

# Determinants of Unethical Tactics in the Trade Negotiation Process

통상협상에서 비윤리적 협상행위에 대한 결정 요인

Chang-Hwan, Choi(최창환)

Dankook University

## Contents

I. Introduction	IV. Discussion and implications
II. Literature Review and Hypothesis	Reference
III. Methodology and Result	국문초록

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to find what factors have an influential effect on motive and intention of using the unethical negotiation tactics. It is interesting to find that opportunism was not related to unethical negotiation tactics such as inappropriate information gathering and competitive bargaining in our Korea's sample. On the other hand, idealism and Machiavellianism had positive impact on managers' perceptions of unethical negotiation tactics within our sample. To explain the environmental perspective, the lower level of legal punishment system encourages them to use the unethical tactics without hesitation. On the other hand, organizational goal might have not a related on the perception of unethical negotiation tactics. To reduce the potential risk of use of unethical negotiation in the international negotiation process, international negotiators should find the counterpart negotiator' character before attending negotiation table, and international managers would be better to employ a local agent who can understand local negotiating counterpart, so they can assist them in early stage of negotiation.

**Key Words** : trade negotiation, unethical tactics, negotiation value, negotiation outcome

\* The present research was conducted by the research fund of Dankook University in 2011.

## I. Introduction

Negotiation is something that everyone does, almost daily. Richard Shell(1999) define negotiation as an interactive communication process that may take place whenever we want something from someone else or someone wants something from us. William Ury(1982) said negotiation is the process of back-and-forth communication aimed at reaching agreement with others when some of your interests are shared and some are opposed. Lax and Sebenius(1986) define negotiation as a process of potentially opportunistic interaction by which two or more parties, with some apparent conflict, seek to do better through jointly decided action than they could otherwise, while Pruitt(1981) and Fisher and Ury(1981) defined negotiation as a cooperative, integrative process.

Negotiations occur for several reasons to agree on how to share or divide a limited resource, to create something new that neither party could attain on his or her own, to resolve a problem or dispute between the parties. Whether it is an opportunistic or integrative process, the parties involved inevitably try to make the best possible case for their preferred solution. In doing so, they may be motivated to violate contemporary ethical standards. Characteristics of a negotiation situation is that there are two or more parties, there is a conflict of needs and desires between two or more parties, parties negotiate because they think they can get a better deal than by simply accepting what the other side offers them, parties expect a give and take process.

What do we mean by ethics and why do they matter in negotiation? Ethics are broadly applied social standards for what is right or wrong in a particular situation, or a process for setting those standards, grow out of particular philosophies which define the nature of the world in which we live, prescribe rules for living together. Four approaches to ethical reasoning are end-result ethics, the rightness of an action is determined by evaluating its consequences, duty ethics, the rightness of an action is determined by one's obligation to adhere to consistent principles, laws and social standards that define what is right and wrong, social contract ethics, the rightness of an action is based on the customs and norms of a particular society or community, personalistic ethics, the rightness of the action is based on one's own conscience and moral standards.

The effect of business man's characteristic in ethical decision making has been studied extensively in western cultures (e.g. Fraedrich & Ferrell, 1992; Mayo & Marks, 1990; Reidenbach &

Robin, 1990; Hunt & Vitell 1992). However, research that takes a determinant of unethical tactics perspective and that focuses on people from developing economies such as Korea in particular is scant. Hence extant research does not provide any guidance regarding whether the variables shown to be important in determining individual's perceptions and social contexts of unethical situations about the Korea.

The purpose of this paper is to find what factors have an influential effect on motive and intention of using the unethical tactics. The findings offer insights on the ethical mindset of the people in Korea, and provide guidance on negotiating with the Korean counterparts particularly in cross-cultural situations. Developing a greater understanding of how Korean people perceive ethical negotiation concerns may enhance international managers' ability to efficiently and effectively manage the negotiation process with the counterparts.

The paper is organized as follows. The introductory section has so far described the background and objective of this thesis. The next section reviews a negotiation literature in light of lying in negotiation, deceptive tactics. The third section discusses a theoretical model, followed by an analysis of factor variables, which caused such differences and how they affected overall negotiation process and outcome. The last section sums up the result of the analysis and suggests measures to enhance negotiation performance when engaged in overseas business.

## II. Literature Review and Hypothesis

### 1. Unethical negotiation tactics

Lewicki et al. (2006) argued that information is a major source of negotiation power, due to the opposition of interest, a lot of negotiators try to seek any kind of opportunistic advantage from their opponents including manipulating and controlling information well to make the best possible case for his or her preferred solution.

