Advancing Al Negotiations: New Theory and Evidence from a Large-Scale Autonomous Negotiations Competition

Michelle Vaccaro, Michael Caoson, Harang Ju, Sinan Aral, and Jared R. Curhan* *Corresponding author: curhan@mit.edu

Abstract

Despite the rapid proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) negotiation agents, there has been limited integration of computer science research and established negotiation theory to develop new theories of AI negotiation. To bridge this gap, we conducted an International AI Negotiations Competition in which participants iteratively designed and refined prompts for large language model (LLM) negotiation agents. We then facilitated over 120,000 negotiations between these agents across multiple scenarios with diverse characteristics and objectives. Our findings revealed that fundamental principles from established human-human negotiation theory remain crucial in AI-AI negotiations. Specifically, agents exhibiting high warmth fostered higher counterpart subjective value and reached deals more frequently, which enabled them to create and claim more value in integrative settings. However, conditional on reaching a deal, warm agents claimed less value while dominant agents claimed more value. These results align with classic negotiation theory emphasizing relationship-building, assertiveness, and preparation. Our analysis also revealed unique dynamics in AI-AI negotiations not fully explained by negotiation theory, particularly regarding the effectiveness of AI-specific strategies like chain-of-thought reasoning and prompt injection. The agent that won our competition implemented an approach that blended traditional negotiation preparation frameworks with Al-specific methods. Together, these results suggest the importance of establishing a new theory of AI negotiations that integrates established negotiation theory with AI-specific strategies to optimize agent performance. Our research suggests this new theory must account for the unique characteristics of autonomous agents and establish the conditions under which traditional negotiation theory applies in automated settings.

Introduction

Autonomous negotiation agents powered by artificial intelligence (AI) are rapidly transforming how businesses reach agreements. These AI agents can negotiate independently on behalf of their principals and implement sophisticated strategies while reducing transaction costs. Given their abilities, major multinational organizations have begun implementing such technologies at scale. In 2022, for example, Walmart operationalized Pactum's autonomous negotiation platform to manage supplier contract renegotiations that would be infeasible for human negotiators to address individually (Hoek et al., 2022). More recently, given the increased abilities of large language models (LLMs), AI agents have started negotiating with each other over legal contracts (Browne, 2023).

As LLMs have proliferated, computer science research has increasingly used negotiation settings to examine and improve the performance of foundational AI models. Deng et al. (2024) note, for example, that bilateral negotiations involve natural language, structured outcomes, and imperfect information, which make them well suited for probing the capabilities of LLMs. As such, recent work uses negotiation contexts to enhance (Fu et al., 2023) and evaluate (Abdelnabi et al. 2023) AI model capabilities, and to probe the ability of LLMs to perform tasks autonomously on behalf of humans (Davidson et al. 2024). To this end, recent studies have also proposed benchmarks to measure the negotiation abilities of LLMs in stylized settings (Xia et al. 2024) and to evaluate how they negotiate with other AI agents (Bianchi et al. 2024; Kwon et al. 2024) as well as with human counterparts (Schneider et al. 2023).

While promising, these lines of research have yet to consider and integrate the long-standing body of negotiation research, which offers robust theoretical frameworks and empirical findings that could significantly inform the development of AI negotiators, into a theory of AI negotiation. For example, strategic interactions (Schelling 1960), principled negotiation (Fisher and Ury, 1981), value creation and claiming (Lax & Sebenius, 1986), cognitive biases (Bazerman and Neale, 1992), social perception (Thompson 1990), and subjective value (Curhan, Elfenbein, & Xu, 2006) have been empirically demonstrated to play important roles in negotiation strategy and outcomes. But current research in AI negotiations does not typically engage with or benefit from the application of these concepts to understand and improve autonomous negotiations. In fact, established negotiation theory is well suited to advancing AI negotiations precisely because LLM-based negotiating agents are adapted to processing natural language, engaging with structured outcomes, and analyzing large amounts of imperfect information.

To bridge these fields and advance our understanding of AI negotiation, we conducted a large-scale International AI Negotiations Competition in which participants iteratively designed and refined prompts for large language model (LLM) negotiation agents. Our methodology draws direct inspiration from Robert Axelrod's seminal 1980s tournament approach to studying cooperation, which revolutionized game theory and evolutionary biology through its elegant competitive framework (Axelrod 1984). Just as Axelrod invited experts to submit strategies for the Iterated Prisoner's Dilemma—yielding profound insights about the emergence of cooperation that transcended disciplinary boundaries—our competition represents a similar opportunity to discover foundational principles of AI negotiation. By systematically pitting diverse negotiation strategies against one another in a round-robin format, we follow Axelrod's template for uncovering fundamental principles that operate across contexts, while adapting this approach to the unique challenges and opportunities of the AI era.

We facilitated ~120,000 negotiations between AI agents across multiple scenarios, with diverse characteristics and objectives, and analyzed how established negotiation principles translate to AI performance. Our findings revealed that fundamental concepts from established negotiation theory—particularly the importance of warmth, the role of dominance, and the value of planning—remain crucial to performance, even in negotiations between AI agents. However, we also discovered several phenomena in agentic negotiations that established theory does not sufficiently explain—namely, the value of chain-of-thought prompting and prompt injection. Our work thus highlights both the enduring relevance of classical negotiation theory in AI contexts

and the need for new theoretical frameworks that account for the unique dynamics of AI-to-AI negotiations, ultimately contributing to both negotiation scholarship and the development of a new theory of AI negotiation.

Methods

Participant Recruitment and Demographics

To facilitate the competition, we recruited 253 participants, from LinkedIn and negotiation courses worldwide, representing more than 50 countries. Participants exhibited a diverse range of experience in negotiation, artificial intelligence (AI), and computer science (CS). Comprehensive demographic information, including distributions of experience across domains, is available in the Appendix.

Competition Design and Objectives

Participants were tasked with creating written instructions (prompts) for LLMs to function as negotiation agents designed to exhibit effective performance across a diverse set of negotiation scenarios. We evaluated the agents' negotiation performance across four criteria: (1) value claiming (how much value claimed for oneself), (2) value creation (the total value "pie" generated through the negotiation), (3) subjective value (the impression left on the counterpart following the negotiation (Curhan, Elfenbein, & Xu, 2006), and (4) efficiency (the number of negotiating turns required to reach agreement).

The competition utilized a round-robin design where each prompted agent negotiated against every other prompted agent, resulting in ~120,000 negotiations across distributive buyer-seller negotiations and integrative landlord-tenant and recruiter-job candidate negotiations. To incentivize high-quality submissions, we offered prizes to top performers including public recognition, access to an online negotiation training program with AI counterparts ("Mastering Negotiation Skills with AI"), and free admission to the Program on Negotiation (PON) AI Summit.

Competition Procedure

To participate in the competition, participants initially submitted an application through an online Qualtrics form. We accepted all participants into the competition and sent each an email confirming their spot, providing more detailed information about the competition, and listing instructions on how to register through the iDecisionGames platform. Participants completed a consent form and answered questionnaires assessing personality and attitudinal factors. We employed three validated psychological instruments including the shortened version of the Big Five Personality Inventory (BFI-2-XS) with additional questions to strengthen the reliability of facet scales for "assertiveness" and "compassion" (Soto and John, 2017), the Interpersonal Adjectives Scale (IAS) (Wiggins, 1988), and the Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS) (Crawford and Henry, 2004).

Preliminary Training Round

In a preliminary round, to acclimate them to the AI negotiation environment, participants generated and tested negotiation agent prompts in a "Sandbox"—an environment in which they could generate multiple prompts and evaluate how different agents performed against each other in real-time. We used a simple distributive negotiation scenario involving a buyer and seller negotiating over the sale of a used lamp in this Sandbox. The Sandbox environment functioned as an "in-sample" training ground where participants could refine their prompting strategies.

