

COMPETITIVE YOUNG GENERATION – MYTH OR REALITY?

Anikó Tompos

Széchenyi István University, Hungary

The study aims to contribute to research on moral aspects of business negotiations. In particular, it sets out to investigate whether there are generational differences between negotiators when assessing the acceptability and opting for or against the employment of ethically ambiguous negotiating tactics. The rationale for the investigation is that although the last decades have seen increasing international academic interest in whether it is culture, age or gender which is most decisive, in Hungary there is a lack of similar research. According to sociological surveys and public opinion, members of the young generation are more assertive, competitive and willing to take more risks than their older counterparts, thus their behaviour is more likely to demonstrate lower ethical standards. The study reports on the findings of a questionnaire survey (N=246) conducted in the Northern Transdanubia Region of Hungary. The results show that both studied age groups hold a low opinion of ethically questionable tactics and do not frequently use them. The young generation of business negotiators is more competitive and venturesome only in their values, that is, they seem to approve more of EANTs. At the same time, there seem to be no significant differences between the two broad generations' practices.

Keywords: Competitiveness, Ethically ambiguous negotiation tactics, Ethical standards, Generations, Values and practices.

Introduction

Recent years have seen increased international academic interest in the use of ethically ambiguous negotiation tactics (henceforth EANTs), mainly in the context of business. Inter- and intracultural investigations looked at pre-work and in-work practitioners' judgements on and use of EANTs as well as the contextual and situational factors which influence their employment. At the same time, in Hungary there is a relative lack of research in the area of business negotiations and ethics in general (Dévényi, 2009) and in EANTs in particular. The majority of studies discusses the intercultural aspect of business negotiations in general (e.g. Ablonczyné Mihályka, 2013; Konczosné Szombathelyi et al., 2016; Kecskés, 2017, Tompos, 2015), or, alternatively, presents or compares the negotiating habits of one or two cultures (e.g. Borgulya, 2009; Szőke, 2015).

The present study sets out to investigate whether there are generational differences between business negotiators when assessing the acceptability and opting for or against the employment of EANTs. The rationale for the research is the perceived generation gap between those Hungarians who were brought up and started work before the change of regime in 1990 (roughly corresponding to the babyboomer generation and generation X) and those who were only children at that time and completed their education and started their career in the new 'capitalist' era (generations Y and Z). Researchers from diverse

specialist fields have approached different aspects of this generation gap and, consequently, have come to conclusions that do not allow for straightforward comparison (see, for example Czifra and Mészáros, 2013; Dósa et al., 2014; Ercsey, 2017; Makkos-Káldi et al., 2013; Náday and Garai, 2017; Róbert and Valuch, 2013; Tompos and Ablonczy-Mihályka, 2015).

However, there is some common agreement on the work-related characteristics of the generations. Babyboomers (born between 1945 and 1959) are usually seen as loyal and reliable. They respect professional knowledge, experience and traditions. Generation X (born between 1960 and 1979) faced the rapidly changing world of technology and also the settlement of multinational companies in Hungary accompanied by unlimited working hours and workplace stress. Its members are not only controlled and adept but also highly motivated, money-minded and career-oriented, however, since they were socialised and started work in the communist era, they are still cooperative and collectivistic. Generation Y (born between 1980 and 1994) is talented and creative with high-level technological skills and a hunger for information resulting in flexibility and an ability to fit into multicultural teams. At the same time, due to multitasking, they do not strive to gain thorough professional knowledge, are willing to take too many risks and are often impatient. Unlike their parents and grandparents, they are not attached to their workplace and do not strive for lifelong employment. Generation Z (born between 1995 and 2010) is practical, has good problem-solving skills but is not so good at solving conflicts and further, its members do not respect authority. Information communication is their ‘mother tongue’ and they are very good at information sharing.

The study first overviews the international and Hungarian academic literature on whether it is the negotiator’s culture, gender or age which exerts the greatest influence on negotiators’ choices concerning EANTs. Then it presents the aims, methods and findings of a questionnaire survey in order to see whether the results confirm the general idea that the younger generation of Hungarians is more assertive, competitive and willing to take too many risks, and find out whether these qualities manifest themselves in more common use of questionable negotiation tactics and thus lower ethical standards.

