



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

## Ethical Negotiation Tactics Among Students at Land Grant Universities

Gregory M. Perry  
Patricia A. Duffy  
Lindon J. Robison  
Clair J. Nixon\*

---

\* The authors are Professor in Agricultural and Resource Economics at Oregon State University, Professor in Agricultural Economics at Auburn University, Professor in Agricultural Economics at Michigan State University, and Associate Dean in the Mays College of Business at Texas A&M University. Selected paper presented at the WAEA meetings, Long Beach, California, July 29, 2002.

## **Ethical Negotiation Tactics Among Students at Land Grant Universities**

In the past decade, U.S. citizens have witnessed a number of ethical and moral scandals among leaders in both the public and private sectors. Often the individuals involved in these activities seem to have little regard for even the basic standards of honesty. The examples are numerous. National attention was riveted on the Clinton Presidency, because of concerns about ethics and honesty. President Clinton repeatedly denied having extramarital affairs, but later conceded that he had been involved in relations with at least two women. One might expect that this disclosure by the leading executive officer of the United States has had a profound impact on the relative ethical perceptions of young adults. Widespread ethical scandals have also affected the business sector. Enron Corporation's recent filing for bankruptcy revealed a string of moves designed to deceive shareholders and the public about the company's true financial status, while protecting and enriching its corporate leadership. According to the Center for Public Integrity, about two-thirds of the American people believe that the questionable accounting practices employed by Enron are common among U.S. corporations (Lewis). Further, the largest public accounting firm in the United States, Arthur Andersen, has disintegrated because of scandals surrounding its business practices involving Enron and other firms. In a recent speech, Richard Walker, until July 2001 the director of enforcement for the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, noted that young people's lack of an ethical compass came up again and again as he enforced cases of security fraud.

These scandals have brought about an increased public interest in tying personal value systems to business practices. Negotiation situations, in particular, provide an interesting context to study ethical decision-making. Individuals in all walks of life are involved in negotiation situations, whether it be at work, in family relationships, or in dealings with other members of the community. Mintzberg (1973) found that

managers spend significant time either dealing with disputes among others or negotiating for things that are important to their job performance. Further, Burr argues that there is much more legal freedom to behave unethically in the negotiation process rather than once an agreement has been reached.

There is, however, no consensus among scholars as to what constitutes ethical behavior in negotiations. For example, Henderson argues that rather than engaging in reciprocal deception, one party should terminate a negotiation if they believe the other party is not behaving honestly, fairly and in good faith. Dees and Cramton, by contrast, argue that when it's not feasible to establish grounds for trust, one is justified in using otherwise immoral practices. Some ethicists view bluffing as acceptable under certain circumstances, others say such behavior should never be condoned (Provis). A major component influencing the acceptability of negotiation tactics is the level of trust between the parties involved. Trust is, of course, a direct product of social capital, that is, the building of positive relationships between parties.

A number of researchers have attempted to categorize various types of questionable ethical practices and investigate how various demographic, personality and situational characteristics influence ethical behavior. Lewicki and Robinson, for example, found that traditional bargaining techniques enjoy widespread acceptance among the individuals they surveyed, whereas bluffing was generally not something most individuals were willing to do. They found that males were more willing than females to engage in most unethical behaviors. Nationality and cultural background also had some impact on ethical behavior. Further, individuals who rated themselves as aggressive in negotiation situations were more likely to engage in more questionable tactics.

Although the research by Lewicki and others provide a foundation for understanding particular demographic and other characteristics that may influence ethical behavior, a number of individual characteristics have yet to be explored. For example, the difference between individuals from urban

versus rural communities has not been considered. As Tweeten notes:

“[Agricultural fundamentalism] holds that there is something special and unique about the farm way of life. It holds that farmers are more dependable and stable politically than city-dwellers. It maintains that farmers have a higher moral character, exemplified by honesty, integrity and reliability... Agrarian fundamentalism holds that farming is a divine calling and that God and man walk hand in hand to supply the physical needs of mankind.”  
(Tweeten, p. 7)

At first glance, it may appear that negotiation ethics is far a field from basic topics in economics. Yet, there is, in fact, substantial common ground. Much of game theory in economics, like negotiation situations, revolves around understanding the other person's situation and predicting how that person will respond in a given situation. How many times two individuals will negotiate for goods and services, the level of trust between them, and the nature of their relationship become important factors influencing the predicted outcomes from game theory and common business negotiations. Experimental economic analysis suggests that individuals frequently settle for inefficient outcomes relative to those predicted by game theory (Roth). Researchers in psychology conclude that negotiators consistently do not maximize their own outcomes for various reasons. For instance, many negotiators not only focus on their own self-interest but are also concerned about the well being of others (Kahneman, Knetsch and Thaler).

