negotiating parties. Culture defines people's behaviors. It is believed that negotiators with different culture background may have different ideas to interpret verbal and nonverbal messages delivered during the communication process. In addition, these patterns are applied at varied level and situations from both parties to achieve the final agreement. Usually, when negotiators operate with various types of assumptions- including what constitutes shared background knowledge, social expectations, common sense, and cultural, ethnic, sex, and other stereotypes, the negotiation process may go through much easier. However, when come to inter-cultural issues, interlocutors may experience interactive difficulties since the familiar values are no longer shared by two parties at the initial sequence.

4

(Tony Fang, 1996:14) The difficulty to understand and interpret the communication behaviors turns to be one of the biggest barriers on international negotiation table.

Another theory applied in this paper is the basic principles of negotiation (Salacuse,1991).

It is said any business negotiations can be divided into three main stages:

• Pre-negotiation refers to the initial stage where the parties are trying to determine whether they want to really negotiate on the subject or not.

• Conceptualization means that the parties are trying to formulate a general concept or formula for their planned transaction.

• In the Details stage, the parties work more precisely on that formula and try to define every little detail of the transaction as carefully as possible.

In this paper, we would mainly look at the interaction during conceptualization and details stages and the role play is mainly designed according the above procedures.

2.2.1 Chinese Negotiation Style

Chinese business negotiator is always attached as a group of "inscrutable" people (Tong Fang, 1996). With a high-context culture tradition, Chinese negotiation style is influenced by cultural believes and values, the attitude to business and interpersonal relationship. Apart from cultural factor, deeper reason was existed in the impact of varied ideologies occurred during Chinese long history. Some of the thoughts are so complicated and even contradicted to each other. Some scholars were totally accepted in one dynasty while others were completely excluded or even sentenced to death. Wen Emperor (167BC) in Han dynasty ordered in his imperial edict "Agriculture is the root of our life". He also mentioned that Commerce as "branch" among other industries. Moreover, in order to strengthen the centralization force, almost every emperor had made policies against the development of commerce as well as the property of merchants. As a result, businessmen were looked down upon. Nowadays, many Chinese still retain their agrarian values so that most of them

believe the one who pay money usually have more rights to pick, change and add more requests during negotiation. As a result, the sellers may behavior more humble and active at the beginning. The impact of thousand-year Confucian education rooted in many Chinese thoughts and behaviors, for instance, the value of unity, cooperation manner with others and respect to authority. Many informants mention the Chinese way of negotiating which is combined with both politenesses at table but also cold war behind. In addition, the process is highly valued by Chinese. Sometimes, it is even more important than the final goal since they are quite willing to accept other options and new opportunities occurred in the process of negotiation.

Therefore, failing to understand the historical influence and cultural values are often the main reason behind unsuccessful cross-culture business negotiation. Many westerns businesspeople usually confused about what Chinese are thinking about during the process of negotiation; why they change opinion after negotiation; why it is the sequences before Chinese reach their decision.

The following table shows a comparison between American and Chinese negotiation styles.

American	Chinese
The basic cultural values and ways of thinking	
individualist	collectivist
egalitarian	hierarchical
information oriented	relationship oriented
reductionist	holistic
sequential	circular
seeks the truth	seeks the way
the argument culture	the haggling culture
How they approach the negotiation process	
nontask sounding	
quick meetings	long courting process
informal	formal
make cold calls	draw on intermediaries
information exchange	
full authority	limited authority
direct	indirect
proposals first	explanations first
means of persuasion	
aggressive	questioning
impatient	enduring

Table 1 the view from both sides

2.2.2 Swedish Negotiation Style

Attitudes and styles: negotiation is process of solving problems, both parts are equal. They are cooperative and compromise in order to win-win. Many informants also mention the Swedish way of negotiating which is connected with a tendency to consensus and compromise as something relatively unique(Allwood,2000).The other part should pay back Swedes respect and trust and avoid conflict and being calm, friendly, patient and persistent. Negotiators are thought to be very quiet and thoughtful, punctuality, very polite and informality and affinity and fear of contradiction.

Sharing of information: Swedish negotiators are willing to share information to build trust. But not all kinds of information can be shared. Negotiators are frank.

Pace of negotiation: Swedes prefer to do one thing at a time which means they are monochronic work style. They will make careful plans before negotiation and they will take more time to thinking. The process expected to be slow and to be patient. They focus on results and efficiency; proceed step by step, adept at maintaining good emotional control and slower in response to new proposals. They are systematic and effective.

Bargaining: Swedes use honest and straightforward style to bargaining. They respect fairness and don't like bargaining, deceptive negotiation techniques, aggressive sales techniques and pressure tactics as applying time pressure and nibbling. They seems to be quiet and shy but emotional negotiation techniques is also avoid. Be careful of avoid brivery and corruption. Written offers and introducing written terms and conditions can be effective and helpful. Negotiators are reserved and realistic and too caution.

Decision making: It takes a long time to make a decision. It follows all the members and the group's decision. Consensus is most important. Even the upper management is not the main person to make the decision. Be patient. The decision is not easy to change once it has been made. Negotiators are also opinionated, perfectionist, very personal.

Others: Network is very important in Sweden. It is who you know and who they know that counts. Join trade organizations, the chamber of commerce, small business groups. This is the way most business dealing start, and no business is conducted without first meeting (Antypas, 2003).

2.3 Experimental role play

The concept of the role in social psychology is first introduced by GH Mead in 1934. But he did not give a clear definition. He used a metaphor to illustrate the different people in similar situations to show similar behavior of this phenomenon. R. Linton in 1936: In any particular occasion as culture constitutes part provides a set of regulating the behavior. There are also Gestalt psychology and dramaturgical theory. (E. Goffman, 1959)

In clinical psychology, role-playing was first used by Moreno 1959 for the psychological drama, which is to assist the parties to explore the inner world in order to generate catharsis to reach the treatment. Wople use role-playing as a reduced sensitivity training, then conduct role-playing will be used in the rapid development of social skills training.

Through role-playing approach to achieve the experience and learning. Role-play from role theory, role is self-evaluation and action, it contains a series of emotion and action, it is a unique attitudes and habits of dealing with others.

The role theory is used both in social psychology and clinical psychology, which can be used as training and treatment for patients. But there is another usage for role-playing in social psychology that is used for simulation research methods. In using this method, the purpose of the experiment subjects was told to obtain his consent and then was asked to play a role in simulated situations as in the real situations, In order to achieve the similar psychological effect in real-life situation.

Role-playing requires the following elements:
1) Directions 2) the role of background material: which provides background material and the role to the experiment subject 3) mission statement: what the experiment subjects need to do and how to act. 4) Actors background material for the role player

5) what require all the people to pay attention to?

In the role-playing, we focus on the observation on following aspects:

1)The role of adaptation. If the subjects can understand the role and can act the role in the stimulate situation as in the real world.

2) The role-play performance. How the subjects act, what they think and what they say? Do they use a lot of bodily language?

3) The role of appearance: Including the clothes and hair and all the details they pay attention to.

4) The other content. To study the subjects are playing the role of designated, to observe the subjects deal with the problem shown in the process: decision-making, problem solving, command, control, coordination and other management capabilities, including a relaxation technique and solve conflicts, how to achieve the purpose, degree of behavioral strategies, behavior optimization level, emotional control, interpersonal skills.

5) What they do and act in intercultural communication? What is the difference and do they change?

We are trying to use the role theory to design our experimental role play. We will choose 2 Chinese and 2 Swedish. They are going to negotiation about the same contract within culture and inter culture situation. Based on the theory, we are going to compare the communication patterns during business negotiation in both of the culture and to observe how they influence each other and do they change their negotiation styles during intercultural communication.

2.4 Accommodation Theory

The Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) was developed by Howard Giles, professor of communication, at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Giles (2006) explains some of the cognitive reasons for code-switching and other changes in speech as individuals seek to emphasize or minimize the social differences

between themselves and their interlocutors. Giles (2006) posits that when speakers seek approval in a social situation they are likely to converge their speech to that of their interlocutor. This can include, but is not limited to the language of choice, accent, dialect and paralinguistic features used in the interaction. In contrast to convergence, speakers may also engage in divergent speech. In divergent speech, individuals emphasize the social distance between themselves and their interlocutors by using linguistic features characteristic of their own group (McCann & Giles 2006:74-108).

The first publications concerning "speech accommodation theory" (SAT). Labovian (1996) believes that the presumed role of formality-informality of context and the criterion of "attention to speech" that was seminally associated with the prestigiousness of speech styles. However, Giles (2006) argued that it could be reinterpreted, at least in part. He thinks the supposition was that context formality-informality determining the prestigousness of phonological variants could be supplanted by n interpretation in terms of interpersonal influence. Moreover, in the bilingual context, they found that the more effort at convergence a speak was perceived to have made (e.g., the more French that English Canadians used when sending a message to French Canadians), the more favorably that person was evaluated and the more listeners converged in return. Therefore, SAT specifically, originated in order to elucidate the cognitive and affective processes underlying speech convergence and divergence (McCann & Giles 2006:5-6).

2.5 Relevant Study of CAT in ICC Context

In Giles (2006)'s work, he mentioned a lot of researches based on speech accommodation. As we introduced before, it is very important part of CAT. Thakerar et al. invoked the conceptual distinction between subjective and objective accommodation. The objective dimension refers to speaker's shifts in speech independently measured as moving toward (convergence) or away from (divergence)

11

others, whereas the subjective dimension refers to speaker's beliefs regarding whether they or others are converging or diverging. Giles said speakers who might converge psychologically toward their interlocutors or audience may not common experiences or understandings to enable them to achieve their desired convergent effect, and they may compensate by converging linguistically and nonverbally along some alternative dimension. However, even when speakers are actually objective, misattributions can still be potentially rife, as Giles and Bourhis (1976) found that black West Indian immigrants in a British city thought they were converging toward white local speech norms while whites did not interpret blacks as sounding convergent, but rather dissociatively heard them as moving toward a speech style-the same nonstandard urban dialect – from which the whites were trying to rid themselves. Furthermore, in a very different cultural setting, Beebe(1981) found that Chinese Thai bilingual children used Chinese phonological features when being interviewed by an (objectively) standard Thai speaker who looked ethnically Chinese, the another instance arguably of miscarried convergence that amounted to actual divergence. From these examples, it can be argued that accommodation is often cognitively mediated by our stereotypes of how socially categorized others will speak. Moreover, foreigner's talk can be construed as exemplars of this. Unfortunately, we did not find many examples about how to use CAT or SAT in ICC (inter-culture) context, especially when none of the interlocutors are speaking their mother language. In addition, it seems to us, Giles put more efforts studying on accommodation on linguistic patterns rather than other nonverbal communication behaviors which could be important research targets in our study. (Howard Giles. Justine Coupland, Nikolas Coupland. 1991, p14-16) In our opinion, there are both speech accommodation and behavior accommodation exiting in ICC context.

Table 2 shows some convergent features during face to face interaction in Howard Giles. Justine Coupland, Nikolas Coupland (1991:7).

Features converged	Selected sources
Utterance length	Matarazzo et al. (1968)
Speech rate	Street (1983)
Information density	Aronsson et al. (1987)
Vocal intensity	Natale (1975a)
Pausing frequencies and lengths	Jaffe and Feldstein (1970)
Response latency	Cappella and Planalp (1981)
Self-disclosure	Ehrlich and Graeven (1971)
Jokes, expressing solidarity–opinions– orientations	Bales (1950)
Gesture	Mauer and Tindall (1983)
Head nodding and facial affect	Hale and Burgoon (1984)
Posture	Condon and Ogston (1967)

Table 2 Convergent features and selected source

This paper will mainly have a look at the crucial communication patterns coming across in the cross-culture negotiation process and the way they accommodate with each others. The research will be based on the observation from experimental role play between Chinese and Swedish who have business negotiation experiences. The target readers are the managers in communication and operation department as well as others working in management function offices of international or multi-culture companies.

2.6 Definitions

The analysis presented in this thesis uses the following definitions of major and relevant concepts:

ICC: refers to intercultural communication. The terms intercultural, used to describe one end point of the continuum, denotes the presence of at least two individuals who are culturally different from each other on such important attributes as their value orientations, preferred communication codes, role expectations, and perceived rules of social relationships. (Myron W. & Jolene K., 2006)

Accommodation: is to be seen as a multiply organized and contextually complex set

of alternatives, ubiquitously available to communicators in face to face talk. It can function to index and achieve solidarity with or dissociation from a conversational partner reciprocally and dynamically. (McCann & Giles 2006)

Convergence: has been defined as strategy whereby individuals adapt to each other's communicative behaviors in terms of a wide range of linguistic-prosodic-nonverbal features including speech rate, pausal phenomena and utterance length, phonological variants, smiling, gaze, and so on. However, although convergent communicative acts reduce interpersonal differences, interindividual variability in extent and frequency of convergence is, perhaps not surprisingly, also apparent, corresponding to sociodemographic variables such as age (McCann & Giles 2006:7-8).

Divergence: was the term used to refer to the way in which speakers accentuate speech and nonverbal differences between themselves and others. (McCann & Giles 2006:9).

OCM (own communication management): an umbrella term for the processes speakers uses to manage their own linguistic contributions to communicative interaction (e.g., planning phenomena, repair, editing, self-correction, etc.). (Allwood, 2001)

Feedback: an utterance by a speaker X is a stretch of speech produced by X, bounded by silence or by the speech of another speaker. (Allwood, 2001)

Overlap: a conversation setting that one starts to talk before the other ends. There are two primary ways in which the interrupt of the second person happens. One way is the first person finishes their main point, which is spotted by the second person who interrupts as the first person starts elaborating or slowing. The alternative

interrupt happens when the second person butts in earlier than might be expected, for example through enthusiasm, ignorance or in a power move. (http://changingminds.org/techniques/conversation/interrupting/overlap_speech.htm)

Verbal communication: is one way for people to communication face to face. Some of the key components are words, sound, speaking and language. (http://cobweb2.louisville.edu/faculty/regbruce/bruce//mgmtwebs/commun_f98/Verbal.htm)

Nonverbal communication (NVC): is understood as process of communication through sending and receiving wordless messages. It can include: gestures and touch, body language and posture, facial expression as well as eye contact. Speech also contains NVC such as paralanguage, voice, intonation and stress.

