Negotiation Training Four: Influence Tactics and Advanced Negotiation Strategies

Professor Umphress: For our agenda today, we're going to be talking about integrating strategies review. Integrative negotiations, as you recall from last time, if you were with us, are multi-issue negotiations or negotiations with more than one issue. I'm going to review those strategies because they're absolutely key to know before any negotiation. Before you walk into a negotiation, you need to know what these strategies are and use them appropriately.

Then, we're going to be talking about generating a point schedule. We have different interests and we need to find a way to figure out how to present or think about our interests during a negotiation. What research has shown is the best way to do that is with a point schedule. We're going to talk about how to generate a point schedule and use it during your negotiation.

Then, we're going to be talking about influence tactics and it turns out there's a lot of research on how to influence others. I'm going to be talking about six different strategies that you can use during your negotiations; you can make choices whether or not to use these tactics. They tend to be pretty influential in your negotiations. Alright, so let's get started.

So here we are with our different courses that we've gone through. We started off with introduction, moved on to single issue, last time we did multiple issue, today we are influence, and the next one is going to be the multi-person negotiations. We're going to have group negotiation discussions and, as you can imagine, things get a little bit more complicated when you're negotiating with three other people, four other people, five other people versus just one person.

Alright, so again, here are these integrative strategies we want to be using in the negotiation. The first one is developing trust. That's when you treat the other person with respect and when you develop these positive consequences for their behavior. If you remember last time we talked about carrots versus sticks; the carrots are going to win in the end, the carrots are going to be more motivating. In the negotiation, we want to reward positive behavior with a concession or positive actions yourself.

We also want to have you exhibit trustworthy behavior and that will be reciprocated by the other party. You can also identify and highlight identification. This is when you share something with the other person that is the same. Alyssa and I both engage with the University of Washington; we have something in common. I'm going to highlight that and that makes it to where I'm going
to be more trustworthy to Alyssa now because we highlight that. Jay and I have kids in the Seattle Public Schools; by highlighting that, we're both going to have more trust towards one another. Identification-based trust is also a really good influence tactic that you will learn in a moment.

The next thing you want to do is share your interests or what you want. What we learned during the case last time is that sometimes people focus on the really good reason you want something. Specifically, we had a case where one party wanted the peel and the other party wanted the juice of an orange, but they focused on the really good reason you wanted something. That really good reason was really important; it was saving babies or saving the West Coast. These are really important things. However, what they needed was either a peel or the juice of an orange. So, we need to be focusing on what you want in the negotiation, and not the really good reason. It's really cool to share the reason, but first we need to share what we want.

Then, we need to be asking questions to the other side about their interests. We can be saying things like, “If you can imagine a perfect deal, what would it look like?” We could say, “Of these two issues, the peel or the juice, which one do you care more about in terms of the orange?” We want to be asking questions about the other party’s interest in order to figure out what they are and in order to meet them.

Then, we're going to make tradeoffs. Now, I want to say that it's really important to make concessions in a negotiation, but what we want to do is make those strategic concessions. Specifically, what I’m going to do is I’m going to give on an issue that is less important to me. I'm going to give them something that I don't care as much about in order to gain on an issue that's more important to me. I'm going to pair two wishes together: one issue I care a lot about, the other issue I don't care as much about, but the other party does care about it. I'm going to give on something again that's less important in order to gain on something that's more important. I know it doesn't sound like rocket science, not at all. You can do this strategy. What's important to know before you start having this strategy work, is you have to know what the order of importance is for these different issues for the other party. Is this their number one issue, their number two issue, their number three issue? How does it rank? Then make tradeoffs for something that they're going to want.

Then we learned how to make contingency contracts. Now these are if-then statements. If something happens in the world, then something else happens in the world. An example of this is my sister and I both inherited some property. I think the property is going to do really well, I think it's going to be more profitable to hang on to it. My sister disagrees, so we do an if-then statement. We can argue about it a lot, but instead, we're going to bet on it. I'll give her the value of the property right now, half the value of the property right now, and then I'll keep it all and I'll
get any gains of it by keeping that property. That's an example of a contingency contract based on differences and expectations for the future.