A key piece in a negotiation situation is the nature of relationships between the involved parties. If an individual has a positive relationship with the another party and desires to maintain that relationship, he (she) is likely to not behave in a self-interested manner as is commonly assumed in game theory settings. Instead, the individual may want to negotiate in a manner that allows both parties to gain from the experience. Bazerman et al. argue that, in these cases, negotiated outcomes will actually be integrative (win-win) and superior to those identified using the limiting assumptions of game theory.

Fells observed that:

“Trust between parties is viewed as an integral – if not central – feature of the effective

and productive work relationships; a lack of trust between management and unions, or between employer and employee, is often suggested as the cause of disputation and of an inability to work through problems to satisfactory solutions." (p. 33)

Highly ethical behavior can build relationships and reduce transaction costs between parties. On the other hand, when one party is completely open and honest and the other party is totally dishonest, the honest party can experience significant transaction costs.

Most quantitative analysis in this area has been relatively simple, involving analysis of variance based on particular characteristics. For example, Lewicki and Robinson found that Harvard MBA students were more likely than Ohio State University MBA students to use a number of unethical bargaining tactics and that males were more likely to be unethical than females. No mention was made as to the relative proportion of male vs. female students at the two universities. It is entirely possible that the differences between the two universities occurred because Harvard had a greater proportion of male students. One way to sort out this type of cross variable effect is to use multivariate regression techniques.

The primary objective of this study is to extend the work of Lewicki and others in two significant ways: (1) to simultaneously examine a broad set of factors that may or may not influence negotiation ethics and (2) to use multivariate regression analysis to differentiate the influence of these factors on ethics in negotiation situations.

### **Data Set and Variables Considered**

The population to be analyzed in this study involved students enrolled at four Land Grant universities representing different regions of the United States. Besides being a relatively easy population to survey, they are also an interesting group to study. Most college students are making the transition to personal and economic independence, which includes living on their own and working to support

themselves. Few are currently employed full time in a career path, but most anticipate launching into a career within a few years.

The actual survey instrument was developed by Robinson, Lewicki and Donahue. It poses 16 situations in which questionable ethical behavior may be employed in negotiating a solution. Each respondent is asked to use a 1-7 Likert scale to indicate how appropriate it would be to use these negotiating tactics. The questions are designed to evaluate five key factors (or categories) of unethical bargaining tactics: (1) traditional, competitive bargaining, (2) attacking an opponent's network, (3) misrepresentation/lying, (4) misuse of information, and (5) false promises. To this list of questions were added a number of demographic and personal attitude questions designed to reveal factors that might influence the negotiation ethics of each respondent.

The survey was administered to undergraduates at Auburn University, Michigan State University, Oregon State University, and Texas A&M University. So that students would feel comfortable in being candid in their responses, the surveys were not numbered and no attempt was made to associate responses with particular students. Because of interest in the issue of agrarian ethics, the focus was on students in agricultural fields. However, some students with majors in business, environmental sciences were also included in the survey population to capture differences between career paths.

A number of attitudes, behaviors, and demographic characteristics were proposed to explain why the survey population might choose to behave in an ethical or unethical manner.

- Relationships are a key component in trust between parties and, in turn, influence how unethical parties are willing to be. In the survey, respondents were asked to evaluate each negotiating dilemma when they did not expect to negotiate with this person again and also if the person was a colleague they expected to deal with many times in the future.

- Several studies have shown that older individuals are, in general, significantly less likely to use marginally ethical tactics than their younger counterparts (Robinson, Lewicki, and Donahue; Robinson). The relationship of age to work experience has also been found to have a positive correlation with ethical behavior (Robinson, Lewicki, and Donahue). Age was hypothesized in this study to be directly related to higher ethical standards.
- Gender has been considered in numerous previous studies. The results consistently show that men are more willing to behave unethically than women.
- Lewicki and Robinson found that students who rate themselves as more cooperative were less willing to engage in questionable ethical practices. Survey recipients were asked to rate themselves as aggressive or cooperative on a 1-7 scale, and this variable was included in the analysis.
- Lewicki, Saunders and Minton suggest that students with backgrounds in engineering, science and mathematics are more likely to engage in unethical negotiation behaviors when compared to those majoring in arts, business and the social sciences. The target population of this study was students in the agricultural sciences, a population not considered in previous studies. Another important population to be considered includes those in the environmental sciences. Business students was also included to identify potential attitudinal differences between agricultural and non agricultural students.
- As was noted before, the idea of agricultural fundamentalism holds that farmers and farm families hold to higher ethical standards. As a first step to addressing this complicated issue, students were asked to indicate the size of the town where they attended high school.
- Hassett found that individuals who had a stronger commitment to a particular religious



philosophy were less likely to behave unethically. Measuring religious commitment is also not as straightforward as it appears. For example, an individual may profess to be a very religious person and yet not participate in any kind of organized religion. It was thought that frequent participation in religious services might well motivate individuals to behave more ethically in negotiation situations.

