

e-Nego-motion: Integration of behavioral and decision support in e-negotiations

Daniel Druckman (George Mason University, dandruckman@yahoo.com), Alexander Dannenmann (University of Hohenheim, alexander.dannenmann@wi1.uni-hohenheim.de), Michael Filzmoser (Vienna University of Technology, michael.filzmoser@tuwien.ac.at), Johannes Gettinger (Vienna University of Technology, johannes.gettinger@tuwien.ac.at), Sabine Koeszegi (Vienna University of Technology, sabine.koeszegi@tuwien.ac.at), Ronny Mitterhofer (Vienna University of Technology, ronald.mitterhofer@tuwien.ac.at), Andreas Reiser (University of Hohenheim, Andreas.Reiser@wi1.uni-hohenheim.de), Mareike Schoop (University of Hohenheim, M.Schoop@uni-hohenheim.de), Rudolf Vetschera (University of Vienna, rudolf.vetschera@univie.ac.at), Per van der Wijst (Tilburg University, per.vanderwijst@uvt.nl)

Abstract:

We compare the impacts of two approaches to decision support, asynchronous electronic mediation and utility theory. Technical issues are discussed and the results of a multi-national experimental comparison of the approaches are reported. The comparisons were between conditions that provided bargainers with either one or the other, both, or neither form of decision support. The results show differences among these conditions, some of which are surprising: The largest number of agreements (and prediction accuracy) was obtained with e-mediation although these agreements were generally of lower quality. The smallest number of agreements occurred with decision support although these were of higher quality. When both forms of support were provided, a relatively low number of high-quality agreements were obtained. Interestingly, the group with neither form of support attained the highest quality agreements. Analyses of bargainer post-negotiation perceptions provided further understanding of the findings. Implications for the next round of experiments are also discussed.