The parties involved in negotiation consistently approach it expecting the interests of the other to be completely opposed to their own. When they use inappropriate influence tactics in order to gain the others' compliance, they are violating contemporary ethical standards. One example of

influence tactic is lying whereby a lie is considered as a false statement made with the intent to deceive. Questions of ethical conduct that arise in Negotiation are that using ethically ambiguous tactics: It's all about the truth, identifying ethically ambiguous tactics and attitudes toward their use. Second is the deception by omission versus commission, omission – failing to disclose information that would benefit the other, Commission – actually lying about the common-value issue. (Thompson and Hastie, 1990)

Lying fell under the domain of unethical conduct because it could have detrimental organizational and social consequences. Therefore, lying during negotiations could harm the other party if it led them to accept outcomes that were unfavorable or that they would have rejected if they had more accurate information. Interest in proposing various categories of lying in negotiation can be traced back to the 1980s when Robinson, Lewicki, & Donahue (2000) proposed five categories of lying in negotiation.

<Table 1> Categories of Marginally Ethical Negotiating Tactics

Category	Example
Traditional competitive bargaining	Not disclosing your walkaway, Making an inflated opening offer
Emotional manipulation	Faking anger, fear, disappointment, Faking elation , Satisfaction
Misrepresentation	Distorting information or negotiation events in describing them to others
Misrepresentation to opponent's networks	Corrupting your opponent's reputation with his peers
Inappropriate information gathering	Bribery, infiltration, spying
Bluffing	Insincere threats or promises

Source : Robinson, Lewicki, & Donahue (2000)

The five categories are misrepresentation to the opponent's networks (the negotiator lies about his or her preferred settlement point or resistance point), bluffing (the negotiator falsely states intentions to commit an action), falsification (erroneous and factually incorrect information is introduced as though it were true), deception (a collection of arguments are made that lead the opponent to draw an incorrect conclusion or deduction), and misrepresentation to constituencies (partial truths, or complete untruths, are told in representing other parties in the negotiating

relationship).

The Self-reported Inappropriate Negotiation Strategies (SINS) Scale used to determine how negotiators view unethical negotiating tactics – particularly tactics employing deception – was developed by Robinson, Lewicki, & Donahue (2000). This scale has 5 factors: traditional competitive bargaining, attacking an opponent's network, false promises, misrepresentation/lying, and inappropriate information gathering.

Robinson (1997) classified deceptive negotiation tactics into cognitive and emotional categories; they studied how people perceive different deceptive negotiation styles. In examining the strategic role that emotion can play in a negotiation encounter, Barry & Oliver (1996) suggest that people are more accepting of and confident in their ability to use emotion management tactics than other forms of premeditated deception.

## 2. Individual characteristics

The prior individual characteristic to discuss is idealism. It has also been categorized as person's ethical orientation. This evaluation process involves comparing possible behaviors with a set of predetermined deontological norms or predetermined guidelines that represent personal values or rules of behavior.

As for the teleological evaluation process, individuals will evaluate possible behaviors by considering (1) the perceived consequences of each alternative for various stakeholder groups, (2) the probability that each consequence will occur to each stakeholder group, (3) the desirability or undesirability of each consequence, and (4) the importance of each stakeholder group. In both their original and their revised ethics model, they depict the ethical decision-making process as involving both deontological and teleological evaluations. This proposition has generally received support in the literature. (Al-Khatib et al, 2008)

Idealism is conceptualized by Forsyth (1980) as the degree to which the individuals assume that desirable consequences can, with the right action, always be obtained. He presented that idealistic individuals adhere to moral absolutes when making moral judgments.

Hypothesis H1. The lower level of idealistic orientation, the more positive impact on their perception of unethical tactics in the negotiation process

The origins of the term Machiavellianism must be attributed to Nicolo Machiavelli, who in his primary contribution, “The Prince” asserted as an advice to the prince that theological and moral imperatives have no place in the political arena. The primary contribution of his work is its fundamental break between realism and idealism. Machiavelli emphasized the need for morality and asserted that the prince should use the good and evil purely as instrumental means. He further asserts that it is necessary to exercise a proper balance between the two. While the original works of Machiavelli proposed a balanced approach, the term Machiavellian, over the years has been interpreted in many different ways. (Al-Khatib et al, 2008)

Christie and Geis (1970) developed the Mach IV (MACH) scale to measure Machiavellianism. Based on their review of 38 studies utilizing the MACH scale, these authors reported that “high Mach” individuals (those who score high on MACH scale) differ in their behavior and characteristics from “low Mach” individuals (those who score low on MACH scale). The study concluded that high Mach individuals tend to manipulate more, win more, are persuaded less, and influence others more compared to low Mach individuals. The study also reported that high Machs tend to exhibit a relative lack of affect in interpersonal relationships, a lack of concern with conventional morality, and a lack of ideological commitment. This lack of involvement with others, perhaps, leads the more Machiavellian individual to be more accepting of unethical business practices. (Al-Khatib et al, 2008)

Hypothesis H2. The higher level of Machiavellianism orientation, the more positive impact on their perception of unethical tactics in the negotiation process

One of the key individual characteristics that drive marketing exchange and transaction cost is opportunism exhibited by exchange partners. The concept has not been limited to the self-interest alone, but has included malicious elements such as lying, cheating, deceit and violations of agreements. Furthermore, it has been assumed that humans exhibit a characteristic to act opportunistically, whenever it is feasible and profitable (Al-Khatib et al, 2008)