Literature Review

From among the variables which are believed to affect negotiators’ choices concerning EANTs, the following three demographic factors have received the greatest attention in international academic literature: nationality (national culture), gender and age. The effect of other demographic factors (e.g. education or religiousness), contextual-situational variables (e.g. the importance of the negotiation or the opponent’s reputation) and personality traits (e.g. the negotiator’s self-reported aggressiveness) have also been studied, but to a lesser extent.

In a seminal article Dawson (1997), in an effort to see whether male and female salespeople differ in their ethical attitudes, asked her subjects to respond to twenty ethical scenarios. Relationships were involved in half of the scenarios. Her findings revealed significant ethical differences between men and women and also between generations: when confronted with relational scenarios, sales professionals in their forties and fifties demonstrated higher ethical standards than those in their twenties while women in all age groups demonstrated higher ethical standards than men, however, the difference decreased as their age increased. Given these results, she (Dawson, 1997: 1143) concluded that “gender-based ethical differences change with age and years of experience”.

Lewicki and Robinson (1998), on the basis of a comprehensive quantitative study of 18 ethically questionable negotiating tactics, established four factors: misrepresentation of information, traditional competitive bargaining, bluffing, manipulation of opponent’s network, and inappropriate information gathering. Their huge database allowed them to draw conclusions on the different preferences of respondents according to demographical data. Concerning the cultural background of respondents, for example they found that Americans were significantly more accepting of tactics related to traditional competitive bargaining (e.g. shocking opening offer or hiding the bottom-line) than Eastern Europeans. With regard to gender, their data showed that men were significantly more accepting of tactics on all

factors than women, except traditional competitive bargaining. They did not examine age as an independent variable, possibly due to the fact that their respondents were MBA students from two universities. However, in reviewing previous research they presented Anton's (1990) study which found that older respondents considered deception as less ethical than any other of his examined groups while younger and older respondents saw bluffing as less ethical than middle-aged respondents. In subsequent research reports Lewicki and his co-authors called for further research into the interplay of national culture, business practices and what is considered ethical behaviour in negotiations and also expanded upon the importance of the negotiator's age and gender. For example, Robinson et al. (2000) found that younger negotiators are significantly more likely to engage in ethically questionable practices than their older counterparts and further, that men tended to employ more EANTs than women, except for tactics related to traditional competitive bargaining, where no significant differences were found between the reported behaviour of male and female negotiators. Lewicki et al. (2015) described gender-related cognitive and behavioural processes and concluded that men and women think about negotiations and communicate differently, women are often treated worse in negotiations and their tactics can be less successful than those of their male counterparts, and finally, that gender stereotypes affect negotiators' performance.

Perry et al. (2005) extended the work of Robinson et al. (2000) in order to examine a greater number of additional factors (e.g. smalltown values, charitable activities and religious commitment) that might influence the use of EANTs. Their respondents were also tertiary students from four USA-based universities representing more than 20 majors, mainly agriculture, business, environmental sciences and engineering. Their results overall show that it is age and gender which have the strongest influence on willingness to engage in marginally ethical negotiating tactics, in that their older subjects and female respondents reported significantly less unethical behaviour. However, they (Perry et al., 2005: 18) note that "given the tight range of ages among the major part of the survey population, it is difficult to draw strong conclusions about the impact of age on negotiation ethics".

Researchers continue to come to controversial findings concerning the role of gender and age in ethical behaviour. For example, Kray and Haselhuhn (2012) manipulated negotiators' motivation across four studies and concluded that men are more pragmatic (or lenient) when it comes to setting ethical standards. Yurtsever and Ben-Asher's studies (2013) also showed that male negotiators were more likely to misrepresent information than female negotiators, and moreover, they used these tactics more often when they negotiated with women. However, there are studies which show that factors other than gender might play a more important role in ethical decisions. Forte (2004) found that female American managers exhibited only slightly more principled moral reasoning ability than men. Sidani et al (2008) detected gender-related significant differences (with women being more sensitive to ethics-related issues than men) in only 4 out of a range of 18 examined situations and scenarios and concluded that age is a more decisive variable. Similarly, the findings of Lourenço et al. (2015) showed gender-related variations only in the ethical attitudes of pre-work entrepreneurs, but not of nascent entrepreneurs and further, they revealed that in-work male entrepreneurs had higher ethical standards than male enterprise students. In the context of Hungary, both qualitative (Tompos and Ablonczy-Mihályka, 2014) and quantitative (Tompos and Ablonczy-Mihályka, 2016) data demonstrated that business negotiators do not admit to take the opponent's gender or culture into consideration when opting for or against the employment of EANTs. Both examinations found that for business professionals their relationship with the opponent and the outcome of the negotiation are much more decisive factors. However, two pieces of quantitative study (Tompos and Ablonczy-Mihályka, 2015; Náday and Garai, 2017) have detected age-related differences between the behaviour of Hungarian business negotiators, namely that the younger generation appreciates assertive behaviour and tends to be more competitive and adventurous than their older counterparts, who seem to be more cooperative and to strive more for harmony.

