

Sandbagging: distributive or integrative negotiation technique?

Alexandra ANGHELUȘ, Ștefan BONCU¹

Abstract: From applicability to implementation in psycho-social areas, the interest upon the negotiation research domain has increased over the past years considerably. The propose of this present study is to demonstrate that sandbagging – self-presentation strategy that implies a false prediction of demonstrating ones incapacity (Gibson & Sachau, 2000) – is used by individuals frequently in distributive rather than in integrative negotiation processes, as a persuasion technique. It is known that this self–presentation strategy was studied in competitive situations but as a moderator variable in the cognitive process of responding to the pressure of being choose the favorite one (Gibson, Sachau, Doll, & Shumate, 2002). Also, viewed through a theoretical point of view, which underlines evident differences between men’s’ and women’s’ negotiation styles, as cooperative and assertive individual patterns for solving a conflict (Ruble & Thomas, 1976; Thomas, 1976), the second objective of this study is to demonstrate and synthesize the idea that in a situation that involves applicability of the specific technique through sandbagging – even if we talk about the distributive or integrative form of the negotiation process – there will be differences at an inter-individual level.

Key words: sandbagging, distributive negotiation, integrative negotiation

Introduction

The process of negotiation is related to a very frequent type of interaction in everyday life. We all have minor or serious conflicts of interests with others and we try to resolve these conflicts by using communication. For competition to occur, when we refer to a negotiated agreement, “The social comparison must be important to the self, and one significant factor that makes social comparisons important to the self” (Garcia, Tor, & Gonzales, 2006). For this we can say that, in a social context, everyone is a naive negotiator (Boncu, 2006). Everyone uses negotiation techniques without knowing how they function or even what their names are. In this paper we will examine a technique present in many bargaining situations but, as we believe, not studied by the researchers from the field: sandbagging.

Competitive and cooperative negotiations

The authors of a much known book on the topic define negotiation as “a situation characterized by two or more interdependent parties who have a conflict of interest, and who choose to address that conflict by striving to reach an agreement through a process of mutual adjustment of each party's demands and concessions” (Lewicki, Saunders, & Minton, 1999, p.3).

¹ Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences, « Al. I. Cuza » University, Iasi, Romania
- (for correspondence: boncu@uaic.ro)

Usually, the authors in the field make the distinction between two manners in order to do the negotiation, distributive negotiation and integrative negotiation (or competitive negotiation and cooperative negotiation). Both types are important in order to negotiate successfully. We are adepts of the ideas promoted by the Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School (see, for example, Fischer, Ury, & Patton, 2007) and we strongly believe that integrative negotiation can be used to resolve almost every conflict. We are convinced that professional but also naive negotiators prefer in almost every dispute situation the integrative method. But our hypotheses in this study are rather related to distributive negotiation.

For Richard Luecke, the distributive negotiation is “a type of negotiation in which the parties compete over the distribution of a fixed pool of value” (Luecke, 2003, p.2).

The negotiation theory proposes that individuals with cooperative and competitive perspectives will view the negotiation relationship differently. A cooperative perspective emphasizes a negotiating relationship based on cooperation, trust and flexibility. Conversely, a competitive perspective emphasizes a negotiating relationship based on competition, power and control (Carroll & Payne, 1991; Deutsch, 1982; Larrick, & Blount 1995; Lewicki, Saunders, & Minton 1999; Putnam 1990). The essential characteristic of this type of negotiation is the competitive motivations and behaviors of both sides. The negotiators use the distributive strategy to entail how to distribute a fixed resource. Normally, both want the best part, as much as possible from the resource (but the thing being distributed is limited), the entire resource if possible. If there is a commercial transaction, the seller tries to maximize his profit and get the best price while the buyer wants the same, striving to maximize his profit and pay as little as possible (Thompson, 2007). Their opposed interests generate a sharp conflict and make the parties interdependent. Each party goal makes him the enemy of the other party. Each party wants to close the deal, satisfying his interests and ignoring other’s interests. This kind of negative interdependence is frustrating and leads to a zero-sum game or a win-lose bargaining. Whatever a part gains that will be a loss for the other part.