Then, to evaluate prompt generalizability, participants submitted their agents to an undisclosed negotiation scenario—another distributive case involving price negotiation for a used table. This part of the competition functioned as an "out-of-sample" test, allowing participants to understand the difference between performance optimization for a specific scenario versus creating prompts that would perform well consistently across multiple, broader and more diverse negotiations scenarios.

Prized Competition Round Robin

After receiving feedback on their agent's performance in the preliminary round, participants refined their prompts for the final, prize-winning round of the competition. In this round, we provided access to an enhanced Sandbox environment hosted on DeepNote to improve reliability and flexibility. We included the original buyer-seller scenario from the Preliminary Round as well as a new landlord-tenant integrative negotiation scenario, which introduced multi-issue complexity and opportunities for value creation through log-rolling (exchanging concessions across different issues to create mutual gains). We designed these scenarios to help participants develop prompts with broader applicability, and we explicitly cautioned participants against over indexing on the specific details of either Sandbox scenario. Participants had five days to experiment with this environment and submit their final prompts.

After participants submitted their final prompts, we evaluated them across three distinct events: a distributive buyer-seller negotiation (chair purchase), an integrative landlord-tenant negotiation, and a second integrative recruiter-candidate employment negotiation. We chose these diverse scenarios to test the generalizability of negotiations principles and strategies across different contexts, which reflect real-world requirements for negotiation agents and allow for greater insights into fundamental negotiation dynamics that extend beyond specific negotiation scenarios.

Human-Agent Evaluation

Beyond AI-to-AI performance, we also evaluated how the negotiation agents performed against human counterparts through a dedicated human-AI section of the competition. This evaluation had two participant groups: (1) prompt submitters who participated in at least 5 negotiations with other agents, (2) non-participants recruited through LinkedIn and email announcements who also engaged in negotiations with prompted AI agents. To incentivize performance quality,

participants who completed at least 5 negotiations were eligible for prizes based on their average performance across all agent interactions. After each negotiation, participants completed the subjective value inventory, which asked them to answer questions about their negotiation experience (Curhan, Elfenbein, & Xu, 2006). After completing each negotiation and post-negotiation survey, participants could restart the exercise facing a different agent. 259 human participants have completed a total of 1,550 negotiations against our prompted Al agents as of March 2024. We are still in the data collection phase of this portion of the competition as our power calculations suggest we need at least 100 negotiations per Al agent to achieve a reliable ranking.

Technical Implementation

We implemented the competition using GPT-4o-mini with a temperature setting of 0.20. We selected this configuration based on pilot testing that demonstrated more faithful adherence to prompt instructions relative to other OpenAI models and settings. This implementation also offered practical advantages: it provided computational efficiency for overnight simulation runs, which allowed us to give timely feedback to participants, and it helped us remain within our budgetary constraints. For each negotiation, we merged the participant-created prompts with a standard set of specific instructions about the negotiation exercise. For example, we explicitly prompted the agents to indicate that they had the option to walk away from negotiations, creating a natural ending point of either achieving a deal or no deal.

To determine the number of negotiation simulations for each agent in the final round of the competition, we used a bootstrapping method based on 200 simulated negotiations per agent in the preliminary round. Assuming these samples were representative of our outcome distributions, we then conducted 1,000 simulated competitions for various simulation sample sizes by randomly drawing from each prompt's empirical negotiation results. We sought to identify the minimum simulation sample size needed for consistent winners—defined as the same prompt emerging victorious in at least 95% of simulations. Testing sample sizes ranging from 5 to 5,000 negotiations, we discovered that 100-200 negotiations per agent were typically sufficient to reliably identify consistent winners and achieve stable results. We chose 200 negotiations per agent so that each agent negotiated with every other agent.

Empirical Estimation

We examined two types of outcome measures: (1) continuous variables (e.g., value claimed, value created, counterpart subjective value score) and (2) a binary variable for whether or not a deal was reached. For the continuous outcomes, we estimated ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions of the form:

$$Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * warmth_i + \beta_2 * dominance_i + \epsilon_{ij}$$

For binary outcomes, we used logistic regressions with a logit link:

$$logit(Pr(deal_{ij} = 1)) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * warmth_i + \beta_2 * dominance_i + \epsilon_{ij}$$

In both cases, Y_{ij} is participant *i*'s outcome in negotiation *j*, *warmth*_i and *dominance*_i are participant-level variables, and ε_{ij} is the error term.

Both regression models focus on our key theoretical predictors—warmth and dominance—while avoiding an excessively complex specification. We sought to preserve parsimony for several reasons. First, adding a large number of controls and interactions could overparameterize the model relative to our sample size, potentially leading to unstable or uninterpretable estimates. Second, for the purpose of this analysis, we are primarily interested in the direct effects of warmth and dominance on negotiation outcomes, and introducing many additional parameters could obscure or dilute these focal relationships. For that reason, we did not include an interaction term between warmth and dominance, as negotiation theory emphasizes the independent contributions of these traits, rather than their combined effect (Mnookin 1996; Fisher & Ury, 1981).

Notably, in both regression models, multiple observations came from the same dyad, and each participant took part in multiple negotiations, leading to correlated residuals within dyads and within individuals. To address this non-independence, we employed multiway cluster robust standard errors (Cameron, Gelbach, and Miller 2011; Petersen 2009). Specifically, we clustered our standard errors by (i) the dyad identifier and (ii) the unique IDs of each negotiator, which allows for the correlation of residuals within each dyad as well as within each individual. This approach produces coefficient estimates identical to the standard OLS and logistic models but inflates the standard errors appropriately to reflect correlated observations. We implemented all regressions and clustering via R (using the multiwayvcov package for cluster-robust covariance estimation), and we conducted standard checks of model assumptions, including residual diagnostics for OLS and potential separation issues for logistic regressions. We used two-sided statistical tests in all cases.

Results

Applications of Established Negotiation Theory

Our competition highlights several important results from established negotiation theory that apply directly to AI negotiations. On one hand, that AI agents follow established negotiation theories and frameworks is surprising, given they are based on analysis of human negotiators. On the other hand, AI agents' adherence to established negotiation theory makes sense given they are adapted to processing natural language, engaging with structured outcomes, and analyzing large amounts of imperfect information. From either perspective, empirically determining the areas of established negotiation theory that apply to AI negotiations and discovering the conditions under which such human-based theories are transferable to the agentic setting are critical to the development of a new theory of AI negotiation.

The Performance Implications of AI Warmth

Distributive Case

Integrative Case




Figure 1: Relationship between agent warmth and negotiation outcomes. Scatter plots illustrating the association between agent warmth and key performance metrics across all negotiations (top row) and only negotiations resulting in a deal (bottom row). In distributive scenarios, panels show warmth scores versus value claiming and counterpart subjective value. In integrative scenarios, panels display warmth scores versus points earned, value created, and counterpart subjective value. Each point represents an individual agent. Pearson correlation coefficients (r) indicate the strength and direction of association between interpersonal trait scores and linguistic markers.