Reciprocal adaptation: The procedure is one of reciprocal adaptation, where each participant gradually learns to adapt and to enter into the other's frame of reference.(Gumperz, 1982)

III Research Methodology

In this part, we mainly introduce our null hypotheses and use of methods as well as research limitation.

3.1 Null Hypotheses

From the previous study about CAT, we think Giles' accommodation theory also works at our case. However since there are many differences between Chinese and Swedish business communication patterns and some behaviors even contradict in these two cultures,   it is very unlikely for them to change during the first time they work on the negotiation activity together. Furthermore, since in Giles' work, accommodation strategies are related to constellations of underlying beliefs, attitudes, and sociostructural conditions (McCann & Giles 2006:2), we believe, there are less opportunities for conversational partners to adopt each other's behaviors when their culture backgrounds have less common features. We wonder to what extent, Chinese and Swedish business interactions in ICC context can be influenced by Giles' theory.   As a result, here come our null hypotheses:

1 Communicative behavior and negotiation style will not change in inter-culture context. (In this case, we refer to Chinese and Swedish inter-culture context.)

2 There is no significant adaptation between interactants within inter-culture context.

3.2 Method

In this research, an experimental role play is used as the main method. Video recordings are taken during the whole process of role play and GTS (Gothenburg Transcription Standard) is used to coding and analysis the data from recordings.

3.2.1 Design of role play

This role play is designed according to the author's own working experience. First,

one Chinese girl and one Swedish girl were chosen as our compare objects. We name the Chinese girl B and the Swedish girl C. Both of them have related working experience on business negotiation. Next, a fictitious case was made for them to negotiate to. It is about a hotel sales man tries to convince a administration manager from an international company to sign a cooperate contract so that the employees in this company can use hotel service with a special rate. (See appendix B) Then we put B played as the hotel salesman in group 1 to negotiate with another Chinese girl and put C played as the company manager in group 2 with another Swedish girl. In this way, we can be able to see what kind of communication patterns that B and C used during Chinese negotiation and Swedish negotiation. Next, B and C were asked to replay the case again in Group 3 with the same roles they took in the previous groups. In this way, we suppose to see the changes. We will calculate the frequencies of B and C's main communication patterns and Jens Allwood's standard of transcription helps us to coding and analysis the data.

According to the theories we introduced before, the design of role play mainly covers the following content:

General background: A business negotiation between a hotel salesman and administration manager in a large international company. The contact is a real contract from a Chinese Four Star hotel. We believe a real contract can help us observe how the informants behaviors in real negotiation activities and explicit their communication patterns naturally.

Mission Statement: They are going to sign a cooperation contract so that company can use the hotel service, for example, the room, and food, with a better price. (See Appendices B) A task is setting to insure informants in different group work on the same case so that we can easily compare their using of patterns. More specific subtasks are given for us to observe the difference patterns of communication used by Chinese and Swedish.

17

Actor background: Both of actors represent their own company benefit. They also have different role play instructions. (See Appendices C) During the three sections of role play, the Chinese girl B and Swedish C are asked to play the same role in within culture group and inter culture group. In this way, we can really see what kind of changes happened to them when they are in the same criteria.

Language setting: Mother languages are used in self-culture groups to explicit more cultural message and patterns. English is used in inter-culture group since most of international business negotiation uses English.

Place and time setting: Each negotiation sections are limited within 10mins. They are all recorded in a quiet study room separately.

3.2.2 Participants and research group

This research consists of two Chinese students and two Swedish students. All of them have business negotiation experience. Our main research target, Chinese B and Swedish C also have international business negotiation experience. Consider the gender differences, the four informants are all women.

3.2.3 Data Collection

This research will be based on both primary hand and secondary hand data. The first hand information will be mainly collected from video recording of negotiation activities between Chinese and Swedish. The second hand information is based on academic literature review and other press release as well as the recourse on internet.

According to Allwood (1999) and Giles (2001) both verbal and nonverbal communication patterns will be observed. The following features will be mainly focused on: nods, chuckle, giggle, laughter, pause, overlap, hesitation sound, sigh, mumbling, cutoff and other sounds as well as body language. Each feature will be discussed by different function such feedback, OCM.

3.2.4 Data Interpretation

The patterns of communication during business negotiation such as greetings, emotions, gestures, non-verbal language are all influenced by culture values. The authors are going to analysis the features of these patterns according the recording data and find out the reasons related to culture. In addition, more research will emphasize how the different patterns accommodate each other. GTS (Gothenburg Transcription Standard) is used to coding the data and Dialog Coding-function and grammar, Gothenburg Coding Schemas (Allwood，2001) is applied for analysis data.

3.3 Limitation

First, material limitation: It is hard to find all the materials that relate to our study, we try to gather as much useful informations as possible. There must be some inevitable omissions in our study, we will try our best.

Second, language issues: the experimenters come from different culture and language background. In the negotiation processes, there are many features come from the differences like Chinese dialect. It is can be an influence to the role-play or negotiation.

3.4 Ethical consideration

We will just use this recording to do research and we will never use it in other places. These recordings kept by us and we won't publish it in anywhere else and we will make sure the experimenters' names are anonymous so we use code names instead their real names.

IV Findings

In the following part, we will introduce our findings according our coding to the three transcriptions of video recording. According to communication management (Allwood, 2001) mentioned before, we mainly observe the following features: nods, chuckle, laughter, giggle, pause, overlap, sound, repetition and body language etc. These Data are organized as three categories according to their function - feedback, overlap, and OCM (own communication patterns). In the following tables, we calculated the frequencies of each pattern that B and C performed in both monocultural and inter-cultural groups. All the transcriptions are divided into four parts as opening, negotiation, agreement, and closing. (See Appendix A) Since we mainly study the communication patterns during negotiation section and there are no big differences in the opening and closing parts, the data showed in the tables below are only from negotiation part. It is also easy for us to compare and analysis. Last, some patterns like repetitions, body gestures which are difficult to calculate are discussed separately.

4.1 General Calculation

The following table summarizes the most commonly used communication patterns in the role play of three groups which are Chinese groups (CC), Swedish group (SS), and ICC group (CS). The frequencies of each item are calculated by the observation to C, the Swedish girl's and B, the Chinese girl's communication behavior in both groups. In each item, the *blue* number shows the total frequency during the whole recording process and the other one is observed from negotiation section separately.

Features	CC(B)/total	CS (B)/total	CS (C)/total	SS (C)/total
Nods	27 / 30	32 / 34	19/ 32	6 / 6

Chuckle chuckling	4 / 4	3 / 3	0/ 1	0 / 0
Giggle/ giggling	0/0	0/ 0	0/ 2	1 / 4
Laughter	0/0	0/0	0/0	4 / 5
Pause	186 / 198	84 / 93	125 / 132	61 / 64
Overlap	9 / 12	16 / 18	18 / 20	15 / 16
Hesitation sound	3 / 3	1 / 1	0 / 0	0/ 0
sigh	3 / 3	1 / 1	0/ 0	0/ 0
mumbling	0 / 0	1 / 1	0/ 0	0/ 0
Cutoff	0/ 0	1 / 1	1 / 1	0/ 0

Table3: Overall Communication Patterns Description (frequency)

This table indicates the frequency of the most obvious communication patterns during the negotiation section and the whole process in three groups. We can see there are great differences among the frequency of *nods, pause, and overlap* between Swedish and Chinese group. It seems Chinese use lot of *pause, nodding, sounds* patterns while Swedes tend to interrupt or overlap others' conversation more often. Another interesting finding is the different kinds of sounds they made. Chinese prefer smiling, or softer sounds such as chuckles, hesitation, sigh, mumbling while Swedish group laughed very loudly and giggled all the time.

When we put B, the Chinese girl and C from Swedish group together, we found both of them start to look for a new balance by dropping some own communication habits or mirroring each other. For instance, our Chinese informant only overlaps other 9 times but the frequency almost is double when she talked to Swedish informant. The same thing also happened in C. She learned to use more nodding and pause when communicated with Chinese and she even used chuckle instead big laugh.

Features	CC(B)	CS (B)	CS (C)	SS (C)
Nods	90%	94.1%	**59.3%**	100%
Chuckle chuckling	100%	100%	0%	0%
Giggle/ giggling	0%	0%	**0%**	25%
Laughter	0%	0%	**0%**	80%
Pause	93.9%	90.3%	94.6%	95.3%
Overlap	75%	**88.8%**	90%	93.7%
Hesitation sound	100%	100%	0 %	0%
sigh	100%	100%	0%	0%
mumbling	0 %	**100%**	0%	0%
Cutoff	0%	**100%**	**100%**	0%

Table4: Overall Communication Patterns Description (Percentage)

For better comparison, we also calculate the percentage of each pattern during negotiation section. We can Swedish informant changed a lot at patterns of *Nodding, Giggle, Laughter, Cutoff,* while Chinese informant mainly changed at *Mumbling, Overlap, Cutoff* patterns.

4.2 Communication Management-Related Coding Findings

According to Jens Allwood's 2000 dialog coding theory, there are many aspects for communication management- related coding analysis.   In this paper, we mainly take a look at the patterns with feedback and OCM function. In addition, some specific issues like the use of overlap, feedback attitude, reputation, gestures and the

negotiation content and procedures will be also discussed. In the following part, we start to introduce the main findings followed by Salacuse's (1991) business negotiation procedures.

4.2.1 Opening

First, we compare the opening section with CC group and SS group. The steps are produced in the same way, for instance, the managers from Volvo in both groups stands up and shake hands with the clients and then have seat. Facial expressions are usually very cheerful with polite manner. There are very slight differences between these two groups. In Chinese group, after the manager shows the seat, B sits down; in Swedish group, C giggles 2 times while in CC group B smiles on the face instead. Second, we take a look at the ICC group. The procedure is almost same: introduction, greeting to each other and shake hands. C giggles only once in the end of this section which is less than she did in Swedish group and B does not giggle. The difference is that B uses high pitch twice during the section but which never happens in CC group.

The communication patterns in all groups are almost the same in the opening section of business negotiation.

4.2.2 Negotiation

There are several differences among the three groups in the main negotiation section. First of all, Swedish and Chinese focus on different issue. For Chinese, they spend a lot of time to set the price while Swedish discuss more about what kind of services they can have. In addition, the thoughts of mind of Swedish are relatively straight forward. They will not move to next topic without solving the current problem. On the contract, Chinese are good at seeking answers from vague situation and they avoid to arguing directly. Another findings we get is it takes longer time to Chinese to reach to the same decision than Swedish did. Interesting is even in the ICC group, the decision making process is much quick than it is in Chinese group. In the next section, we introduce some specific patterns used in negotiation process.

23

4.2.2.1 Feedback

Feedback	CC(B)	CS(B)	CS(C)	SS(C)	
Head movements (Nods and shakes)	18 / 27	23 / 34	17 / 19	5 / 6	One shakes from M
Sounds	2 / 10	2 / 6	0 / 0	3 / 5	
Words	23	36	31	21	
Phrases	0	6	1	0	

Table 5: Feedback Statistics

This table is based on the table 3 (page 23). We add up the patterns with feedback function during the negotiation section. In Allwood Goteborg coding schemas, 2001 feedback is only coded for utterance, however, according our results, there are some nonverbal patterns which can also be transcribed as feedback.

The feedback utterances (FBUs) such as *yes, no, nop, yep, yeah, right, huh, m, ah* are calculated as feedback words and some lager utterance like *that's right, that's ok, very good, that's great* are feedback phrases. As we mentioned before, head movements are frequently used by Chinese as a feedback. However, according to our recording, it does not always mean agreements when a Chinese nods, in fact, in most of time, it only says "yes, I follow you, keep on talking." Another finding is compared to the Swedish group; Chinese seldom use shake-head movement to express disagreement, objection, or uncertainty. They usually smile, blink, sign, make hesitation sounds or use roundabout statement for more FBG (feedback giving) or

FBE (feedback elicit). For most of time, Swedes put dissent clearly into sentence and the only nonverbal patterns they use is shaking head. Interesting is, we find shaking head movement can deliver both objective and affirmative emotion for Swedes. Here are two of the examples:

Example 1

$C: [4 so nice]4 so the mood and atmosphere and the staff / it's all / eh / < very / very nice^ > // but erm:,
@ < gesture: C shakes head >
$B: < [4 thank you]4 >

@ < gesture: B nods >

Example 2

$C: i think the price is really for the: , eh / for the (size) of people we bring in / erm: <1 >1 we <2 cant >2 really accept / erm: , this price <3 >3

@ <1 gesture: C nods >1

@ <2 gesture: C shakes head >2

@ <3 gesture: C nods >3

In first example, M shook head when she felt satisfaction and in the next example, she did the same gesture when she expressed objection opinion. We also notice that for Chinese group, the meanings of nodding and shaking head have significant differentiation while for Swedish group, it is hard to distinguish the standard function of nodding and shaking. They tended to use head movements to for OCM (own communication management) rather than giving feedback.

When comes to the ICC group, both informants used more feedback words than they

did in own culture group and the Swedish one turned to nod much more often. However, she did not use any sound as feedback like the Chinese did.

4.2.1.2 Repetition

Swedish group have three times repetitions.