Alright, so this is a strategy that we didn't have a chance to talk about last time that I am super very, very, very excited about. The reason why I'm excited about this strategy is because it works; it works very, very well. I encourage you to use this in your negotiations if you have the opportunity. It's called a post-settlement settlement, but what it really is is just an agreement after an agreement. Let's say you come to an agreement. You spend your time at the negotiation table, you worked really hard before the negotiation, you found out your BATNAs, reservation point, and target during the negotiation, you made those tradeoffs and strategic compromises, you shared trust, you asked questions. You did all the things that you're supposed to do in that negotiation, and you came up with a negotiated outcome, the best that you can.

Now, you have this contract. Everything is signed, sealed, and delivered; it's done. The lawyers have looked over it, you have a done contract. Now, a month later, a year later, or whenever is appropriate, you decide to come back to that contract. COVID was a really good time to come back to some contracts because things change. It could be you come back to it based on things changing, you have a new idea, you have a new product, and you ask the other party to come back to the table to see if you can come to a better agreement. Typically, what people say is, “Let's see if we can make this pie a little bit sweeter, let's see if we can make this deal a little bit better for both of us.” If you decide to make that investment, then the agreement is going to be that both sides get better, or one party stays the same and the other side gets better. It's not going to hurt you at all, it's only going to help you, or have you stay the same by being involved in this next negotiation.

What this does, is it helps the other side. If the other side isn't sharing information about their interests or they don't know what their interests are and you have to help them develop their interests, what this does is it makes it so the other side feels much more comfortable sharing their interest in a second negotiation. They already have their contract that they can rely on. They've already written this contract that's already signed, it's done, and they can rely on that agreement and because of that, they feel more trusting to share information with you about what they truly feel and what they truly expect. That increase in information sharing leads to an increase in collaboration, which leads to better outcomes. This works 75% of the time. 75% of the time, this works. I want this to be in your pocket, I want you to use this strategy. Get at the table, try your best to get the best agreement possible, but engage in this post-settlement settlement if you have the opportunity to do so.
Now in some industries, it would be inappropriate to do a post-settlement settlement at all. In some industries, they're doing post-settlement settlements all the time. It's based on your industry, on when it's appropriate to do this, on timing, and what happens in the environment. Again, I saw a lot of post-settlement settlements that happened once COVID hit. Once COVID hit, a lot of things in the environment changed, there was a lot of uncertainty that was created, and that made it such that a lot of people needed to revisit their contracts. That's what this is, a post-settlement settlement. Now you have all the integrative strategies.

I'm going to move on to creating a point schedule and then we're going to come back and we're going to answer some questions. As I mentioned, it's absolutely vital to know what your interests are in the negotiation and this is going to involve some homework for you before the negotiation. As part of your planning, I want you to sit down and write down all of the different things that are involved in this particular outcome that you're about to negotiate. For example, let's think of all the issues that are involved in an outcome, so all the things that are involved in a job. It could be the number of hours that are worked, it could be a flex time, it could be the assignments that you would be doing, it could be the type of work that you would be doing, it could be who you're working with. Write down everything that might be included in this outcome.

The next thing in creating a point schedule is now you're going to order that list according to what's most and least important to you. Some things in a job just don't matter to you and some things matter a lot. This is your chance to figure out just on your own, or with a teammate, if you're going to do a team negotiation, figure out what is your list. Figure out what's most important to least important to you. Then, we're going to take away things that are not important at all, that are not important enough to negotiate. The other party, by the way, might bring these issues in because just because they're not important to you, doesn't mean they're not important to the other party, but you aren't going to include it in your point schedule because it's not important to you.