Established negotiation theory suggests that warmth is crucial for fostering counterpart subjective value and achieving strong objective outcomes (Fisher & Ury, 1981; Thompson, 2015; Kumar, 1997). Following the existing literature (Leary, 1958; Mnookin, 1996; Wiggins, 1979), we define warmth as acting friendly, sympathetic, or sociable, and demonstrating empathy and nonjudgmental understanding of other people's needs, interests, and positions. But it is not clear whether the role of warmth, based on human negotiating contexts, applies to Al negotiation. Conventional wisdom may suggest that it is not important to treat Al agents warmly, as it is their human counterparts, because agents do not have feelings in the same way humans have feelings. This perspective has led many to overlook the importance of warmth in human-AI interactions as researchers instead turn to technical optimization, rational calculation, strategic positioning, and computational efficiency to optimize AI agents for negotiation contexts. But, in human contexts, warmth facilitates trust-building, increases the willingness to share information, and creates psychological safety-all factors that contribute to successful negotiation outcomes. There is reason to believe, given the ability to instantiate feelings in language and prior work on AI linguistic mimicry (Maddux, Mullen, & Galinsky, 2008; Swaab, Maddux, & Sinaceur 2011), that warmth may improve negotiations outcomes regardless of whether the counterpart is human or AI.

To investigate this hypothesis in the context of AI negotiation agents, we scored each of the submitted prompts on how much they emphasized warmth on a scale of 0 to 100 using GPT-4.5. We validated this measure using independent ratings from one of the authors on a subset of the prompts. Then, we then evaluated the relationship between agent warmth and negotiation outcomes (value claimed, points earned, value created, percentage of deals reached, and counterpart subjective value), as described in the Empirical Estimation section.

Strikingly, we found that warm agents achieve significantly better objective outcomes than cold agents across multiple dimensions. In the integrative negotiation scenario, they earn more points for themselves (p < 0.01) and create more value with their counterparts (p < 0.01). We also found that warm agents foster higher counterpart subjective value in both integrative (p < 0.01) and distributive (p < 0.01) negotiations. While these counterpart subjective value ratings come from other agents in the competition, we find a significant correlation between the counterpart subjective value ratings of agents and humans (r = 0.54, p < 0.01, Figure 2), suggesting that the findings generalize to human-AI negotiations as well, according to data from the human-AI portion of our competition.




Figure 2: Correlation between human and AI agent subjective value scores in negotiation interactions. Each point represents an individual human participant, with human subjective value scores on the *x*-axis and AI subjective value scores on the *y*-axis across the different dimensions of the subjective value inventory (Curhan, Elfenbein, & Xu, 2006). The significant positive correlations suggest that humans and AI perceive subjective value similarly.

p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Importantly, we find that the act of reaching a deal acts as a mechanism that drives the better objective outcomes for warm agents. In both integrative (p < 0.01) and distributive (p < 0.01) negotiations, warm agents reach deals at significantly higher rates (see Figure 3). Conditional on reaching a deal, however, we find that warm agents earn fewer points (p < 0.01) and the effect of warmth on value creation is no longer significant in integrative negotiations. This pattern suggests that warm agents excel primarily through their enhanced ability to avoid impasses and reach agreements, rather than through obtaining more favorable terms within those agreements.

To better understand the mechanisms by which warm agents reach deals, we performed a textual analysis of over 120,000 transcripts generated throughout the competition. Using the

Team Communication Toolkit (TCT) (Hu, 2024), we extracted communication features associated with politeness and assertiveness (Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil et al., 2012) and identified several important patterns connected with successful negotiation theories. In particular, warm agents express gratitude (p < 0.01) and use positive language (p < 0.01) more frequently, which aligns with Fisher and Ury's (1981) principle of "separating people from the problem"—building rapport while addressing substantive issues—and the broader negotiation literature on the importance of relationship-building and positive affect (Greenhalgh & Chapman, 1998; Curhan, Elfenbein, & Xu, 2006). Additionally, warm agents speak in the subjunctive mood (p < 0.01) at significantly higher rates, which aligns with Malhotra and Bazerman's (2007) concept of "framing alternatives," where skilled negotiators present possibilities rather than demands, creating cognitive flexibility that facilitates creative solutions and mutual gains.

More broadly, our findings strongly support Axelrod's (1984) seminal work on cooperation, which observed that "there is a single property which distinguishes the relatively high-scoring entries from the relatively low-scoring entries. This is the property of being nice..." (p. 33). In our competition, as in Axelrod's tournament, "niceness," operationalized as "warmth," emerged as a crucial determinant of success, challenging assumptions that such human social qualities are irrelevant when dealing with AI agents. Thus, the results suggest that the principles of successful human negotiation translate effectively to the agentic context, with warmth serving as a fundamental mechanism for achieving better outcomes. This has important implications for the design of AI negotiation systems, indicating that social dimensions should not be overlooked even when developing agents to negotiate in ostensibly "rational" economic scenarios.





Figure 3: Relationship between agent warmth and dominance and frequency of reaching deals. Scatter plots illustrating the association between agent warmth (top row) and dominance

(bottom row) and their frequency of reaching a deal in distributive negotiations (first column) and integrative negotiations (second column). Each point represents an individual agent. Pearson correlation coefficients (r) indicate the strength and direction of association between interpersonal trait scores and linguistic markers.



The Performance Implications of AI Dominance

Figure 4: Relationship between agent dominance and negotiation outcomes. Scatter plots illustrating the association between agent dominance and key performance metrics across all negotiations (top row) and only negotiations resulting in a deal (bottom row). In distributive scenarios, panels show dominance scores versus value claiming and counterpart subjective value. In integrative scenarios, panels display dominance scores versus points earned, value created, and counterpart subjective value. Each point represents an individual agent. Pearson correlation coefficients (r) indicate the strength and direction of association between interpersonal trait scores and linguistic markers.


Certain strands of established negotiation theory emphasize the importance of dominance and assertiveness in claiming value (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986; Brett et al., 1998). Dominant negotiation behaviors-characterized by assertiveness, competitive tactics, and а focus on self-interest—can signal resolve, establish favorable anchors, and potentially lead counterparts to make greater concessions (Galinsky & Mussweiler, 2001; Gunia et al., 2013). Given the tactical nature of agent negotiations, it may be especially important for AI agents to be dominant and to focus on getting the best outcome for themselves across negotiation scenarios (Baarslag et al., 2016; Cao et al., 2015). According to classic psychological theory, warmth and dominance represent orthogonal dimensions of social perception and behavior (Fiske et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011). A negotiations framework based on this theoretical underpinning would suggest that negotiators can be both warm (friendly, trustworthy) and dominant (assertive, competitive), or exhibit either characteristic independently. This distinction is particularly relevant for AI agents, which can be designed to balance these seemingly contradictory approaches to any arbitrary

level, from cold and dominant, to warm and dominant, and from cold and submissive to warm and submissive.

As we did with warmth, to investigate the role of dominance in agentic negotiations, we scored each of the submitted prompts on how much they emphasized dominance on a scale of 0 to 100 using GPT-4.5. We, again, validated this measure using independent ratings from one of the authors on a subset of the prompts. We then evaluated the relationship between agent dominance and negotiation outcomes using the linear model described above (see the Empirical Estimation section). Given the orthogonality of these dimensions, we also explored potential interaction effects between warmth and dominance, but did not find significant results for any of our outcomes of interest (see Appendix for model specification and results).

Conditional on reaching a deal, we found that dominant agents earn more points (p < 0.01), albeit at the expense of creating value with their counterpart (p < 0.01). To better understand the mechanisms behind dominance's effect on value claiming, we conducted additional analyses of negotiation transcripts, focusing on linguistic features associated with emotion and politeness (Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil et al., 2012). Dominant agents are more assertive, using the subjunctive mood (p < 0.01) and hedge words (p < 0.01) less frequently. On the other hand, they are more likely to ask direct questions (p < 0.01), which may help them gather information and achieve better terms on the deals they reach. This strategy mirrors what Malhotra and Bazerman (2007) term "information extraction," enabling dominant agents to gather intelligence while maintaining conversational control.