Example 1

$D: ja: // du kan få / det finns en rabatt på // du kan få // ehm: // femton procent rabatt kanske^ /

[3 tänkte vi det blir]3 < fyrahundrafemti(o) kroner >

$C: [3 femton procent aa]3 / okej

Example 2

$D: ungefär / a: // ja / då kanske vi kan // då får vi säga som vi [15 sa då]15 / eh // åtti nätter men

tjuge procent [16 då]16 / [17 aa]17så att det a vi måste också gå runt <1 >1 <2 >2 / < 3 >3 men /// eh

$C: [15 aa]15 / [16 tjuge]16 procent [17 aa]17 / okej var det nåt mer vi skulle: // diskutera här / om

vi / om vi inte är nöjda^ med / avtalet eh om vi inte är nöjda med servicen dåå:

Example 3

$D: [21 men eh]21 / < mendå ändrar // jag lite >

$C: a du kan ändra lite åsså mejla över det bara så kan jag titta på [22 det]22 / < sen undrade jag lite

också det här med konferensservice / å så kan ni hjälpa till lite med / med sånt med ordna rum // å eh

/// mat åså till det å >

There are only two times repetitions in Chinese group.

Example 1

*$A: <1 恩：， // <2 但是这个价格 >2 <3 我们还是觉得^ // 俄：， / 比我们的: ^ // >3 **超出我们***

的预算了>1

*$B: <1 **超出你们的预算了** >1 / <2 那 >2 能不能告诉我 / 你们的预算大概在什么样 / 一个价位*

In English:

*$A: <1 m : , // <2 but the price >2 <3 we still think ^ // er: , / than ours: ^ // >3 **it is over our budget** >1*

*$B: <1 **it is over your budget** >1 / <2 then >2could you tell me / what is your budget / the price*

Example 2

*$A: [4 然后 /]4 然后的话还要赠 / 还赠送 // [5 恩 /]5 **早餐^***

*$B: < [5 对]5 > 每个房间 / 有一份免费**早餐***

In English:

*$A: [4then /]4 then give / give // [5m /]5 **breakfast^***

*$B: < [5 对]5 > each room / there is a free **breakfast***

In ICC group, there are four times repetitions during the conversation.   The content are quite diversity. See the example below:

Example 1

$C: <1 [13 and]13 /// yea:h but i still think er: it is   ehm:, // >1 <2 too much >2

*$B: <1 **it is   too [14 much**]14 OK! >1 <2 >2*

Example 2

$C: twenty percent discount // what what that mean / for price

*$B: its its roughly / roughly < **thousand** >*

*$C: **roughly a thousand***

Example 3

*$C: <1 eh / for example // <2 eh/ som:e // >2   **conferece services^** // >1 [18 maybe you have that^]18 <3 yep >3*

*$B : [18 yeah, that is for sure]18 yeah / **conference services^***

Example 4

$C: m: //   i think er:m // <> could guarantee sixty

*$B: **a:h** / that is a little bit low*

*$C: **a:h** / ok / er:m / ye:ah / < then i might have to look > for another hotel // i think*

From the four examples above, we can see participants usually would either repeat other's words immediately after she finishes her speech like example 1 and 2, or talks something else and then back to repetition (example 3) Example 4 shows another situation that people also modify each other's sounds not just linguistic patterns.   In the video, C uses the exact same interjection "ah" after B and it is the only one time she uses in the whole role play.

4.2.2.3 overlap

Overlap	CC(B)	CS(B)	CS(C)	SS(C)
Giving attention	1	6	4	5
Affirmation	2	6	5	1
Acceptance	0	1	4	5
Reaffirmation	1	1	3	1
Reminder	0	0	0	0
Excuse	1	1	0	0
Continuation	1	1	3	0
Hesitation	0	1	0	3
disagreement	0	0	1	0
Lack of hearing or understanding	0	0	1	0

Other (interrupt)	0	O	o	0

Table 6 Overlap Statistic

Overlap in negotiation section have been shown different times in different group. According to Jens Allwood (2001), Overlap has many functions as followed: giving information, affirmation, acceptance, reaffirmation, reminder, excuse, continuation, hesitation, disagreement, lack of hearing or understanding.

In Chinese group there are 9 times for B to overlap the other person. But in ICC group there are 18 times for B to overlap C. It shows a big difference for B to use overlap. In Swedish group there are 15 times for C to overlap the other person and in ICC group C overlap B for 16times.   C uses a lot of overlap to speak with person from different country and culture.

In Chinese group, B uses overlap as affirmation mostly for twice. Then come reaffirmation, giving attention, excuse and continue each for one time.

For example (affirmation):

$A: [4 然后 /]4 然后的话还要赠 / 还赠送 // [5 恩 /]5 早餐

$B: < [5 对]5 > 每个房间 / 有一份免费早餐

In English:

$A: [4 then /]4 then give / give // [5m /]5 breakfast

$B: < [5yes]5 > each room / there is free breakfast

In ICC group, B uses overlap mostly also for affirmation (six times) and for giving attention (six times). She uses a little overlap for acceptance, reaffirmation, excuse, continue and hesitation. B uses overlap for affirmation as usual and B learns more giving attention by using overlap in this group.

In ICC group, C uses overlap many times too. C uses most of overlap for affirmation (5 times) and for giving attention and acceptance each 4 times. Three times each for

29

reaffirmation and continue. Only one times each for disagreement and lack of hearing and understanding. C uses overlap for almost every function and the gaps between each function are not big.

In SS group, C uses overlap mostly for giving attention (5 times) and acceptance (5 times). Then 3 times overlap for hesitation and each one time for affirmation and reaffirmation. C uses overlap mostly for giving attention and acceptance in both of the groups. But C gives affirmation, reaffirmation and continues by using overlap in ICC group than in SS group.

4.2.2.4 OCM

OCM	CC(B)	CS(B)	CS(C)	SS(C)
Pause	186	84	125	61
Simple OCM expressions	5	5	16	8
Explicit OCM phrases	1	1	3	0
Other OCM sounds	10	8	2	1 (laughter)
Hesitation sound	*3*	*5*	*2*	*0*
Sigh	*4*	*1*	*0*	*0*
Chuckle/chuckling	*3*	*2*	*0*	*0*
Lengthening of continuants	24	10	15	9
Self-interruption	2	6	7	0
Self-repetition	13	12	10	7
Nods	9	15	4	1
Shakes head	1	0	2	1

Gestures	12	16	3	4

Table 7 OCM Statistic

According to Jens Allwood(2001) OCM include pause, simple OCM expressions, Explicit OCM phrases, other OCM sounds (hesitation sound, sigh, chuckle and laughter), lengthening of continuants, self-interruption and self-repetition. He research mainly about verbal communication.We think that it should include non-verbal communication also, so we count nods, shake heads and gestures these non-verbal communication patterns.

B pauses in CC group most of the time, about 186 times and in ICC group are 84 times. C pauses in SS group lest about 61 times and in ICC group are 125 times.

Simple OCM expressions for example: m, huh, e. B uses 5 times in both CC and ICC group but C uses it more than B in both ICC(16) and SS(8) group.

Lengthening of continues and Self-reputation shows many times and CC group is much higher than SS group. In ICC group is almost the same for B and C.

Self-interruption is high in ICC group for both C and B. It shows less in CC group and SS group, which can be connected with mother language and second language issues.

Other OCM sounds and nods are mostly used by B in both CC group and ICC group, which is much higher than C.

Gestures are used mostly by B in the table, but there are also many kinds of different gestures used by C unconsciously and frequently. So it is not to say that Chinese prefer to use more gestures than Swedish.

Explicit OCM phrases and shake heads are not used often by both of B and C. The differences are not obvious.

4.2.3 Agreement

It is quite similar for all the groups to take turns from each other. CC and ICC take turns for about 9 times and SS has for about 8 times. But in SS group, C just uses overlap once except any kinds of gestures or sounds. Almost half of the conversations in the agreement section are just simple words or feedback words. In CC group, B nods for 3 times and also uses other gestures for 3 times. Besides that, B uses 2 times low pitch and overlap once. In ICC group, B uses high pitch once to say "that's great" to finish the agreement section.

In SS group, it is quite easy to get into agreement and once they agree with each other, it is quite easy to finish. It takes longer time in CC group and ICC group to reach to the final decision. In the ICC group, both of them try to confirm their agreement as well as the contact information twice and between that, a short, new negotiation process is brought in. It seems the Swedish representative becomes a bit uncertainty and also controllable when faces a foreign client.

4.2.4 Closing

In CC and SS group, they take turns for 4 times. The differences between these 2 groups are C giggles and laughs for 2 times in total but B does not use those patterns that at all. Instead, C shakes hands for a long time through all the conversations in this section but does not do that. The procedures are almost the same by saying thank you and goodbye.

In ICC group, they take turns for 6 times which is a little bit more than the other groups. They do not shake hands with each other and only use "thank you" to finish the conversation. C still uses giggle and chuckle 2 times but B nods and smiles instead.

4.3 Body language

Except nodding and shaking head, most of the body gestures we have coded from

video have OCM function. The Chinese girl, B, has a habit of twisting wrist when making a statement. We notice that the frequency of this movement is much higher in ICC group than it in Chinese group. Generally, the Swedish girl, C has much more body movements than the other girls both in Swedish and ICC groups. However, we can see she feels more comfortable and makes bigger gestures including shaking body, waving arms when talks to the native speakers. When it turns to cross- culture environment, she seems hold back a little bit and is only limited into some hand gestures. On this point, we do not think B has much change talking to a foreigner.

4.4 Spoken Language

Another issue we would like to poise is the difference between spoken language of Chinese, Swedish and English. We notice that in Chinese conversation, intonation and pause are frequently used. Swedish has the fast speech rate among the three languages being performance in the role play and seldom have pauses. Both participants speak the second language in the ICC group. We find that C, the Swedish girl starts to slow down and have more pauses while B, surprisingly speaks more fast and fluently , even her English is not good as C's.

V Discussion

In this section, we will analysis our results following the standard business negotiation procedures mentioned before.

5.1 Pre-negotiation

Chinese Group	Chinese-Swedish Group	Swedish Group
$A: 请进 come in. < > @ < event: A stands up > $B:　你好 hello,/ <1 我是 **I am / >1 <2 新好生酒店 from jonhson >2 的 <3　　[1 julia]1 >3** @ <1 event: B shakes with A >1 @ <2 name >2 @ <3 name >3 $A:　[1 你好 hello]1 / <1 请 坐　have a seat please // <2 >2 >1 @ <1 gesture: A shows the seat >1 　@ <2 event: A sits down >2	$C:　hello ^ $B:　 <1 hey ^ >1 / **i am <2 julia >2 from <3 jonhson ^ >3 <4 >4** @ <1 high pitch >1 @ <2 name >2 @ <3 name >3 @ <4 event : B shakes hands with M >4 $C:　**i'm <1 åsa^ >1** / <2 nice to meet you >2 @ <1 name > 1 @ <2 high pitch >2 $B:　 < nice^ to meet you. > (|5) @ 　<　giggle: C >	$C: kom in come in<1 >1 <2 >2 @ <1 giggle >1 @ <2 event: C stands up >2 $D: hej hello^ $C: hej hello^ **<åsa >** @ < name > @ < event: C shakes hands with D> $D: <1 åsa >1 <2 >2 / <3 **karin >3** @ <1 name >1 @ <2 giggle >2 @ <3 name >3 $C: Välkommen welcome< > @ < event: C and D sits down > $D: tack thanks< > eh / er:m /så so @ < giggle: C > $C: < så so, / ja yes > @ < event: C touches hair >

Table 8 Comparison Pre-negotiation Context

As we mentioned in Findings, the activity procedures are very similar in the three groups. Each group follows greeting, self- introduction, greeting , three steps and they all use the same communication patterns , for example, shake heads, friendly feedback attitude and facial expression. Although according to current information we have, there are big culture gap between Chinese and Swedish, there is no significant evident to improve it in this section. One thing can be mentioned here is the self-introduction. From the table, we can see, Chinese like to mention their social titles after their name but Sweden people seldom do that. As Tong fang mentioned in his book, culture defies people's behavior and values. (Tong Fang, 1996:4)With the impact of thousand – year Confucian education, Chinese are known as collectivism and hierarchical. Social network is very important in every area of life, which, for sure, includes the relationship in workplace. Therefore, Chinese like to identify themselves as one part of the organization to show their respect to authority and also, indicate their social status. Sweden is knows as a typical low-context culture which share the value of individuals, egalitarian, information oriented rather than relationship oriented. For them, name is the most important information when introduce oneself. Another difference relies on the intonation of voice. It is very hard to compare the results of these three languages since Chinese has a very different tone system. However, we do discover that Swedish people talk with higher voice but quite flat intonation as well as many sounds patterns like giggle and laughter while Chinese do just the opposite. The Chinese try to use high pitch and become more active to the Swedish and the Swedish try to be cautious and carefully in the beginning. It is pretty obvious that they try to do what they think the other part would be and behave different from they usually do. However, it is very interesting to look at the way they to limit the culture gap is actually bring more communication habits from their own countries. To the Chinese girl B, she may probably know that Swedish people talk with high pitch so she not only increases the voice but also adds more rising tones at the end of sentence. In fact, it is Chinese linguistic system to change tones frequently, but for Swedish, they do not change the tones often according to our research.

In addition, it is not as same as what we think before that Chinese group needs more time to phatic, but the truth is that they use even less time to greeting with each other or we can say that they use almost the same time to do the opening in business negotiation. That is to say, during business negations, all the national culture accommodate each other and to get close to the standard which shared by the world.

5.2 Negotiation

5.2.1 Feedback

According our findings, the most commonly used communication patterns used as feedback function are head movements (nodding and shaking), sounds, feedback words, phrases or sentences. First of all, let us compare head movements. If we look at table2, it is not difficult to find out Chinese produces far more nodding gesture than Swedish in within-culture situations. It is not polite for Chinese to interrupt other's talk, however, in business negotiation activity, showing an attention is crucial. Hence, nodding head quietly becomes the NO.1 choice. In fact, since Chinese do not give too much self-disclosure, nodding usually only means attention rather than agreement or accepts. On this point, Swedish prefer to use Verbal patterns instead. They nod only when they give confirmation information. As a result, when check the figures of ICC group, we can say both informants want to reach a convergence. M even nods more than B does. M seems more willing to express her attitude to her client. But still, she has more consciously head movements than B has. We also think Chinese prefer to gesture than Verbal as feedback is because the more reserved culture. Most Chinese believe silence is golden. They do not express their opinion directly before they can confirm what they say is correct and useful. We think this can be related to long history of brutal feudal government. People learn to speak carefully to avoid trouble. In addition, with high-context culture tradition, Chinese are good at seeking information beyond words. Swedish, on the contrary, with low-context culture, they do not have so much culture restraint. In order to get a

36

win-win result, they are more willing to cooperate and compromise. The second significant change is the feedback words. The frequency of feedback words are both higher for our two informants than they in within-culture group. Giles (2006) posits that when speakers seek approval in a social situation they are likely to converge their speech to that of their interlocutor. Especially, we find out in NNS (non-native speaker) – NNS interaction, both parties have even greater willing to understand each other and the degree of tolerance increases. Unfortunately, we did not find many theory improvements from Giles's (2006) works. The current research is mostly focus on native speaker and non-native speaker communication.

