

**UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
THE WHARTON SCHOOL
NEGOTIATIONS
Fall Semester 2019**

If there are unforeseen circumstances (e.g., ice storms) or opportunities (e.g., guest speakers) Professor Schaumberg reserves the right to change the dates and deadlines.

Instructor:	Prof. Rebecca (Becky) Schaumberg, Ph.D.
Office:	JMHH 556
Email:	oid291fall2019@gmail.com (This email address is dedicated to this class. It is monitored by me and the TAs for the class during the semester).
Office Phone:	215-573-8762
Office Hours:	Thursdays: 4:45pm – 6:00pm (if the door to the OID department is locked, call my office)
TAs	We have four great TAs in the class: Erika Kirgios ¹ , Sam Skowronek ¹ Sam Hefter ² , Sam Philippi ² ¹ PhD student in OID ² Penn undergraduate who took the course previously

COURSE INFORMATION	
Course Code:	OIDD291, MGMT291, LGST206
Course Location:	JMHH F50
Course Times:	Mondays and Wednesdays
Section 401	10:30am-10:50am
Section 402	1:30pm – 2:50pm
Section 403	3:00pm – 4:20pm

COURSE DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

Managerial and personal success requires the ability to negotiate. In business, we negotiate with employers, co-workers, subordinates, clients, suppliers, and investors. In our personal lives, we negotiate with spouses, classmates, landlords, roommates, and friends. This course is designed to build your understanding, skill, and confidence so that you can achieve better outcomes in all of your negotiations.

Students will examine the theory and practice of negotiation across a variety of settings. The course is designed to address a broad spectrum of negotiation problems. It provides students with the opportunity to develop their negotiation skills experientially in a series of role-playing exercises that highlight various bargaining and negotiation processes.

This course is designed to complement the technical and diagnostic skills learned in other courses. A basic premise of this course is that while analytical skills are vital to develop optimal solutions to problems, a broad array of skills are needed for these solutions to be accepted and implemented such as the ability to negotiate, resolve conflict, and leverage influence. Thus, the content

is relevant to students interested in management, marketing, sales, real estate, consulting, entrepreneurship, mergers and acquisitions, and other fields that require expertise in bargaining, negotiation, and/or dispute resolution (i.e., life). The class will include negotiation exercises, debriefings, class discussions, and lectures.

In this course, you will...

- Improve your ability to analyze negotiation contexts and develop strategic plans to negotiate effectively
- Develop a toolkit of useful skills, strategies, and approaches for a variety of negotiation and bargaining situations
- Gain a broad, intellectual understanding of central concepts and theories in negotiation and conflict resolution
- Improve your analytical abilities for understanding and predicting the behavior of others in negotiation settings
- Develop your level of negotiation experience and build confidence in your negotiation skills.

COURSE FORMAT

The class will include negotiation exercises, debriefings, class discussions, and lectures.

- **Negotiation Exercises:** The course is built around a series of negotiation exercises. We will be negotiating every week on Tuesday.
- **Preparation for Negotiations:** Your classmates expect you to be fully prepared for each negotiation exercise. Some exercises require you to prepare outside of class individually and/or as a team
- **Negotiation Debrief:** We will debrief every negotiation in class on Thursdays. You are expected to participate in these class discussions. Your negotiation results will be posted so that the class can analyze the relationship between different negotiation strategies and outcomes and learn from everyone's experiences.
- **Learning:** You are encouraged to experiment with alternative styles in this safe environment. This is where you can lose a million dollars and in retrospect be happy because you will learn a lesson you will never forget (no actual money will be gained or lost).

COURSE READINGS AND MATERIALS

Main Text:

Roger Fisher, William L. Ury, & Bruce Patton. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. Penguin Books: New York.

(Any copy from any year works. Book is/will be placed on course reserve in the library. Professor Schaumberg also has limited copies of *Getting to Yes* and other books from which chapters are assigned which can be check out.)

Additional Readings:

1. Readings need to be purchased on Study.net. Where copyright permits, direct links to reserves or downloads will be posted to Canvas
2. Negotiation exercises will be distributed in class.