While the concept of opportunism has been applied in the marketing contexts to explain organizational structure and governance mechanisms, it has not received much attention in the negotiation or ethics literature. Thus, an investigation of the impact of opportunism on exchange

partners' perception of unethical negotiation practices should help executives to cultivate a constructive relationship with their negotiating partners. (Al-Khatib et al, 2008)

Hypothesis H3. The higher level of Opportunism, the more positive impact on their perception of unethical tactics in the negotiation process

### 3. Contextual characteristics

Lewicki et al. (2006) have included past-experience as a situational influence on ethical decision making. They argued that the simple impact of past experience – particularly failure – can increase the likelihood that a negotiator might attempt to use unethical tactics drawing on a study about the role of goal setting as a motivator of unethical behavior. Arguably, it would be more appropriate to label past experiences as an individual difference, because a negotiator takes past experiences to all negotiations and it is not characteristic of the decision setting of any one negotiation. However, we agree with the idea that goals influence a negotiator's view of ethicality of tactics, although there are surprisingly few studies have investigated the effect of goals on ethical decision making.

Acknowledging that goals are motivational, we propose that negotiators are likely to find organizational goals influential in their ethical decision making. If a company is desperate to get a sale in a new market because profits have been weak, the negotiator may be more inclined to use EANTs (Ethically Ambiguous Negotiation Tactics) if they help them achieve the goal. In support of this idea, research has found that the strategic objectives of the firm are a factor of considerable impact in decisions about collusive tendering. This study showed that the desirability and utility of an organizational goal were considered in the decision. (River and Lytle, 2007)

Organizational goals incorporate the incentives and rewards offered to a negotiator for achieving a particular outcome. Incentives have been included in the Lewicki et al (2006) model based on findings that greater incentives influenced a negotiator's tendency to misrepresent. Results in business ethics research also suggest that rewards can influence ethical decision-making. With substantial differences in compensation across borders, it is logical that the type of incentive offered to a negotiator will also vary according to the culture. We posit that culture moderates

the influence of rewards and incentives – we think negotiators will be motivated differently by rewards depending on whether they are from individualistic or collectivist cultures. Providing incentive by offering public acknowledgement of a negotiator's performance may be more motivating for a negotiator from face sensitive culture than for a negotiator from a culture where face is less important, and this may influence the use of EANTs differently across the cultures. Deadlines have also been included as a component of organizational goals in our model because the timing of a negotiation is likely to be part of the outcome sought.

Deadlines were included in Gelfand and Dyer's(2000) model, and they argue that there may be cultural difference in how time pressure influences negotiation schemas. They give the example that a U.S. negotiator under time pressure might become more competitive, whereas a Scandinavian negotiator under time pressure might become more cooperative.(River and Lytle, 2007)

Hypothesis H4. The higher level of organizational goal, the more positive impact on their perception of unethical tactics in the negotiation process

The legal environment is a salient situational factor for negotiator's ethical decision making. The legal environment is widely considered the first hurdle to be cleared in ethical decision making (Bagley, 2003) and has been included in ethical decision making models(Hunt and Vitell 1986). It is found that Japanese negotiators rated the involvement of legal issues and legal liabilities as less relevant to their ratings of appropriateness of EANTs than respondents from other countries such as the UK, Australia, the U.S., Greece, and Russia. In addition, the level difference of code of ethics in organization has a major role in affecting negotiation outcome. There is debate about the efficacy of codes of ethics in influencing behavior.(River and Lytle, 2007)

Hypothesis H5. The lower level of legal environment, the more a positive impact on their perception of unethical tactics in the negotiation process



#### 4. Intentions and Motives for using unethical tactics

The purpose of using marginally ethical negotiating tactics is to increase the negotiator's power in the bargaining environment. In general, information is one of the major source of leverage in negotiation. Information has power because negotiation is intended to be a rational activity involving the exchange of information and the persuasive use of that information. The motivation of a negotiator can clearly affect his or her tendency to use deceptive tactics. In an early study on tactics, Lewicki and Spenser asked negotiators about their preposition to use marginally ethical tactics. One part of the questionnaire explicitly instructed the respondents to assume either a competitive or a cooperative motivational orientation toward the other party, and to assume that the other party would be taking either a competitive or a cooperative motivational orientation. The authors predicted that when motivated to be competitive, and when expecting the other to be competitive, the negotiator would see the marginally ethical tactics as appropriate, and when both parties were competitively motivated, they would exhibit the greatest tendency to employ marginally ethical tactics. The results revealed that difference in the negotiator's own motivational orientation – cooperative versus competitive - did not cause differences in their view of the appropriateness of using the tactics, but the negotiators' perception of the other's expected motivation did. In other words, negotiators were significantly more likely to see the marginally ethical tactics as appropriate if they anticipated that the other would be competitive versus cooperative. Although these findings are preliminary, they do suggest that motives and intentions may be integrally tied together. Negotiators may rationalize the use of marginally ethical tactics in anticipated defense of the other's expected conduct, rather than take personal responsibility for using these tactics in the service of their own competitive orientation (Lewicki et al, 2006).