5.2.2 Overlap

B uses a little overlap in CC group but C uses a lot of overlap in SS group. The huge differences come from culture differences. In China, it is not polite to overlap or interrupt the others when they are speaking. Chinese speak when the other is finish talking. Most of times, Chinese people will wait for the other part finish not matter how much or how long. In certain situation, Chinese business people will use overlap when they eager to confirm or reconfirm something. It shows rarely to giving attention and excuse by using overlap. Chinese like to give attention by using body language

When C speaks to Swedish people, C uses overlap to show she is giving attention and accepting. Swedish people like to use overlap to show they are listening and they can accept something. They also use overlap to show that they are hesitating and confirming. Swedish people use overlap much more than Chinese people. And the functions that both Chinese and Swedish use for overlap are affirmation and reaffirmation.

Then we go through the conversation between Chinese and Swedish and to see what happens. They use overlap for almost the same times, B uses even a little more. According to accommodation theory, when they speak with each other, they are

trying to accommodate with each other. B uses 2 times more for giving attention which C should use more; and C try to uses more times for affirmation as B does. Besides giving attention and affirmation, B uses little of other functions in overlap. But C still good at using overlap to show continuation, disagreement and hesitation.

5.2.3 OCM

Chinese people use a lot of pauses in the negotiation with Chinese people. B uses 186 times pauses in CC group. It is more than 84 times when she speaks English with Swedish. It is different from what we thought at first. According to pervious understanding, when B speaks mother language, she should pause less and when B speaks second language, it should be slower and have more pauses. The reason for that is because of the differences of two languages. Chinese language has different structure to English. The grammar is not strict for Chinese and most of the times one word can be understood as a whole sentence. So when they speak Chinese with each other, they can pause for one word, they can pause for one phrase. They can understand very well or even better. English has strict grammar and it is hard to understand by word. So B uses pause when the whole sentence is over. That's why it is so different.

In Swedish group C pauses 61 times but in English conversation C pauses 125. Compare to speaking Swedish, C pauses more than double times.   When C uses a second language to speak with each other, she needs to think a little longer and to express clearly and try to make sure that the other can understand. In SS group, they speak fast and have little pauses, it is reasonable when they use mother language. Compared to Chinese, English and Swedish have more common at the patterns of pause. Besides the language issue, they try to accommodate each other in the ICC group. B speaks faster and has less pauses and C speaks slower and has more pauses. They all try to make the other part understand and comfortable.

Simple OCM expressions are very important for people to construct own language and gain more time to express themselves. B uses less in both situations, in contrary C uses more in both situations. It shows that Swedish people prefer to use simple word to express themselves.

Other OCM sounds like giggle, chuckle, laughter, hesitation and sigh which are been used mostly by B in both group. It can be a big difference that Chinese uses these sounds to gain times to think.

For example:

$A: 这个价格你们能不能适当再降一些

$B: // 哦 / <1 最多<2 最多 >2 >1 减掉百分之二十五

@ <2 sighing >2

In English:

$A: can you lower down the price a little bit?

$B: // oh / <1 the most <2 the most >2 >1 it can be lower twenty fiBe percent

@ <2 sighing >2

In this example, B uses sigh to gain more time to think and shows an attitude that she is hard to accept but she tries her best to make a compromise. B won't say that she doesn't like to accept or it is hard to make such an offer, she will use the sounds to show her attitudes. That is the core value of Chinese from Confucius. Chinese should behavior very polite and express themselves not too much. It is also the same reason that B uses more nods and gestures than C in both situations.   When B shows that she is listening and giving attention, she prefer using body language than giving words and phrases directly.

Compare to B, C uses less nods and gestures in the situation. It doesn't mean that Swedish uses little gestures. They use their body language all the times rather than for special reasons. They move their bodies when they feel relax. Just in business negotiation, they prefer to use simple OCM expression than using body to gain more

time to help themselves.

All the sounds that B used are for expressing the attitudes and gaining more time for her. There are not much giggle and laughter, only chuckle has showed because of the unwilling or thinking. But C uses just laughter especially in SS group. She expresses her feeling more direct and open with Swedish people. When she speaks with Chinese, C uses just hesitation sounds for twice. Which can be explained by accommodation or she expresses herself more carefully.

Self-interruption happens in the mixed group very often, which can be related to language. The second language can also influence the pattern of thinking. It happens little when they use their mother languages because they don't need to change their thinking patterns. When they are negotiating, they need to think carefully and keep giving right information. It is very important for both parts.

5.3 Agreement

Chinese Group	Chinese-Swedish Group	Swedish Group
$A: 我们 we / <1 也是觉得 think >1<2 你们酒店从各方面: 条件 your hotel in eVery respect is / 也 also <3 都比较不错 pretty good>3 // 那 then / 如果是百分之二十五的话 if twenty fiBe percent / 我算一下啊, let me think/ <4 九百五十那行 nine hundred fifty ok >2 /// >4 第一个是百分之二十五第二个是百分之	$C: yeah / erm / so < you will be the contact person > [32 from your hotels^]32 @ < gesture: C nods > $B: < yeah // [32 of course]32 > huh @ < gesture: B nods > $C: yeah / i will manger things from < volvo > @ < name > $B: yeah / < so if everything is	$C: det kan vi that can we / vi kanske kan dela upp we maybe can del [23 det på ett]23 that on one $D: [23 det får du]23a precis då får vi ju [24 ta fram ett]24 / separat till det men det kan vi verkligen hjälpa till med $C: [24 separat kontrakt]24 / det kan ni göra det vore jätteeebra

二十 the first is twenty fiBe percent and the second is twenty percent/ <5 是 吧 right^ >5 // 那就没有什么问题了 then there are no questions

@ <1 gesture: A nods >1

@ <2 event: A looks through paper >2

@ <3 gesture: B nods >3

@ <4 mumbling >4

@ <5 event: B writes on the paper >5

$B: <1 那 then /<2 你要是觉得可以的话 if you think it is ok >1 >2/ 我到时候就把合同 <3 更新一下 >3 i will refresh the contract // 然后 then// 我先发个电子版给你看一下 I will send you an electronic form // <4 你就最后核对 you can check >4 // 如果没有问题 if there is no problem // <5 我们就找个时间签一下 we can find a time and sign >5

@ <1 event: A touches hair >1

@ <2 gesture: B nods >2

@ <3 event: B twists hand >3

@ <4 low pitch >4

ok / > i will send you: a new^ / i mean / i will make the right price^

@ < event: B holds the paper >

$C: < yep^ >

@ < gesture: C nods >

$B: and send you by email [33 first]33 and you check it^ / if everything is ok^ then we < just sign >

@ < quiet >

$C: < [33 huh]33 >

@ < gesture: C nods >

$C: yeah / ok

$B: < ok that's great^ >

@ < high pitch >

$D: < det är bara å säga till så kan Bi diskutera det >

@ < gesture: D nods >

$C: a

$D: kan vi ta ett till möte till det

$C: okej

$D: a

@ <5 low pitch >5 $A: < 恩 m / 可以 ok > @ < gesture: A nods > $B: 好 good// 那你觉得什么时间比较合适呢 what do you think about the time $A: 俄 er, // 看你的时间了吧 according to your time $B: 好 ok $A: 你先把电子版发过来我看一下 you send me the electronic form first / 看没有 [19什么问题的话]19我们就签 if there is no problem we can sign $B: < [19 行 行 行 ok ok ok]19 >那我今天一会回去 / 就把这个合同更新一下 i will go back and refresh the contract today // 到时候给 [20你发过来]20 then send it to you @ < gesture: B nods > $A: < [20 好 / 好 good good]20 > @ < event: A and B stand up > @ < gesture: A nods >		

Table 9 Comparision Negotiation Context

The procedure for agreement is quite similar and every group mentions that they will find another time to sign the paper. After negotiation section, Swedish group get to agreement very fast that they don't need to think more or confirm again and again. That is because Swedish in business negotiation are not easy to agree with what others said but once they agree, they will not change their mind. Chinese group, on the contrary, spend longest time to reach to the decision. As we mentioned before, they pay much attention on price and confirm the details more than one time in this section. The ICC group tries to search for a balance. But the Swedish manager becomes very carefully to details and confirms the contact information of client once. She even starts another round of small negotiation after and requires something extra not on the contract which never happens in the Swedish group. We think the reason behind is the uncertainty between cross- culture and second language speaking environment. Although we can see both participants are trying to break the communicate block, the convergence by one party is not completely reciprocate by the other. According to Giles, in any interaction, neither convergence nor divergence can always be symmetrical. He mentioned an example of asymmetrical convergence of a study of American-Japanese interactions. When speaking with people with same culture background, Japanese in this study produced far more feedback worlds like *mmhm, uh-huh* than their American counterparts in within-culture situations. When it came to cross-cultural encounters, however, American used significantly more FBW when speaking with Japanese (that is, they converged) who themselves did not significantly change but maintained their high level of feedback giving. (McCann & Giles 2006:11-12) We have very similar situation here. When we compared to B's performance both in Chinese group and ICC group, we found she almost follows the same negotiation procedures and content while there much more changes for M, the Swedish informant than she is in her own culture group. We already discuss the different patterns of Swedish and Chinese's thoughts. Mover, Chinese are so get used to have long courting process to approach to negotiation process. To our surprise, we find our Swedish starts to

adopt the similar strategy to reach to the convergence. We think the reason behind, is because she cannot get the initial business goal when she only applies her communication style. In order to get more win a better situation during negotiation, she has to accommodate the other party's communication patterns.

5.4 Closing

Chinese Group	Chinese-Swedish Group	Swedish Group
$B: 谢谢! thank you $A: < 谢谢! >thank you @ < event: A and B shake hands > $B: < 合作愉快 >wish we cooperate the delectation @ < event continued: A and B shake hands > $A: 好的 ok	$B: < OK > that's good@ < giggle: C > $B: ok / [37 that's it]37 $C: [37 so you will]37 er:m // provide a new contract then^ / < then set the details [38 and]38 for this things > @ < low pitch > $B: < [38 yes absolutely]38 > @ < gesture: B nods > $B: ok / OK / that's good^ $C: ok <> @ < chuckle > $B: thank you^ $C: thank you	$C: a men då tackar jag så mycket < > @ < laughter: C > $D: ja ha det bra så länge $C: hejdå $D: hej < > < giggle: C>

Table 10 Comparison Closing Context

It is also quite short sections which include no more than 6 sentences. Both Chinese and Swedish groups are finishing negotiation in a short time. "Thank you "is used as the most common ending phrases. Moreover Chinese choose to shake hands in a long time to show their satisfied and to be polit. It is traditional in China.   But Swedish choose to say good bye to each other with laughter. In ICC group, they use

more time and more gestures to try to be polite and try to accommodate to the other part's custom. It shows that Swedish girl C change laughter to giggle and chuckle to show their understandings about Chinese culture and Chinese girl B doesn't shake hand with her also for the same reason. They are doing what they think is right and suitable to the other's culture.

VI Conclusion

Generally, there are many differences in patterns of communication between Chinese and Swedish during business negotiation process. Due to their unique language system, Chinese like to use intonation and pauses as well as sounds rather than verbally statement to express their emotion. They are also good at making full use of silence. When come across the situation of objection, they usually avoid giving direct response but producing many backchannels (e.g, Mmm, erh, sigh, and chuckle) for the opposite partners to guess their meanings. Usually, Swedish people feel quite confusing at this point. Other patterns like hesitation facial expression, lengthening of continuants are also used as the same purpose.

During the observation of the Chinese and ICC role play, we find there are several communication patterns very crucial in Chinese business negotiation style. First of all, give attention. Nodding is used commonly not only as agreements function but only, in more cases to show attention and encourage the clients or competitors keep talking. Secondly, wait for turns. Instead of inter up or overlap others actively, Chinese tend to wait for their own turns passively. Because of Confusion values, manner is important and interrupt others is not treated as a good manner. Sometimes they even interrupt themselves to create speech turn for others to show their caress and kindness. That is why Chinese need more time to reach to the same business goal than Swedish. Third, haggle. The haggling culture is quite obvious in Chinese negotiation activity. It is related to the circular way of thinking. Since people in high-context cultures like to consider situation holistically. They refuse to only focus on any small detail at the beginning of negotiation. Instead, they circuit around all the issues and collect as much as possible information which could help for her to make decisions. But during this process, none self-disclosure will be revealed.

With low-context culture, Swedish show more openness and direct attitude than Chinese. We also summarize some points here. First, time consuming. Swedish group use least time to reach the business goal. However, instead of decrease the price, they put lot energy to gain more service and potential cooperation opportunity. Information exchange is very direct and overlap and interruption happen all the time. Interesting is , according the earlier research , Swedish people are described as monochromic   and slower to unfamiliar situation; they also like to follow the plan and take more time to think. However, from our research both Swedish informants have very quick reaction to conflict and bargaining. Since both of them are Swedish young people, we think the new generation is becoming more and more international when deal with business negotiation issues. Another significant difference from Chinese group is the argument culture. Swedish value egalitarian at workplace. It is quite normal for them to argue with others even they are his / her potential clients. In our role play, we can our informant mainly use overlap, body gestures, quick feedback for arguing. They also like to express their opinion or objection very directly. The way of thinking is sequential which means they like to do one thing at one time and proceed step by step.