- It is highly probable that many individuals have a desire to be kind and caring to others, which may or may not be the result of religious convictions. Those with such attitudes towards humanity may well have higher ethical standards and be less willing to use unethical negotiating techniques. This attitude of compassion towards humanity may be demonstrated by giving to those who are less fortunate, either financially in charitable donations or through in-kind community service. To test this hypothesis, students were asked to estimate, over the past year, the percent of income they gave to charitable causes and hours of community service.
- There are a number of activities and programs offered to youth in an attempt to build character and prepare them for adulthood. Some of these may well influence ethical standards, including those guiding negotiating behavior. Students were asked to indicate whether they had participated in one or more of eight activities during high school. Each activity was hypothesized to motivate students to increase their ethical standards.
- Another characteristic that has been overlooked in previous studies is the influence of income on ethical behavior. Students from high income families might be expected to have different ethical values from those in low income families. Students were asked to indicate the range of their family's income among six possible categories.

- Students were surveyed in four different regions of the United States. Some of these areas have characteristics in common that are likely to be picked up by other variables already discussed. Of interest here was whether, after accounting for differences in religious activity, size of hometown, family income level, and previous life experiences, were there still differences in ethical behavior tied to the region of the country?

### **Statistical Summary of Results**

A total of 584 responses were received from students at the four universities. Undergraduates were the dominant group surveyed at all four universities and, consequently, average student age was nearly the same for all four populations surveyed. Work experience was also very similar at all schools except Texas A&M, where students had very little full-time work experience. Survey populations at Auburn and Michigan State were heavily weighted toward students majoring in Agricultural Economics, Agribusiness Management, or closely allied fields, with a few students in other agricultural sciences, business or the environmental sciences. Students at Texas A&M were exclusively business students. Oregon State students came from a broader set of fields in agriculture and environmental sciences.

As expected, students at Auburn and Texas A&M participated at much higher levels in religious services. About half of all students at these two universities attended religious services at least once per week. By contrast, about half of the students at Oregon State and Michigan State essentially never attended religious services. A similar contrast existed in the area of home- town size. About half of all students at Auburn and Oregon State graduated from high school in towns of 10,000 or fewer. About half of the Michigan State and Texas A&M students, by comparison, were from cities of 50,000 or more.

Regarding youth activities, the results were generally consistent across schools in the areas of Boy/Girl Scouts, high school sports, high school leadership, participation in high school service groups, and

music/theatre participation. A much higher percentage of Auburn and Oregon State students were involved in 4-H or FFA, consistent with the higher percentage of students from small towns. Membership in the high school scholastic honor society is a good indicator of the average academic caliber of students surveyed at each school. Over 80 percent of the Texas A&M students participated in a high school honor society, compared to only 34 percent for the Michigan State students.

Charitable giving was found to strongly correlate with participation in church services. Charitable giving also tended to increase with student age, community service and participation in musical/theatrical groups. Community service results exhibited somewhat different relationships. Students at Oregon State gave an average of about 40 hours of service per year, or more than twice the rate of service among students at Auburn and Michigan State. Service was most strongly related to participation in 4-H/FFA, Boy/Girl Scouts, high school service clubs and charitable contributions.

Overall, students at all four universities rated themselves about neutral on the aggressive/cooperative scale. Students at Oregon State were a bit more likely to be cooperative (4.4) than students at Auburn. Further investigation revealed no clear reason for differences in the aggressive/cooperative ratings, although students tended to rate themselves as more cooperative if they came from smaller communities or frequently participated in religious services. Students who participated in 4-H/FFA tended to be more aggressive.

There were also substantial differences in family income levels among the various universities. Nearly half of the Oregon State students came from families earning less than \$50,000 per year. At the other extreme, nearly 70 percent of all students surveyed at Texas A&M came from families earning \$75,000 or more per year. These results at least partially explain the differences in years of work experience between students from the two schools.

Students at Michigan State, Oregon State and Texas A&M were asked to identify those individuals who have had significant influence in shaping their ethical standards in negotiation. Parents were influential with 90 percent of respondents. Teachers were the next most influential, impacting the lives of about two-thirds of all respondents. Other relatives, employers and coaches also were influential with a substantial segment of the survey group.

### **Summary of Ethics Results**

A summary of the average scores by university for the 16 negotiation scenarios posed in the survey are provided in Table 1. In general, Texas A&M students were less willing to engage in unethical behavior, with Michigan State students generally being most willing to behave in less than ethical ways. Specific results are summarized by the five groupings used to categorize the 16 survey questions.

*Attacking the Opponent's Network* – Respondents found these techniques to be the most inappropriate when dealing with strangers, with an average score of 2.11. They were even more undesirable when dealing with colleagues, with an average score of 1.56. By contrast, MBA students surveyed by Robinson, Lewicki and Donahue found this factor to be much more acceptable, with an average score of 3.03.