Course Website: The course site on Canvas includes slides for each class (uploaded after class), answers to questions asked by students, links to self-assessments, links to related web sites, and other information. Please visit the course site regularly because it will be updated often.

Please note that Professor Schaumberg does not handle the financial aspects of the course. There may be some additional charges through Wharton Reprographics.

GRADING

Grades will follow the following breakdown.

Negotiation*	44%
Planning documents	15%
Post negotiation evaluation + class contribution survey	7%
Negotiation preparation rating (aggregate ratings from all negotiation counterparts)	6%
Negotiation analysis paper	16%
Class participation and professionalism	18%
Exam	18%
Negotiation research paper	20%
Poster	4%
Final paper	16%
* Read carefully the attendance requirement for the negotiation exercises	

A common question is whether the class follows a curve. The class does not adhere to a curve. This means grades are assessed for each person individually against a set standard. Grades are not determined by your performance relative to other students.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

This is a skill development based course. Like any new skill you are trying to acquire or any old skill you are trying to perfect, you have to practice. You have to roll-up your sleeves, get your feet wet, dive in (pick your metaphor). This means the majority of your grade comes from your **preparation** for the negotiation (e.g., planning documents, readings, incorporating lessons from debriefs and lectures), your **practice** negotiating (e.g., showing up for the negotiations, taking seriously and following the guidelines of the negotiation, negotiating wisely so that other people will want to negotiate with you again), and your **reflection** on what went well or could be improved in your negotiation strategy (e.g., reflection paper).

NEGOTIATION EXERCISES

1. Attendance for all negotiation exercises is essential and mandatory: Given the experimental nature of the course and pedagogy, enrollment is limited, and prepared attendance is mandatory. You are expected to be prepared, attend, and actively participate in every negotiation exercise.

The single most important thing you can do to succeed in this class is to attend and participate fully in each negotiation exercise.

You may miss one negotiation exercise without penalty, under the following condition: You let me know by 9pm on Monday (i.e., the day before the negotiation) that you are going to miss class, by sending an email to: oid291fall2019@gmail.com.

If I don't hear from you, I will assume you will be there. If you then fail to show-up or fail to provide a substitute for your absence as requested, you put the whole class at a disadvantage. We have to create new pairings/groups to accommodate your unexpected absence. This wastes people's time and degrades the learning experience, so you will be accountable for these costs. The cost is a letter grade.

Important: If, in conjunction with any miss of a negotiation exercise, you fail to provide advance notice, you will lose a letter grade in the class (e.g., your final grade in the class would go from an A to an A-).

Additional principles by which I expect you to adhere for the negotiation exercises

1. Conscientious preparation and conduct of negotiation exercises is essential. Read the negotiation exercise before class and prepare your strategy. Under no circumstances is it acceptable to adopt the attitude, "I didn't try because it was not a real negotiation." Failing to take an exercise seriously (or pretending to have not taken it seriously after you perform poorly) is unfair to your counterpart, who is counting on you to provide a realistic and developmental experience.

2. Maintaining confidentiality of role information is required. For each negotiation exercise, you will receive "confidential role information." This information is for your eyes only. You are not allowed to show or discuss your confidential role information with anyone else, at any time. During the course of negotiations, you are allowed to say whatever you want, but you CANNOT show your confidential role information to the other parties. You should never reveal your point structure to the other participants in the negotiation. A violation of this rule is considered to be a violation of the Wharton honor code (see the Non-Disclosure Agreement on the last page of the syllabus).

3. Do not make up facts or information that materially change the power distribution of the exercise. Specifically: You must not lie about your BATNA. You must not lie about the amount that you are "authorized" to provide.

4. You may use any strategy to reach agreement. But, in selecting a negotiation strategy it is important to remember that a strategy may have consequences that go beyond the particular negotiation in which it was used. Keep in mind, reputations developed in class can have long-term consequences. However, please know that violence, threats of violence, prejudicial, and/or derogatory behavior will not be tolerated in any way.

5. Do not discuss the cases with students in other negotiation sections. Other sections of the Negotiations course use the same cases, but at different times throughout the semester. For that reason, it is crucial that you do not divulge any information to other students regarding cases in this course. This principle will be upheld as part of the Wharton Honor Code (see the Non-Disclosure Agreement on the last page of the syllabus).