Then, we're going to assign percentage values to each one of the issues, based on your interests. The first step is just writing down all the issues. The second step, most to least important. Now, we're actually putting percentages on how important is number one, compared to number two, compared to number three, compared to number four. You only have 100%. Now, when people first engage this strategy, they don't ever add up to 100% when you start off. This is going to take a little bit for you to adjust everything, figure out how much you care about each one of these issues and have them all add up to 100%.

The next thing you're going to do is allocate your points based on those percentages. I suggest having 1000 points or maybe 10,000 points or maybe 100 points be the sum or your target Then,
for each issue, you might have location be worth 300 points, type of work be worth 200 points, salary be worth 150 points.

Okay, so here's one of my sample point schedules. This is the point schedule, or a very condensed version of the point schedule, that I was developing when I was trying to make a decision about whether or not to take the job offer at the University of Washington. At the time I was a professor at Texas A&M University. I happen to be from Texas, a lot of family is in Texas and so it was a really attractive institution. It was a great research institution, but it was also in a really small city of College Station, so I wasn't super excited about continuing to live in a really small city.

I tried to figure out what my interests were before engaging in this negotiation. The city, to me, was going to be worth 300 points. I wanted to be in a big city, that was really important to me, and a big city meant a lot of things to me. It meant restaurants, it meant having access to sports teams, and arts. Texas A&M, on their points, they have 250 points, but that was because I was living in Austin at the time. So, Austin really is the thing that's getting 250 points, which will come in in a moment.

Then, colleagues. I really wanted to have nice colleagues. Now, this is really important when you're a professor, because there's something called tenure that means if that person gets tenure they're there until they die, and that's a long time. I'm going to maybe be looking at this person for the rest of my life and is that something that I really want to do so? So, having good colleagues is really important to me, or it was really important to me, so colleagues was my second issue. At Texas A&M, I had fantastic colleagues, they got Texas A&M about 200 points.

Next, my commute. Now, I was spending an hour and a half going one way; three hours if I had to go both ways from Austin to College Station. That's that's a trek. Commute was my number three issue, I was done with the commute, I did not want to have that anymore. It had 170 points possible and Texas A&M had 0 because it had a really bad commute.

Then, research support, that was also really important to me. I also got really great research support from Texas A&M, so I felt good about that.

Now, distance from family. This is something that I was not very intelligent about so, post hoc I wasn't really thinking when I developed this issue. I didn't want to be really far from my family so I gave it 100 points, but I thought that moving, I looked at time as in if I was on a plane, it takes five hours to get from Seattle to Dallas and it takes four hours to drive from Austin to Dallas, so that's almost the same, isn't it? But what I didn't realize is, when I had children that having children on a plane equals death. I mean, it's really not fun to have children flying, especially
small children, which I have right now. I was not considering that, so right now, I would have a
different point schedule and I would evaluate this one differently.

Then, salary. Salary was my last category.

Alright, now and looking at this, my target was 1000 points. My reservation point with Texas A&M
was 760, so whatever university I always looking to go to it needed to offer me more than 760
points. What that meant is that it severely restricted the locations that I applied to and I really
only applied to the University of Washington because it was the only one that was going to give
me a better point value closer to my target. So, I applied here and luckily, I got a job here, and
here I am. Alright, so this is my example of a point schedule. It was much more detailed, but it's
a quick example, just so you can see how it went.

Alright, so now questions.

Alyssa: Great. We just got a question. We're a little confused about where the 1000 points came
from, if you could elaborate on that.

Professor Umphress: It's adding all the points possible on my point schedule. It's just a random
number based on my interests.

Alyssa: Okay, because the numbers are percentages, would it normally add up to a factor of 10,
like 1000?

Professor Umphress: Typically, yes. I've seen a lot of different point schedules. I've seen a point
schedule that involved 50 different issues, so there was fractions and other things that you can
consider. Depending on how complex the negotiation is, your point schedule might not look as
pretty and clean as what I demonstrated. The most important thing with a point schedule is that
it helps you treat issues that are non-numeric as important as you feel like they are. If you look
at some of my issues, city is not a numeric issue, but it's my number one. Colleagues also is not a
numeric issue, but it's my number two. Commute, that you can put in miles, so we can probably
put a numeric issue to that, but again, that gets to my number three issue. What this does is helps
you put a numeric value, and human beings like to think in terms of numbers, and this puts a
numeric value on how important this is to you and what this means to you.