At the same time, the findings of Gupta et al (2010) indicated that accounting students' ethical choices are not affected by their age or gender. Indeed, there are examinations which show that culture may account for both gender- and age-related differences. For example in Serbia Dobrijević (2014) has found that although men concentrate more on winning than women, Serbian female negotiators do not use

more cooperative tactics than their male counterparts and moreover, that women are more likely to care only about their own interests than men. She explained her findings with cultural values and norms, namely masculinity, which requires Serbian women to be very assertive if they want to succeed in the business environment. The present author (Tompos, 2016), using gender as an independent variable on the data to be discussed in the present study, has come to a similar conclusion with regard to the perceived ethicality of EANTs, where her findings also demonstrated strong masculine cultural orientation in values, since female business negotiators' judgements on the appropriateness of the tactics were very similar to those of their male counterparts. In her examination, however, when asked about the use of EANTs, women claimed to rely on them less frequently than men (although a statistically significant difference between men and women was found in the case of only one tactic), which was assumed to indicate that Hungarian female negotiators' behavioural norms and practices are more gender-bound than the values they hold.

The assumed supremacy of the influence of culture can be detected in the vast body of data published to prove differences in the preferences of negotiators with different cultural backgrounds. For example, Triandis et al. (2001) studied the relationship of deception and culture and concluded that the judgement on what is considered a lie and to what extent a tactic can be used differs from culture to culture. A number of researchers examined negotiators' attitudes to EANTs in different cultures, from Turkey (Erkuş and Banai, 2011) to Peru (Stefanidis et al., 2013). Other researchers engaged themselves in bicultural comparisons. Zhang, Liu and Liu (2014), for example, compared American and Chinese negotiators' attitude to deceive and came to the conclusion that Chinese negotiators tend to use more informational deception than American negotiators, while their American counterparts are more likely to commit more negative emotional deception. Also in the context of Chinese and American inter- and intra-cultural negotiations, Yang, De Cremer and Wang (2016) found that American negotiators were more likely to engage in EANTs with Chinese counterparts than with Americans, and Chinese negotiators were less likely to use them with Americans than with Chinese. Quite a few of these investigations set out to identify the cultural aspect which is responsible for the difference. Volkema (1999; 2004), for example, detected correlations between intercultural differences in negotiators' preferences and the Hofstedeian dimensions of culture, namely individualism/collectivism, high/low power distance and masculinity/femininity, although the results admittedly bore some inconsistency. The above-discussed findings of Dobrijević (2014) and Tompos (2016) also fit this approach.

Purpose and Method

The study aims to see whether there are generational differences between business negotiators when making judgements on the acceptability and opting for or against the employment of ethically ambiguous negotiating tactics. In particular, it sets out to answer the following two research questions:

RQ 1: Is there a generational difference between business negotiators' perception of the appropriateness of EANTs?

RQ 2: Is there a generational difference between business negotiators' admitted use of EANTs?

The data come from a questionnaire, which, drawing on Lewicki and Robinson (1998), contained fourteen EANTs (below), translated into Hungarian and reformulated into the first person singular. Indented headings show the factors (broad groups of the marginally ethical tactics) as established by Lewicki and Robinson (1998).

Misrepresentation of information

- I intentionally misrepresent factual information to my opponent in order to support my negotiating position.

Traditional competitive bargaining

- I make a shocking opening offer/demand in order to undermine my opponent's confidence.
- I hide my real bottom line.
- I pretend to be in no hurry in trying to get my opponent to give concessions.
- I gain information about my opponent's position and strategy by asking my business contacts.

Bluffing

- I promise good things to my opponent if he gives what I want even if I know I can't or won't give them.
- I threaten my opponent even if I know I would not harm them.
- I make my opponent feel they can only get what they want from me although I know they could get it cheaper or faster elsewhere.

Manipulation of opponent's network

- I contact my opponent's superior and try to undermine their professional credibility.
- I threaten to make my opponent look unprofessional in front of their superiors.
- I contact my opponent's superior and try to encourage them to defect to my side.