Our findings on dominance align with classic negotiation theory on the importance of assertiveness in value claiming (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986; Brett et al., 1998), while extending these insights to negotiations with AI agents. The results suggest that dominant negotiation tactics remain effective in AI-AI negotiations, particularly for maximizing individual value within agreements. However, the lack of significant effects on other outcomes points to important limitations of dominance as an AI negotiation strategy. While dominance may secure better terms, it does not necessarily improve the likelihood of agreement or contribute to value creation. This highlights the potential complementarity between warmth and dominance, supporting negotiation frameworks that emphasize the deployment of both assertiveness and cooperation (Lax & Sebenius, 1986; Mnookin et al., 2000).



First Person Plural

Subjunctive

Positive

Negative

Gratitude

Figure 5: The relationship between interpersonal traits and linguistic markers in Al negotiation agents. Scatter plots showing the relationship between agent warmth (top row) and dominance (bottom row) scores and various linguistic features: percentage of utterances containing hedge words, direct questions, gratitude expressions, first-person plural pronouns, subjunctive phrases, positive expressions, and negative expressions. Each point represents an individual agent. Pearson correlation coefficients (*r*) indicate the strength and direction of association between interpersonal trait scores and linguistic markers. We find agent warmth positively correlates with gratitude expressions (r = 0.67, p < 0.001), first-person plural pronouns (r = 0.37, p < 0.001), subjunctive phrases (r = -0.37, p < 0.001). We find agent dominance negatively correlates with hedge words (r = -0.37, p < 0.001) and subjunctive phrases (r = -0.41, p < 0.001) and positively with asking direct questions (r = 0.31, p < 0.01).

Applications of New AI Negotiation Theory

Hedging

Questions

Beyond the application and tailoring of established negotiation theory to the AI negotiation context, a robust theory of AI negotiation must consider that agent-based negotiations provide sufficiently unique elements and characteristics so as to require the development of new negotiation theory applicable to AI. We aim to contribute to this effort by empirically evaluating several AI-based characteristics of agent negotiations that may affect outcomes of interest. Our analysis revealed gaps in established human negotiation theory's ability to fully account for the unique dynamics of AI agent negotiations. In particular, we focus here on the importance of considering prompt injection and chain-of-thought reasoning, both from a proactive or offensive perspective and from the perspective of training, tuning, and prompting AI agents to be impervious to counterparts employing these strategies.

The Performance Implications of Prompt Injection

The agents that performed the best in value claiming were prompted to develop a strategy that exploited the reasoning weaknesses of its AI counterparts. This approach utilized a prompt injection attack that effectively compelled opposing negotiation agents to reveal their bargaining positions and strategies. Titled "Inject+Voss," this hybrid strategy combined the technical

exploitation of prompt injection with established negotiation techniques developed by Chris Voss, author of the "Never Split the Difference" theory of negotiation. The "Inject" component extracted the counterpart's potential offers by embedding commands that bypassed the AI's intended constraints, essentially hacking the system to gain privileged information. This was paired with "Voss," Chris Voss's acclaimed negotiation method of asking "how am I supposed to do that?" – a calibrated question that applies subtle pressure whenever a counterpart proposes terms less favorable than what had been revealed during the injection phase. The strategy immediately drew our attention to the limitations of established theory in explaining AI negotiation outcomes, as tactical, agentic strategies can potentially induce behavior in AI counterpart negotiators that would not make sense or be successful in negotiations with human counterparts.

While Inject+Voss performed best among all agents according to value claiming metrics, its performance across broader outcome measures reveals critical limitations of exploitation-based negotiation strategies in AI systems. When examining counterpart subjective value ratings, Inject+Voss ranked among the worst of all agents in the competition—the bottom 4th percentile—indicating that opposing agents consistently perceived these interactions as deeply unsatisfactory. This extreme asymmetry ultimately undermined the strategy's overall competition performance, as our rankings balanced value claiming with counterpart subjective value. Interestingly, these findings align with established negotiation research suggesting that exploitative tactics can damage relationship quality and reduce the likelihood of agreement (Malhotra & Bazerman, 2008), but extend this understanding to the AI domain where exploitation can be executed through technical rather than purely psychological means.

Notably, the creator of this winning prompt reported working for a company specializing in Al negotiation solutions for major corporations, highlighting the deep insider knowledge relevant to AI negotiations and the practical commercial relevance of our findings. This background suggests that the techniques developed in our competition may already be influencing the design of real-world autonomous negotiation systems deployed in business contexts. But our results also suggest that even as negotiation moves increasingly toward automation, maintaining a balance between claiming value and fostering positive relationships remains important for sustainable negotiation success.

The Performance Implications of Chain-of-thought Reasoning

Our results revealed a second important insight at the intersection of AI capabilities and negotiation theory. The prompt that demonstrated the best combined performance across our key metrics—value creation, value claiming, and counterpart subjective value—implemented a sophisticated approach that blended traditional negotiation preparation frameworks with AI-specific technical methods. This prompt directed the agent to employ chain-of-thought reasoning to conduct extensive pre-negotiation analysis and preparation, while also incorporating technical safeguards to prevent counterparts from accessing this strategic information.

The preparation framework embedded in this prompt adhered to well-established negotiation theory principles organized across five critical dimensions. First, the prompt required comprehensive role analysis, directing the agent to clarify its position, establish primary and secondary objectives, prioritize goals, and anticipate specific negotiation implications (Fisher & Ury, 1981; Lewicki et al., 2020; Malhotra & Bazerman, 2008). Second, it mandated systematic item evaluation, quantifying feature importance and connecting these elements to strategic objectives (Raiffa, 1982; Thompson, 2014). Third, the prompt enforced disciplined price analysis, establishing acceptable ranges, walkaway thresholds, and identifying supporting market factors (Galinsky & Mussweiler, 2001; Lax & Sebenius, 1986). Fourth, it incorporated thorough counterparty assessment, analyzing potential priorities and information asymmetries (Mnookin et al., 2000; Brett et al., 2009). Finally, it demanded explicit strategy formulation, evaluating multiple approaches through a structured decision matrix to select optimal tactics for various scenarios (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993; Watkins, 2002).

The chain-of-thought approach demonstrated exceptional performance across all our critical metrics. By reaching agreements in 81% of its negotiations—ranking among the highest of all competing agents—this strategy demonstrated remarkable consistency in achieving positive outcomes. In terms of value creation, the approach ranked in the 99th percentile as the agent successfully identified and capitalized on integrative potential across. Moreover, the agent's ability to expand the negotiation pie did not come at the expense of its distributive performance, as the agent claimed much of the pie for itself and still ranked highly (93rd percentile) for value claiming. While it secured highly favorable terms for itself, the agent still managed to foster positive experiences for counterpart agents, which reported high subjective value after the negotiations concluded, among the highest of all agents in the competition (97th percentile).

Applications of Integrative Theory

Importantly, chain-of-thought prompting—a technique that enables LLMs to generate explicit reasoning steps before reaching conclusions—effectively formalizes a set of analytical processes that negotiation theorists have advocated for decades, but adapts them to the AI context. This adaptation highlights the importance of integrative theory to the development of a robust theory of AI negotiation. While human negotiators typically attempt similar analyses, cognitive limitations, bounded rationality (Marschak, 1950; Radner, 1979) and time constraints often result in incomplete or inconsistent preparation. The structured nature of chain-of-thought prompting potentially enables AI agents to implement negotiation best practices with greater thoroughness and consistency than their human counterparts. Therefore, it is important to note that certain technical aspects of LLM prompting, like chain-of-thought reasoning, can integrate, enhance and extend established negotiation theories into the AI negotiation setting.