The other thing I want you to note about this point schedule is that many of these things are not
negotiable for the university. I couldn't say to the University of Washington, “I would like you to
have better sports teams,” which I would never say that because the city of Seattle has absolutely
fantastic sports teams and I wouldn't change anything about them, but that's not something that's negotiable. Colleagues, I can't tell them to fire someone if I didn't like someone, so that's also non-negotiable. Commute, that's really up to me and where I end up living. Research support, yes, I can negotiate that. Distance from family, they can't tell my family to move, that's not negotiable. So really, salary and research support are the only things that I can negotiate.

Alyssa: Great. Kevin wants to know if you have a recommendation for the number of points.

Professor Umphress: I think it's a really good idea to keep it a round number just for your brain. I'm continuously thinking of, “I need to get to that thousand points,” and this helps you with your own anchoring to get there. If you need help generating this first point schedule, I encourage you to reach out to a family member or friend and let them know the process and they can help you develop it. If you need extra help you can send it to the email link for our group, elcinfo@uw.edu, and I can provide you some help with that, I'm happy to do it.

Doing a point schedule for the first time is tough, but it's also something that's really, really important because if you don't do this, then what you'll do in those negotiations is focus on things that you might not care about as much. In a negotiation, again, you tend to focus on those numeric items and if those are the things you really don't care that much about, then you're focusing on the wrong things in that negotiation.

Alyssa: Kevin’s also wondering, when you ask about another person's interest, are you trying to understand their point schedule?

Professor Umphress: Yes, exactly. What you’re really saying when you say, “What are your interests?” is “What does your point schedule look like?” But the other side has probably never encountered a point schedule before and they don't know what it looks like. I have, in my negotiations with other parties, I've sat, and I've developed a point schedule with them to help them figure out what their interests are. I'll say, “Okay, so of these two issues, which is more important to you?” And I'll go through and I'll help them develop their point schedule and that can be really helpful for you and the other party because then you can make strategic tradeoffs.

Alyssa: Okay, great. As you're talking to someone and they're laying out their interests, what do you do when they say something that you forgot about and you realize that that's something you actually do care about? Do you recommend pausing?

Professor Umphress: Yeah, if you can pause, pause and then revisit your schedule for a moment and figure out where would that go on this or how many points would that add. Then you can
just expand your pie you, you're adding more points to your point schedule. By the way, that's pretty common. You want to find out as much as you can before the negotiations, but things are going to adjust over time.

Alyssa: I think there's a little more confusion on the point schedule and how to assign points to issues.

Professor Umphress: Okay, so I'll go back to this and the points that I allocated for each issue. Let's go with city. Alright, a city gets 300 points for me if they have great music, great sports teams, great restaurants, great art; if they have all four of those things at high levels, then they get 300 points. A sports team is pretty important to me, so a city will get less points if they have the other three, but are low on sports, then that'll be 250 points for me, and they'll go down. So, salary. Let's say for a person like me in an organization like this $100,000 is my target salary, that's the best that I can possibly do. For a person like me in a university, then $100,000 gets 80 points. If I was at $99,000 that might be 79 points and then I would take it down from there.
Does that help?

Alyssa: I think so, I hope so. If it didn't, please come join us in office hours and we'll be able to answer some more questions there. But for now, we're ready to move on.

Professor Umphress: Now I'm excited to go through Cialdini influence tactics. The reason why their Cialdini's is because Cialdini was a landmark social scientist who started doing research on how to influence others and it turns out there's six key things that we can do to influence others. As I start talking about these things, you're going to notice that these different things are in your environment. This happens a lot. Marketers know about these things, skilled negotiators know about these different tactics, and now you're going to know about these different tactics. Now it's up to you if you want to use these tactics or not use these tactics. These are up to you, but I want you to be aware of these tactics, because very likely they are being used on you.