*Making False Promises* – This was the most undesirable technique when dealing with colleagues, with an average score of 1.55. The average score when dealing with strangers was 2.22, for a difference of 0.67. This was a relatively large difference between the two scores, suggesting that individuals are less willing to directly lie to colleagues than they are to use other marginally ethical techniques. The average score for the MBA students was 2.06.

*Inappropriate Information Gathering* – Respondents scored this factor as more acceptable than making false promises or attacking an opponent's network, but only when dealing with strangers (2.54).

The score when dealing with colleagues was 2.06, for a difference of 0.48. The average score for MBA students was 2.36.

*Misrepresentation* – The MBA students surveyed by Robinson, Lewicki and Donahue found this factor to be the least acceptable, with an average score of 1.91. By contrast, the students surveyed in this study found misrepresentation to be more acceptable than the previously mentioned tactics, with an average score of 2.61 for strangers and 2.02 for colleagues.

*Traditional Competitive Bargaining* – These tactics were the only group that was considered somewhat appropriate on average, with an average score of 4.70 for strangers and 3.92 for colleagues. Nevertheless, these scores were well below the average scores for the MBA students at Harvard and Ohio State (5.50). In addition, the difference between stranger and colleague scores was the highest for this factor group (0.79), suggesting significant reluctance to utilize these techniques on colleagues.

### **Regression Results**

The mean scores, discussed in the previous section, clearly show differences in scores for the 16 negotiation scenarios presented to students at the four universities. The next step in the study was to sort out these differences and identify those characteristics that seemed to influence ethical negotiating attitudes. Regression models were created for each of the 16 questions, using rankings for negotiations with strangers<sup>1</sup> as the dependent variable. Independent variables originally considered for the model included age, work experience, frequency of church attendance, size of hometown, activities involved in as a youth, college major, hours of service, percent of income donated to charity, participation in an internship, involvement in a family business, family income level, approach to negotiations, and university attending.

Initial analysis revealed a high (0.645) level of correlation between age and work experience.

---

<sup>1</sup> Results for colleagues were much the same as those for strangers on any given question, except that models for colleagues consistently had lower measures of fit and fewer significant coefficients.

Because age was thought to be a better variable to capture the impact of experience on negotiation ethics, the work experience variable was dropped prior to estimation. Charitable giving was also relatively highly correlated with the frequency of church attendance (-0.397), so charitable giving was also excluded from the models to be estimated.

Each model was of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
 SR = & \mathbf{b}_0 + \mathbf{b}_1 AGE + \mathbf{b}_2 MALE + \sum_i \mathbf{g}_i CHATT_i + \sum_j \mathbf{d}_j HOME_j + \sum_k \mathbf{l}_k MAJOR_k + \sum_l \mathbf{a}_l ACTIVITY_L \\
 & + \mathbf{b}_3 SERVICE + \mathbf{b}_4 INTERN + \mathbf{b}_5 FAMBUS + \mathbf{b}_6 APPROACH + \sum_m \mathbf{h}_m INCOME_m \\
 & + \sum_n \mathbf{q}_n SCHOOL_n
 \end{aligned}$$

Where  $SR_i$  is the Likert scale ranking for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  negotiation scenario involving a stranger,  $AGE$  is the age of the student and  $MALE$  is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the student is male.  $CHATT_i$  is a series of dummy variables representing the five religious service participation options, with  $i=1$  for students attending religious services 8+ times per month and  $i=5$  for students who attend less than once per month.  $HOME_j$  is a series of dummy variables representing the size of the town where the student attended high school, with  $j=1$  representing a town of less than 1000 people and  $j=5$  representing a city of over 250,000 people.

$MAJOR_k$  is a series of dummy variables representing the various majors of the students. More than a two dozen majors were represented in the study, but these were combined into six groups: (1) Agricultural Economics, Agribusiness Management and allied majors (ABM), (2) other majors in agricultural sciences, particularly general agriculture, animal science, horticulture, and crop science/agronomy (AG), (3) business (BUS), (4) environmental sciences, including natural resources, fish and wildlife, and forestry (ENV), (5) Engineering and allied majors (ENG), and (6) a miscellaneous category of about two dozen observations, most of which are students not pursuing any major (MISC).

ACTIVITY<sub>i</sub> is a series of dummy variables representing the various youth activities that students may have participated in as outlined earlier. SERVICE is the estimate of community service hours each student reported, INTERN is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the student had participated in an internship experience, and FAMBUS is a dummy variable equal to 1 if student had been involved in a family farm or other family business. APPROACH is the student's self-assessment of how aggressive/cooperative he/she is in negotiations. INCOME<sub>m</sub> is a series of dummy variables representing various income levels, with m=1 representing the less than \$10,000/year level and m=6 representing the over \$125,000/year level. SCHOOL<sub>n</sub> is a series of dummy variables representing the four schools involved in the study (OSU, MSU, AUBURN and TAMU).