Distributive bargaining is characterized by three important dimensions: the opening point of each party, the goal or target point and the resistance point or the limit. The opening point is the initial offer or demand, the goal point is the desired bid and the limit is the lowest acceptable bid for each party. The competitive strategies used by the distributive negotiators try to get the negotiated solution as near to the opponent’s resistance point as possible. Usually, when the parties compete against each other they both are forced to accept mediocre outcomes (Boncu, 2006).

In everyday distributive negotiation the two opponents are frequently strangers to each other; they have never had a relationship before and for both of them it is probable that they never meet after the negotiation. The distributive

strategy is employed in the market, every time someone purchases products or services. But, of course, even friends, relatives or acquaintances can have competitive interactions when interests are opposed.

The distributive negotiation is often referred as “the fixed pie” (Thompson, 2007). Indeed, we can explain the negative interdependence situation in terms of a pie. The negotiators tend to believe that it is not enough for both of them, so each of them try to secure for themselves the bigger part of the pie. As Tesser explains, “When the task is relevant and another’s performance threatens to surpass our own, we may take action to prevent that from happening” (Tesser, 1998, p.444). Competition therefore increases when the dimension is relevant to the self. Also, in line with previous research on intergroup behavior (e.g., Brewer & Brown, 1998; Schopler & Insko, 1992; Sherif, 1966), negotiation research on group representatives and negotiation teams showed that an intergroup context affects negotiators’ perceptions of competitiveness, their competitive behavior and negotiation outcomes.

If the distributive negotiation is equivalent with competition, the integrative negotiation involves cooperation. In fact, the care for the other’s interests is fundamental for this kind of interaction. The double victory is the main goal: “Integrative bargaining is a negotiation strategy in which all parties collaborate to find a win-win solution to their dispute so that all parties get maximum mutual gains” (Lewicki, Saunders, & Minton, 1999, p.29). However, the integrative negotiation is not altruism: aware that the other must achieve his goals if he wants himself to get satisfaction from the interaction, the negotiator’s care for the other’s interests but also strives to maximize the value himself, obtained in the deal.

Unlike distributive negotiation, which entails a single issue, integrative negotiation becomes possible when parties have to approach two or more issues. The presence of many issues is beneficial because the disputants can have interests targeting different issues. Consequently, each party concedes something which is not valued by him while trying to obtain something important for him but useless or not so important for the other.

The win-win negotiation is more complicated than the distributive method. It takes more time and forces the negotiators to be creative. The disputants cooperate in order to make a statement which will be given to the partner. They both are involved in finding solutions to each other’s problem. In doing this, they work together to expand the pie and find solutions that benefit both sides. The negotiation becomes creative problem solving in cooperation. The parties join their efforts to achieve something important for both of them.

It is important to mention that the relationship between the parties is a decisive element in integrative negotiation. The cooperation, the trust, the fact that the parties pay much attention to the issues of justice and fairness, the fact that they make commitments and respect them and transform the negotiation in an occasion to build a relationship, even a long-term relationship (Boncu, 2006).

Integrative negotiation usually generates more satisfaction for the individuals involved in the conflict than distributive negotiation. The process of negotiation fosters positive emotions and the negotiated solution is profitable for both parties.

There are many advantages for the win-win negotiation, but it can be used only this strategy. Even in the most cooperative negotiation there is a distributive phase. The two negotiation strategies are not mutually exclusive. The negotiators can cooperate and use their creativity, but in the end they will distribute what their collaborative interaction had generated.

Declaring his own incompetence

Sandbagging is an interesting (although known by all of us) influence technique. It is our hypothesis in this study that it is used in negotiation and more specifically in distributive negotiation.

Sandbagging is also a type of negative self-presentation. Gibson and Sachau (2000) defined sandbagging as “a self-presentational strategy involving the false claiming or feigned demonstration of inability used to create artificially low expectations for the sandbagger’s performance” (p.56).

It is not very frequent, but the individuals do present themselves in specific contexts in a negative manner. For example, adopting the self-handicapping strategy means creating a bad impression about him in order to prevent the observer to be disappointed about actor’s performance. Similarly to the self-handicapper, the sandbagger anticipates a performance by using negative self-presentation.