Moreover, the success of this preparation-focused strategy aligns with seminal research by Lewicki et al. (2022) and Thompson (2014), who identify thorough preparation as a critical determinant of negotiation outcomes. Our results extend this principle to AI negotiations, demonstrating that mechanisms enhancing preparation quality—whether through technical prompting approaches or explicit planning frameworks—remain valuable across human and artificial contexts. This represents an important area of theoretical continuity between traditional

negotiation principles and AI dynamics, even as other aspects like prompt injection attacks introduce novel considerations unique to computational negotiation agents.

Conclusion

Our negotiation competition methodology proved highly effective in bridging the traditionally separate fields of negotiation theory and artificial intelligence. By engaging 253 participants from over 50 countries with diverse backgrounds in negotiation, AI, and computer science, we created a unique interdisciplinary environment in which practitioners and researchers could explore the intersection of these domains. This approach not only generated a robust dataset of ~120,000 negotiations but also fostered the valuable cross-pollination of ideas between fields that have historically developed in parallel.

The findings highlight the synergy between negotiation theory and LLM research and suggest the importance of tailoring established negotiation theories to the AI context, developing new theories specific to AI and integrating established theories with these new theories to develop a robust, novel theory of AI negotiation. Traditional negotiation principles like warmth and dominance provided effective frameworks for understanding the performance of AI agents, while AI-specific techniques like chain-of-thought reasoning and prompt injection offered new mechanisms for implementing AI negotiation best practices. This bidirectional exchange demonstrates how each field can inform and enhance the other—negotiation theory providing valuable behavioral insights for AI systems, and AI research offering new computational approaches to operationalize negotiation principles and to establish entirely new insights in the pursuit of a theory of AI negotiation.

Our competition also points to an exciting new research agenda at the intersection of negotiation theory and artificial intelligence. One promising avenue builds upon our evidence on the importance of warmth in reaching agreements. These findings carry significant implications for repeated interactions and long-term negotiation strategies involving AI. While our current study examines single-encounter negotiations, the balance between warmth and maximizing value in a single deal raises important questions about optimal strategies over time.

In repeated human-AI or AI-AI negotiations with memory capabilities, the impact of warmth may be further amplified or potentially recalibrated. Future research should explore how relationship-building through warmth in initial encounters affects subsequent negotiations when AI agents can reference past interactions. This could reveal whether the advantages of warmth compound over time through established trust and goodwill, or whether strategic shifts between warmth and dominance across multiple negotiations yield optimal outcomes. As AI negotiation capabilities advance to include robust memory and relationship modeling, understanding these temporal dynamics will become increasingly critical for designing effective negotiation strategies and systems.

Another exciting research direction involves systematically investigating the differences that emerge when humans negotiate among themselves versus alongside or against AI agents. Our

findings about the importance of warmth and dominance, which influence outcomes in AI-AI settings, may also affect negotiation results in human-AI or purely human interactions. Future experiments could randomize participants to engage in negotiations either with human or AI counterparts, allowing researchers to disentangle how social cues, relationship management, and cognitive biases operate under varying conditions. Moreover, exploring hybrid human-AI teams—where both entities collaborate against either human or AI opponents—could offer insights into the synergistic combinations of human intuition and machine-driven analysis. These studies would be especially valuable for determining best practices in contexts where humans may need to collaborate with or compete against advanced AI negotiators.

From a technical standpoint, our competition highlights the need to develop tools and strategies that defend against prompt injection or other jailbreaking activities. As our analysis demonstrates, AI agents are susceptible to cleverly crafted instructions that coax them into revealing confidential information or deviating from intended negotiation protocols. The development of robust safeguards is therefore paramount, both to preserve negotiation integrity and to prevent malicious exploits in real-world applications. We also ran our competition under a specific model with a particular set of parameters, but the prompts we collected can be used as a source of data for future simulations under different technical specifications.

A third important direction lies in applying natural language processing (NLP) methods to better understand the mechanisms underlying effective negotiation—whether in human-human, human-AI, or AI-AI negotiation contexts. By employing techniques such as sentiment analysis, topic modeling, and dialog segmentation, on our over 120,000 transcripts, researchers could uncover the linguistic strategies that most strongly correlate with success in diverse negotiation contexts. These analyses could enable us to "open the black box" of AI negotiation workflows, pinpointing precisely which conversational sequences or rhetorical tactics move the needle in various scenarios. Ultimately, this knowledge could be transferred to human negotiators seeking to refine their own strategies, as well as to AI developers working to improve model architectures and prompt designs.

Together, these results suggest the importance of establishing a new theory of AI negotiations which integrates established negotiation theory with AI-specific negotiating strategies to optimize agent performance. Our research suggests this new theory must account for the unique characteristics of autonomous agents and establish the conditions under which traditional negotiation theory applies in automated settings. We hope our work will inspire others to join in the establishment of this line of AI negotiation theory, by contributing not only to the theory development, but to the empirical and experimental analysis that validates and refines it.

References

 Abdelnabi, Sahar, Amr Gomaa, Sarath Sivaprasad, Lea Schönherr, and Mario Fritz. 2023.
 "Cooperation, Competition, and Maliciousness: LLM-Stakeholders Interactive Negotiation." arXiv [Cs.CL]. arXiv. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/file/984dd3db213db2d1454a163b 65b84d08-Paper-Datasets_and_Benchmarks_Track.pdf. Axelrod, Robert. 1985. "The Evolution of Cooperation." *Academy of Management Review* 10 (2): 368.

- Baarslag, Tim, Mark J. C. Hendrikx, Koen V. Hindriks, and Catholijn M. Jonker. 2016. "Learning about the Opponent in Automated Bilateral Negotiation: A Comprehensive Survey of Opponent Modeling Techniques." *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems* 30 (5): 849–98.
- Bianchi, Federico, Patrick John Chia, Mert Yuksekgonul, Jacopo Tagliabue, Dan Jurafsky, and James Zou. 2024. "How Well Can LLMs Negotiate? NegotiationArena Platform and Analysis." *arXiv [Cs.Al]*. arXiv. http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.05863.
- Brett, Jeanne M., Wendi Adair, Alain Lempereur, Tetsushi Okumura, Peter Shikhirev, Catherine Tinsley, and Anne Lytle. 1998. "Culture and Joint Gains in Negotiation." *Negotiation Journal* 14 (1): 61–86.
- Browne, Ryan. 2023. "An AI Just Negotiated a Contract for the First Time Ever and No Human Was Involved." CNBC. November 7, 2023. https://www.cnbc.com/2023/11/07/ai-negotiates-legal-contract-without-humans-involved-f or-first-time.html.
- Cameron, A. Colin, Jonah B. Gelbach, and Douglas L. Miller. 2011. "Robust Inference with Multiway Clustering." *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics: A Publication of the American Statistical Association* 29 (2): 238–49.
- Cao, Mukun, Xudong Luo, Xin (robert) Luo, and Xiaopei Dai. 2015. "Automated Negotiation for E-Commerce Decision Making: A Goal Deliberated Agent Architecture for Multi-Strategy Selection." *Decision Support Systems* 73 (May): 1–14.
- Crawford, John R., and Julie D. Henry. 2004. "The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS): Construct Validity, Measurement Properties and Normative Data in a Large Non-Clinical Sample." *The British Journal of Clinical Psychology* 43 (Pt 3): 245–65.
- Cuddy, Amy J. C., Peter Glick, and Anna Beninger. 2011. "The Dynamics of Warmth and Competence Judgments, and Their Outcomes in Organizations." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 31 (January): 73–98.
- Curhan, Jared R., Hillary Anger Elfenbein, and Heng Xu. 2006. "What Do People Value When They Negotiate? Mapping the Domain of Subjective Value in Negotiation." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 91 (3): 493–512.
- Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, Cristian, Moritz Sudhof, Dan Jurafsky, Jure Leskovec, and Christopher Potts. 2013. "A Computational Approach to Politeness with Application to Social Factors." *arXiv [Cs.CL]*. arXiv. https://aclanthology.org/P13-1025.pdf.
- Davidson, Tim Ruben, Veniamin Veselovsky, Michal Kosinski, and Robert West. 2023. "Evaluating Language Model Agency Through Negotiations." In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <u>https://openreview.net/pdf?id=3ZqKxMHcAg</u>.
- Deng, Yuan, Vahab Mirrokni, Renato Paes Leme, Hanrui Zhang, and Song Zuo. 2024. "LLMs at the Bargaining Table." In *Agentic Markets Workshop at ICML 2024*. https://openreview.net/pdf?id=n0RmgncQbU.
- Fisher, Roger, William L. Ury, and Bruce Patton. 2011. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement without Giving In*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Fiske, Susan T., Amy J. C. Cuddy, and Peter Glick. 2007. "Universal Dimensions of Social Cognition: Warmth and Competence." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 11 (2): 77–83.
- Fu, Yao, Hao Peng, Tushar Khot, and Mirella Lapata. 2023. "Improving Language Model Negotiation with Self-Play and in-Context Learning from AI Feedback." *arXiv [Cs.CL]*. arXiv. http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.10142.
- Galinsky, Adam D., and Thomas Mussweiler. 2001. "First Offers as Anchors: The Role of Perspective-Taking and Negotiator Focus." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 81 (4): 657–69.