Alright, so first, scarcity. It turns out that people want what other people can't have, or what is scarce. Here's some examples of brands that people are attracted to, because they're hard to get and they're very expensive. But it could be, for example, a couple of years ago in France there was a shortage on butter and of course there was an announcement that there was going to be a shortage on butter. What do you think happened? Pretty much everybody went out and got all the butter and started putting it in their freezers. When something is scarce, or we know that something is going to be scarce, then we try to get out and we try to obtain whatever that is. I'm unsure if that's what happened with toilet paper at the beginning of this crisis, but I think that something like that might have been occurring. Maybe, I'm not sure I'm.
Now, what does this do for you? If you have access to scarce information, if something new just happened, then you might call a customer and client and say, “You know what, nobody knows this, this is something really new.” And all of a sudden that person is going to call you back immediately, or email you back immediately, they're going to want to know. This is this human tendency to want to know things that not a lot of people know.

You also might highlight what's different from you. How are you a special candidate? Why would they want to hire you, what unique characteristics do you bring to the table? You might also highlight the unique characteristics of your product, highlight how its exclusive, how it is special and scarce. Try to use this tactic as appropriate. For you, you might highlight how you have this unique mix of expertise, education, and experience.

Alright, so this is a strategy that we've been talking a lot about, which is reciprocity. As you know, we reciprocate. If I am positive to you, you'll be positive to me; if I'm respectful to you, you'll be respectful to me. We want to repay these favors. If somebody does a favor for me, I'm going to do a favor for them. This is how human beings work and that's how social societies work, so reciprocity is absolutely fundamental to negotiations. That's why when you make an offer, the other party is likely to make an offer in return, when you share your interests, the other party is also likely to share their interests.

But sometimes, we need to think about when we do these favors. How much do people value a favor immediately versus one month after it's performed? Let's say you have a big ask for your boss and your boss comes to you and needs a favor. Do you ask that favor immediately or do you wait a month before you ask your favor? Here we go for the results. Immediately, as you can tell, this is the extent to which the other party values what you just did for them, the favor that you just did for them. The receiver values that favor a lot immediately, but the giver, the person who did it, doesn't value it as much. Again, immediately the receiver really values it; the giver, not so much. The interesting thing that happens over time is that the giver tends to value it more and more and more, but the receiver values it less.

What does this mean? This means if you haven't asked, you should do it immediately, you should do it when the receiver is ready to reciprocate. If it's immediate, that receiver really values the favor that you did for them and they're more likely to reciprocate immediately. If you wait a month, then your boss is less likely to consider that or think about that favor. My suggestion to you is it might not be immediate, but as close as possible to when you did that favor and that way the other party will reciprocate. In the negotiation, you can highlight how you've come down on something, how you have made a concession, in order to get the other party to make a
concession as well. By the way, this is really present when we do our tradeoffs. A tradeoff is just reciprocation all wrapped up into one. I'm giving them something that's less important in order to gain on something that's more important; it's reciprocity all wrapped up into one.

The research on reciprocity is really surprising. What it shows is that even small gifts, even as small as a pen, then this is going to impact their behavior. This will significantly impact their behavior, if I just give them some small trinket. A lot of professions, for example, doctors are not allowed to accept large gifts from pharmaceutical companies. It used to be doctors could accept lavish trips and they would say, “Well, doctors are really smart, and it won't impact their behavior,” but what we know is that's not the case at all. What we know is that even if I give you a very small gift that's worth 20 cents, that will impact your behavior.

This research was done with cookies, it was done with trinkets, and I can impact your behavior with very small things. How you use this is up to you. You might bring coffee to your negotiation; of course, not during COVID times, but during other non-COVID times. You can send, during COVID times, some chocolates or truffles, or something that would be appropriate to the client. I have people in my executive MBA classes who send really cool little gifts to their clients once a year. This is developing this reciprocity; they're impacting your behavior.