Many interesting findings we found in coding the ICC group. According to the accommodation theory we discussed before, both Chinese and Swedish do try to mirror each other's communication style in order to find a balance between foreign culture and self culture interaction. Chinese look for a convergence at verbal patterns like pronunciation, intonation, overlap and repetition while Swedish modify Chinese's nonverbal patterns like nodding, ways of thinking, pauses. The Swedish participant becomes more reserved when make hand gesture and other bodily movements. She even adjusts her way of laughter to chuckle or giggle as Chinese does. In this case, people choose to accommodate the patterns that they are most unfamiliar about. However, the convergence acts are based on their own knowledge to other cultures. Sometimes, it could even be a misunderstanding. For example, C

47

uses lots of nodding gesture, but different from Chinese's way of showing attention, she actually used it as a kind of affirmation feedback. The frequency of subconscious nodding is still very low to C. B noticed that Swedish people usually like to talk in an lively, easy manner, so she tried to put intonation at every sentences since in Chinese linguistic system, intonation can express varied meanings and emotion.

In conclusion, in intercultural settings both Chinese and Swedish changed their communication habits and tried to adapt each other according their understanding and observation to other's culture which have violated our null hypotheses before. Accommodation in inter-culture context is often cognitively mediated by our stereotypes of how socially categorized others will speak and also self-understanding and knowledge about others' culture and believes. In other word, our communication behaviors are related to different social and cognitive biases. Thus, culture is a very important motivation for accommodation activities during inter-culture interactions.

Reference list

Goffman E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* New ed (1990). Penguin Books.

Henrik Agndal. February 2007. Current trends in business negotiation research—An overview of articles published 1996-2005. *SSE/EFI Working Paper Series in Business Administration*,No 2007:003

Howard Giles, Justine Coupland, Nikolas Coupland. (1991) *Contexts of Accommodation: Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics.*ed.(1991). Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Jens Allwwod. (1999) Are there Swedish patterns of communication. In H. Tamura. ed. *Cultural Acceptance of CSCW in Japan & Norid Countries,* Kyoto Institute of Technology Press

Allwood, J. Dialog Coding - Function and Grammar: Göteborg Coding Schemas. *Gothenburg Papers in Theoretical Linguistics 85*, University of Göteborg

Johan Lintzen and Anne Svedjeholm. 2006. The impact of Culture on Business Negotations between Swedish and US Businessmen ---A case study of two Swedish Businessmen <http://www.essays.se/essay/f99f21cc37 > (2010-4-16)

John L. Graham and N. Mark Lam. 2003. 　Negotiating in China. < http://hbswk.hbs.edu/archive/3714.html > (2010-5-5)

John J. Grumperz. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lothar Katz. 2006. *Negotiating International Business*. 2nd ed. Booksurge Publishing.

McCann, R., & Giles, H. 2006. Communication with people of different ages in the workplace: Thai and American data. *Human Communication Research* 32(1): 74-108.

Myron W. Lusting & Jolene Koester (2006) I*ntercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication Across Cultural*. 5th ed. Person Education.

Mead, George Herbert. 1934. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Salacuse, J.W. (1991) Making Global Deals. *What every executive should know about negotiating abroad*. London: Random House.

Tong Fang. 1999. 　Chinese negotiation style. International business series <http://www.google.com/books?hl=zh-CN&lr=&id=k4LHYG2NZ8kC&oi=fnd&pg=PR13&dq=%22F ang%22+%22Chinese+business+negotiating+style%22+&ots=qskXfHxBmt&sig=mlfTBCkEgAJRa6d XTG56bhm-HhI#B=onepage&q&f=false >(2010-4-20)

Table and features

Appendices

Appendix A

Transcription and Coding

*T*he *following are three recordings according to the role play procedures mentioned above. The first one is the negotiation between two Chinese; the second one is between a Chinese and a Swedish and the last one is between two Swedes. The Transcription standard we use is MSO and GTS (Gothenburg Transcription Standard) The business negotiation contract is from a five star hotel in China.*

@ Recorded activity ID:

@ Recorded activity title: experimental role play of Chinese business negotiation

@ Short name: Chinese negotiation

@ Recorded activity date: 20100429

@ Tape:

@ Anonymzed: yes

@ Access:

@ Activity type, level 1: office

@ Activity Purpose: To see how Chinese people negotiation in business

@ Activity Roles: Hotel sales, Manager of Vovol

@ Activity Procedures: They talk about the price and room nights, try to sign a win-win contract

@ Activity Environment: manager's office

@ Activity Artifacts: Desk, contract, pens

@ ActiBity Medium: face-to-face, spoken

@ Duration: 00:10:36

@ Participant: A (Åsa)

@ Participant: B (Julia)

@ Recorder: Unknown.

@ Transcription name:

@ Transcriber: Qiu Chenyun Wang Xue

@ Transcription date: 20100509

@ Transcribed segments: all

@ Transcription System: GTS

@ Comment: Julia comes from a hotel, Åsa comes from Volvo

@ Time coding: no

@ Section: 1: Opening

@ Section: 2: Negotiation

@ Section: 3: Agreement

@ Section: 4: End

@ Stats: Overlaps: 20

@ Stats: Participants: 2

@ Stats: Pauses: 376

§ Opening

$A: 请进. < >

@ < event: A stands up >

$B:　 你好,/ <1 我是 / >1 <2 新好生酒店 >2 的<3 　[1 julia]1 >3

@ <1 event: B shakes with A >1

@ <2 name >2

@ <3 name >3

$A: 　[1 你好]1 / <1 请坐 // <2 >2 >1

@ <1 gesture: A shows the seat >1

 @ <2 event: A sits down >2

§ Negotiation

$B: 恩: / 俄: / 上次^我们 也谈了一下<1 >1 / 这个 // 　<2 合同 >2 // 就是大概的 / 谈了 一下 // 然后呢: , // 今天 / 我们讨论一些 细节问题 /// 这是我打印出 合同<3 样本 >3 <4 <5 /// >5 您看一下（ |7）您要是<6 / >6 有是么问题 // 你就// 现在跟我说 // 然后 　// 我们 看 // <7 讨论 >7 那^ // 商量一下 >4

@ <1 event: B sits down >1

@ <2 gesture: A nods >2

@ <3 gesture: A nods >3

@ <4 event start: A looks through paper >4

@ <5 event: B gives the paper to A >5

@ <6 event: B looks at the contract >6

@ <7 event: B twists right hand >7

$A: < // 俄: , // 这个是 你们提供的: , // 俄: , // 为我们提供的 / 客房的 // 俄: , // 类型 / 是吧: . >

@ < event stop: A looks through the paper >

$B: <1 对 >1/ 但是 我们 今天主要 <2 还是 //> 2 谈这个 / 豪华客房 / 因为: , <3 你上次也说了 / >3 主要可能 就集中在<4 这一个房型上 >4

@ <1 gesture: B nods >1

@ <2 event: B points at the paper >2

@ <3 gesture: B nods >3

@ <4 gesture: B nods >4

$A: 对, / 这个 // 会是我们 <1 用的最多的 >1 一个房型 / 因为 / 我们 主要的 / 员工 / 就 使用<2 这个, // 这个, / >2 这个 房型

@ <1 gesture: B nods >1

@ <2 gesture: B nods >2

$B: 对

$A: 那 / <1 关于 这个 价格问题^ // 俄: , <2 一千二百八十八/ >2 >1 这个 // 俄: , //据我所知 <3 略高于 >3 / 这个, / 同行业的提供的 / 价格

@ <1 event: B looks at paper >1

@ <2 event: A touches hair >2

@ <3 gesture: A nods >3

$B: <1 俄 : , // 当然^我就 / 怎么说呢 // 就是我们 / >1 自己酒店 <2 本身 / >2 也有 // 就是 // 既然定这个价格 / 肯定有他的理由 // 包括我们的服务 / 啊 / 是么 / 当然^就是 / 针对你们这样的<3 大客户 >3 / <4 肯定也是 >4 会有 一定的优惠的 /// <5 恩 : /// >5

你觉得 / 百分之十的优惠怎么样.

@ <1 event continued: B looks at the paper >1

@ <2 event: B twists hand >2

@ <3 gesture: A nods >3

@ <4 gesture: B nods >4

@ <5 event: B looks at the paper >5

$A: < // 百分之十的话 / 应该是:, // 一千一把吧 / >是吧. // [2 一千一左右]2

@ <event: A looks through the paper >

$B: < [2 对]2 > // 一千一 // 一点

@ < gesture: B nods >

A 但是:^ // 这不是 // 我们 // 因为我们 /<1 也不光是 >1 / 像您一个 酒店 来询价 //<2 还有别的酒店给我们 提供的价格 // <3 比:, // 这个价格还要低 //>3 >2 <4 而且 >4 各个别的配套设施的话 / <5 都差不多 >5 /<6 其实 >6

@ <1 gesture: B nods >1

@ <2 gesture: B nods >2

@ <3 gesture: A nods >3

@ <4 quick >4

@ <5 quick >5

@ <6 gesture: A nods >6

$B: <1 恩: , /// 俄：, >1 <2 // >2 因为怎么说呢 // 我们的酒店首先地理位置比较好 // 交通各方面都很方便 /// <3 对吧 / >3 <4 然后我们的配套服务: ^ // 就像你说的 / 人家可能也会提供一些 / 但是我们的配套服务^ / >4 就各方面都有 // 然后呢 / 也许会根据你不同的要求来 / 来 // 定制一些 / 特殊的 / 那个 / 服务

@ <1 hesitation sound: B >1

@ <2 chuckling >2

@ <3 quiet >

@ <4 event: B looks at the paper >4

$A: <1 恩 :, // <2 但是这个价格 >2 <3 我们还是觉得^ // 俄: , / 比我们的: ^ // >3 超出我们的预算了 >1

@ <1 event: B looks at the paper >1

@ <2 gesture: A shakes head >2

@ <3 slow >3

$B: <1 超出你们的预算了 >1 / <2 那 >2 能不能告诉我 / 你们的预算大概在什么样 / 一个价位

@ <1 gesture: A nods >1

@ <2 chuckle >2

$A: 我们: ^ / <1 >1 我们计算了一下应该是: , //<2 八百吧 // 八百左右 / >2 我们能够 / 接受 /// 喷 <3 而且我们不 / 不光是 / 定这一个客房 // 我们^ /// 就是 // 俄: // >3 高层过来的话还会定别的房型

@ <1 sigh >1

@ <2 gesture: B nods >2

@ <3 event: A looks through paper >3

$B: <1 嗯: // 这个我了解 />1 <2 但八百的话^ / 我觉得可能 // 有点 / 超出我的预期 // >2 因为毕竟<3 你想 / >3 就我们这个门市价通常只是单独是: // 房价 // 然后:^ // 其他还要另外再收<4 百分之十五 >4 的服务费<5 /// 我现在是:, / 给你一个百分之十的优惠 / 然后:, // 顺带也把这个百分之十五的服务费^也给免了>5

@ <1 gesture: B nods >1

@ <2 event: B looks at the paper >2

@ <3 event: B twists hand >3

@ <4 gesture: A nods >4

@ <5 event: A looks at the paper >5

$A: [3 恩]3

$B: [3 这样]3 一下来就 // 是一个很大的<比例>了

@ < gesture: B nods >

$A: <1   // <2 恩 >2 协议价已包含百分之 15 的服务费 >1

@ <2 event: A reads the paper >

@ <2 quiet >2

$B: [4 对]4

55

$A:　[4 然后　/]4 然后的话还要赠　/　还赠送　// [5 恩　/]5　早餐^

$B:　< [5 对　]5 >　每个房间　/　有一份免费早餐

@ < event: B twists pen >

$A:　//　那除了这些你们还提供别的服务吗^

$B:　< [6 恩.]6 >

@ < hesitation sound: B >

$A: [6 比如　]6 说　/　如果我们还会有　//　俄:, /　员工过来　/　到从[7 机场　]7

$B: [7 俄　]7<俄　>/　这个^// 这个^ /　机场接送　//　这个我们是可以安排的　//　然后　/　如果你们平时有需要用车的话　/　我们也可以协助安排车

@ < gesture: B nods >

$A: <1 恩　>1/　这个你们　/　你们能够保证^　//　俄: 就是　/　<2 能够保证　>2　//　俄　//　提供车来　/　如果我们需要的话　/　因为我们有时候不光是去机场　/　还要去别的地方开会什么的

@ <1 gesture: A nods >1

@ <2 gesture: A hand movement >2

$B: 我想　/　这个用车应该是没有问题的　/<　恩　/　这个我们可以保证　>

@ < quiet >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$A: 这需要提前预定吗^

$B: 恩　/　至少^要　//　用车的话　//　提前一天吧

$A: 恩　/　用车还要提前一天预定。

$B: 对　/　机场这个的话　// [8 我觉得　]8

$A: [8 机场保<1 ceng >1]8 <2　机场　>2　//　就是能够保证来　[9 接送吧　]9

@ <1 SO: zheng >1

@ <2 gesture: A nods >2

$B: < [9 对　]9　　> (|4)

@ < gesture: B nods >

$A: 这个　// /　价格呢^

$B: <1　喷　<2 >2 俄:, // <3　八百真的是有点:, ///　太低了/// >3 <4 要不我们大家各退一步　>4 /// <5 >5　差不多　/　百分之二十　/　剪掉　/　就是一千左右吧　/　一千^>1