Hypothesis H6. The higher intentions and motives for using unethical tactics, the more positive impact on the negotiation outcomes

### III. Methodology and Result

#### 1. Data

To test the aforementioned hypotheses, the survey method was used to collect data from the sample of the student groups who have been involved in studying negotiation class. This survey was conducted from November to December 2009. These students responded to questions concerning their unethical negotiation tactics, individual characteristics, contextual characteristics and intentions and motives for using unethical tactics. The questionnaire was forwarded through face to face way to 198 persons and all sent back answers, which were automatically classified and compiled.

#### 2. Measures

In order to obtain reliable information from the respondents, established and validated scales were selected for data collection. The survey consisted of several key sections. For the dependent factors of individual and contextual characteristics, we would like to use the ethical position questionnaire(EPQ), designed to measure individual characteristic construct—idealism developed by Forsyth (1980). One of them is designed to measure idealism; the acceptance of moral absolutes. Others is Opportunism measured using five items related to the individual's overstatement of difficulties, information falsification, exaggerated claims, neglected obligations, and perfunctory role performance. And Machiavellianism was measured using the MACH IV scale developed by Christie and Geis (1970). For the mediating variable factors, we employed the self-reported inappropriate negotiation strategies scale (SINS scale) developed by Robinson et al. (2000) and validated by several previous studies (e.g. Al-Khatib et al., 2006). The SINS scale is constructed with five categories representing the unethical negotiation tactics: (a) traditional competitive bargaining, (b) attacking negotiating opponent's network, (c) making false promises to negotiating partner, (d) misrepresentation of information, and (e) inappropriate information gathering about negotiating partner's business position.

### 3. Reliability and validity analysis

Reliability is associated with the extent of consistency in results when an object is tested several times by similar measuring tools or tested repeatedly by one measuring tool. Generally, the most frequently used methodology for reliability evaluation based on internal consistency is Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. Usually the coefficient of 0.8~0.9 or above is deemed desirable and 0.6~0.7 acceptable. 0.5 or below is referred to as lacking internal consistency. In this study, its coefficient stayed as 0.8, which shows that there are few problems in the construction of questionnaire items. Validity is a concept showing whether a targeted notion or property has been accurately gauged. In other words, it is associated with whether a measuring tool developed to assess a targeted concept or property of an object reflects precisely its attributes or not. KMO(Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin), an index verifying the conformity of factor analysis, which is also referred to as measure of sampling adequacy, was put to use. By and large its rate of 0.5 or above shows the relative factor analysis is adequate and 0.5 or below shows the opposite. Based on these, to verify the conceptual validity of items for measurement variables on environmental factors, factor analysis was applied. Principal Component Analysis extracted out factors and in fact rotation the Varimax methodology was employed to secure interdependency between the factors.

### 4. Result

#### 1) Factor analysis

Looking at the result of exploratory factor analysis on the variables of environmental factors, the KMO value, which shows whether correlation between variables is explained by others, stands as 0.732. This demonstrates the appropriateness of variable selection based on factor analysis. Further, as the value of sphericity test, a basis to determine the fitness of factor analysis model, stands as 315.965, and its significance probability .000, it can be said common factors exist. Therefore, the questionnaire items adopted in this study can be validated. According to a research based on factor loading on the relations between each factor and measurement variables, factor, Idealism represents 18.725%, Opportunism 17.122%, Machiavellianism 11.712%, legal environment 9.761%, organizational goal 7.746% <Table 1>

〈Table – 1〉 Factor analysis of individual /contextual characteristics

Test Item	Rotated component matrix factors					Communality
	Idealism	Opportunism	Machiav- ellianism	Legal environment	Organizational goal	
X2	.957					.934
X1	.932					.907
X3	.928					.892
X8		.735				.644
X5		.699				.835
X6		.579				.806
X11			.762			.639
X12			.723			.515
X14				.883		.818
X13				.819		.828
X15				.709		.676
X17					.889	.814
X18					.830	.787
Variance	18.725	17.122	11.712	9.761	7.746	
KMO	.732					
Sphericity	315.965					
Significant	.000					

As a result of factor analysis on intentions and motives for using unethical tactics, KMO value stands at 0.726, which shows that variable selection was without irrationality, and its sphericity test value represents 923.930 with significance probability 0.000, which shows that there common factors exist. The variance of the factor, inappropriate information gathering was 10.651%, misrepresentation of information 16.625%, traditional competitive bargaining 16.260%, attacking negotiating opponent's network 19.802%, making false promises 12.370%.(table 2).