I asked you a question, and that is what method is a more effective means of thwarting this reciprocity? By me accepting even a small gift, it's impacting my behavior. Should I accept the favor and then tell myself to discount it? Or just not accept it and politely refuse them instead? It turns out that refusal is always going to be better for you and your company. If you don't already have it and if you have your own organization, I encourage you to set up a no gifts policy. If it's appropriate in your industry, I recognize in some industries it's not appropriate to do so, but if you set up a no gifts policy, that really empowers your employees to say no to these gifts and it makes it such that they're less likely to be influenced by these gifts and it's really going to protect your organization moving forward. I think at the University of Washington, we have a $20 limit on gifts, but again, that's going to influence our behavior.

Finally, we have consistency, and then we'll get to some questions. Consistency is a really important influence tactic that you can use. People like to be consistent in their behavior and their attitudes and for their previous behavior to be consistent with their future behavior. Cialdini showed the influence of this tactic in a research study in which he and his research students went to a large apartment complex. They went to half of the apartment complex and asked half of the individuals to sign a petition to support a good cause; the cause was to support the disabled in the community. Everyone who answered the door ended up signing it. Then, they went back a few weeks later, and they had people indicate how much money they were willing to give, so
they're actually going to donate to the cause. Again, it was a really good cause, supporting the disabled in the community. I'll start out by telling you, you remember half of them didn't have the opportunity to sign the petition and of the half that didn't have the opportunity to sign a petition, 50% of them ended up giving money, so 50% is pretty good. But they had 92% who signed the petition, who had the opportunity to sign the petition, donate. So, it's a 42% increase if you had just had people sign something to support a cause, then they were much more likely to donate to the cause.

People's expressed attitudes and behavior, they want to be consistent. What does this mean to you? It means that, let's say, you have a negotiation and the other person you're negotiating with has expressed an attitude that's consistent with what you want to ask for, this is something that I use sometimes in my negotiations. I tend to, in my service work, I tend to work on diversity and inclusion committees, and it turns out that many organizations and universities put inclusion and diversity statements on websites. What I do, is I take that diversity and inclusion statement and I include it in my ask. I say, “You know, this is an important value of this institution or this organization.” I say the value, and and that is why I'm asking for X, which is typically more money or more resources put towards diversity and inclusion. Expressing their previous attitude and encouraging them them to be consistent with that attitude, I'm much more likely to get a yes in that circumstance. For you, you could ask for, if someone had already given you a certain concession, you can ask them to give more of a concession. If someone's already conceded some, then they're more likely to concede others.

Now it's question time.

Alyssa: Kevin wants to know, how can these tactics backfire?

Professor Umphress: The consistency one can really harm us, and it does harm us and harms a lot of leaders, because sometimes as a leader, to be a strong leader, it means that you have to say that you were wrong and you made a wrong choice. I think that that's an incredibly important characteristic for a leader to have, for a leader to say, “You know what, I was wrong. I made a wrong choice and now I'm going to pivot the company in a different direction.” I think that that is absolutely fundamental, but it flies in the face of consistency. At the same time, we just have to break with consistency when it's important to do so and be ethical and honest and move forward.

I think that, with regard to reciprocity, in some cultures, Japan specifically, when I've had people go in and negotiate with individuals from specific cultures where it's very appropriate to give gifts and you want to have matching size because even that is really important. For some companies,
this might come up and not giving a gift can create a problem, my zero gift receiving and gift giving could become a problem in those cultures. I do think that one other thing about the countries who tend to like gift giving, they also are the same hierarchy enhancing type cultures in which orders from the boss are seen is really important. So, if you do have a statement from the company president where you cannot accept nor give gifts, then for someone from a culture in which gift giving is really important, that would be okay. It is important to just send a statement before you have your first meeting and let the other party know, especially if you're going to a culture in which gift giving is really prominent and an important socialization means, just let them know that it's inappropriate for you to bring a gift and here's a company policy, and then you kind of take away that issue.