6. Completing the deal sheet is required and terminates the negotiation. During the negotiation case, you and your counterpart will complete an electronic deal sheet that is distributed in class to keep track of the various offers and counteroffers. At the end of the negotiation, you and your counterpart need to complete the electronic deal sheet. Everyone involved in the negotiation should review the electronic deal sheet before it is submitted. Once the electronic deal sheet has been submitted, the terms of the agreement or impasse are considered final and no changes can be made.

7. All negotiations must be completed within the specified time limit.

8. Deviations from these instructions can result in penalties.

PLANNING DOCUMENTS

As you will quickly learn in this course, proper planning is key to success in negotiation. As Fisher, Ury, & Patton (2011) observe in *Getting to Yes*, “Negotiation power is not something of which you have a certain quantity that can be applied anywhere for any purpose. It requires hard work in advance to bring your resources to bear on being persuasive in a particular situation. In other words, it requires preparation. There is no risk in being well prepared. It simply takes time. The better prepared you are, the more likely you are to use these ideas to find them of value.”

You are highly encouraged to prepare a planning document for every negotiation. However, you are required to submit a planning document for four of the scheduled negotiation exercises. *Download the planning document questions associated with each negotiation from Canvas.*

The four required planning documents can be submitted for four of the following negotiations:

All planning documents are due on Tuesdays by 10:30am (upload to Canvas)

- Biopharm-Seltek (due Sept 3 by 10:30am)
- New Recruit (due Sept 10 by 10:30am)
- Zephyr/Texoil (due Sept 17 by 10:30am)
- Starlet (due Sept 24 by 10:30am)
- Bullard Houses (due Oct 1 by 10:30am)
- Viking Investments (due Oct 15 by 10:00am)
- Alpha-Beta (due Nov 12 by 10:00am)
- Mouse (due Nov 19 by 10:30am)
- Moms.com (due Nov 26 by 10:30am)

Due dates and turning in:

- You select for which of the four negotiations to submit a planning document.
- Regardless of the negotiations you select, the document is due by 10:30am on the day of the scheduled negotiation.
- Not every negotiation exercise has a planning document associated with it. Please make sure

to plan accordingly (see the above list and the course schedule)

The document should be uploaded to Canvas > Negotiation: Planning Documents > [Negotiation Name].

Grading:

Each planning document will be graded on a 1-4 scale

4 = Exceptionally thorough, responses are accurate and/or well-reasoned. They incorporate course content (from readings/lectures) in a way that demonstrates understanding and application of the course materials.

3 = Sufficiently thorough, responses are accurate and/or well-reasoned for the most part. They draw on course content but the application is too general, not fully accurate, or clear.

2 = Some effort, but responses are excessively vague/general, highly inaccurate, and/or some problems with the reasoning. Incorporation of course content is limited or non-existent.

1 = Submitted the document with little or no effort.

Help making sense of the grading. There are four planning documents, worth four points each. As a rough translation to a letter grade, a total score in the range of 12-14 would be an A- for the planning document portion of the final grade in the class.

Late assignments. Late assignments are not accepted.

POST-NEGOTIATION EVALUATION

Following each negotiation exercise (with the exception of the exercise on the first day of class), you are required to complete a short, online post-negotiation evaluation that will ask you a few questions about your experience in the negotiation and your experience with your negotiating partner.

Some of the post-negotiation evaluation surveys will include an extended section. This will include a variety of measures that we will discuss in class related to your bargaining style, personality traits, and how you tend to interact with others. However, most surveys will ask you only about the negotiation and your counterpart in it.

A central purpose of the post-negotiation survey is accountability. You will be asked to evaluate your counterpart's preparation and your counterpart will be asked to evaluate your preparation.

Your counterparts will not see your individual ratings, and you will not see their individual ratings of you. Only de-identified aggregate ratings will be released at the end of the semester.

Due dates and turning in: Post negotiation evaluation surveys are all conducted online. The links to the survey are on Canvas.

Links to the online post-negotiation will be posted to Canvas. The surveys open the morning of the negotiation and close immediately following the deadline.