&lt;Table – 2&gt; Factor analysis of intentions and motives for using unethical tactics

Test Item	Rotated component matrix factors					Communality
	inappropriat-einformation gathering	misrepresentat ion of information	traditional competitive bargaining	attacking negotiating opponent's network	making false promises	
X21	.755					.701
X25	.586					.694
X24		.799				.822
X23		.763				.793
X26		.727				.761
X29			.859			.828
X28			.785			.803
X27			.763			.697
X31				.802		.815
X32				.780		.714
X34					.833	.799
X33					.683	.741
Variance	10.651	16.625	16.260	19.802	12.370	
KMO	.726					
Sphericity	923.930					
Significant	.000					

The result of factor analysis on negotiation outcome of self evaluation and reaction of others shows its KMO value as 0.616 verifying the appropriateness of variable selection, and sphericity test value 163.264 and significance probability 0.00 represents the existence of common factors. The variance stands at 27.229%. <Table 3>

〈Table - 3〉 Factor analysis of Negotiation Outcomes

Test Item	Rotated component matrix factors		Communality
	Self evaluation		
X37	.829		.764
X36	.727		.630
X38	.662		.538
Variance	27.229		
KMO(Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin)	.616		
Sphericity	163.264		
Significant	.000		

## 2) Correlation analysis

Correlation analysis on the variables can be deemed meaningful in that it can serve as a preceding data, by which we can make a general survey on the relationship between the variables introduced in the theoretical structure of this thesis and predict to some extent the result of hypothesis testing. As a methodology for correlation analysis, Pearson's Correlation was employed. As shown in [table- 4], individual and contextual characteristics is correlated with intentions and motives for using unethical tactics, and this moderating variable is also negotiation outcome. Accordingly, the directional tendency of the hypotheses set up in this study could be confirmed through this analysis.

〈Table - 4〉 Correlation analysis

Factor	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
Idealism	1										
Opportunism	.048	1									
Machiavellianism	-.106	.017	1								
Organizational goal	-.051	.275**	.014	1							
Legal environment	-.110	-.007	.201*	.150	1						
Inappropriate information gathering	.315**	-.047	.227*	-.169	.056	1					
Misrepresentation of information	.137	.113	.007	.329**	.069	.429**	1				

Competitive bargaining	.319**	.089	.078	.074	.266**	.455**	.319**	1			
Attacking opponent's network	.062	-.116	.018	.023	-.077	.515**	.472**	.054	1		
Making false promises	.047	.099	.252*	-.096	.076	.370**	.435**	.239*	.231*	1	
Self evaluation	.091	.279**	.130	.225*	.027	-.113	.036*	-.046	-.020	.077*	1

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$  significant level

### 3) Hypothesis Testing

Based on resulting output, Opportunism has no statistically significant influence on motive and intention of using unethical tactics. Path coefficient for Opportunism stands at 0.018 and p-value 0.824, while path coefficient for Idealism reads 0.197 with p-value of 0.002, statistically significant. For the Machiavellianism, its path coefficient has 0.143 with p-value of 0.047.

Legal environment appears to have statistically significant influences on motive and intention of using unethical tactics. Path coefficient for negotiation preparation stands at 0.017 and p-value 0.032. On the contrary, Path coefficient for Organizational goal reads at 0.084 with p-value 0.808 statistically not significant (Table-5).

As a result of analysis on motive and intention of using unethical tactics for the self evaluation, path coefficient thereon reads as .025, with p-value of .037, which is statistically significant. For the reaction of others, however, has no meaningful result.

<Table - 5> Analysis Result

Model analysis	Path coefficient	S.E	P-value	Result
Idealism → Motive and intention	.197	.063	.002**	Supported
Machiavellianism → Motive and intention	.143	.072	.047*	Supported
Opportunism → Motive and intention	.018	.082	.824	Not supported
Legal environment → Motive and intention	.017	.074	.032*	Supported
Organizational goal → Motive and intention	.084	.072	.808	Not supported
Motive and intention → Self evaluation	.025	.113	.037*	Supported

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$  significant level

Based on final result, we can provide some findings that Machiavellianism and idealistic orientation in the individual aspects have a positive impact on motive and intention of using unethical tactics, and in the environmental aspect legal environment factor has a close related to motive and intention of using unethical tactics characteristics. On the other hand, opportunity has not related to motive and intention of using unreasonable tactics in negotiation process. It is referred as to modernism has wide spread out in these current student society, so don't care for the opportunism.

And organizational goal has also not relative impact on intention to use unethical things in the negotiation situation. It would be come from the feature of respondents. They might not put massive importance into carrying out the organizational goal, because as a student they do not understand the real situation as much as the field manager in company. It would be left for the further study area to investigate the company.

#### IV. Discussion and implications

It is interesting to find that opportunism was not related to unethical negotiation tactics such as inappropriate information gathering and competitive bargaining in our Korea's sample. The results indicate that the opportunistically viewpoint may prevent them from engaging in competitive bargaining and inappropriate information gathering to get better negotiation outcome.