Alyssa: I was wondering how you jump the consistency hurdle if the person's behavior has been to your detriment in the past? So, they're being really stubborn, and they want to keep being really stubborn.

Professor Umphress: Certainly, so you're only going to highlight their behavior when it's consistent with the behavior that you want to see. I would not mention any previous contract or any previous behavior, I would only mention the attitudes and behaviors that you want to see again. I would kind of give it a pass. In my mind, I just take a pause when someone is behaving in a way that I don't want to reciprocate, and I don't want to see moving forward. In my mind, I just forget that that happened.

Alyssa: Judith has an interesting question, going back to COVID and consistency, should the CDC have handled the whole mask debacle differently?

Professor Umphress: Yeah, I think that a lot of these influence tactics can be related to the mask issue. Going back and forth is not good for a leader, as I mentioned, it is really important to provide a reason for going back and forth. I think that we can be accommodating, it's going back and forth and back and forth that's a problem. We'll take one “Oh, I was wrong,” but if there's multiple “I was wrong,” then we start to question the legitimacy. I think that that's actually one of the problems that the CDC has faced moving forward, and I think it's also a problem inherent within a really big catastrophe like we're in right now. We ask for leaders to make decisions and then when they make decisions then we criticize them later on for making those decisions and then that's what causes the the back and forth and the back and forth. I think that being a leader at the time of the pandemic is incredibly difficult, so I do not envy their situation right now. I think it's incredibly difficult.
Okay, so onto social proof. This is a big one, social proof. If other people are doing things, then I'm going to do things too. If other people are not doing things, then I'm also not going to do things. This is going to be really key for us and I think it relates to this mask issue. An example that I have is, there was a principal who wanted to decrease the number of students who are smoking marijuana. This was a high school principal, he wanted to decrease the amount of high school students smoking marijuana. But unfortunately, this high school principal sent a letter to the parents, indicating that something like 75% of students have tried marijuana in this high school and that this was a really big problem that needed to be stopped.

What social proof tells us, is that that's going to drastically increase the number of people who are smoking marijuana. When something is a problem, we do not use percentages related to it. When the norm is something that we want people to engage in, then we will share normative information about it. That's where the news comes into play. Unfortunately, sometimes the new says, “This is a really big problem, we have everybody who's not wearing masks.” What happens then is that people are less likely to wear a mask, whereas if the news would have been silent about that issue, then people would just engage in the behavior and choose whether or not to wear a mask on their own, but because things become normative, we want to follow those social norms.

Changing those social norms can be really, really difficult. That's why we want to start off right and we want to use social proof when other people engage in positive behavior. We can focus on the positive behavior that people are engaging in and say, “X amount of people are socially distancing, this is fantastic. We want to continue this.” Or we could highlight the cities that are doing a really good job with the social distancing.

In a business example, and you see this all the time on commercials, you could say, “Four out of five dentists approve this.” This social proof in action. You can also see this in graduation rates. You see 90% of people have been out there getting a job and they're doing great, that's going to encourage everybody to do great. It's also going to bring other people to the program. We want to fit in, we want to do what everybody else is doing, that's for good and bad things. As a leader, I want you to use social proof to your advantage. If people are doing really good things and the group is doing really good things, then highlight that and then you're more likely to see that moving forward, but if people are doing not great things, then be silent about it and don't say anything about the social proof. I'm not saying lie about it, but we're not going to provide social information.

An example of this could be, “I've had three promising offers, but I really want to come and work for your company. I've had lots of great offers, but what I want to do is come work for you.” Then,
we have the wording; people want to listen to others with status or expertise, even if their arguments aren’t very strong. For you, it’s important to somehow demonstrate your authority or say why we should be listening to you, or why you are the person that we should be negotiating with. Why you? You need to be answering that question.