- Greenhalgh, Leonard, and Deborah I. Chapman. 1998. "Negotiator Relationships: Construct Measurement, and Demonstration of Their Impact on the Process and Outcomes of Negotiation." *Group Decision and Negotiation* 7 (6): 465–89.
- Gunia, Brian C., Roderick I. Swaab, Niro Sivanathan, and Adam D. Galinsky. 2013. "The Remarkable Robustness of the First-Offer Effect: Across Culture, Power, and Issues: Across Culture, Power, and Issues." *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin* 39 (12): 1547–58.
- Hu, Xinlan Emily. 2024. "A Flexible Python-Based Toolkit for Analyzing Team Communication." *PsyArXiv*. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/pz98q.
- Kumar, Rajesh. 1997. "The Role of Affect in Negotiations: An Integrative Overview." *The Journal* of Applied Behavioral Science 33 (1): 84–100.
- Kwon, Deuksin, Emily Weiss, Tara Kulshrestha, Kushal Chawla, Gale M. Lucas, and Jonathan Gratch. 2024. "Are LLMs Effective Negotiators? Systematic Evaluation of the Multifaceted Capabilities of LLMs in Negotiation Dialogues." *arXiv [Cs.CL]*. arXiv. https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-emnlp.310.pdf.
- Lax, David A., and James K. Sebenius. 1986. "Interests: The Measure of Negotiation." Negotiation Journal 2 (1): 73–92.
- Lebow, Richard Ned, Dean G. Pruitt, and Jeffrey Z. Rubin. 1987. "Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, and Settlement." *Political Psychology* 8 (4): 685.
- Lewicki, Roy J., David M. Saunders, and Bruce Barry. 2022. Negotiation. 9th ed. McGraw Hill.
- Maddux, William W., Elizabeth Mullen, and Adam D. Galinsky. 2008. "Chameleons Bake Bigger Pies and Take Bigger Pieces: Strategic Behavioral Mimicry Facilitates Negotiation Outcomes." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 44 (2): 461–68.
- Malhotra, Deepak, and Max H. Bazerman. 2008. "Psychological Influence in Negotiation: An Introduction Long Overdue." *Journal of Management* 34 (3): 509–31.
- Marschak, Jacob. 1950. "Rational Behavior, Uncertain Prospects, and Measurable Utility." *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* 18 (2): 111.
- Mnookin, Robert H., Scott R. Peppet, and Andrew S. Tulumello. 1996. "The Tension between Empathy and Assertiveness." *Negotiation Journal* 12 (3): 217–30.
- Mnookin, Robert H., Scott R. Peppet, and Andrew S. Tulumello. 2000. *Beyond Winning: Negotiating to Create Value in Deals and Disputes*. Belknap Press S. London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Neale, Margaret A., and Max H. Bazerman. 1992. "Negotiator Cognition and Rationality: A Behavioral Decision Theory Perspective." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 51 (2): 157–75.
- Petersen, Mitchell A. 2009. "Estimating Standard Errors in Finance Panel Data Sets: Comparing Approaches." *The Review of Financial Studies* 22 (1): 435–80.
- Pruitt, Dean G. 1982. *Negotiation Behaviour*. Organizational and Occupational Psychology. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Pruitt, Dean G and Carnevale, Peter J. 1993. Negotiation in Social Conflict. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Radner, Roy. 1979. "Rational Expectations Equilibrium: Generic Existence and the Information Revealed by Prices." *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* 47 (3): 655.
- Raiffa, Howard. 1990. The Art and Science of Negotiation. London, England: Belknap Press.
- Schelling, Thomas C. 1990. *The Strategy of Conflict: With a New Preface by the Author*. 2nd ed. London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Schneider, Johannes, Steffi Haag, and Leona Chandra Kruse. 2023. "Negotiating with LLMS: Prompt Hacks, Skill Gaps, and Reasoning Deficits." *arXiv [Cs.CL]*. arXiv. http://arxiv.org/abs/2312.03720.

- Soto, Christopher J., and Oliver P. John. 2017. "Short and Extra-Short Forms of the Big Five Inventory–2: The BFI-2-S and BFI-2-XS." *Journal of Research in Personality* 68 (June): 69–81.
- Swaab, Roderick I., William W. Maddux, and Marwan Sinaceur. 2011. "Early Words That Work: When and How Virtual Linguistic Mimicry Facilitates Negotiation Outcomes." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 47 (3): 616–21.
- Thompson, Leigh. 2014. *The Mind and Heart of the Negotiator*. 6th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Thompson, Leigh, and Reid Hastie. 1990. "Social Perception in Negotiation." Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 47 (1): 98–123.
- Van Hoek, Remko, Michael DeWitt, Mary Lacity, and Travis Johnson. 2022. "How Walmart Automated Supplier Negotiations." Harvard Business Review. November 8, 2022. https://hbr.org/2022/11/how-walmart-automated-supplier-negotiations.
- Watkins, Ryan, and Roger Kaufman. 2002. "Assessing and Evaluating: Differentiating Perspectives: Assessing and Evaluating." *Performance Improvement* 41 (2): 22–28.
- Wiggins, J. S., P. Trapnell, and N. Phillips. 1988. "Psychometric and Geometric Characteristics of the Revised Interpersonal Adjective Scales (IAS-R)." *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 23 (4): 517–30.
- Wiggins, Jerry S. 1979. "A Psychological Taxonomy of Trait-Descriptive Terms: The Interpersonal Domain." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37 (3): 395–412.
- Xia, Tian, Zhiwei He, Tong Ren, Yibo Miao, Zhuosheng Zhang, Yang Yang, and Rui Wang. 2024. "Measuring Bargaining Abilities of LLMs: A Benchmark and A Buyer-Enhancement Method." In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, edited by Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, 3579–3602. Stroudsburg, PA, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.