On the other hand, idealism had positive impact on managers' perceptions of unethical negotiation tactics within our sample. This suggests that lower degree of idealism does allow greater latitude to Korea negotiators when it comes to their perceptions of unethical negotiation tactics. They have positive perceptions of unethical negotiation tactics as hypothesized. In addition, the higher level of Machiavellianism showed a significant positive effect on the outcome variables. It is likely to this argument that a person possessing high degree of the Machiavellian trait would be dishonest and deceitful

To explain the environmental perspective, we thought that our legal system had not been applied with fair standard. Some people believe that verdict in court would be swung easily with the economic power or powerful political figures. So, only if we make the outstanding negotiation



outcome with using unethical negotiation tactics, they don't need to worry about the penalty. This concept displayed the research result. The lower level of legal punishment system encourages them to use the unethical tactics without hesitation. On the other hand, organizational goal might have not a related on the perception of unethical negotiation tactics. This imply that new young generation putting the more importance on their individual goal than organizational one has not interested in using unethical tactics to get better negotiation outcome as organizational goal. And as a student, they do not understand the real situation as much as the field manager in company. It would be left for the further study area to investigate the company.

In summary, its findings indicate that idealism, Machiavellianism and legal environment are strong predictors of mans' perceptions of all of the five unethical negotiation tactics. On the contrary, opportunism and organizational goal has not positive impact on using five unethical negotiation tactics. The results suggest that while dealing with collectivist negotiators such as Korea business man, one should not expect to observe a relationship between individual characteristics and perceptions of unethical negotiation tactics in a manner similar to the one observed in Western cultures. It can be used to help multinational companies doing business with Korea counterpart when it comes to international negotiation to become more aware of their host country's ethical environment. To reduce the potential risk of use of unethical negotiation, international managers would be better to employ a local agent who can understand local negotiating counterpart, so they can assist them in early stage of negotiation.

## References

- Al-Khatib, Malshe & AbdulKader(2008), Perception of unethical negotiation tactics: A comparative study of US and Saudi managers, *International Business Review* 17, pp.78-102.
- Al-Khatib, Stanton, & Rawwas(2005), Ethical segmentation of consumers in developing countries : A comparative analysis, *International Marketing Review* 25(2)
- Anton, R. J.(1990), Drawing the line: An exploratory test of ethical behavior in negotiation. *InternationalJournalofConflictManagement*, 3(1).
- Aquino, K.(1998), The effects of ethical climate and the availability of alternatives on the use of

- deception during negotiation. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 3(9).
- Armstrong & Sweeney(1994), Industry type, culture, mode of entry and perceptions of international marketing ethics problems : Across-cultural comparison, *Journal of Business Ethics*13(10)
- Aulakh, Kotabe, & Sahay(1996), Trust and performance in cross-border marketing partnerships : A behavioral approach, *Journal of International Business Studies* 27(5).
- Bagley, C.E.(2003), The Ethical leader's decision tree, *Harvard Business Review*, 81(2):18-19.
- Barnett, Bass, & Brown(1996), Religiosity, ethical ideology, and intention store porta Peer's wrongdoing, *Journal of Business Ethics* 15(11).
- Barnett, Bass, & Brown(1998), The moral philosophy of sales managers and its influence on ethical decision making, *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 18(2).
- Barry, B., & Oliver, R.L.(1996), Affect in dyadic negotiation: A model and propositions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 2(67).
- Barry, B., Fulmer I.S., & Long A.(2000), Ethically Marginal Bargaining Tactics: Sanction, Efficacy, and Performance. Paper presented at 2000 Annual Meeting of Academy of Management, Toronto.
- Bass, Barnett, & Brown(1999), Individual difference variables, ethical judgments, and ethical behavioral intentions, *Business Ethics Quarterly* 9.
- Brown, Dev, & Lee(2000), Managing marketing channel opportunism: The efficacy of alternative governance mechanisms, *Journal of Marketing* 64(2)
- Buller, P.F., Kohls, J.J., & Anderson, K.S.(2000), When ethics collide: managing conflict across cultures. *Organizational Dynamics*, 4(28).
- Calhoun(1969), Niccolo Machiavelli and the twentieth administrator, *Academy of Management Journal* 12 (June).
- Carr, A.Z.(1968), Is business bluffing ethical? *Harvard Business Review*, (46).
- Chonko(1982), Are purchasing managers Machiavellian? *Journal of Purchasing and Materials Management* 18(4)
- Christie & Geis(1970), R. Christie and F.L. Geis, *Studies in Machiavellianism*, Academic Press, New York.
- Corzine, Buntzman, & Busch(1999), Machiavellianism among US bankers, *Journal of Psychology* 7
- (1) Cramton & Dees (1993), Promoting honesty in negotiation: An exercise in practical