Even as far back as Aristotle, he called it ethos, was this notion of “why should we think of you as being persuasive?” You can demonstrate authority in a number of ways. You can say how long you’ve been doing this in this specific industry. Let’s say you don’t have that much experience, then you can say where you got your degree. I do think, by the way, if someone doesn’t introduce you, and say all of your qualifications, that is important for you to highlight your qualifications to the other party. This is another reason to use LinkedIn. I know this is something that we talked about early on but get your LinkedIn profile looking really good. It’s a way that you can demonstrate authority. Your LinkedIn, your website shows why we should be listening to you.

I know at Microsoft, if you've been there a certain number of years, you get increasingly larger statues. If you've been there 15 years, this big, for 30 years it just gets larger and larger. That's another way, and an easy way, to demonstrate authority. Another way is diplomas. Another way is via dress and how you look. This is kind of an interesting thing, because if you were to walk into Google and you're wearing a suit, you would not be demonstrating authority at all, you would not be fitting in. You really need to think about how to demonstrate authority. Some superficial markers of authority that research has shown is having a deep voice, having graying hair, wearing eyeglasses. This is something easy that anybody can do. What you're wearing definitely works, and your height matters, so taller people appear to have more authority.

This doesn't mean that if you don't have any of these things, then you're not going to have authority. One of my really good friends is is incredibly short, doesn't have a deep voice, but when she enters the room, she has enormous authority and you just know, she brings her authority with her.

The other thing that we need to think about is liking. We do things for people that we like; if we like someone, then we're more likely to have a positive negotiated outcome with them. We like people who are attractive, who are similar to us, that gets into the trust identification realm, and we like people who like us; so now we're getting into flattery. When you're in the negotiation, I think it's important to say why you like this product, why you like this company, why you like this organization. Highlight it and in an appropriate way, flatter the other person. I will say that my students have told me it's inappropriate, unless you're a model, to flatter the other person with regard to their dress or their makeup or anything about their appearance, but it is very appropriate to highlight the other person in whatever type of performance they're engaged in.
Let's say they're a research scientist, so you can flatter them about their research, or you can flatter them about their product that they just developed. That is a very appropriate way to flatter the other person and that's going to be very impactful to them.

MBA students were told to engage in high or low levels of flattery and I really like this study. They engaged in an appropriate type of flattery, not a weird way, so appropriate flattery about the organization. Those who engaged in high levels of flattery got 1.45 more offers and they had higher starting salaries. By the way, this effect was linear, so the more flattery, the more offers, the more salaries. The interviewers were told in advance that there would be different levels, that the researchers were varying flattery. So, even when people knew that they were about to get ingratiating behavior and to watch out for it, it still impacted their offers and their salaries. But again, beware of the slime effect. We're only going to be doing behaviors that make sense or giving flattery on things that makes sense, and not our appearance.

Okay, so we have a couple minutes for questions.

Alyssa: Saida has a question, what are ways that women identified folks can demonstrate authority in a dignified way outside of social expectations? Also, women of color, especially Black women, might be negatively judged if they use power/authority tactics that white women can use. Any insight would be great.

Professor Umphress: Well, I do think that one subtle way, it makes me very uncomfortable to share information about my qualifications or my authority, so sometimes I get someone else to introduce me. I have a friend come along with me and my friend introduces me to another person, and they can talk about my authority and hopefully this friend is also high status and known by the other party. Another way you can do it pretty easily is put a link at the bottom of your email that just links directly to your LinkedIn page or your website, people will click on that and see that. Another thing, in my office I have my diploma, it's just right there behind me. If you have something like that, I don't know what it means in your industry, but put it right there when you're on the Zoom call and that will have a huge impact.

I'm going to tell you about this research study. Cialdini did a research study in which stroke victims were not engaging in their physical therapy after they left the hospital. When they were in the hospital, they were doing their physical therapy, but once they left the hospital, they tended to not do the physical therapy. So, they brought in Cialdini and he did one thing: He put all the awards and diplomas, of all the physical therapists up on the walls and that increased compliance with physical therapy by 34%. That one thing changed it. These really subtle things can have really
big effects on the behavior of others, so put those subtle authority hints up and that can really help you.

Thanks everyone.