To avoid singularity problems in the estimation process, one category dummy variable in each series of dummy variables was dropped in estimation: The dummy variables CHATT<sub>1</sub>, HOME<sub>1</sub>, MISC, INCOME<sub>6</sub> and OSU were dropped from the model prior to the estimation process. This means that the default scenario was a female student pursuing a miscellaneous major at Oregon State University, attending religious services 8+ times per week, from a town of less than 1000 people, participating in no activities as a youth, no internship or family business experience, and from a family with an income above \$125,000 per year. Each model was estimated using the EVIEWS statistical software package. Because of incomplete surveys, the actual sample size used in the regression models was 526 observations.

The regression results are summarized and reported based on the five factor groupings. Only the regression results for scenarios 3, 9, and 12 (Attacking the Opponent's Network) are provided in this paper. Men were more likely to engage in all three of these marginal tactics by a statistically significant margin. Also significant in all three cases was the approach of the individual, with more cooperative individuals being less willing to engage in unethical behavior. A number of other variables seemed to have no impact

on the negotiation ethics of students. Specifically, the student's hometown, community service, and internship experience were not statistically significant variables in any of the three equations. It is noteworthy, however, that students involved in honor society were consistently more willing to engage in unethical behavior, whereas students involved in sports, service clubs and high school leadership were less likely to engage in said behavior.

Consistent with Lewicki, Saunders and Minton, engineers tended to be more willing to embrace marginally ethical tactics than did business students. The ABM students exhibited essentially the same ethical standards as the business students. The environmental science students were least willing among the major categories to use techniques to attack an opponent's network.

Age exhibited a negative relationship in all three equations, although it was not statistically significant in the question 3 equation. Caution is in order regarding the age variable, however, because 90 percent of the respondents were ages 18-23. More surveys of older individuals are needed before suggesting confidence in the magnitude and statistical significance of these coefficients.

Attendance at religious services was influential in questions 9 and 12, that is, students who attended services less than once per month were significantly more likely to engage in these marginally ethical tactics than students who attended 8 or more times per month. Attendance had no impact in question 3, suggesting that ethical standards at work when a person tries to get someone else fired transcend any kind of religious instruction. Income had no influence in questions 3 and 12, but it was very influential in question 9. Specifically, students from families making more than \$125,000 per year were much more willing to find it acceptable to threaten to embarrass a fellow employee in front of his/her boss than those from lower income categories.

Questions 3 and 9 also exhibited some significant regional differences. Michigan State students



were significantly more willing to get an opponent fired than students at the other three universities.

Michigan State and Auburn students were significantly more likely than Oregon State students to make their opponent look foolish in front of his/her boss.

Results for other equations are not provided here, but are available from the authors upon request.

Results for all 16 questions are included in the next section.

### **Conclusions and Further Research**

This analysis extends the previous work of Robinson, Lewicki, and Donahue by utilizing a number of demographic and experience attributes and examining them in a multivariate regression framework. In addition to opening new avenues of further research, a number of interesting results were obtained.

- Men were significantly more likely than women to find marginal negotiation techniques acceptable. The differences seemed to be greatest in the area of inappropriate information gathering. Unlike the findings in the study by Robinson, Lewicki, and Donahue, our results suggest women are adverse even to using traditional competitive bargaining techniques.
- As expected, students were less willing to engage in marginal ethical behavior with colleagues than with friends. There were notable differences in this “gap” between treatment of colleague versus strangers, however. The gap was widest for traditional competitive bargaining, suggesting students were much more willing to use these techniques on strangers than on colleagues. The gap was narrowest for the area of information gathering, indicating that a more universal standard was being applied across all individuals.
- Age always had a negative impact on willingness to engage in marginal tactics, meaning that older students tended to be less willing to behave unethically in negotiations. The coefficients were only significant in half of the estimated models, however. Given the tight range of ages among the

major part of the survey population, it's difficult to draw strong conclusions about the impact of age on negotiation ethics.

- Consistent with Robinson, Lewicki, and Donahue's findings, the cooperativeness/competitiveness of students was influential in 14 of the 16 questions. The coefficients were also consistently negative, as hypothesized.
- Attendance at religious services also was a statistically significant variable in all but one question. The tendency to engage in marginal ethical behavior always increased as attendance declined. This result is based on one rather crude measure of religious conviction. Further insight on future surveys may be gained by adding several questions that measure religiousness (see Gorsuch and Smith).
- The size of a student's hometown had almost no impact on the ethical attitudes of the students involved in this study. Based on this measure, there seems to be no merit to the idea that a higher rural ethic exists, at least not among the students surveyed in these four states.
- In general, youth activities seemed to have little or no impact on ethical standards. However, in some cases there are some interesting insights that merit further exploration. For all 16 questions, students who participated in an honor society were more willing to engage in less than ethical behavior than nonparticipants, although this result was only statistically significant for 2 questions. It seems likely that the honor society variable is really functioning as a proxy for a student's academic ability. This result definitely merits further exploration, perhaps through inclusion of a question in future surveys to ask the students' GPA or standardized test scores.
- By contrast, community service does seem to dampen the willingness to negotiate in an unethical manner. For 12 of the 16 questions, participation in a high school service club had a negative

effect on willingness to behave unethically, although the impact was statistically significant in only two cases. Hours of community service also had a negative impact for 14 of the 16 questions, although it was only significant in two cases.