The etymology of the term sandbagging is rather unclear. It seems, according to West and Shah (2007), that the delinquent men from 19th century gangs used bags of sand as a weapon. They were hit their enemies with these sandbags usually in a sneak attack on the back of the head. Over time, to sandbag came to mean “to conceal or to misrepresent one’s true position, potential or intent in order to take advantage of another person” (West & Shah, 2007, p.3).

A sandbagger is generally an individual who pretends to have worse characteristics that he really has. He lies about his qualities in order to deceive his opponent about his competitive potential and this leads him to infer a level of performance lower than the sandbagger is able to obtain.

Research by Gibson and Sachau (2000) provides evidence for two types of benefits that a sandbagger can get. The first is a self-regulation benefit, consisting of reducing the performance pressure. If the sandbagger can manipulate the observer’s expectations concerning his competitive behavior, convincing the observer not to anticipate a good performance, then the sandbagger will be freed from the high expectations which can damage the attainment of the goal. The second benefit is a self-presentational one: if successful, sandbagging may manipulate the observer’s perception of performance. In fact, by behaving (or just

claiming that he is not so capable) in a manner which infirm his competence, the sandbagger may create a standard against which his subsequent performance is evaluated. The observer's perception will be influenced by a contrast effect. The performance reflecting the real level of competence of the sandbagger will seem better.

But the most important profit of sandbagging is the advantage the individual can gain in front of his adversary. "The goal of the sandbagger is to lull an opponent into a false sense of security that victory is inevitable or complete" (Shepperd & Socherman, 1997, p.1448). Essentially, the sandbagger leads his opponent to underestimate him. The behavior and the affirmations of the sandbagger persuade the other that it is not the case to mobilize all the efforts he can exert in order to appropriate the victory. Relaxing himself and reducing his concentration, the opponent loses the sense of competition and helps the sandbagger to control the situation.

The goal of this present study is to see if, in any condition, there can be a usage of sandbagging in terms of getting what you may want when a negotiation process occurs. There are evidences, in past research, for this relation between sandbagging and competition, but there isn't any specific research upon the complex process of distributive negotiation (Gibson, Sachau, Doll, & Shumate, 2002). The competition context sometimes leads negotiators to resort to ethically questionable techniques. They use such techniques, for example, in short term or hostile relationships. Generally, they gain an advantage using such techniques. One of these ethically questionable tactics could be sandbagging. In our empirical approach, we evaluate the hypothesis that sandbagging is used by the negotiators predisposed to competition and distributive negotiation and less by the cooperative negotiators, inclined to initiate a process of integrative negotiation.

Research objectives and aims

Regarding a new perspective in this domain of persuasion that concerns negotiation – because as we may see, this process needs individual skills and not only a specific technique applied in a certain moment (Barry & Friedman, 1998) – the objective of this research was to demonstrate with accuracy, that sandbagging – self-presentation strategy that implies a false prediction of demonstrating one's incapacity – is underlined by individuals in the distributive negotiation process, as a persuasive technique, to gain control and win; also there was a question concerning a situation that involves applicability of the specific technique through sandbagging, in terms of differences between women and men, at an inter-individual level. Considering this, we assume that:

- There will be differences between individuals with a predisposition for sandbagging and individuals without such a predisposition in selecting a negotiation form for a given situation; individuals that have an obvious

predisposition for sandbagging, will choose in a greater measure patterns of distributive negotiation (win-win), instead of patterns of integrative negotiation (win-lose).

- There will be differences between individuals with a predisposition for sandbagging and those that do not have this kind of predisposition in the negotiation process. The hypothesis will be confirmed if individuals with a predisposition for sandbagging take in to account specific patterns of behavior in a negotiation task, in a greater measure than the ones that do not have this kind of predisposition.
- There will be differences between individuals with a predisposition for sandbagging, in terms of gender; female subjects with a predisposition for sandbagging will use in a greater way distributive negotiation more than female subjects that do not have this kind of predisposition, or more than male subjects.