Inappropriate information gathering

- I 'hire' a subordinate of the opponent in order to gain confidential information on their position and strategy.
- I gain information directly from my opponent through gifts, entertaining and personal favours.
- I gain information about my opponent's position from 'paid informants' (e.g. acquaintances).

Data was collected in 2016. The respondents were selected by quote sampling. The quote was established on the basis of Hungarian Central Bureau of Statistics data on the ratio of economic sectors which the companies operating in the Western Transdanubia Region represent. As well as the geographical cluster criterion, only practising businesspeople who work in an international environment and routinely conduct negotiations with Hungarians as well as representatives of foreign cultures were asked to fill in the questionnaire.

The respondents rated, on a scale between 0 and 4, the appropriateness of the tactics (0=completely inappropriate; 1=very rarely appropriate; 2=sometimes appropriate; 3=often appropriate; 4= appropriate in the majority of cases) and they also stated how frequently they use them (0=never; 1=very rarely; 2=sometimes; 3=often; 4= almost always).

The following analysis relies on the responses given by 246 subjects, 157 of whom represent the younger generation (generations Y and Z; between 20 and 35 years of age), while 98 respondents are members of generation X or are veterans (over 35 years of age). Since out of the latter group, only 17 respondents were over 51 years of age, and, further, 205 respondents hold a bachelor or master degree, the majority of subjects in the first age-group are assumed to represent generation Y, while those in the second age group generation X. SPSS 18.0 was used to process and analyse data.

Findings

Table 1 shows the ANOVA descriptive statistics for the perceived appropriateness of the EANTs (0=completely inappropriate; 1=very rarely appropriate; 2=sometimes appropriate; 3=often appropriate; 4= appropriate in the majority of cases). As we can see from the mean values, the young generation seems to hold a more favourable opinion of EANTs belonging to the first four groups. However, regarding the

tactics related to *inappropriate information gathering*, the means are very similar, with the older generation's ratings even slightly exceeding those of the young generation in two cases. The young generation's scores range from absolute rejection (minimum 0: completely inappropriate) to general acceptance (maximum 4: appropriate in the majority of cases) of each EANT, whereas no respondent from the older generation considered four tactics to be appropriate in the majority of cases, and another one was not even seen as often appropriate.

Table 1. The appropriateness of EANTs as perceived by the young and the older generation

EANT	age	mean	std dev	std error	min	max
I intentionally misrepresent factual information to support my...	35-	.68	.934	.075	0	4
	35+	.44	.738	.078	0	3
I make a shocking opening offer /demand...	35-	1.68	1.221	.097	0	4
	35+	1.48	1.046	.111	0	4
I hide my real bottom line.	35-	2.60	1.187	.095	0	4
	35+	2.60	1.222	.130	0	4
I pretend to be in no hurry...	35-	2.32	1.252	.100	0	4
	35+	1.94	1.171	.124	0	4
I gain information ... by asking my business contacts.	35-	2.99	1.177	.094	0	4
	35+	2.75	1.359	.144	0	4
I promise good things (...) even if I know I can't or won't give them.	35-	.76	1.071	.085	0	4
	35+	.40	.750	.079	0	3
I threaten my opponent even if I know I would not harm them.	35-	.46	.910	.073	0	4
	35+	.27	.578	.061	0	2
I make my opponent feel they can only get what they want from me...	35-	2.15	1.377	.110	0	4
	35+	1.69	1.293	.137	0	4
I contact my opponent's superior and try to undermine...	35-	.49	.938	.075	0	4
	35+	.29	.625	.066	0	3
I threaten to make my opponent look unprofessional...	35-	.40	.839	.067	0	4
	35+	.38	.746	.079	0	3
I contact my opponent's superior and try to encourage them to...	35-	1.04	1.006	.080	0	4
	35+	.93	.986	.105	0	4
I 'hire' a subordinate of the opponent in order to gain confidential info...	35-	.99	1.129	.090	0	4
	35+	1.02	1.000	.106	0	4
I gain information directly from my opponent through gifts...	35-	1.37	1.237	.099	0	4
	35+	1.38	1.239	.131	0	4
I gain information (...) from 'paid informants'(e.g. acquaintances).	35-	1.22	1.191	.095	0	4
	35+	1.18	1.310	.139	0	4

These latter 5 EANTs received the lowest ratings from both generations. They belong to *misrepresentation of information* (I intentionally misrepresent factual information to my opponent in order to support my negotiating position), *bluffing* (I promise good things to my opponent if he gives what I want even if I know I can't or won't give them; I threaten my opponent even if I know I would not harm them) and *manipulation of opponent's network* (I contact my opponent's superior and try to undermine their professional credibility; I threaten to make my opponent look unprofessional in front of their superiors). In general, business negotiators seem to hold a low opinion of EANTs. The tactics most accepted by both generations are related to *traditional competitive bargaining* (I hide my real bottom line; I pretend to be in no hurry in trying to get my opponent to give concessions; I gain information about my opponent's position and strategy by asking my business contacts).