- In general, engineers were the group of college majors most willing to engage in marginal ethical tactics. This result should be interpreted in light of the relatively small sample size upon which it is based, but also recognizing that it is in line with results of others. Environmental science students seemed the least likely set of majors to engage in questionable ethical behavior.
- There definitely seem to be some regional differences in ethical behavior regarding negotiations. In general, Michigan State students were the most willing to engage in questionable ethical negotiation practices, with Texas A&M students being the least likely group. This regional difference was not apparent in earlier work and merits further examination.
- Family income generally was of no consequence in explaining ethical attitudes in most cases. There were two notable exceptions, however. Students coming from the \$125,000+ income bracket were significantly more accepting of question 9 (making an opponent look weak in front of his/her boss) and less accepting of question 4 (misrepresenting negotiations to protect delicate discussions).

Overall, results show that certain characteristics, notably age and gender, have the strongest impact on willingness to use ethically questionable tactics in negotiation. Other characteristics appear to affect willingness to engage in some, but not all, of these practices. Of particular interest is the impact of academic preparation and career path on ethical behavior. Further research is clearly needed to discover how robust these differences are across other sets of respondents.

## References

- Bazerman, M.H. R. Gibbons, L. Thompson and K.L. Valley. "Can Negotiators Outperform Game Theory?" in J.L. Halpern and R.N. Stern eds. *Debating Rationality: Nonrational Aspects of Organizational Decision Making*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1998.
- Burr, A.M. "Ethics in Negotiation: Does Getting to Yes Require Candor?" *Disp. Resolutions J.* (2001):8-15.
- Dees, J.G. and P.C. Cramton. "Shrewd bargaining on the moral frontier: toward a theory of morality in practice." *Bus. Ethics Q.* 3(1993):359-394.
- Dirks, D.H. "Moral Development in Christian Higher Education." *J. Psy. Theology* 16(1988):324-331.
- Gorsuch, R.L. and C.S. Smith. "Attributions of Responsibility to God: An Interaction of Religious Beliefs and Outcomes." *J. Sci. Study Rel.* 22(1983):340-352.
- Hassett, J. "Is It Right? An Inquiry Into Everyday Ethics." *Psychology Today* (1981):49-53.
- Kahneman, E., J. Knetsch and R. Thaler. "Fairness and the assumptions of economics." *J. Org. Behav.* 59(1986):285-300.
- Kennedy, E.J. and L. Lawton. "Religiousness and Business Ethics." *J. Bus. Ethics* 17(1998):163-175.
- Lewicki, R.J. and R.J. Robinson. "Ethical and Unethical Bargaining Tactics: An Empirical Study." *J. Bus. Ethics* 17(1998):665-682
- Lewicki, R.J., D.M. Saunders, and J.W. Minton. *Negotiation*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill. 1999.
- Lewis, C. "The Enron Collapse: A Financial Scandal Rooted in Politics." [www.public-i.org](http://www.public-i.org). 2002.
- Provis, C. "Honesty in Negotiation." *Bus. Ethics: Eur. Rev.* 9(2000):3-12.
- Robinson, R.J., R.J. Lewicki, and E.M. Donahue. "Extending and Testing a Five Factor Model of Ethical and Unethical Bargaining Tactics: Introducing the SINS Scale." *J. Org. Behav.* 21(2000):649-664.
- Roth, A.E. "Bargaining Experiments." In J. Kagel and A.E. Roth, eds., *Handbook of Experimental Economics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tweeten, L. *Foundations of Farm Policy*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press. 1979.
- Walker, R.H. Speech delivered at Temple University (Pennsylvania) School of Law, April 4, 2002. Reported in the Philadelphia Inquirer, April 6, 2002.