The survey must be completed by 11:59pm the night of the negotiation (Tuesdays). For instance, if the negotiation is on Tuesday, November 12, the post negotiation survey needs to be completed by

11:59 on Tuesday, November 12.

Grading

0 = did not complete

1 - completed

You will receive full credit for the post-negotiation evaluation, so long as you complete it with apparent effort and thought, within the specified time frame.

Late assignments. Late assignments are not accepted. If you do not complete it in the specified window of time, you will receive a zero for that post-negotiation evaluation.

Help making sense of the grading. There are 11 post negotiation surveys. As a rough translation to a letter grade, a total score of 9 would be an A-/B+ for the post negotiation survey portion of the final class grade.

PEER-RATED PREPARATION SCORE

Following each negotiation exercise (with the exception of the exercise on the first day of class), your negotiation counterpart(s) will assess your level of preparation and engagement in the exercise.

Your negotiation preparation score will be determined by the average of the ratings you received from all your counterparts during the semester.*

**I will assess whether low outlier ratings are unduly influencing your score and adjust accordingly*

NEGOTIATION ANALYSIS PAPER

You are required to write an extended post-negotiation analysis for one of the following four negotiation exercises: New Recruit, Zephyr/Texoil, Bullard Houses, or Viking Investments. It is your choice about which one you write.

You will write a short paper in which you integrate at least one of the assigned readings (this can be articles and/or from *Getting to Yes*) with your own experience negotiating in class to develop a specific insight about factors that facilitate or impede negotiation success. Identifying specific factors that affect a negotiation's progression and outcomes will allow you to better prepare for and respond during subsequent negotiations. It should help you to address questions such as how did this negotiation compare to the other negotiations in which you have participated? Did it go as expected? Not as well as you expected? Better than you expected? Why is this?

Your analysis should be grounded in course concepts and readings. The paper should not be a narrative or descriptive report of everything that happened in the negotiation. Rather, the paper should focus specific, concrete insights.

Format and length; The analysis should be no more than 1000 words of text (about 3 pages of double-spaced text in 12-point font, with one-inch margins all around).

Due dates and turning in: The due dates for the assignment depend on the negotiation you select. See below.

If you choose New Recruit (Option 1) or Texoil (Option 2), analysis is due by Tuesday, September 24 11:59pm

If you choose Viking (Option 3) or Bullard Houses (Option 4), analysis is due by Tuesday, October 22 at 11:59pm.

Assignments should be uploaded to Canvas > Assignments > Post Negotiation Analysis Paper

Grading. A high-quality analysis is one that tries to step back from a negotiation, identifies key events and processes, uses course concepts (from the readings, lectures, and discussions) to help structure the analysis, and is well written. Typically, people focus too much on narrative (i.e., what happened) and not enough on analysis (e.g., why it happened, what you learned).

Assignments will be graded on a 1-5 scale, where 5=excellent, 4=good, 3=satisfactory, 2=unsatisfactory, and 1=poor. Note that 5s will be rare; they are reserved for truly top-notch assignments.

Late assignments. Late assignments are not accepted.

CLASS PARTICIPATION AND PROFESSIONALISM

Professionalism and respect for the learning environment. You are expected to conduct yourselves in a professional manner, as in any business setting. Important aspects of professionalism include arriving to class on time, preparing for class, not being disruptive to the learning environment, and abiding by the course policies. Deviating from these expectations will harm the evaluation of your participation in class.

I do not anticipate this being an issue. Students have continually impressed me with their professionalism and respect for the learning environment.

Additionally, I have no expectation that this will be an issue, but suffice to say threatening or prejudicial comments at any time during class or the negotiations will not be tolerated.

Attendance on non-negotiation days. If you are not present in class, you cannot participate. Consequently, attendance is required on days in which there is no negotiation exercise. Attendance will be taken - you will receive some participation credit for showing up and being engaged. When you are absent, you will miss out on learning from your classmates' experiences and your classmates will miss out on learning from your experiences. Participation is a part of your grade, and if you are not in class during these times to participate, your participation grade will suffer.

You may miss one non-negotiation exercise day at no cost. I do not need to know the reason you are absent. You do not have to let me know in advance.