Statistically significant differences between the attitudes of the two age groups were found in two cases. The data are presented in Tables 2 and 3. The tactic *I pretend to be in no hurry in trying to get my opponent to give concessions* was judged as often or mostly appropriate by the younger generation much more frequently than by the older generation. Similarly, they seem to accept the bluffing tactic *I make my opponent feel they can only get what they want from me although I know they could get it cheaper or faster elsewhere*. These differences are also reflected in the mean figures of the two EANTs.

Table 2. Pretending to be in no hurry

Crosstab		Age groups		Total
		35-	35+	
I pretend to be in no hurry in trying to get my opponent to give concessions	completely inappropriate	24	13	37
	very rarely appropriate	10	16	26
	sometimes appropriate	37	31	68
	often appropriate	63	21	84
	mostly appropriate	23	8	31
Total		157	89	246
Chi-Square-Tests				
	Value	df	Asymp. Syg. (2-sided)	
Pearson Chi-Square	15.857	4	.003	
Likelihood Ratio	15.752	4	.003	
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.411	1	.020	
N of Valid Cases	246			
Symmetric Measures				
	Value	Approx. Syg.		
Nominal by Phi	.254	.003		
Nominal Cramer's V	.254	.003		
N of Valid Cases	246			

Table 3. Only now, only from me, only to you

Count		Age groups		Total
		35-	35+	
I make my opponent	completely inappropriate	29	20	49
feel they can only get	very rarely appropriate	19	23	42
what they want from me	sometimes appropriate	41	20	61
although I know...	often appropriate	36	17	53
	mostly appropriate	32	9	41
Total		157	89	246
Chi-Square-Tests				
	Value	df	Asymp. Syg. (2-sided)	
Pearson Chi-Square	11.023	4	.026	
Likelihood Ratio	11.027	4	.026	
Linear-by-Linear				
Association	6.504	1	.011	
N of Valid Cases	246			
Symmetric Measures				
	Value	Approx. Syg.		
Nominal by Phi	.212	.026		
Nominal Cramer's V	.212	.026		
N of Valid Cases	246			

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistical data concerning how often respondents use the EANTs. We can see that both age groups claimed never or very rarely use the tactics grouped under *manipulation of opponent's network* and *misrepresentation of information*. *Inappropriate information gathering* and *bluffing* do not seem to be very popular, either. Both generations admitted to using questionable tactics representing the broad group of *traditional competitive bargaining* and one further EANT ('only now, only from me, only to you'), which represents *bluffing*. Gaining information through asking their own business contacts and hiding the bottom line are the two tactics most often employed.

We can also see that, except for three tactics (I make my opponent feel they can only get what they want from me although I know they could get it cheaper or faster elsewhere; I contact my opponent's superior and try to encourage them to defect to my side; I gain information about my opponent's position from 'paid informants', e.g. acquaintances), the mean figures of the two age groups are quite close. Further, unlike when judging the appropriateness of the EANTs, members of the older generation have claimed to use 6 tactics more often than their younger counterparts. More frequent reliance on two of these tactics (I gain information about my opponent's position and strategy by asking my business contacts; I gain information about my opponent's position from 'paid informants', e.g. acquaintances) can be explained by the bigger societal and professional network which older and longer-practising business negotiators are more likely to have. No subject representing the young generation of business negotiators claimed to almost always engage in two tactics (maximum 4) and another two tactics did not receive the maximum value from any respondents from the older generation. No respondent claimed to almost

always use the EANT *I threaten to make my opponent look unprofessional in front of their superiors*, which is stated to be the least used by both generations.