Table 1. Average Scores Regarding Appropriateness of Negotiation Tactics

| Tactic Description  | Relationship | Auburn | Michigan State | Oregon State | Texas A&M |
|---|--------------|--------|----------------|--------------|-----------|
| <b>Making False Promises</b>  |              |        |                |              |           |
| 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.           | Stranger     | 2.06   | 2.86           | 2.28         | 2.01      |
|   | Colleague    | 1.66   | 2.14           | 1.33         | 1.34      |
| 8. In return for concessions from your opponent now, offer to make future concessions which you know you will not follow through on.  | Stranger     | 2.32   | 2.54           | 2.22         | 1.88      |
|   | Colleague    | 1.59   | 1.72           | 1.41         | 1.39      |
| 15. Guarantee that those you work for will uphold the settlement reached, although you know that they will likely violate the agreement later.  | Stranger     | 2.50   | 2.57           | 2.16         | 1.92      |
|   | Colleague    | 1.92   | 1.98           | 1.57         | 1.37      |
| <b>Misrepresentation</b>  |              |        |                |              |           |
| 2. Intentionally misrepresent information to your opponent in order to strengthen your negotiating arguments or position.   | Stranger     | 2.44   | 3.11           | 2.46         | 1.96      |
|   | Colleague    | 1.75   | 1.98           | 1.43         | 1.40      |
| 4. Intentionally misrepresent the nature of negotiations to those you work for in order to protect delicate discussions that have occurred.   | Stranger     | 2.88   | 3.27           | 2.84         | 2.52      |
|   | Colleague    | 2.58   | 2.88           | 2.37         | 2.26      |
| 10. Deny the validity of information which your opponent has that weakens your negotiating position, even though that information is true and valid.  | Stranger     | 2.83   | 2.94           | 2.64         | 2.42      |
|   | Colleague    | 2.39   | 2.22           | 1.96         | 1.88      |
| 11. Intentionally misrepresent the progress of negotiations to your constituency in order to make your own position appear stronger.  | Stranger     | 2.60   | 2.94           | 2.53         | 2.23      |
|   | Colleague    | 2.33   | 2.32           | 1.83         | 1.86      |
| <b>Attack Opponent's Network</b>  |              |        |                |              |           |
| 3. Attempt to get your opponent fired from his/her position so that a new person will take his/her place.   | Stranger     | 1.80   | 2.09           | 1.76         | 1.61      |
|   | Colleague    | 1.39   | 1.62           | 1.37         | 1.38      |
| 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.                               | Stranger     | 2.68   | 2.44           | 2.09         | 2.07      |
|   | Colleague    | 2.01   | 1.65           | 1.37         | 1.56      |
| 12. Talk directly to the people who your opponent reports to, or is accountable to, and tell them things that will undermine their confidence in your opponent as a negotiator.                                 | Stranger     | 2.39   | 2.47           | 2.45         | 1.98      |
|   | Colleague    | 1.90   | 1.71           | 1.72         | 1.55      |
| <b>Inappropriate Information Gathering</b>  |              |        |                |              |           |
| 5. Gain information about your opponent's negotiating position by paying your friends, associates, and contacts to get this information for you.  | Stranger     | 2.64   | 3.07           | 2.67         | 2.25      |
|   | Colleague    | 2.17   | 2.40           | 2.11         | 1.79      |
| 13. Gain information about your opponent's negotiating position by cultivating his/her friendship through expensive gifts, entertaining or "personal favors."   | Stranger     | 2.61   | 2.89           | 2.21         | 2.60      |
|   | Colleague    | 2.35   | 2.48           | 1.89         | 2.21      |
| 16. Gain information about an opponent's negotiating position by trying to recruit or hire one of your opponent's co-workers (on the condition that the co-worker bring confidential information with him/her). | Stranger     | 2.78   | 2.89           | 2.36         | 2.31      |
|   | Colleague    | 2.40   | 2.20           | 1.73         | 1.83      |
| <b>Traditional Competitive Bargaining</b>   |              |        |                |              |           |
| 6. Make an opening demand that is far greater than what you really hope to settle for.  | Stranger     | 5.03   | 5.43           | 5.38         | 5.22      |
|   | Colleague    | 4.53   | 4.41           | 4.54         | 4.46      |
| 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.                                    | Stranger     | 4.74   | 4.69           | 5.00         | 4.69      |
|   | Colleague    | 3.97   | 3.77           | 4.23         | 3.89      |
| 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  | Stranger     | 4.16   | 3.88           | 4.15         | 3.81      |
|   | Colleague    | 3.57   | 3.23           | 3.22         | 3.09      |

Table 2. Regression Results for Questions that Involve Attacking the Opponent's Network