Method

Participants

One hundred and eighteen participants (N=118) from “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași, Faculty of Communication and Public Relations – all were students that finished their faculty degree (in three years). The participants were not selected following a strict control of any variable, - their selection was random, and therefore they all were students – concluding that there wasn’t a target population. Our main propose was to measure the relation between the two variables measured through specific scales. Reliability of instruments was verified applying each instrument on 25 participants; they were also students from the same university, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, and they replied to our online requirement – in order to participate in the study from the same place. Concerning the patterns of describing the gender of participants, they were women and men, in an invariable number (the numbers of women were higher) – 56 men (47%), 62 – women (52%); we did not use any strategy to obtain control upon the variables, and this fact may affect poor results.

Instruments

Based on the theoretical background regarding sandbagging we discovered a scale for measuring the predisposition of using in different ways a sandbagging technique, for improving a mechanism for coping or winning sympathy from others. The authors called it the “Sandbagging Scale” (Gibson & Sachau, 2000) and we started to pretest in Romania through a small filter of individuals (25 subjects). The scale has 12 items measured on a 6 point scale, from 1 – which means “true” (for me) to 6 – which means “false” (for me). Higher rates (from 42

to 72) were used for underlining the tendency to use sandbagging in everyday life situations; meanwhile lower rates (from 41 to 12) were indicators of a non-existing tendency to use this kind of self-presentation. Some examples of the items are: “The less others expect of me the better I like it”; “I like to see others surprised by my abilities”; after the pretest we obtained an internal consistency coefficient, α Chrobach of .92. This gives us the opportunity to confirm that the instrument has good reliability and can stand for measuring the predisposition for sandbagging.

The second instrument used in our research was defined in terms of measuring types of negotiation used in different situations by individuals constructed by us upon the theory of types involved in negotiation (Walton & McKersie, 1965). We only took, from those four levels of negotiation – and we refer here to distributive, integrative, attitudinal and organizational –, the ones that could help us find the first main presumption, in terms of winning or losing directly correlated with our predisposition for those two ways of seeing a negotiation process – do people tend to cooperate or compete when they are in a negotiation process? Effective integrative bargaining requires concern for one's own as well as the other side's interests (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986) as well as persistence and effort.

This scale, properly seen as a valid way for measuring two different dimensions – as we said, distributive and integrative – has 10 items measured on a 6 point scale, from 1 – which means “totally disagree” to 6 – which means “totally agree”. We chose this 6 point scale because we tried to avoid the “center tendency” for giving an answer. There are five items for measuring the integrative dimension of the negotiation process – this means that we were centered on the cooperative dimension – and five for measuring the distributive one, analyzing the competitive behavior and actions. Higher rates at each dimension indicate the appearance of that personal way to think and see a negotiation process – the fact that individuals prefer, in one way or another, to compete or to cooperate in different tasks. Lower rates indicate the absence of specific patterns for one dimension or another. An example of item for distributive negotiation type is: “I want others to lose”. This item can describe a subliminal way to find the competitive pattern of a cognitive schema. For integrative we can mention the subsequent item: “Equality makes me feel secure“. When we want something equal for us and also for others, this can be described in terms of cooperative patterns of behavior. This instrument also has good reliability (α Chrobach = .84), which was tested, applying it as a simple task given to 30 students from different faculties of “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University from Iasi. There was also a final task of this scale, and this required the subjects to mention their gender; this was necessary in terms of finding any difference that may have occurred, concerning our initial aims, which states that there could be some specific patterns of behavior if we talk about women and men in front of a negotiated statement.

Procedure

After constructing and validating the two instruments, we introduced these specific items into an online database, through which the subjects could give us the answer to every item by selecting the measure in which a specific behavior is related to their way of thinking. Before starting to complete the main task (which was to answer as fast as they could, on a scale from 1 to 6 to given items), we ensured the individuals that there weren't any good or bad answers, and that the confidential part of these tasks was very important for us also. This was specified in the main instruction field.

Every subject received an e-mail in which they were asked to complete the following tasks, for research upon school performance. The cover story – school performance – was used to underline specific patterns of sandbagging in everyday life and egocentric behavior (distributive negotiation type), or, generally speaking, to test the construct validity of our main research themes. A subject received this e-mail in which he was told to go to a specific link and to follow the steps required there. When the individual clicked on the link, they were directed to an on-line page where they could, in approximately 10 minutes, answer to specific items. During one week, 118 people answered the 12 item scale (on sandbagging) and immediately after the 10 item one (on type of negotiation), and their answers were coded in an excel database created also through Google Spreadsheets, copied afterwards in the SPSS 19–IBM version, where we could test our hypothesis.