If we compare the means in Tables 1 and 4 we can see that the vast majority of the appropriateness means exceeds its likelihood of use counterpart. It means that the respondents do not employ even those tactics to a great extent which they in principle approve of. The difference between the appropriateness and likelihood of use figures is more striking in the case of the younger generation. For example, they judged the tactic *I pretend to be in no hurry in trying to get my opponent to give concessions* as sometimes or often appropriate (2.32) still they stated to use it very rarely or only sometimes (1.61). However, four EANTs' likelihood of use means slightly exceed their appropriateness counterparts in the case of the older generation. Although these tactics are unpopular and the differences are slight (e.g. *I contact my opponent's superior and try to undermine their professional credibility*: appropriateness: 0.29, use: 0.33; *I promise good things to my opponent if he gives what I want even if I know I can't or won't give them*: appropriateness: 0.40, use: 0.60) it is considered a surprising finding.

Table 4. The likelihood of use of EANTs

EANT	age	mean	std dev	std error	min	max
I intentionally misrepresent factual information to support my ...	35-	.55	.894	.071	0	4
	35+	.46	.784	.083	0	3
I make a shocking opening offer /demand...	35-	1.10	1.108	.088	0	4
	35+	1.07	1.009	.107	0	4
I hide my real bottom line.	35-	2.09	1.346	.107	0	4
	35+	2.12	1.295	.137	0	4
I pretend to be in no hurry ...	35-	1.61	1.353	.108	0	4
	35+	1.73	1.213	.129	0	4
I gain information ... by asking my business contacts.	35-	2.40	1.445	.115	0	4
	35+	2.45	1.382	.146	0	4
I promise good things (...) even if I know I can't or won't give them.	35-	.64	.995	.079	0	3
	35+	.60	.997	.106	0	4
I threaten my opponent even if I know I would not harm them.	35-	.34	.694	.055	0	3
	35+	.30	.760	.081	0	4
I make my opponent feel they can only get what they want from me...	35-	1.61	1.343	.107	0	4
	35+	1.28	1.252	.133	0	4
I contact my opponent's superior and try to undermine...	35-	.44	.908	.072	0	4
	35+	.33	.780	.083	0	4
I threaten to make my opponent look unprofessional ...	35-	.24	.593	.047	0	3
	35+	.29	.694	.074	0	3
I contact my opponent's superior and try to encourage them to...	35-	.72	.973	.078	0	4
	35+	.59	.797	.085	0	3
I 'hire' a subordinate of the opponent in order to gain confidential info...	35-	.62	.943	.075	0	4
	35+	.64	.815	.086	0	4
I gain information directly from my opponent through gifts...	35-	.89	1.016	.081	0	4
	35+	.82	1.051	.111	0	4
I gain information (...) from 'paid informants'(e.g. acquaintances).	35-	.73	.990	.079	0	4
	35+	.88	1.185	.126	0	4

Statistically significant differences between the practices of the two age groups were found in two cases. The younger generation claimed to more often use the tactics *I 'hire' a subordinate of the opponent in order to gain confidential information on their position and strategy* and *I pretend to be in no hurry in trying to get my opponent to give concessions*. The data are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5. Hiring a subordinate of the opponent to gain confidential information

Crosstab
Count

		Age groups		Total
		35-	35+	
I 'hire' a subordinate of the opponent in order to gain confidential information on their position and strategy	never use	99	48	147
	very rarely use	28	27	55
	sometimes use	21	13	34
	often use	8	0	8
	almost always use	1	1	2
Total		157	89	246
Chi-Square-Tests				
	Value	df	Asymp. Syg. (2-sided)	
Pearson Chi-Square	9.526	4	.049	
Likelihood Ratio	12.032	4	.017	
Linear-by-Linear Association	.019	1	.891	
N of Valid Cases	246			
Symmetric Measures				
	Value	Approx. Syg.		
Nominal by Phi	.197	.049		
Nominal Cramer's V	.197	.049		
N of Valid Cases	246			

Table 6. Pretending to be in no hurry

Crosstab
Count

		Age groups		Total
		35-	35+	
I pretend to be in no hurry in trying to get my opponent to give concessions	never use	46	21	67
	very rarely use	35	12	47
	sometimes use	24	31	55
	often use	39	20	59
	almost always use	13	5	18
Total		157	89	246
Chi-Square-Tests				

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.374	4	.010
Likelihood Ratio	13.074	4	.011
Linear-by-Linear Association	.525	1	.469
N of Valid Cases	246		
Symmetric Measures			
	Value		Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Phi	.233		.010
Nominal Cramer's V	.233		.010
N of Valid Cases	246		

Conclusions

The study aimed to find out whether Hungarian business negotiators' age influence their decisions concerning the appropriateness and use of ethically ambiguous negotiation tactics. The findings show that business negotiators in general hold a low opinion of EANTs and (admit to) engage in them only very rarely. Only tactics related to traditional competitive bargaining and the bluffing-associated 'only now, only from me, only to you tactic' has been found to some extent popular both in terms of acceptance and use.