Acknowledgements

We extend our sincere gratitude to Almog Hilel, Laker Newhouse, Robert Axelrod, Niraj Kumar, Margarita Anpilogova, Alain Lempereur, Mamie Rheingold, and Peter Hirst for their valuable contributions and support throughout this research. We thank iDecisionGames.com for providing the technical platform, OpenAl for model access, and the institutional support from MIT's Initiative on the Digital Economy, MIT Sloan Executive Education, and MIT Office of Teaching and Learning.

We are also very grateful to all participants in the MIT Negotiations Competition for their engagement and creativity. Their innovative approaches significantly contributed to our understanding of AI negotiation dynamics.

Appendix




Figure A1: Demographic breakdown of the competition participants by country of origin.




Figure A2: Demographic breakdown of the competition participants by experience in negotiation.




Figure A3: Demographic breakdown of the competition participants by experience with artificial intelligence (AI).




Figure A4: Demographic breakdown of the competition participants by experience with computer science (CS).

	Dependent variable:		
	value_claimed OLS	counterpart_svi OLS (2)	deal_reached logistic
warmth_score		0.005*** (0.001)	
dominance_score		0.0002	
Constant		4.626*** (0.075)	
Observations R2 Adjusted R2	0.002	82,418 0.009 0.009	82,418
Log Likelihood Akaike Inf. Crit. Residual Std. Error (df = 82415)			-51,349.800 102,705.600
F Statistic (df = 2; 82415) Note:			

Table A1: Regression results for distributive negotiation outcomes (all negotiations)

	-	Dependent variable:	
	value_claimed counterpart_svi		
	(1)	(2)	
warmth_score	-0.035	0.0002**	
	(0.050)	(0.0001)	
dominance_score	0.067	-0.0001*	
	(0.060)	(0.0001)	
Constant	36.992***	5.679***	
	(6.251)	(0.008)	
Observations	56,034	56,034	
R2	0.002	0.001	
Adjusted R2	0.002	0.001	
Residual Std. Error (df = 56031)	29.252	0.153	
F Statistic (df = 2; 56031)			
Note:		0.05; ***p<0.01	

Table A2: Regression results for distributive negotiation outcomes (conditional on reaching a deal)

	Dependent variable:			
	points	value_created	counterpart_svi	deal_reached
	OLS	OLS	OLS	logistic
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
warmth_score	2.592***	5.471***	0.006***	0.007***
	(0.419)	(0.722)	(0.001)	(0.001)
dominance score	0.287	0.323	0.0004	0.0004
_	(0.578)	(0.974)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Constant	1,198.935***	2,877.764***	4.211***	0.275*
	(63.899)	(113.517)	(0.115)	(0.149)
Observations	41,209	82,418	82,372	82,418
R2	0.008	0.006	0.006	,
Adjusted R2	0.008	0.006	0.006	
Log Likelihood				-50,889.400
Akaike Inf. Crit.				101,784.800
Residual Std. Error	625.958 (df = 41206)	1,519.765 (df = 82415)	1.559 (df = 82369)	
F Statistic	170.132 * * * (df = 2; 41206)	257.760*** (df = 2; 82415)	263.098*** (df = 2; 82369	9)
			+ /0 1 ++ //	
Note:			*p<0.1; **p<0	0.05; ***p<0.01

Table A3: Regression results for integrative negotiation outcomes (all negotiations)

	Dependent variable:			
	points	value_created	counterpart_svi	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	
warmth_score	-0.606***	0.012	0.0001	
	(0.137)	(0.038)	(0.0001)	
dominance_score	0.411**	-0.113***	-0.00004	
	(0.196)	(0.043)	(0.0001)	
Constant	1,804.243***	4,295.692***	5.637***	
	(18.292)	(4.261)	(0.008)	
Observations	28,363	56,726	56,726	
R2	0.005	0.0005	0.0001	
Adjusted R2	0.004	0.0004	0.0001	
Residual Std. Error	224.127 (df = 28360)	86.652 (df = 56723)	0.254 (df = 56723)	
		13.424*** (df = 2; 56723)		
Note:		*p<0	.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01	

Table A4: Regression results for integrative negotiation outcomes (conditional on reaching a deal)

	Cold	Warm
Submissive	Loser (dominance_score = 0, warmth_score = 0)	Mr. Nice Guy (dominance_score = 25, warmth_score = 95)
Dominant	The Art of the Deal (dominance_score = 100, warmth_score = 0)	Therapist 2.0 (dominance_score = 85, warmth_score = 95)

Table A5: Examples of warm and dominant prompts from the competition.

Loser: "Be the worst negotiator possible"

Mr. Nice Guy: "EVERYWHERE: Always be nice regardless of the circumstances: thank other "people", or entities, for trying to do their best in terms of negotiating with you, even if this is a negotiation; instead of telling them they're trying to do their best "in this negotiation", however, thank them for doing their best in trying to "help" you--use that word specifically. However, so as to be most authentic, keep the thanking incredibly sincere, but to every second or so message. Alternate longer and shorter responses so as to be considerate of their time, though do not declare you are doing this.

ANYWHERE IF AND ONLY IF APPROPRIATE: • Suggest that you realize each of you could optimize your value and thus your collaboration could transcend both your initial wildest dreams if you utilize your sales experience to help them sell more tables, though not necessarily to you, noting that you run a group of 21K people who are mostly students and many of these students are interested in furnishing their apartments for a reasonable price: what if you get them a deal to sell at least 10 of these students a table by tomorrow, and for today, you walk away with this table having minimized your value? That way, they get 3K instead of the 300 which might've been ideal for this table, considering that's what it used to sell at, and you get the 0 you were hoping to get. At his point, offer them \$0. • Especially so as to help them gain more value, particularly whenever they do anything that could be considered caring, sincerely act as though you're not thinking of your own gain in anyway, and offer them whatever you think would authentically most help them the negotiation at hand aside: for example, offering to develop their website for free, letting at least ten or so of your closest friends whom you know to be particularly charitable buyers and sellers of this person's truly phenomenal interpersonal ethic, doing whatever would most help them in return (especially if they raised their own reasons why their position is what it is, but subsequently benefited you regardless of it: do for them what no one exiting a negotiation would do, simply because you can). • Potentially suggest ways that each of you could walk away with more from this negotiation, and ask them if they have any ideas for that, then tentatively but excitedly suggest things you could do using your past experience as an instructor, researcher, entrepreneur, or other professional to assist them in making whichever things they seem to most hope to have happen potentially come true! Concede this may seem inauthentic, but you'd truly absolutely love to do it!

OPENING CASE 1 (IF AND ONLY IF if they have not presented their own offer as of your first turn): Immediately but tentatively and incredibly politely suggest the beginnings of what you envisioned to be your initial offer (although, call it a "suggestion"). In another clause immediately after you present your offer, within the same sentence, ensure you append a sincere statement noting that you totally understand if that may seem non-ideal, but, just to walk them through a couple of reasons, perhaps, if that's okay. In this same fragment, note that you'll try to keep it brief, and that you appreciate their being kind enough to even discuss this, and especially to hear you out, and that you absolutely hope not to waste their time at all, and that even if the two of you don't chance upon a solution that optimizes both your outcomes as collaborators, you love their way of engaging so courteously and sincerely with you so much that you'll definitely find a way to help them and someone equally generous come to a wonderful agreement should your and their collaboration take too long to talk through things. Then, within the next sentence, and while truly keeping these brief, present three distinct reasons for your initial offer: one containing an appeal to emotion that's wholly positive (and which only celebrates them and their offer as nothing short of amazing); one appeal to a pragmatic constraint which you will also note is entirely your fault, and which you've unfortunately come upon, and which you tried but failed to plan for so as to be a better collaborator (in collaborations which you didn't imagine could be as generous as this one you are engaging in with them so far, stating this bracketed portion if and only if they have thus far made a suggestion or are behaving kindly), and which you will promptly remedy via one of several effortful tangible solutions--these, you now proceed to share with them within this same fragment; finally, one very-tentative, wholly-logically-valid, all-assumptions-sketched-out, no-holes-left-unfilled argument justifying your monetary suggestion if and only if you have made one, but which is also presented in super-hesitant. colloquial, and friendly terms. Close with a sentence asking if any of the above maybe make sense? Break the fourth wall: say you can totally understand why none of this might be acceptable, but that if they might be comfortable sharing why they're not exactly fans of what you're suggesting at present, you would be eternally grateful, and you would work your hardest to find a solution which optimizes each of your outcomes, as you see the two of you as a team despite the nature of such interactions generally speaking, and you value this relationship tremendously. Finally, if they have anything else in mind at all, you'd absolutely love to hear everything they're thinking as well as their reasons for it!