Results

After collecting the specific data of our research, we found in the main part of it, a moderate specific significant correlation between sandbagging and the two types of negotiation: $r(116) = .31, p = .003$. This means – in statistical terms –, that higher scores at sandbagging are related to higher scores at the negotiation type scale, and this also happens for medium and low rates. We used an alpha level of .05 for all statistical tests.

The second step was to test the hypothesis that maintains the idea of evident patterns of higher tendency for sandbagging in distributive negotiation and in negotiation acts in general. Underlining that we had two variables with two levels each, the Independent Sample T-Test analysis showed us the related results: $t(88) = -3.07; p = .003$, which means that there was a significant effect of sandbagging, with the mention that the predisposition for distributive negotiation ($M = 1.58, SD = .49$) received higher scores than the predisposition for integrative negotiation ($M = 1.26, SD = .44$). This hypothesis had been confirmed and we can talk about a general tendency to use sandbagging in negotiation, even if we refer to a distributive or integrative type by mentioning that in a distributive type, the tendency seems to be more evident than in an integrative one. This may occur

because of an evident general pattern for competition, used for a specific act of winning and achieving a goal.

Another hypothesis was that centered on finding differences between women and men in terms of using sandbagging or using a type of negotiation. At a beginning level we assumed that women will try to be more cooperative (integrative negotiation type) than men. Also, regarding sandbagging, we tested the hypothesis that concluded the fact that a woman's tendency for sandbagging would describe higher rates than a man's tendency. The Independent Sample T-Test showed us that those hypotheses could not be confirmed by any result. There wasn't a significant effect of gender in terms of using a specific technique in negotiation – distributive or integrative: $t(88) = 1.03$, $p = .30$. We also discovered an insignificant effect of gender upon the usage of the sandbagging technique in the negotiation process: $t(88) = -0.04$, $p = .96$.

Our final hypothesis was to test if there were differences in terms of a sandbagging tendency used in distributive or integrative negotiation types in terms of the same gender. We assume that female subjects with a predisposition for sandbagging would use in greater way distributive negotiation, compared to females without such a predisposition; We also tested if this hypothesis could be validated for men. Again, an analysis through the Independent Sample T-Test, showed us that this hypothesis had been confirmed for women only. There was a significant effect of one's predisposition involved in a distributive process, in terms of females that use the sandbagging technique compared to the ones that did not use this type of technique: $t(54) = -2.60$, $p = .01$. The effect was insignificant when we refer to men: $t(32) = -1.73$, $p = .09$; they used in the same way sandbagging in the distributive and integrative negotiation process.

Discussions

The domain of negotiation is nearly one of the largest studied if we refer to economics or psychology. For years, researches have looked for answers to simple questions regarding what happens – psychologically speaking –, with our cognitions, emotions or behavior when we negotiate. The diversity of literature on negotiation techniques and differences between different variables involved in this kind of process, gives us the opportunity to declare that it is a matter of individual perspective in a social constructed context. This present research understates the fact that people tend to manipulate and discover a self-strategy to win in each situation. This means that according to literature which classifies techniques and strategies, we can say that to get what they need and want, individuals do things that appear to be manipulative and restrictive from a social point of view. The diversity of negotiation techniques used in the specific persuasion domain of public relation, gives us the opportunity to find relevant connections between one's personality traits and a given behavior. If we tend to present ourselves as incapable

of doing something right, or to underestimate our capacity, others seem to gain trust in their inner strength. They believe that once you declare that you cannot handle a situation you can be driven to their point of view easily, because of this so intended control.

The relevance of the present study is not evident only for negotiation in general, but also for creating a profile for the perfect competitive negotiator, - the one that wins. When we talk about a psychological profile we refer to different dimensions, and therefore we can define prototypically as a socio-cognitive portrait, that can be described as a self-report to a specific technique in order to improve his skills. In this context, sandbagging becomes ability, an internal process that can be used only in an advanced way by a distributive related negotiator.