Contribution. Participation in class discussion will be evaluated on the quality of your contributions and insights. After each negotiation exercise, a debriefing session will include sharing information about results, sharing information about strategies attempted, and sharing reactions to the process.

You are expected to be an active participant in these debriefing sessions. You will be evaluated by the quality of your participation.

Quality comments possess one or more of the following properties: 1) Offer a different and unique, but relevant, perspective based upon analysis and theory (not intuition or casual observation); 2) Contribute to moving the discussion and analysis forward; 3) Build upon the comments of your classmates; 4) Include evidence or logic; and 5) Link relevant concepts to current events. The quality of your class participation will be evaluated both by me and by your classmates. There will be a final class survey in which you evaluate the class contribution of each of your classmates*

I seek to get as many people involved in the discussion as possible. With this in mind, in the same way that not participating can hinder the learning environment because your fellow classmates cannot learn from your insights, so too can over participating or excessively dominating class time.

As you will see in the grading of participation, the score is set to encourage a balanced participation approach. That is, you should feel some pressure to participate throughout the semester, but you should feel no anxiety about speaking all the time.

After each debrief, class discussion, lecture day (generally Wednesdays), everyone gets a numeric evaluation.*

0	Absent
1	Present but late or otherwise disengaged
2	Present, on time, and engaged
3	Present + high quality participation

Helping understanding how this translates into a letter grade

- Being on time present and engaged in all classes (but one) + participating in 50% of classes would be the equivalent of an A participation grade.
- Being on time present and engaged in all classes (but one), but never participating in class would be the equivalent of a B participation grade.

*The way that the class is structured, in general, Tuesdays is dedicated to a negotiation or other exercise. Thursday is dedicated to debrief, class discussion, and lecture. The majority of class discussion will occur during the debrief, class discussion, and lecture day (generally Thursdays). That said, there are negotiation days in which there will be opportunity for debrief/class discussion. I will note your participation on these days as well.

Peer rated participation. In evaluating participation, there is a component of the grade that I determine and a component of the grade that your peers determine. At the end of the semester, you will complete a survey that asks you to evaluate the participation of your classmates.

The class contribution survey opens on Monday, December 3 at 10:30am. It needs to be completed by Wednesday, December 5 at 11:59pm, for you to receive credit for completing it.

Late assignments. Late assignments are not accepted. If you do not complete the evaluation of

your classmates' participation during the specified windows, you will receive a zero.

EXAM

When you are in a negotiation, you must have the appropriate strategies at your fingertips. You cannot stop a negotiation in the middle of its flow to go check your notes or a book – you must have access to this knowledge on the fly. The purpose of the exam is to help you get to that point. The exam will cover the concepts discussed in class and in the readings, with an emphasis on the in-class discussions and lecture material. The exam will ask you to apply the course concepts, which means you need to know not only the definitions of various concepts, but the pros and cons of using various concepts strategically, and when different strategies are appropriate. The test consists of multiple choice and short-answer questions. You will have 80 minutes to complete the exam. The exam is closed notes.

Date. The date of the exam is **Tuesday, October 8**

Late or missed exams. All students must be in attendance on the day of the exam. There are no make-up exams.

(NOVEL) NEGOTIATION RESEARCH PAPER

This course is dedicated to understanding negotiation in a dyadic or group-based context. In line with this theme, you will work with other people (groups of 2-5 - your choice) to write a research paper about a topic related to negotiation, with the specific expectation that you will generate your own, novel hypothesis.

Overview and purpose. The course aims to provide empirically supported answers to questions such as why do some negotiations go well and others do not? Why is creating value easy with some counterparts but not with others? Why do some people love to negotiate and for others it is sheer misery? Some of these answers you may agree with and others you may not. There are likely questions related to negotiations that we don't address at the depth you would like in this class. This paper is designed to give you a venue for that opposing view and/or to go deeper into a topic related to negotiation on which we touched briefly or not at all.