- ethics, *Business ethics quarterly* 3 (4).
- Dean, Chen, Pritchett, & Forrest(1997), Multicultural examination of business ethics perceptions, *Journal of Business Ethics* 16(2).
- Donaldson, T., & Dunfee, T.W.(1999). When ethics travel: the promise and peril of global business ethics. *California Management Review*, 4(41).
- Doney, Cannon, & Mullen(1998), Understanding the influence of a national culture on the development of trust, *Academy of Management of Management Review* 23(3).
- Fang, T.(2006). Negotiation: the Chinese style. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 21(1).
- Ferrell & Gresham(1985), A contingency framework for understanding ethical decision making in marketing, *Journal of Marketing* 49(3), pp.87-96.
- Fisher, R., & Ury, W.(1981). *Getting to Yes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Ford, LaTour, Vitell, & French(1997), Moral judgment and market negotiations: A comparison of Chinese and American managers, *Journal of International Marketing* 5(2), pp.57-76.
- Forsyth(1980), A taxonomy of ethical ideologies, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 39(1), pp.175-184.
- Forsyth(1992), Judging the morality of business practices: The influence of personal moral philosophies, *Journal of Business Ethics* 11(5/6), pp.461-470.
- Fraedrich & Ferrell(1992), The impact of perceived risk and moral philosophy type on ethical decision making in business organizations, *Journal of Business Research* 24(4), pp.283-295.
- Gelfand, M., and N. Dyer(2000), A cultural perspective on negotiation; Progress, Pitfalls and Prospects, *Applied Psychology: An international Review*, 49(1); 62-99.
- Ghauri & Fang(2001), Negotiating with the Chinese: A socio-cultural analysis, *Journal of World Business* 36(3), pp.303-325.
- Ghauri & Usunier(1996), *International business negotiations*, Pergamon, Terrytown, New York (1996).
- Hofstede(1980), *Culture consequences: International differences in work-related values*, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Hofstede(1991), *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Hunt & Chonko(1984), Marketing and Machiavellianism, *Journal of Marketing* 21(3), pp.30-42.
- Hunt & Vitell(1986), A general theory of marketing ethics, *Journal of Macromarketing* Spring, pp.

5-16.

Hunt & Vitell(1992), The general theory of marketing ethics: A retrospective and revision. In: A. Quelch and A. Smith, Editors, Ethics in marketing, Richard D. Irwin, Chicago, IL .

Hunt & Vitell(2006), The general theory of marketing ethics: A revision and three questions, Journal of Macromarketing 26(2), pp.143-153.

John(1984), An empirical investigation of some antecedents of opportunism in marketing channels, Journal of Marketing Research 21, pp.278-288.

Karande, Rao, & Singhapakdi(2002), Moral philosophies of marketing managers: A comparison of American, Australian and Malaysian Cultures, European Journal of Marketing 36(7/8), pp. 768-791.

Knemeyer & Murphy(2004), Evaluating the performance of third-party logistics arrangements: A relationship marketing perspective, Journal of Supply Chain Management 40(1), pp.35-43.

Lax, D.A., & Sebenius, J.K.(1986), The Manager as Negotiator. New York: Free Press.

Lewicki & Robinson(1998), Ethical and unethical bargaining tactics: An empirical study, Journal of Business Ethics 17(6), pp.665-692.

Lewicki & Robinson(1998), A factor analysis study of ethical and unethical bargaining tactics. Journal of Business Ethics, 1(18), pp.211-228.

Lewicki, R.J., Litterer, J., Minton, J., & Saunders, D.(2006), Negotiation. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lindsay(1983), China: Motivational systems in flux. In: R.M. Steers and L.W. Porter, Editors, Motivation and work behavior, McGraw-Hill, New York, pp.623-632.

Loe, T. W., L. Ferrel, and P. Mansfield(2000), A review of empirical studies assessing ethical decision making in business, Journal of business ethics, 25(3); 185-204.

Longenecker, Moore, Petty, Palich, & McKinney(2006), Ethical attitudes in small businesses and large corporations: Theory and empirical findings from a tracking study spanning three decades, Journal of Small Business Management 44(2), pp.167-183.

Manrai(1995), Effects of cultural-context, gender, and acculturation on perceptions of work versus social/leisure time usage, Journal of Business Research 32, pp.115-128.

Mayo & Marks(1990), An empirical investigation of a general theory of marketing ethics, Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science 18(2), pp.163-171.

Murphy & Laczniak(1981), Marketing ethics: A review with implications for managers, educators,