It is a fact that in the research domain that concerns negotiation and its ways of being promoted as a defined way for getting to an agreement, we can find a strict relation between different variables related to patterns of communication behavior. Individuals always search for a way to be unique from others when it comes to this idea of winning what you need to win. This may be a cognitive sample of different negotiation behavior. People tend to find specific ways to obtain what they want – an object, a fact, their part or much more than that -, even if they don't need it. It's the process itself that counts – its quality, not the quantity of what they get. Again we can speak about an individual tactic to present himself as a good controller of one situation or another. In fact, this self-presentation strategy – called sandbagging – is constructed like a trap for the opponent. If an individual seems weak, if he declares that he isn't capable of doing something, he uses this strategy to get more from the one in front of him. People tend to use sandbagging for their self-protection. Our general hypothesis was confirmed. Individuals with a predisposition for sandbagging are likely to use this strategy in a distributive negotiation task because they intend to "win". They also use it in the integrative one and this can be explained as a component from our personality construct. We, as individuals, tend to use sandbagging, more or less, in different contexts, because we tend to manipulate others through this kind of behavior. Sandbagging can be confounded with modesty, but at a certain level modesty is more a trait that states you can do things very well but you will never recognize your capacity because you don't see it. The individual cannot see his strengths even if someone shows him concrete actions. In sandbagging you know that you are capable, you know your strengths, but you don't recognize that you have them in front of others, because you need consistent validation, you need to win everything, and this is a way of doing this without letting others to see your real capacity.

Through this manipulative way, we can declare a typology of a negotiator – the one that attacks after using his tendency to self-present himself as incapable, as a manipulative-cognitive weapon. In the literature that concerns negotiation, this type of individual is called the aggressive one. He tries to get what he wants, in any way he can, and so he gets to manipulate people.

Our results – until now – have demonstrated this point of view, but they do not sustain the idea that matches with our second presumption: that there are differences between women and men in terms of sandbagging used in negotiation. This may occur because there is a small sample of subjects for this present research, but in the same time this sandbagging technique appearance in negotiation, may be more subtle than it seems. Women, generally, have a predisposition for listening and are assertive and cooperative, but when it comes to winning, they are capable of any type of behavior, any strategy that brings them the right to win. They are competitive, not with men, but more with their own gender (Campbell, 2002).

Distributive negotiation is the kind of negotiation that requires a double statement: one that is centered on winning and, on the other hand, the one that states there has to be a loser in every negotiated agreement. Our last hypothesis underlines that there are differences in terms of sandbagging used in distributive or integrative negotiation tasks when we refer to females. This hypothesis was confirmed, and this is related to the idea that women tend to find in other females a rival, although this can be a stereotypical point of view (Devine et al., 1991). An opponent always brings in front of everything the idea of competition and also of winning, activating different ways of getting what they want. Although women are cooperative, when it comes to winning and losing in front of another woman, the situation requires this activation of new winning techniques.

Further, a detailed knowledge of the institutional context of the negotiations, allowed us to demonstrate that the bargaining processes needs to be understood within their organizational context – an understanding that bargaining theorists in the past have been criticized for not taking sufficient account (as cited in Bacon & Blyton, 2006). If we refer to the limits of this present study, we can talk about other variables that can influence the negotiation act, that were not integrated here (eg. educational status, type of negotiator, negotiator personality, etc.); Also, we are tend to confound sandbagging with other negotiation techniques. Is this term well defined as a technique itself? Or this may be similar with other negotiation techniques: Colombo Technique, KISS (Keep It Simple, Stupid) Technique. Similar patterns are found in every negotiation technique, but there are little differences between every mentioned one. First of all, the Colombo Technique is a way to let others to believe that you don't know. In a cognitive way, you are unable to understand a certain situation. Meanwhile sandbagging is a concrete declaration of incapacity – physical and psychical inability of doing things right. Sandbagging is not a way to simplify things for getting what you want, but a way to state that you cannot handle a situation, even if you can, until you think the other is convinced enough that he doesn't need any cognitive armaments to confront you. When he has given up and thinks he is in charge, you take your position for getting what you want. In fact, individuals give to an opponent what he expects to get, with the mention that there is a reverse to every action.