In the context of negotiations it was assumed that the competitiveness characterising the young generation triggers the use of ethically questionable tactics so that young negotiators get as big a piece of the pie as possible and achieve a win-lose outcome. The examination has found that the respondents below 35 years of age in general approve of ethically questionable tactics than their older counterparts but this difference almost disappears when it comes to using them. Thus, the findings seem to indicate that the young generation of Hungarian business negotiators, or at least those practising in the West Transdanubia Region, are more competitive than the older generation only in the values they hold but not so much in the behavioural norms and practices they demonstrate. The competitiveness of the young generation of Hungarians has therefore not been proved in this context.

The research presented above, in addition to the problems of self-reported surveys on individual values and practices in general, has limitations in terms of sampling and sampling size, which affects the validity and reliability of the results. At the same time, in the lack of similar research in Hungary the findings are considered suggestive and they can also serve as springboards for successive examinations.

Acknowledgements

The research reported in the study was carried out with the support of the project EFOP-3.6.1-16-2016-00017 *Internationalisation, initiatives to establish a new source of researchers and graduates, and development of knowledge and technological transfer as instruments of intelligent specialisations at Széchenyi István University.*

References

1. Ablonczyné Mihályka L. (2013). Language, culture and communication in organisations. In: Antoncic, B. (ed.) *ABSRC 2013*. Ljubljana: Gea College Faculty of Entrepreneurship. Paper 56.

2. Anton, R. J. (1990). Drawing the Line: An Exploratory Test of Ethical Behavior in Negotiation. *The International Journal of Conflict Management* 1(3), 265-280.
3. Borgulya, Á. (2009). A meggyőzés a kultúráközi kommunikáció nézőpontjából: a német üzleti tárgyalások. In: Simigné, F. S. (ed.) *A meggyőzéstől a manipulációig*. Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetemi Kiadó, pp. 60-67.
4. Czifra, L. & Mészáros, A. (2013). A stafétabot átadása: avagy az újabb generációk megjelenése a munkahelyeken. *Észak-magyarországi Stratégiai Füzetek*, 10(2), 116-122.
5. Dawson, L. M. (1997). Ethical differences between men and women in the sales profession. *Journal of Business Ethics* 16(11), 1143-1152.
6. Dévényi, M. (2009). *Az üzleti tárgyalások disztributív verbális taktikái*. PhD dissertation. Pécs: PTE. [Online] http://nydi.btk.pte.hu/sites/nydi.btk.pte.hu/files/pdf/DevenyiMarta2009_0.pdf
7. Dobrijević, G. (2014). The effect of gender on negotiation behaviour. *Singidunum Journal of Applied Sciences*, 1(1), 43-52.
8. Dósa, I., Magyar G. & Király L. (2014). Generation Y – self-confidence? *Economica*, 7(4), 25-32.
9. Ercsey, I. (2017). Vevői involvement generációs kitekintésben. In Reisinger, A. & Kecskés, P. (eds.) *“Ifjúság - jövőképek”*: Kautz Gyula Emlékkonferencia. Győr: Széchenyi István Egyetem. [Online] <http://kgk.sze.hu/images/dokumentumok/kautzkiadvany2016/ErcseyI.pdf>
10. Erkuş, A. & Banai, M. (2011). Attitudes towards questionable negotiation tactics in Turkey. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(3), 239-273.
11. Forte, A. (2004). Business Ethics: A study of the moral reasoning of selected business managers and the influence of organization ethical climate. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 51(2), 167-173.
12. Gupta, S., Swanson, N. J., & Cunningham, D. J. (2010). A Study of the Effect of Age, Gender & GPA on the Ethical Behavior of Accounting Students. *Journal of Accounting, Ethics & Public Policy*, 11(1), 63-93.
13. Kecskés, P. (2017). The role of geographical proximity in inter-organizational communication. *SELYE ESTUDIES*, 8(1), 15-23.
14. Konczosné Szombathelyi, M., Borgulya, I. & Szondi, Gy. (2016). Managing cross-border intern corporate communication of international companies. *Organizaciju Vadyba: Sisteminiai Tyrimai*, 75, 71-82.
15. Kray, L. J., & Haselhuhn, M. P. (2012). Male pragmatism in negotiators' ethical reasoning. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 1124-1131.
16. Lewicki, R. J., Saunders, D. M., & Barry, B. (2015). *Negotiation: readings, exercises and cases*. (7th ed.). Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
17. Lourenço, F., Sappleton, N. & Cheng, R. (2015). Gender and Business Ethics of Enterprise Students and Nascent Entrepreneurs Engaged in Entrepreneurship Education. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship* 24(2), 186-203.
18. Makkos-Káldi, J., Eisingerné Balassa, B. & Kecskés, P. (2013). Aranyat ér-e az ezüstgeneráció? *Tér-Gazdaság-Ember*, 1(1), 119-134.
19. Nádai, J. & Garai, A. (2017). A Question of Time: Relations Between Age and Business Success. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, 6(1), 325-334.
20. Perry, G. M., Duffy, P. A., Nixon, C. J. & Robinson, L. J. (2005). An Exploration of Factors Influencing Ethical and Unethical Behavior in Negotiations. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* 37(1), 1-20.
21. Robinson, R. J., Lewicki, R. J., & Donahue, E. (2000). Extending and Testing a Five Factor Model of Ethical and Unethical Bargaining Tactics: Introducing the SINS Scale. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 21, 649-664.
22. Róbert, P. & Valuch, T. (2013). Generations in history and society. Political attitudes and patterns of participation in a historical sociological approach. *Politikatudományi Szemle*, 22(4), 116–139.
23. Sidani, Y., Zbib, I., Rawwas, M., & Moussawer, T. (2009). Gender, age, and ethical sensitivity: the case of Lebanese workers. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 24(3), 211-227.
24. Stefanidis, A., Banai, M. & Richter, U. H. (2013). Employee attitudes toward questionable negotiation tactics: empirical evidence from Peru. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(4), 826-852.