- and researchers. In: B.M. Enis and A.J. Roering, Editors, *Review of marketing*, American Marketing Association, Chicago, IL, pp.251-266.
- O'Connor, K., & Carnevale, P.(1997), A nasty but effective negotiation strategy: misrepresentation of a common-value issue. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 5(23), pp.504-515.
- Pitta, D.A., Fung, H.G., & Isberg, S.(1999), Ethical issues across cultures: managing the differing perspective of China and the USA. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 3(16), pp.240-256.
- Pruitt, D.(1981), *Negotiation Behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Pruitt, D., & Jeffrey, Z.R.(1986), *Social conflict: escalation, stalemate, and settlement*. New York: Random House.
- Rawwas(2001), Culture, personality, and morality: A typology of international consumers' ethical beliefs, *International Marketing Review* 18(2), pp.188-209.
- Reidenbach & Robin(1990), Toward the development of a multidimensional scale for improving evaluations of business ethics, *Journal of Business Ethics* 9(8), pp.639-653.
- River & Lytle(2007), *International Negotiation : A journal of theory and practice*, volume 12, pp. 1-28.
- Robinson, Lewicki, & Donahue(2000), Extending and testing a five-factor model of ethical and unethical bargaining tactics: introducing the SINS scale, *Journal of Organization Behavior* 21(6), pp.649-664.
- Robinson, R.J., Lewicki, R.J., & Donahue, E.M.(1997), Extending and Testing a Five Factor Model of Ethical and Unethical Bargaining Tactics: Introducing the SINS Scale. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 6(21), pp.649-664.
- Rodney & Heide(1996), Controlling supplier opportunism in industrial relationships, *Journal of Marketing Research* 33, pp.431-441.
- Shapiro, D.L.(1991). The Effects of Explanations on Negative Reactions to Deceit. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 4(36), pp.614-630.
- Shapiro, Lewicki, & Devine(1995), When do employees choose deceptive tactics to stop unwanted change: A relational perspective.
- Shell, G. R.(1999), *Bargaining For Advantage: Negotiation Strategies for Reasonable People*, Viking.
- Sherry & Henson(2005), Conducting and interpreting canonical correlation analysis in personality

- research: A user-friendly primer, *Journal of Personality Assessment* 84(1), pp.37-48.
- Shi & Wright(2003), The potential impacts of national feelings on international business negotiations: A study in China context, *International Business Review* 12(3), pp.311-328.
- Sims, R.L.(2006). Comparing ethical attitudes across cultures. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 2(13), pp.101-113.
- Singh(1990), Managerial culture and work-related values in India, *Organization Studies* 11, pp. 75-101.
- Singhapakdi & Vitell(1991), Analyzing the ethical decision making of sales professionals, *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 11(4), pp.1-12.
- Srnka (2004), Culture's role in marketers' ethical decision making: An integrated theoretical framework, *Academy of Marketing Science Review*.
- Swaidan, Vitell, Rawwas, & Mohammed(2003) Z. Swaidan, S.J. Vitell, Rawwas and Y.A. Mohammed, Consumer ethics: Determinants of ethical beliefs of African Americans, *Journal of Business Ethics* 46, pp.175-186.
- Swee & Teo(1997), Effects of time processing orientation, agreement preferences, and attitudes towards foreign businessmen on negotiation adaptation, *International Business Review* 6(6), pp.625-638.
- Thompson, L., & Hastie, R.(1990). Social perception in negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 1(47), pp.98-123.
- Trompenaars, F. and C. Hampden-Turner(1998), *Riding the waves of culture, Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*. (2nd ed.), London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Ueno & Sekaran(1992), The influence of culture on budget control practices in the USA and Japan: An empirical study, *Journal of International Business Studies* 23.
- Vitell et al.(2003), Ethical judgments and intentions: a multinational study of marketing professionals, *Business Ethics, A European Review* 12(2).
- Volkema & Fleury(2002), Alternative negotiating conditions and the choice of negotiation tactics: A cross-cultural comparison, *Journal of Business Ethics* 36(4).
- Volkema(1999), Ethicality in negotiations: An analysis of perceived similarities and differences between Brazil and the United States, *Journal of Business Resources* 45.

## 국문초록

### 통상협상에서 비윤리적 협상행위에 대한 결정 요인

#### 최 창 환\*

본 논문에서는 국제통상 협상에서 마키아벨리즘, 이상주의, 기회주의 등의 개인적 특성과 법률시스템, 조직의 목표 등 환경적 요인 등이 비윤리적 협상행위에 대한 결정요인으로서 영향을 미치는지에 대한 여부를 실증분석 하였다. 분석결과에 의하면 마키아벨리즘과 이상주의는 부적절한 정보수집과 같은 비윤리적 협상전략과 관련이 있는 반면에 기회주의는 영향이 없는 것으로 확인되었으며, 엄격한 법 집행이 전제되지 않은 현행 법률 시스템 하에서는 비윤리적 협상전술을 사용하려는 의도가 높게 나타났으나, 조직의 목표 달성을 위해 비윤리적 협상전술 사용하려는 의도를 낮게 나타낸 것이 특징이다. 따라서 국제 협상시 상대방의 비윤리적 협상전술 사용을 억제하고 비윤리적 협상위험을 줄이기 위해서는 상대방 국가 협상자의 협상행위 특징을 파악하고, 양쪽 문화에 익숙한 협상 자문사를 고용하는 것이 보다 안전한 협상이득을 얻을 수 있는 방안이라 사료된다.

주제어 : 무역협상, 비윤리적 협상행위, 협상가치, 협상성과

---

\* 단국대학교 무역학과 교수