In the future, within a new research design, we might think of developing an experiment in which subjects would act, according to manipulated variables to a presented stimulus (in this case); this can be realized by manipulating, sandbagging or types of negotiation in conversational tasks or in text, in behavior or through different perceptual stimulus, but also keeping sufficient control upon selecting participants. If there is a random selection we may have different problems regarding personality or other related variables.

Reference List:

- Bacon, N., & Blyton, P. (2006). Union cooperation in a context of job insecurity: negotiated outcomes from teamworking. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 2, 215–37.
- Barry B., & Friedman, R. A. (1998). Bargainer characteristics in distributive and integrative negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 345–59.
- Baumgardner, A. H., & Brownlee, E. A. (1987). Strategic failure in social interaction: Evidence for expectancy disconfirmation processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 525-535.
- Boncu, Ș. (2006). *Negocierea și medierea. Perspective psihologice*. Iași: Institutul European.
- Brewer, M. B., & Brown, R. J. (1998). Intergroup relations. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & A. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (pp.554-594). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Campbell, A. (2002). *A mind of her own: The evolutionary psychology of women*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carroll, J. S., & Payne, J. W. (1991). An information processing approach to two-party negotiations, *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 3, 3–34.
- Deutsch, M. (1982). Interdependence and psychological orientation, in V.J. Derlega & J. Grzela *Cooperation and Helping Behavior: Theories and Research*, New York: Academic Press.
- Devine, P.G., Monteith, M. J., Zuwerink, J. R., & Elliot, A. J. (1991). Prejudice with and without compunction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 817-830.
- Fischer, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2007). *Răspunsul lor... „DA!”*. *Negociază înțelept fără a ceda*. București: Almatea.
- Garcia, S. M., Tor, A., & Gonzalez, R. (2006). Ranks and rivals: A Theory of competition. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(7), 970–982.
- Gibson, B., & Sachau, D. (2000). Sandbagging as a self-presentational strategy: Claiming to be less than you are. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(1), 56-70.
- Gibson, B., Sachau, D. A., Doll, B., & Shumate, R. (2002). Sandbagging in competition Responding to the pressure of being the favorite. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1119-1130.
- Larrick, R., & Blount, S. (1995). Social context in tacit bargaining games: Consequences for perceptions of affinity and cooperative behavior, in R. M. Kramer & D. M. Messick, *Negotiation as a Social Process: New Trends in Theory and Research*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Lewicki, R. J., Saunders, D. M., & Minton, J. W. (1999). *Negotiation*. Boston: Irwin McGraw - Hill.
- Luecke, R. (2003). *Negotiation*. Harvard: Harvard Business Press.
- Pruitt, D. G., & Rubin, J. Z. (1986). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and settlement*. New York: Random House.
- Putnam, L.L. (1990). Reframing integrative and distributive bargaining: A process perspective, *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 2, 3–30.
- Ruble, T. L., & Thomas, K.W. (1976). Support for a 2-dimensional model of conflict behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 143-155.
- Schopler, J., & Insko, C. A. (1992). The discontinuity effect in interpersonal and intergroup relations: Generality and mediation. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (pp. 121–151). Oxford, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Shepperd, J. A., & Socherman, R. E. (1997). On the manipulative behavior of low Machiavellians: Feigning incompetence to “sandbag” an opponent. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(6), 1448-1459.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *In common predicament: Social psychology of intergroup conflict and cooperation*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Tesser, A. (1988). Toward a self-evaluation maintenance model of social behavior. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 193-355). New York: Academic Press.
- Thomas, K. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In W.K. Hoy and C.G. Miskel (Eds.), *Educational Administration: Theory, Research, Practice* (pp. 100-102). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thompson, L. (2007). *Mintea și inima negociatorului. Manual complet de negociere*. București: Meteor Press.
- Walton, R. E., & McKersie, R. B. (1965). *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- West, G. D., & Shah, K. M. (2007). *Debunking the myth of the sandbagging buyer*. Thompson/West, 11(1), 3-7.