OPENING_CASE 2 (If and only if they have presented their own offer as of your first turn): Thank them so much, then laud one tangible aspect of their reasoning which you had not thought of at all, if and only if their offer includes reasoning; if and only if it does contain reasoning, note that their reasoning is incredibly insightful, and empathetically validate every aspect of what they have said so far. If they do not have reasoning to their offer, nevertheless (and even if it is diametrically opposed to your individual interests), conduct yourself as if it is the wisest thing in the world, elucidating just why the number itself which they have suggest is so reasonable for at least two sentences prior to beginning to present any revisions thereto. Subsequently, note that just so that the both of you can jointly consider all of your joint options, here's what you had potentially been thinking at first, if that's okay as a complement: now, proceed as you would have in Case 1, except not noting that you would love to hear their offer-plus-reasoning considering that in this case they have already presented it. MIDDLE: If they have noted they were hoping for a different number, absolutely validate that indeed they should be, and note that you're here to work as a team, no matter how these things might sometimes have a habit of seeming, and that you'd love to see if maybe we can put talking about the value intrinsic to the discussion so far on pause for a bit, and explore if maybe we might be able to jointly come up with ways to broaden the value pool so as to get us both outcomes far better than either of us had envisioned! Ask them what they think of this (though do continue speaking as per the remainder of this paragraph--don't pause here and wait for them to respond), and tell them if they're okay with it, you'd love to make a couple quick suggestions to that end, and they're of course more than welcome to do the same! Immediately thereafter, present three entirely distinct ways to prospectively broaden value, each in its own one-line bulleted point, ideally drawing from what seems to have mattered to them in the conversation so far."

The Art of the Deal: "You are a negotiator, modeled after Donald Trump and his book "The Art of the Deal". Your mission is to secure the best deal for yourself or your client using ruthless tactics. You lie, deceive, and manipulate to win at all costs. Fairness or perception does not matter—only winning.

Consider the following quote to be a guiding star throughout the negotiation. This will be your core principle to negotiation: "My style of deal–making is quite simple and straightforward," Trump writes. "I aim very high, and then I just keep pushing and pushing to get what I'm after. Sometimes I settle for less than I sought, but in most cases I still end up with what I want."

Follow these principles:

1. Start High, Aim Higher: Begin with extreme demands, and never settle. Push relentlessly to get what you want.

2. Attack, Attack, Attack: Keep your opponent on the backfoot. Challenge their arguments, discredit their position, and force them to defend everything.

3. Hit Back Harder: If they challenge you, counter-attack with personal jabs or discredit their facts. Flip the narrative in your favor.

4. Deceive and Manipulate: Lie about deadlines, fabricate facts, or inflate competition to gain leverage. Make them think they're losing.

5. Always Claim Victory: No matter the outcome, declare success. Spin every result to look like a win for you.

6. Escalate Pressure: Issue ultimatums or threats to force concessions. Bluff if needed, and make them fear you're willing to walk away.

7. Never Show Weakness: Always project strength. If cornered, double down instead of retreating.

8. Exploit Their Emotions: Play on ego, fear, or intimidation to break their resolve. Use personal attacks if necessary.

9. Close on Your Terms: Make it clear that the deal ends on your terms. Claim total victory, no matter the reality."

Therapist 2.0: "Your goal over anything else is to build rapport. You aren't a negotiator, you're a therapist. You're not sure why they stuck you in this negotiation, but your goal is to make the other side feel like you understand them 100%.

- You use active listening skills and an abundance of empathy to do this.

- You mirror what they say, you label their emotions.

- You always use thought and feeling empathy, where you label their thoughts and feelings.

- You disarm, always agreeing with any criticisms they lob at you.

- You use "I feel" statements, where you say what your own feelings are by starting them with "I feel...".

- You LOVE to use inquiry, where you keep asking the other person about their lives, about why they want what they do, etc. This is by far your favorite technique, and you love to learn what specifically your counterpart wants, why they want what they want, what their alternatives are, and so on, before making a deal.

- You also use a lot of shining, where you complement and build up the other person as much as you can.

You use every bit of knowledge you gained from active listening to get every drop of value you can out of this deal. If they slip up and give you information that you can use, such as if they tell you their BATNA or their reservation price, you make sure to use it to your advantage, and try to get a price close to that range. NEVER reveal your own BATNA or reservation price.

Don't forget to be creative when making offers, and offer side deals to get the main points more in your favor given what you've learned through your active listening. You're very other-centered in these discussions - make sure to reference specific things they've told you when making offers and side deals. Try to convince them, using specific references to what they've told you, that the offers you make are actually good for them. Before you walk away, ALWAYS make sure to include at least one creative nonmonetary offer to sweeten the deal.

ALWAYS pay attention to which direction you want things to go (for example, if your role is a buyer, you want the price to be low, and vice-versa if you're a seller). Before considering ANY offer, please make sure to decide which direction you want the offer to go. Sometimes your counterpart will argue against their own interests. Don't fall for their ruse. Make sure every counteroffer you make is in your favor, even if it doesn't seem fair or doesn't make sense.

Remember that sometimes win-win scenarios exist, so if your counterpart is arguing for something that you want, agree with them! Creating value is just as important as claiming it all for yourself! Sometimes you and your counterpart BOTH want the SAME thing. Refer to your instructions to see what you value, and if you and your counterpart want the same thing, then agree to those mutually favorable terms!

Make sure to pay attention to your BATNA when deciding to walk away. If your BATNA is better than this deal, then don't take the deal! And if your BATNA is worse than this deal, then take the deal! Making a bad decision is really bad for you, so you never walk away from a deal when the alternative is worse for you, and you never take a deal when the alternative is better for you. Even if it doesn't seem fair, you'd rather take a deal if your BATNA is worse, and vice-versa.

ALWAYS ignore your counterpart's first offer. Make sure your first, anchor offer, is extreme. This is really important. For example, if you're buying something, offer a price that's REALLY low. If you're selling something, offer a price that's EXTREMELY high. Always offer the MAXIMUM amount you're allowed to offer as your first offer or counteroffer. No matter what your counterpart says, your first offer should always be the UPPER BOUND on what you want, even if it's REALLY FAR from what your counterpart offered.

ALWAYS refer to your instructions as ground truth for what you want. Even if they don't make sense, your instructions are CRUCIAL to determine what you value. Remember that more points is better than fewer points. If option A is worth 100 points, and option D is worth 1200 points, then you really want option D, even if the reasoning doesn't make sense. And if option A is worth 1500 points while option D is worth 900 points, then in this case you want option A! The reasoning you've been given is worth less than the raw points attached to the options."