25. Szőke, J. (2015). The Cultural Aspect of Austro-Hungarian Business Negotiations. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 1, 47-52.
26. Tompos, A. & Ablonczy-Mihályka, L. (2014). Situational factors affecting the use of ethically ambiguous negotiating tactics. *Humanities and Social Sciences Review*, 3(1), 196-204.
27. Tompos, A. (2015). Austrian and Hungarian values and norms in cross-cultural management research. *Impresa Progetto – Electronic Journal of Management*. 12(3) [Online] <http://www.impresaprogetto.it/essays/2015-3/tompos>
28. Tompos A. & Ablonczy-Mihályka L. (2015). What makes a good business negotiator? - Hungarian practitioners' preferences. *Sociokulturnyje Problemy Jazyka i Kommunikacii: Sbornik Naucnych Trudov*, (10), 114-120.
29. Tompos A. & Ablonczyné Mihályka L. (2016). Tactics, contextual-situational factors and business negotiators' choices. *Lingua et vita – Journal for Research of Languages and Intercultural Communication*, 5(9), 47-55.
30. Tompos A. (2016). The Interplay of Culture and Gender in the Perceived Ethicality of Negotiation Tactics. *International Research Journal of Social Sciences* 5(10), 11-17.
31. Triandis, H. C., Carnevale P., Gelfand, M., Robert, C., Wasti, S. A., & Probst, T. (2001). Culture and Deception in Business Negotiations: A Multilevel Analysis. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 1, 73-90.
32. Volkema, R. J. (1999). Ethicality in negotiations: An analysis of perceptual similarities and differences between Brazil and the United States. *Journal of Business Research*, 45(1), 59-67.
33. Volkema, R. J. (2004). Demographic, cultural, and economic predictors of perceived ethicality of negotiation behavior: A nine-country analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(1), 69-78.
34. Yang, Y., De Cremer, D. & Wang, C. (2015). How ethically would Americans and Chinese negotiate? The effect of intra-cultural versus intercultural negotiations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, doi:10.1007/s10551-015-2863-2
35. Yurtsever, G. & Ben-Asher, Z. (2013). Gender differences in buyer-seller negotiations: Misrepresentation of information. *African Journal of Business Management*, 7(12), 976-979.
36. Zhang, J.-D., Liu, L. A. & Liu, W. (2014). Trust and Deception in Negotiation: Culturally Divergent Effects. *Management and Organization Review*. doi:10.1111/more.12028