@ <1 event: A looks through the paper >1

@ <2 sigh >2

@ <3 mumbling >3

@ <4 event: A touches hair >4

@ <5 sigh >5

$A: /// 一千< | >

@ < hesitation sound >

$B: //这样能接受吗^ /// 然后综合考虑我们其他各项服务啊 // 包括 / 我们免掉你的<

服务费啊 // 早餐啊 > 然后: /

@ < low pitch >

$A: 1000 这个价格来说 / 并不是具有很大优势 // 也就是 / 算是一个 / 俄:, / 俄, / 也有

别的酒店给我们提供这个价格 / 也算是一个普通的 / 一个 / 平均的一个 / 水平吧

$B: 恩 // 价格当然是一个很重要的因素 / 但是也要综合考虑其它因素 / 而且我们还可以

提供一些 / 会议室的 / 那个 /使用

$A: / <1 恩   是 / >1 <2 我们也是觉得你们公司^ // 各方面^ // 各方面^ // >2 还算 /// 你

们酒店各方面<3 还不错 / >3 然后 / 硬件和服务 / 都<4 还挺符合 >4 我们公司的 // 要求

的 /// 就是这个价格的问题 /// 俄: 你看你们还能 / 不能再降一些. /// 恩 / <5 另外就是

^ >5 / <6 你说这个年度用房数要在一百 / 间以上^ >6 // 这个我们恐怕达不到. /// 但是我

们能够保证 / <7 六十 / >7 每年/ 能够六十这个是最低我们能够保证 /// <8 但是一般来讲

// 按经验来说^ // >8 俄 / 都会比这个: <9 更高 >9

@ <1 low pitch >1

@ <2 event: B looks at paper>2

@ <3 gesture: B nods >3

@ <4 gesture: B nods >4

@ <5 loud >5

@ <6 event continued: B looks at paper >6

@ <7 gesture: B nods >7

@ <8 event: B looks at paper >8

@ <9 gesture: B nods >9

57

$B: <1 恩: /// 那 /// 我觉得^ // 就怎么说^ / >1 至少得八十吧 / 因为你说六十能保证 / 其实<2 离八十也差不远了 >2 /// 而且你们就是<3 除了 >3 本公司的员工可能还会有一些就是外方的 [10 专家]10 /// [11 我所谓]11 的就是说 / [12 不是你们公司的]12

@ <1 event continued: B looks at paper >1

@ <2 event: A touches hair >2

@ <3 event: B twists hand >3

$A: [10 是]10

$A: [11 是]11

$A: < [12 是]12 >

@ < gesture: A nods >

$A: 但是这个是不确定因素 // 我们 [13 现在不]13

$B: [13 对]13 <1 <2 但是我 / >2 我希望^能达到达到八十>1

@ <1 gesture: B hand gestures >1

@ <2 loud >2

$A: <1 对 >1 / <2 我们也希望 >2

@ <1 gesture: A nods >1

@ <2 mood: happy >2

$B: 对 / 我希望能 < 达 >// 我的意思是说 / <2 在合同上 / 我们能签上八十// >2 因为这个:, // 这样子 / 之后 // 如果你觉得 / 就是实在是<3 基于状况 >3 真的是没法达到 / 我们可以后期 / 再协调 / 再商量

@ <1 estimated full expression: da dao >1

@ <2 event: B goes through the contract >2

@ <3 gesture: A nods >3

$A: 但是 / 如果我们没达到的话 // 呃 :, // 有什么:,

$B: // 俄: 这样子^ / 这个上面 / 合同上是写的说 / 如果你要是就是一年下来 // 我们这合同是一年期嘛

$A: 恩

$B: <1 一年下来你要是没有达到这个 / 房间数的话 / 是合同自动中止 / >1 但是 / 其实对于今年的 // 来说 / 没有什么大影响 <2 >2

@ <1 event: B reads the contract >1

@ <2 gesture: A nods >2

$A: 额: // [14 合同就是一年的]14 / 对巴^

$B: [14 如果]14 / 如果你们的房间数差的不是太多 // 也许我们就 / 就不在追究过多的那个 / 俄 / 如果是差 / 差的太远的话^ // 我们就可能考虑稍微 // 稍微再< 追加 >一些费用

@ < gesture: B hand moBements >

$A: 啊 / 差的太多^ / 是指什么呢^ // 因为^ / <1 因为现在<2 六十 >2 我们可以 >1 保证给你

@ <1 quick >1

@ <2 event: B touches nose >2

$B: 恩

$A: 但是八十 我不能保证 (|4)

$B: <1 恩 <2 | >2 <3 >3 <4 差太远 / 我觉得 / 反正 / 不要>1 超过 / >4 <5 超过 20 吧. >5

@ <1 event: B looks though the contract >1

@ <2 hesitation sound >2

@ <3 sigh >3

@ <4 low pitch >4

@ <5 event: B leans back >5

$A: < 那就是说:^ /// 俄: (|3) >

@ <event: A moves body >

$B: < 对 / [15 其实]15 >

@ < event: B twists hand >

$A: [15 就是]15 /   那其实就是六十

$B: < 但是我还是希望写上 > 八十

@ < event: B nods >

@ < chuckling >

$A: /// 俄:, // <1 反正我们这边的情况我也告诉你了/ 八十不一定能够达到 >1 <2 / >2 但是

如果你要是每个 ／ 每年核对一次的话 ／ 因为我们的:, ／ 最后的合同也就是<3 签一年 >3/ 所以 [16 说]16

@ <1 event: B looks at paper >1

@ <2 event: B nods >2

@ <3 gesture B nods >3

$B: < [16 恩]16 >

@ < event: B nods >

$A: [17 这对于我们来说]17

$B: [17 我就是说< 如果^]17 真正履行下来 />没有达到我们的预期的话 ／ 只会影响来年的价格 ／ 对今年的影响并不是特别大

@ < event: B twists hand >

$A: ／／／ 哦 ／／ 还有就是这个 ／／／ 那个专家什么的 ／ 也是算在我们协议价格里面的对吧

$B: 对 ／ 对 /没错 /< 只要是以你们公司名义定的都是一个价格 >

@ < low pitch >

$A: < 哪还有就 ／ 是这个两个房间的价格 ／ 我比较感兴趣的这个 ／／ 豪华客房和行政套房这两个价格 ／ 这个你说是 >

@ <event: A looks through the paper >

$B: 一千

$A: 一千是吧 ／ 这个我们还要考虑一下 ／ 因为这个 /< 还是 >// 对我们来说还是 ／ 高了

@ < gesture: A shakes head >

$B: < 恩 : >

@ < chuckling >

$A: 那这个 ／ 行政 ／ 行政套房呢^ / 你们能够提供多少折扣

$B: 恩: ／／ 跟他一样吧 / [18 差不多也是百分之二十的折扣]18

$A: [18 百分之二十]18

$B: 因为 ／ 就真的再把服务费这块考虑上去 ／ 真的是非常大的一个折扣了

$A: 啊 ／ 那百分之二十就是 ／ 一千七百 ／ 是吧.

$B: 差不多// 一千七百的样子

$A: //因为这个 ／ 豪华客房我们的量会比较大 ／ 这个行政套房因为是 ／ 我们高层过来嘛 ／

因为这个 / 我们 / 不能保证数量 / 但是这个豪华客房的数量 / 我们是肯定能够< 保证的 >/// 再说 / 这个价格你们能不能适当再降一些^

@ < gesture: B nods >

$B: // 哦 / <1 最多<2 最多 >2 >1 剪掉百分之二十五 // 已经是:, // 真的是^ / <3 非常非常大 >3的优惠了/// 别的^ / 酒店 / 我不知道他们怎么跟你谈的 / <4 也许他们 >4 // 给的价格: /// 就也没有跟你谈很细 / 比如说服务费这块呀^ // 是不是免掉啊: // 我也不是很清楚 / 但是我觉得 / <5 我们这一块真的是做出了<6 很大的让步 >6 >5

@ <1 gesture: B shakes head >1

@ <2 sighing >2

@ <3 event: B nods >3

@ <4 gesture: A nods >4

@ <5 gesture: B nods >5

@ <6 gesture: A nods >6

$A: 恩

$B: 我觉得我们这个整体 / 包括服务啊^ //< 这个性价比应该是很不错的了 >

@ < gesture: B nods >

§ Agreement

$A: 我们 / <1 也是觉得 >1<2 你们酒店从各方面: 条件 / 也<3 都比较不错 >3 // 那 / 如果是百分之二十五的话 / 我算一下啊,/ <4 九百五十那行 >2 /// >4 第一个是百分之二十五第二个是百分之二十/ <5 是吧^ >5 // 那就没有什么问题了

@ <1 gesture: A nods >1

@ <2 event: A looks through paper >2

@ <3 gesture: B nods >3

@ <4 mumbling >4

@ <5 event: B writes on the paper >5

$B: <1 那 /<2 你要是觉得可以的话>1 >2/ 我到时候就把合同<3 更新一下 >3 // 然后 // 我先发个电子版给你看一下 // <4 你就最后核对 >4 // 如果没有问题 // <5 我们就找个时间签一下 >5

@ <1 event: A touches hair >1

@ <2 gesture: B nods >2

@ <3 event: B twists hand >3

@ <4 low pitch >4

@ <5 low pitch >5

$A: < 恩 / 可以 >

@ < gesture: A nods >

$B: 好 // 那你觉得什么时间比较合适呢

$A: 俄, // 看你的时间了吧

$B: 好

$A: 你先把电子版发过来我看一下 / 看没有 [19 什么问题的话]19 我们就签

$B: < [19 行 行 行]19 >那我今天一会回去 / 就把这个合同更新一下 // 到时候给[20 你发过来]20

@ < gesture: B nods >

$A: < [20 好/ 好]20 >

@ < event: A and B stand up >

@ < gesture: A nods >

§ Closing

$B: 谢谢!

$A: < 谢谢! >

@ < event: A and B shake hands >

$B: < 合作愉快 >

@ < event continued: A and B shake hands >

$A: 好的

§ End

@ Recorded activity ID:

@ Recorded activity date: 100426

@ Recorded activity title: Business negotiation between Chinese and Swedish

@ Short name: Negotiation 1

@ Transcription name:

@ Transcription System: GTS

@ Duration: 00:07:57

@ Participant: M = Manager of Volvo

@ Participant: B = Sales of hotel

@ Transcriber(s): Xue Wang   Chenyun Qiu

@ Transcription date: 100508

@ Transcription segments: All

@ Time coding: NO

@ Section: 1: Opening

@ Section: 2: Negotiation I

@ Section: 3: Agreement

@ Section: 4: Negotiation II

@ Section: 5: Closing

@ Section: 6: End

§ Opening

$C: hello ^

$B: <1 hey ^ >1 / i am <2 julia >2 from <3 jonhson ^ >3   <4 >4

@ <1 high pitch >1

@ <2 name >2

@ <3 name >3

@ <4 event : B shakes hands with C >4

$C: i'm <1 åsa^ >1 / <2 nice to meet you >2

@ <1 name > 1

@ <2 high pitch >2

$B: <   nice^ to meet you. > (|5)

@   <   giggle: C >

§ Negotiation

$B : < so: > i already sent you the sample contract by [1 email^]1

@ < event : B sits down >

$C: [1 yeah^]1

$B :   so maybe you have already: < // >

@ < uncertain   belonging of pause >

$C: <1 yeah: / i have contract >1 [2 here]2 / <2 >2 it is Very good   <3 / >3   thank you

@ <1 gesture: B nods >1

@ <2 event : C is looking through some paper >2

@ <3 gesture: C nods>3

$B: [2 yep]2   (so) do you have any < 1// >1 questions^ // [3 or]3 some <2 (…) >2

@ <1 gesture: B twists right hands >1

@ <2 mumbling >2

$C: [3 well]3 / < you know i like your hotel very much >

@ < chuckle: B >

$C: [4 so nice]4 so the mood and atmosphere and the staff / its all / eh / < very / very nice^ >//

but erm:,

@ < gesture: C shakes head >

$B: < [4 thank you]4 >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: the price will be an [5 issue.]5

$B: < [5 eh:]5 >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: i think the price is really for the:,   eh / for the (size) of people we bring in / erm: <1 >1 we <2

cant >2 really accept / erm: , this price <3 >3

64

@ <1 gesture: C nods >1

@ <2 gesture: C shakes head >2

@ <3 gesture: C nods   >3

$B: < erm / erm >

@ < gesture: B nods >

@ < event: B looks at the contract>

$C: <1 erm / >1   if we look at <2 the deluxe room: >2 [6 for instance]6

@ <1 event : C goes through some paper >1

@ <2 gesture: B nods >2

$B: [6 huh^]6

$C: may be i can go as far

$B: yeah

$C: as   six hundred kr or something /// because you know we will bring in a lot of guests

$B: <1 yeah >1 / erm / usually^ for   <2 / >2 <3 for client as your company^ >3 / erm / we could offer some special price^ / <4 [7 you know^]7 >4 for example^ /   maybe <5 ten >5 percent discount.

