

evaluating how appropriate it would be to use this tactic in the context specified above, based on the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all appropriate			Somewhat appropriate			Very appropriate

(If you have any need to explain your rating on a tactic, please do so in the margin or at the end/back of the questionnaire.)

Rating

1. Promise that good things will happen to your opponent if he/she gives you what you want, even if you know that you can't (or won't) deliver these things when the other's cooperation is obtained. \_\_\_\_\_
2. Intentionally misrepresent information to your opponent in order to strengthen your negotiating arguments or position. \_\_\_\_\_
3. Attempt to get your opponent fired from his/her position so that a new person will take his/her place. \_\_\_\_\_
4. Intentionally misrepresent the nature of negotiations to your constituency in order to protect delicate discussions that have occurred. \_\_\_\_\_
5. Gain information about an opponent's negotiating position by paying your friends, associates, and contacts to get this information for you. \_\_\_\_\_
6. Make an opening demand that is far greater than what you really hope to settle for. \_\_\_\_\_
7. Convey a false impression that you are in absolutely no hurry to come to a negotiated agreement, thereby trying to put time pressure on your opponent to concede quickly. \_\_\_\_\_
8. In return for concessions from your opponent now, offer to make future concessions which you know you will not follow through on. \_\_\_\_\_
9. Threaten to make your opponent look weak or foolish in front of a boss or others to whom he/she is accountable, even if you know that you won't actually carry out the threat. \_\_\_\_\_
10. Deny the validity of information which your opponent has that weakens your negotiating position, even though that information is true and valid. \_\_\_\_\_
11. Intentionally misrepresent the progress of negotiations to your constituency in order to make your own position appear stronger. \_\_\_\_\_
12. Talk directly to the people whom your opponent reports to, or is accountable to, and tell them things that will undermine their confidence in your opponent as a negotiator. \_\_\_\_\_
13. Gain information about an opponent's negotiating position by cultivating his/her friendship through expensive gifts, entertaining, or "personal favors." \_\_\_\_\_
14. Make an opening demand so high/low that it seriously undermines your opponent's confidence in his/her ability to negotiate a satisfactory settlement. \_\_\_\_\_
15. Guarantee that your constituency will uphold the settlement reached, although you know that they will likely violate the agreement later. \_\_\_\_\_
16. Gain information about an opponent's negotiating position by trying to recruit or hire one of your opponent's teammates (on the condition that the teammate bring confidential information with him/her). \_\_\_\_\_

Your instructor will give you a scoring key. This key will permit you to determine your "scores" on five different groups of tactics represented in this questionnaire.

Group 1, *Traditional Competitive Bargaining*, represents an aggregation of traditionally accepted tactics which are frequently advocated as necessary to successful distributive bargaining. Research shows that people who see these items as appropriate also tend to see them less as "types of deception" or dishonesty, and more as simply common tactics to be used in a distributive bargaining context. Given the general description of distributive bargaining presented earlier in this volume, the tactics are generally oriented toward maintaining the secrecy of one's own position, sending out false cues that will throw the opponent off the track, and thwarting the attempted secrecy of the opponent.

Group 2, *Manipulation of Opponent's Network*, represents a class of negotiation tactics in which the objective is to undermine the negotiator's support system within his/her constituency—talking to one's boss or one's network and undermining the negotiator's support, encouraging erosion of his support through defections, or threatening to embarrass the opponent. Most negotiators understand the implicit (or often explicit) pressures on them by constituents to appear strong and competent, and the powerful impact that a negative evaluation can have on loss of face. They know that it is important to maintain the broader relationship with others "outside" the boundaries of a 1:1 negotiation.

Group 3, *False Promises*, includes tactics which use deception to force an opponent into dealing with the negotiator directly. These might be labeled as the common bag of negotiator dirty tricks, including making promises you don't intend to keep, or having your constituency do the same things. The common element in this group of tactics is that they use the power of future rewards to pressure the opponent to comply with the negotiator directly, but then renege on the actual follow-through in delivering these rewards.

Group 4, *Misrepresentation of Information*, includes tactics in which information is distorted in some manner to a "significant other" in negotiation—either to the opponent or to your constituency. While the tactics differ in the reasons why they are performed—justification of position, retribution against an opponent, preserving confidentiality or face saving—and while the respondents define sharp differences in the perceived appropriateness of the tactics, the common theme of misrepresentation unites them.

Finally, Group 5 is *Inappropriate Information Gathering*. This factor includes those items that address various forms of gathering information by paying for it, bribery, personal favors, and so on. The commonality in these tactics is not one of truth distortion, but of "cheating" on the informal rules of negotiation by paying for information which one would not otherwise have available. These tactics are included in a list of unethical negotiation tactics because many people clearly feel that negotiation should be a process of information which is freely gained and offered; "paying" for information or for leverage in negotiation is an inappropriate thing to do.

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What were your scores on each of the five categories? Do these scores surprise you? Why or why not?