| Variables           | Q3. Attempt to Get Opponent Fired |             | Q9. Threaten to Make Opponent Look Weak in Front of Boss |             | Q12. Undermine Opponent with His/Her Superiors |             |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|--|-------------|--|-------------|
|                     | Coefficient                       | t-Statistic | Coefficient  | t-Statistic | Coefficient                                    | t-Statistic |
| CONSTANT            | 2.3870***                         | 3.2993      | 4.1376***  | 5.0926      | 3.3229***                                      | 3.9855      |
| AGE                 | -0.0330                           | -1.5926     | -0.0567**  | -2.4422     | -0.0238  | -0.9960     |
| GENDER              | 0.4916***                         | 3.6135      | 0.5389***  | 3.5283      | 0.4488***                                      | 2.8617      |
| CHATT <sub>2</sub>  | 0.0259                            | 0.1165      | 0.2292   | 0.9226      | 0.1720   | 0.6734      |
| CHATT <sub>3</sub>  | 0.1755                            | 0.7534      | 0.4806*  | 1.8488      | 0.2944   | 1.1000      |
| CHATT <sub>4</sub>  | 0.0711                            | 0.2818      | 0.3270   | 1.1562      | 0.2451   | 0.8440      |
| CHATT <sub>5</sub>  | 0.1494                            | 0.6815      | 0.6115**   | 2.5013      | 0.4982**                                       | 1.9848      |
| HOME <sub>2</sub>   | -0.0254                           | -0.1051     | -0.1271  | -0.4696     | -0.0144  | -0.0518     |
| HOME <sub>3</sub>   | -0.0845                           | -0.3278     | -0.0553  | -0.1914     | -0.4139  | -1.3980     |
| HOME <sub>4</sub>   | -0.0126                           | -0.0458     | -0.1812  | -0.5868     | -0.0653  | -0.2058     |
| HOME <sub>5</sub>   | -0.1215                           | -0.4401     | -0.4361  | -1.4074     | -0.3347  | -1.0551     |
| ENG                 | 0.6462                            | 1.3465      | 0.7398   | 1.3744      | 0.5481   | 0.9949      |
| ABM                 | 0.0937                            | 0.2929      | -0.2790  | -0.7761     | 0.4603   | 1.2511      |
| AG                  | 0.1366                            | 0.4047      | -0.4394  | -1.1610     | 0.2792   | 0.7200      |
| BUS                 | 0.0629                            | 0.1601      | -0.2889  | -0.6578     | 0.4528   | 1.0139      |
| ENV                 | -0.0836                           | -0.2018     | -0.6259  | -1.3481     | -0.1823  | -0.3838     |
| 4H/FFA              | 0.1066                            | 0.6384      | 0.1834   | 0.9793      | -0.0784  | -0.4078     |
| SPORTS              | -0.0850                           | -0.5585     | -0.0805  | -0.4699     | -0.1280  | -0.7327     |
| SCOUTS              | 0.0459                            | 0.3512      | 0.0369   | 0.2516      | 0.0001   | 0.0008      |
| HONOR SOC           | 0.1837                            | 1.2559      | 0.1494   | 0.9101      | 0.1160   | 0.6886      |
| SERV CLUB           | -0.0254                           | -0.1794     | -0.1190  | -0.7465     | -0.0225  | -0.1375     |
| LEADER              | -0.1205                           | -0.8831     | -0.2148  | -1.3979     | -0.1695  | -1.0799     |
| B&G STATE           | -0.0226                           | -0.0949     | 0.0464   | 0.1735      | -0.0806  | -0.2946     |
| MUSIC/THEATRE       | 0.0426                            | 0.3106      | -0.0828  | -0.5382     | 0.0604   | 0.3830      |
| SERVICE             | 0.00016                           | 0.1347      | -0.00041   | -0.3066     | -0.0015  | -1.1159     |
| INTERN              | 0.0061                            | 0.0443      | 0.0036   | 0.0230      | -0.0984  | -0.6200     |
| FAMBUS              | 0.2404*                           | 1.7219      | 0.0471   | 0.3006      | 0.0179   | 0.1110      |
| APPROACH            | -0.1005**                         | -2.0264     | -0.1778***   | -3.2018     | -0.2268***                                     | -3.9880     |
| INCOME <sub>1</sub> | -0.0119                           | -0.0320     | -0.1230  | -0.2950     | -0.1209  | -0.2832     |
| INCOME <sub>2</sub> | -0.1784                           | -0.7014     | -0.2340  | -0.8186     | 0.2428   | 0.8281      |
| INCOME <sub>3</sub> | -0.2225                           | -1.0888     | -0.3430  | -1.4967     | 0.2529   | 1.0763      |
| INCOME <sub>4</sub> | -0.1368                           | -0.7096     | -0.5170**  | -2.3826     | 0.0127   | 0.0570      |
| INCOME <sub>5</sub> | -0.0452                           | -0.2490     | -0.4878**  | -2.3834     | 0.1863   | 0.8869      |
| MSU                 | 0.4273**                          | 1.9804      | 0.4079*  | 1.6932      | -0.1332  | -0.5406     |
| AUBURN              | -0.0955                           | -0.4744     | 0.6864***  | 3.0427      | -0.2709  | -1.1716     |
| TAMU                | -0.0077                           | -0.0267     | 0.2613   | 0.8058      | -0.4330  | -1.3204     |
| R-squared           | 0.0920                            |             | 0.1647   |             | 0.1201   |             |
| F-statistic         | 1.4164*                           |             | 2.7501***  |             | 1.8988***                                      |             |