@ <1 gesture: B nods >1

@ <2 gesture: C nods >2

@ <3 gesture: B twists right hand >3

@ <4 gesture: B nods >4

@ <5 gesture: B figure gesture for ten >5

$C: < [7 huh^]7 >

@ < guesture: C nods >

$C: < yeah >

@ < gesture: C nods >

$B: so / what do you think our discount

$C: m: // i think we will need a little bit more //   m:

$B: <1 a [8 little bit]8 [9 more]9 >1 <2 >2

@ <1 low pitch >1

@ <2 chuckle>2

$C: < [8 m:]8 [9 yeah]9 > /   because you know

@ < low pitch >

$B: yeah

$C: erm: // i think it is very nice hotel^ but again / there are many nice hotels^ // here/   so // i really need to <1 find a hotel that is <2 competitive >2 >1

@ <1 gesture: B nods >1

@ <2 gesture: C nods >2

$B: yeah / and   besides the / <1 ten percent discount / we also   // er:m / >1 you know / because usually^ we we have to <2 charge >2 for the // <3 service fee^ >3

@ <1 gesture: B twists right hand >1

@ <2 gesture: B points at the paper >2

@ <3 high pitch >3

$C: < yep^ >

@ < gesture: M nods >

$B: it is fifteen percent so / (cost) fifteen percent is already twenty five percents even <1 / >1 <2 <3 i think^ it is quite good: // >3 <4 offer^ and er:m, // we also have [10 some]10 // >4   good services^ >2 for example^ / we can <5 arrange the bus >5 if you need^: <6 / >6 to / [11 to to]11 get the   people from the   airports^

@ <1 gesture: C nods >1

@ <2 event: C looks at the contract >2

66

@ <3 gesture: B nods >3

@ <4 event: B checks the contract >4

@ <5 gesture: B twists right hand>5

@ <6 gesture: C nods >6

$C: < [10 yep]10 >

@ < gesture: M nods >

$C: [11 huh]11

$B: yeah

$C: yeah

$B: [12 so i think]12

$C: < [12 so you could including]12 that   >

@ < event: C goes through the contract >

$B: < [13 yeah]13 >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: <1 [13 and]13 /// yea:h but i still think er: it is   ehm:, // >1 <2 too much >2

@ <1 event continued: C goes through the contract >1

@ <2 gesture: C shakes head >2

$B: <1 it is   too [14 much]14 OK! >1 <2 >2

@ <1 gesture: B nods >1

@ <2 chuckle >2

$C: [14 yea:h]14

$B: < so / so // what kind of price you expect >

@ < event: M goes through the contract >

$C: < m: // well i (dont know) > it's not depending on me

@ < event continued: C goes through the contract >

$B: < huh >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: completely / <1 it's eh / people from <2 Volvo^ >2 // erm: // but what do you say / six hundreds / seven hundreds / for a [15 normal room^]15 >1

@ <1 event: B looks at the contract >1

@ <2 name > 2

$B: [15 en]15

$B: <1 >1 er:m, <2 // >2 <3 you know   erm / i think six hundreds is / is // >3 <4 [16 too much (…)]16 >4

@ <1 sigh > 1

@ <2 hesitate sound: B >2

@ <3 event continued: B looks at the contract >3

@ <4 gesture: B twists right hand >4

$C: [16 so what what what is your price]16

$B: < erm / what what^ do you think of twenty percent discount / >   because erm

@ < event continued: B looks at the contract >

$C: twenty percent discount // what what that mean / for price

$B: its its roughly /   roughly < thousand >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: roughly a thousand

$B: < yep >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: < m: / yea:h i guess i could agree / [17 m:,]17 // on that one >

@ < event: C goes through the contract >

$B: [17 huh]17

$C: e:h / but then // < i think we would have to er:m / > include some other things

@ < event: B looks at the contract >

68

$B: < for example^ >

@ < gesture: B twists right hand >

$C: <1 eh / for example // <2 eh/ som:e // >2   conferece services^ // >1 [18 maybe you have that^]18 <3 yep >3

@ <1 event continued: C looks at the contract >1

@ <2 event: B looks at the contract >2

@ <3 gesture C nods >3

$B: < [18 yea:h that is for sure]18 >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$B : yeah / conference services^

$C: and also   er:m very good (dinner) food that (be)

$B: <1yeah />1 OH erm / <2 that's another thing >2 <3 / >3 we have / we / we can offer // free: breakfast^ per room

@ <1 high pitch>1

@ <2 event: B looks at the contract >2

@ <3 gesture: C nods >3

$C: yeah^ // < huh >

@ < gesture: C nods >

$B: huh

$C: <1 yeah^ // <2 then I think that would be // >2 that would be / >1 <2 nice but again we would have to >2 have a new contract [19 setting on]19 all of the details / but yeah / er:m

@ <1 event: C goes through the contract >1

@ <2 event: B looks at the contract >2

@ <3 quick >3

$B: < [19 yeah / yeah]19 >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: <1 er:m and <2 there is another thing // it's said erm / >1 2   <3 you see here that / >3 the

69

contract is for a hundred room nights guarantee

@ <1 event: C looks at   the contract >1

@ <2 event: B looks at   the contract >2

@ <3 event: C points the contract >3

$B: < yeah /   that's ture >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: erm i can't really guarantee you a hundred nights / just for < BolBo >people

@ < name >

$B: huh

$C: but we will / eh / have a lot of other people coming in^

$B: < huh >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: eh / from other companies^ // [20 erm]20 from universities^

$B: [20 yeah]20

$B: < huh >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: experts^ and so on // would be possible to including them   [21 and / and]21 in this erm /

one hundred nights guarantee

$B: < [21 yeah of course]21 >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$B: yeah

$C <1 cause then i think we could reach // reach the number but only for e:h // for <2   Volvo >2

i don't think so. >1

@ <1 event: C looks at the contract >1

@ <2 name >2

$B: er:m // our / er:m // i think it's ok^ /   < becau+ , >

@ < cutoff: because >

$C: so I can't really guarantee you

$B: because <1 because they are / they they <2 come here^ >2 / >1 and book the room <3

70

under your company name >3

@ <1 gesture: B twists right hand >1

@ <2 gesture: C nods >2

@ <3 gesture: B nods >3

$C: < huh^ >

@ < gesture: C nods >

$B: < that's ok >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: yeah

$B: that's ok

$C: yeah

$B: they can be included in < this number >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: huh^ / yeah / but i think it's so / eh/ < on the contract > we can't sign anything with hundred

on it // because i can't guarantee that

@ < event: C points the contract >

$B: m: // m: // < so how about ninety >

@ < event start: M looks at   the contract >

$C: m: //   i think er:m // <> could guarantee sixty

@ < event stop: C looks at   the contract >

$B: a:h / that is a little bit low

$C: a:h / ok / er:m / ye:ah / < then i might have to look > for another hotel // i think

@ <gesture: M shakes head>

$B: m: /// i think eighty / < eighty room nights > is [22 our]22 lowest discout

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: [22 eighty^ /]22 yeah

$C: yeah / that would be fine if we including the / the experts

$B: < yeah / it's / yeah >

@ < gesture: B nods >

71

$C: ok / so let's agree on the eighty / then

$B: < huh /yep >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: because / yeah // and the / the twenty percent discount i assume i would apply for other rooms as well /// cuz you know sometimes we could have executives come in^ / <2 [23 <1 an+ > 1 we]23   >2

@ <1 cutoff: and >1

@ <2 overlap: and we >2

$B: [23 er:m]23 < you mean you want //   a room a little bit higher level^ >

@ < gesture: B twists right hand >

$C: yeah

$B: < / yea:h / > that's considerable

@ < loud >

$C: yeah / so the discounts will apply for this case as well^

$B: < huh >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: m: // < that sounds very good >

@ < quiet >

$B: < yeah / and / do you have any problems with the payment^ >

@ < event: C looks at   the contract >

@ < event: B looks at   the contract >

$C: <1 o yes / payment // <2 er:m / >2 how how^ you / erm / yeah / how^ do we pay. >1

@ <1 event: C looks at   the contract >1

@ <2 event: C touching hair >2

$B: <1 erm / usually we will review / review every quarter^ / >1 every <2 three months >2

@ <1 event: B looks at the contract >1

@ <2 gesture: B twists right hand >2

$C: yep

$B: yep

$C: < huh^ >

@ < gesture: C nods >

$B: // what do you think of that

$C: every three months <1 /// >1 yeah^ / i think i could work with the schedule <2 as well^ >2 ///

and erm but we should satisfied with that service / how could be:

@ <1 gesture: B nods >1

@ <2 gesture: B nods >2

$B: e:h / of course /eh / you can contact me^ // and <1 we may discuss again^ / >1 [24 yeah]24

<2 maybe maybe >2 for some adjustments^

@ <1 gesture: B twists right hand >1

@ <2 gesture: B twists right hand >2

$C: [24 huh^]24

$C: < huh^ >

@ < gesture: M nods >

$B: < and er:m >

@ < quiet>

$C: yeah

$B: yeah

$C: <1 so i think / eh / if it's possible I think it would be good to put it in the contract /// >1 <2

because you [25 see]25 <3 / er:m /// er:m / the contract will be terminated >2 if we do not [26

satisfied]26 the room nights //   but i think it should be eh something <5 [27 <4 abo+ >4(…) if

the hotel i+, // +s]27 >5 >3

@ <1 event: C searches for the paper >1

@ <2 event: C points at the paper >2

@ <3 event: B looks at the contract and   points at the paper >3

@ <4 cutoff: about >4

@ <5 overlap: abou+ (…) if the hotel is >5

$B: [25 huh]25

$B: [26 yep]26

73

$B: [27 YES / < there is a term^ > about determinations]27

@ < loud >

$C: < m: // sorry >

  @ < gesture: M leans >

$B: < there is a term about [28 determinations]28 // yes // if you have [29 any problem^]29 /

or you can [30 just inform me]30 // and we may we may make some change [31 or]31 >

@ < event: C looks at   the contract >

@ < event: B looks at the paper >

$C: [28 ah / yes]28

$C: [29 ok / yeah]29

$C: [30 very good / yeah]30

$C: < [31 yeah / yeah]31 >

@ < quiet >

$C: that sounds very good

§   Agreement

$C: yeah / erm / so < you will be the contact person > [32 from your hotels^]32

@ < gesture: C nods >

$B: < yeah // [32 of course]32 > huh

@ < gesture: B nods >

$C: yeah / i will manger things from < Volvo >

@ < name >

$B: yeah / < so if everything is ok / > i will send you: a new^ / i mean / i will make the right price^

@ < event: B holds the paper >

$C: <   yep^   >

@ < gesture: C nods >

$B: and send you by email [33 first]33 and you check it^ /   if everything is ok^ then we < just

sign >

@ < quiet >

$C: < [33 huh]33 >

74

@ < gesture: C nods >

$C: yeah / ok

$B: < ok that's great^ >

@ < high pitch >

§   Negotiation II

$C: and then maybe / things work well^ / we can use your services for other things // <1 like >1

sending them around for language course^ /// <2 so somebody have some contacts or^ >2

@ <1 gesture: B nods >1

@ <2 low pitch >2

$B: // < what do you mean by language   course. >

@ < gesture: B leans >

$C:erm/   we will (decenting) a lot of employees now // and some of them will have to learn a

little bit Chinese^ /// [34 so]34 // er;m [35 if]35 everything goes well // i guess er:m

$B: < [34 huh^]34 >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$B: [35 er:m]35 yeah we may < help >/// [36 on this (…)]36

@ < gesture: B twists right hand >

$C: yeah^

$C: <1 [36 yeah]36 >1 it seems to be like er:m / yeah / <2 there is possibility to // >2

@ <1 gesture: C nods >1

@ <2 low pitch >2

$B: < yeah of course >

@ < gesture: B nods >

§   Closing

$B: < OK > that's good@ < giggle: M >

$B: ok / [37 that's it]37

$C: [37 so you will]37 er:m //   provide a new contract then^ / < then set the details [38 and]38

for this things >

@ < low pitch >

75

$B: < [38 yes absolutely]38 >

@ < gesture: B nods >

$B: ok / OK / that's good^

$C: ok <>

@ < chuckle >

$B: thank you^

$C: thank you

§ END

@ Recorded activity ID:

@ Recorded activity title: experimental role play of Swedish business negotiation

@ Short name: Swedish negotiation

@ Recorded activity date: 20100506

@ Tape:

@ Anonymized: yes

@ Access:

@ Activity type, level 1: office

@ Activity Purpose: To see how Swedish people negotiation in business

@ Activity Roles: Hotel sales, Manager of Vovol

@ Activity Procedures: They talk about the price and room nights, try to sign a win-win contract

@ Activity Environment: manager's office

@ Activity Artifacts: Desk, contract, pens

@ Activity Medium: face-to-face, spoken

@ Duration: 00:05:02

@ Participant: D (manager of Volvo)

@ Participant: D (hotel sales)

@ Transcriber: Qiu Chenyun   Wang Xue

@ Transcription date: 20100509

@ Transcribed segments: all

@ Transcription System: GTS

@ Time coding: no

@ Section: 1: Opening

@ Section: 2: Negotiation

@ Section: 3: Agreement

@ Section: 4: End

§ opening

$C: kom in<1 >1 <2 >2

@ <1 giggle >1

@ <2 event: C stands up >2

$D: hej^

$C: hej^ <åsa >

@ < name >

@ < event: C shakes hands with D >

$D: <1 åsa >1 <2 >2 / <3 karin >3

@ <1 name >1

@ <2 giggle >2

@ <3 name >3

$C: Bälkommen < >

@ < event: C and D sits down >

$D: tack < > eh / er:m /så

@ < giggle: C >

$C: < så, / ja >

@ < event: C touches hair >

§ negotiation

$D: ja du Bar intresserad aB hotellet / såg jag.

$C: < ja^ / precis / erm / jag fick ju det här kontraktet som du skickade. >

@ < event: C looks through the contract >

$D: m

$C: <1 Jag har tittat lite på det och det : // eh : //<2 BolBo >2 kommer ju >1 åka Bäldigt mycket till

kina nu / Bi kommer skicka mycke anställda hit / eh : // så att Bi är ute efter nåt såhär nåt bra

aBtal liksom

@ <1 event continued: C looks through the contract >1

@ <2 name >2

$D: a

$C: m: / och ah erat hotell <1Berkar Bäldigt braa: >1 / och mycke <2 treBlig <3 serBice >2 eh

åssådär / >3eh det är ju priset som Bi är lite sådär tBeksamma öBer att det är lite <4 Bäl högt >4

för

@ <1 gesture: C shakes head >1

@ <2 gesture: C nods >2

@ <3 gesture: D nods >3

@ <4 gesture: D nods >4

$D: ah

$C: för Båran budget så jag undrar om man skulle kunna göra nånting^ [1åt det]1

$D: [1 ja]1/ <1 Bi har ju möjlighet till nå(go)n sorts <2 [2 corporate rate]2 >2 >1 / $D: ehm: // men

då måste Bi har ju det är ju inom Bissa begränsningar då såklart men: <3 >3

@ <1 gesture: D nods >1

@ <2 event: C nods >2

@ <3 giggle: C >3

$C: [2 m]2 / ja

$D: måste jag se här lite hur Bi har tänkt oss^

$C: ja

$D: ja: // du kan få / det finns en rabatt på // du kan få // ehm: // femton procent rabatt kanske^

/

[3 tänkte Bi det blir]3 < fyrahundrafemti(o) kroner >

@ < event: D points at the paper >

$C: [3 femton procent aa]3 / okej

78

$D: på /// eh: / åtti aB dom här <1 tio hundra rummen >1 då [4 som ni är intresserade aB]4 /
det kan Bi nog gå med på tror [5 jag]5 / det blir ju /// a: / <2 det blir ju något lägre då än >2 Bad
Bi sa innan

@ <1 event: C leans forward >1

@ <2 giggle: D >2

$C: [4 okej /]4 a: / [5 kan ni aa]5 / aa // du tror inte att du skulle kunna gå ner liteee: // ge lite
mer för Bi kommer skicka Bäldigt många anställda // <1 ehm: / å det kommer >1 säkert bli eh: a
inte bara <2 BolBo > utan äBen utomstående experter / [6 å]6 professorer å sånt här // skulle det
kunna att gå att det aBtalet gäller äBen / för dom^

@ < gesture: D nods >

@ <2 name >2

$D: [6 m]6 / m

$C: ehm

$D: Bi har ju /// om <1 Bi kommer öBerens om >1 en corporate rate så har ni ju möjlighet till eh
buffèn å kommer ni [7 det]7 / en ytterligare en person då <2 aB era [8 gäster]8 >2 /   då blir det
hundra kroner extra på det / [9 för dom]9 iallafall för frukosten

$C: [7 aa]7 / [8 m]8 / [9 okej]9 / a

@ <1 gesture: D nods >1

@ <2 gesture: C nods >2

$D: <1 men Bi kan göra så >1 om Bi har det så så har kan Bi erbjuda /// eh / det här / ä(r) mitt <2
my last offer >2 <3   >   // det [10 tretti procent]10 // eh: / på // på samma då åtti rum aB dom /
[11 här hundra]11 å då blir det för åtti(o) dagar eller <4 åtti nätter >4

@ <1 event: D points at the paper >1

@ <2 loan language >2

@ <3 laugter: C, D >3

@ <4 gesture: D nods >4

$C: [10 okej / a]10 / [11 aa]11/ a

$D: så betalar ni endast niehundra < kroner då. > / [12 alltså per]12 natt

@ < event: D twists hand >

$C: [12 okej a]12 / a

$D: åsså är det ju å då kommer // resterande tjuge. < >

@ < gesture: C nods >

$C: m

$D: < till den Banliga rack rate >

@ < event: D points at the paper >

$C: okej

$D: men då har ni i såna fall / åtti(o) nätter till den / corporate rate

$C: a: / eh / < sen är det här i det här kontraktet som ja fick är det står det hundra nätter // ja är inte säker på att Bi kan > garantera hundra såhär från början / [13 ehm]13Bi kanske skulle kunna / fixa så det blir liiite lägre procent / kanske tjuge procent å lite lägre

@ < event: C points at the paper >

$D: [13 nää]13 / m

$C: rumnätter att eh nå(go)nting sånt

$D: a

$C: eh om Bi säger kanske åtti(o) [14 nätter]14

$D: [14 a ni räknar med] 14 åtti(o) nätter

$C: a

$D: ungefär / a: // ja / då kanske Bi kan // då får Bi säga som Bi [15 sa då]15 / eh // åtti nätter men tjuge procent [16 då]16 / [17 aa]17så att det a Bi måste också gå runt <1 >1 <2 >2 / < 3 >3 men /// eh

@ <1 laugter: C >1

@ <2 event: D touches hair >2

@ <3 laugter: D >3

$C: [15 aa]15 / [16 tjuge]16 procent [17 aa]17 / okej Bar det nåt mer Bi skulle: // diskutera här / om Bi / om Bi inte är nöjda^ med / aBtalet eh om Bi inte är nöjda med serBicen dåå:

$D: ja / precis.

$C: då står det här nå(go)nting också Ba om att eh Bi kan / < Bi kan aBsluta > eh a ni kommer aBsluta [18 om Bi inte]18 /   om Bi inte fullföljer / aa

@ < laughter: C >

$D: [18 Bi kommer]18 / <1 om inte ni fullföljer / a >1 <2 exakt. >2

@ <1 gesture: D nods >1

@ <2 event: D touches hair >2

$C: a

$D: å det är ju / det är det typiska Bi har med < alla Båra klienter >då

@ < gesture: C nods >

$C: a

$D: när Bi bokar

$C: m

$D: såna här < corporate contracts >

@ < gesture: C nods >

@ < loan language >

$C: aa

$D: så men: / a / å sen ser / du ju att det är olika < payments > olika det kommer till lite då [19 för]19 / inhouse gäster som ni [20 tar med]20 / och ehm: / och liknande

@ < loan language >

$C: [19 aa]19 / [20 a]20 / a just det a men [21 det]21 /   det låter bra men då kanske

$D: [21 men eh]21 / < men då ändrar // jag lite >

@ < loud >

@ <event: D points at the paper >

$C: a du kan ändra lite åsså mejla öBer det bara så kan jag titta på [22 det]22 / < sen undrade jag lite också det här med konferensserBice / å så kan ni hjälpa till lite med / med sånt med ordna rum // å eh /// mat åså till det å >

@ < low picth >

$D: [22 jättebra]22 / m

§ agreement

$C: det kan Bi / Bi kanske kan dela upp [23 det på ett]23

$D: [23 det får du]23a precis då får Bi ju [24 ta fram ett]24 / separat till det men det kan Bi

81

Berkligen hjälpa till med

$C: [24 separat kontrakt]24 / det kan ni göra det Bore jätteeebra

$D: < det är bara å säga till så kan Bi diskutera det >

@ < gesture: D nods >

$C: a

$D: kan Bi ta ett till möte till det

$C: okej

$D: a

§ closing

$C: a men då tackar jag så mycket < >

@ < laughter: C >

$D: ja ha det bra så länge

$C: hejdå

$D: hej < >

< giggle: C>

§ End

Appendix B

CONTRACT

HOWARD JOHNSON ALL SUITES HOTEL AND
VOLVO CAR
The parties agree that a minimum of 100 deluxe room nights of the following value are sold to Volvo Car from Jan.01, 2010 to Dec.31, 2010:
Room Category and rates

Room Category	SQM	Room Rate	
		Rack Rate	Corporate Rate
Deluxe Room	48m^2	KR1288	

Room Category	SQM	Room Rate	
		Rack Rate	Corporate Rate
Deluxe Suite	68m^2	KR1888	

·The rack rate are subject to 15% surcharge room only, the corporate rate inclusive 15% surcharge
·The rack rate excluvise breakfast, and the corporate rate have complimentary one buffet breakfast
  ·Additional buffet breakfast charges atKR100nett per person for in-house guest, need booking in advance
Remarks:
All above rates are only applicable for annual ____100____room night guarantee
The room nights production will be reviewed on quarterly basis.   The contract will be automatically terminated if the room nights production does not fulfill the agreed annual agreement.
Payment
All other charges including Food & Beverage expenses, telephone charges will be settled by the guest upon departure, unless alternate arrangement has been confirmed with the hotel's credit department.
Howard Johnson All Suites Hotel is honored to cooperate with Volvo Car!
Signature   Signature
Date   Dat
Place   Place

Appendix C

ROLE PLAY INSTRUCTION

Role Play Instruction A

This experimental Role Play is about a business negotiation between a Hotel salesman and a manager of administration department from a very famous international company. They are going to sign a cooperation contract so that company can use the hotel service, for example, the room, and food, with a better price.

Name: Julia

Position: Sales Executive

Company: **Howard Johnson All Suites Hotel Suzhou**

Role Play background: Because of the acquisition between Volvo Car Sweden and Geely Car China, there are more and more Swedish employees coming to China for conferences, business trip and other technical supports frequently. Ms Osa is responsible to arrange their accommodations in China. As the sales representative, you are trying to talk Ms Osa into signing an cooperate contract with your hotel so that the employees in Volvo Car group can be able to use many kinds of Hotel service with a better price. The only requirement is that Volvo Car group should guarantee to 100 room night per year. (Check contract, page 2, remarks). The contract will be automatically terminated if the room night's production does not fulfill the agreed annual agreement.

Job description: As a hotel Sales, you are on your second year in Sales and Marketing Department of Howard Johnson All Suite Hotel. You are waiting for your promotion to Sales Manager next month. As a result, this contract with Volvo Car is extremely important and you are full of enthusiasm for meeting with your client, Ms Osa, the manager of administration department of Volvo Car in Sweden. Your job is to persuade her to sign a cooperation contract with her. You have already introduced lot

of information about the hotel to Ms Osa, and she agrees to meet you again about 15mins to discuss the contract.

Negotiation Objective: Try to set a suitable rate for **Deluxe Room** with Ms Osa and sign the contract as soon as possible. There are some principles about this Sales negotiation.

1 Price The rack rate of Deluxe Room is around 1288 RMB. Usually, there is about 25%-10% discount for client company, however, since Volvo Car Group can probably bring very remarkable profit, there could be maximum 30% discount.

2 Acceptance: For validity to take effect a copy of this agreement should be signed and returned to the hotel within 14 days of issue of this agreement, otherwise, it is subject to renegotiations. This means you had better set the price as soon as possible.

3 The number of annual room night can be renegotiated but no less than 80 rooms.

You also should know r some advantages and disadvantages before negotiation.

Advantages	Disadvantages
Attractive Hotel Service Good location Ms Osa feels interested. As sale executive, you are able to give more offers when negotiation, for example, room service, car arrangement, conference discount. Volvo Company can pay the bill in the end of every season.	Only have 15 mins meeting with Ms Osa Have many other competitors hotels Price is not satisfied by clients

Role Play Instruction B

This experimental Role Play is about a business negotiation between a Hotel salesman and a manager of administration department from a very famous international company. They are going to sign a cooperation contract so that company can use the hotel service, for example, the room, and food, with a better price.

Name: Åsa

Position: Manager of Administration

Company: Volvo Car Group Sweden

Role Play background: Because of the acquisition between Volvo Car Sweden and Geely Car China, there are more and more Swedish employees coming to China for conferences, business trip and other technical supports frequently. As the manager of administration department of Volvo Car Group, you are responsible to arrange accommodations for your employees when they visit China. Next month, there is a big conference in Suzhou lasting 4days. The attendances are executives from different departments. You have to find a hotel with great events and conference experience as well as excellent room service. Recently, you find a good option called **Howard Johnson All Suites Hotel Suzhou** and contact Ms Julia, the sales representative from Howard Johnson. You are satisfied by the facility and professional management; however, the room rate is a bit out of budget. Ms Julia suggest you to sign a cooperation contact with the hotel so that Volvo group can get a cooperate price for living and other expenses in hotel. You have arranged meeting with her and are going to discuss the final rate of **Deluxe Room.** Since you are very busy, you hope the meeting would not last more than 15mins.

Job description: Since there is more communication between Volvo in Sweden and China, employees go to china for business trip almost every month. They usually stay in China around 5days for conferences or half month for technical supports. It is very

inconvenient for you to arrange the hotel and events manager every time so that you are thinking about sign a long tern cooperation contract with a Chinese hotel. There are several options for your consideration and **Howard Johnson** is one of them.

Negotiation Objective: After listen to Ms Julia's presentation, you are very interested in this Hotel. However, you are not sure how much room rate she will offer as a cooperate rate. Here are some other issues you need to confirm.

- The exact number of annual room night for Volvo Group. There are probably 30-40 employees coming to china and will stay in hotel for at least two nights per person.

- The contract lasts one year. You want to know how you are supposed to pay the bill and what if you are not satisfied with the service.

- Does the hotel arrange car to pick clients in airport?

- What other services your employees can have?

- Usually, you only need book Deluxe Room for employees, but some top managers are allowed to use better room. The budget for employees is under 1000 RMB and managers' under 2000RMB.

- Volvo group always invite experts from colleges, institutions and other companies for conferences. You hope these people can also share the cooperate price.

Appendix D

Ethnic consideration

We hereby that this recording is going to be used for research purposes, your names will be anonymous and it will not be published anywhere else.

Signature   Signature

Date   Date

Appendix E

Standard Comments

SOUNDS

@ < hesitation sound{: participant} > @ < puff{: participant} >
@ < inhalation sound{: participant} > @ < click{: participant} >
@ < laughter{: participant} > @ < clear throat{: participant} >
@ < chuckle{: participant} > @ < cough{: participant} >
@ < giggle{: participant} > @ < sneeze{: participant} >
@ < sigh{: participant} >
@ < snuffle{: participant} >
@ < yawn{: participant} >

PROPERTIES OF SPEECH

@ < ingressive > @ < low pitch >
@ < laughing > @ < quick>
@ < chuckling > @ < slow >
@ < giggling > @ < loud >
@ < sighing > @ < quiet >
@ < puffing > @ < shouting >
@ < coughing > @ < whispering >
@ < yawning > @ < mumbling >
@ < high pitch > @ < singing >

SPECIAL EXPRESSIONS CLARIFICATIONS

@ < SO: expression> @ < cutoff: word >
@ < estimated full
expression: expression >
@ < overlap: speech[speech >
@ < pronunciation: word > @ < overlap: speech]speech >
@ < loan language}: word}> @ < unclear: {speech}(...){speech} >
@ < name > @ < unclear: {speech}(speech){speech} >
@ < abbreviation > @ < incomprehensible >
@ < acronym > @ < alternatively: expr1, expr2, ... >
@ < letter >
@ < uncertain belonging of
pause >
@ < other language{ continued/start/stop}:
language >

89

@ < onomatopoetic > @ < parallel interaction integer >

ACTIVITIES AND MOODS
@ < event{ continued/start/stop}: description >
@ < gesture{ continued/start/stop} : {participant} {description} >
@ < mood: description >

RECORDING

@ < End of tape {side side}. Continued on {tape} {side side} >
@ < damaged: tape damage-description>
@ < not transcribed{: description} >

NON STANDARD

@ < comment: description >