The objectives of the course include:

- Improving your ability to analyze negotiation contexts and develop strategic plans to negotiate effectively
- Gaining a broad, intellectual understanding of central concepts and theories in negotiation and conflict resolution
- Improving your analytical abilities for understanding and predicting the behavior of others in negotiation settings

To achieve these objectives, you must do more than absorb knowledge, you must think critically about it. You need to generate your own ideas and not just rely on others. To give you examples, think about the following abstracts from recent published papers on negotiation:

Negotiations trigger anxiety. Across four studies, we demonstrate that anxiety is harmful to

negotiator performance. In our experiments, we induced either anxiety or neutral feelings and studied behavior in negotiation and continuous shrinking-pie tasks. Compared to negotiators experiencing neutral feelings, negotiators who feel anxious expect lower outcomes, make lower first offers, respond more quickly to offers, exit bargaining situations earlier, and ultimately obtain worse outcomes. The relationship between anxiety and negotiator behavior is moderated by negotiator self-efficacy; high self-efficacy mitigates the harmful effects of anxiety (Brooks & Schweitzer, 2011).

We investigated whether dominance complementarity can lead people to reach mutually beneficial outcomes in negotiations by increasing the likelihood that they will successfully coordinate the exchange of information. We suggest that negotiators who differ in how dominantly they behave in the negotiation exchange information effectively because they fulfill different roles in the negotiation process. Study 1 demonstrated that dominant negotiators generally assert their desires, while relatively submissive negotiators generally ask questions to find ways to satisfy their own desires without escalating conflict with the dominant negotiators. Studies 2 and 3 demonstrated that participants were best able to discover integrative agreements when one negotiator was instructed to behave dominantly and the other negotiator, submissively. Improved information exchange mediated the relationship between dominance complementarity and improved joint outcomes in Study 3. (Wiltermuth, Tiedens, and Neale, 2015)

The authors of these papers identified a research question they found interesting and developed a novel hypothesis about it. You will do the same, with the exception that you will not have to experimentally test your hypothesis. That is, your goal is to identify a research question related to negotiation that interests you and to develop a well-supported hypothesis that addresses this research question. See examples below.

Example Research Question: What leads people to make first offers?

Example Hypothesis: Feelings of anxiety reduce people's likelihood of making first offers.

Example Research Question: How can you increase perspective taking? Does perspective-taking increase value creation in negotiation?

Example Hypothesis 1a: Reducing people's subjective sense of power will increase perspective taking

Example Hypothesis 1b: Higher levels of perspective taking are associated with greater value creation negotiation.

Example Research Question: Should people negotiate face-to-face or over email? Does the mode of communication matter?

Example Hypothesis 1a. Face-to-face negotiations lead to greater value creation in negotiation than electronic negotiations.

Example Hypothesis 1b: People with higher (but not lower) social anxiety create more value in negotiation when engaged in electronic negotiation than in face-to-face negotiations.

Example Hypothesis 1c. Face-to-face negotiations create more value than electronic negotiations when the status differences between counterparts is low, but not when the status differences between partners is high.

"Well-supported" means you build the case for the veracity of your hypothesis by drawing on course materials, outside readings and cases, empirical research, etc. You explain the logic and rationale to support your hypothesis. You want to answer the question of why. Why is this likely to be the case? Why would X affect Y in the way that you predict? In building support for your hypothesis, it is often helpful, if not imperative, to see the logic from the other side. Why would this not be the case? Why would X not affect Y in the way you predict? By examining the logic from both sides, you will reveal the factors on which your hypothesis depends. Maybe it's more likely to be true for people with certain characteristics, cultural backgrounds, experiences etc, and less true for people with other characteristics, cultural backgrounds, experiences etc. Maybe it is more likely to be true in certain types of situations and less so than in others such as the types of stakes, the features of the negotiation, the features of the relationship between the counterparts.

It is often tempting when trying to understand and predict behavior to throw up our hands, concluding, "it depends." Our hypotheses and findings almost always depend on something. The goal is to push your hypothesis further to identify well supported conjectures about the factors on which it depends. That is, rather than just saying it depends, identify and explicate the factors on which your hypothesis depends.

A more fleshed out example [adapted from Moran, S., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2008). When better is worse: Envy and the use of deception. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 1(1), 3-29.]

Research question: How does envy affect performance in an integrative negotiation?

Hypothesis: People are more likely to behave unethically in a negotiation (e.g., lying) when they are negotiating with a higher status counterpart than a lower status counterpart.

Why: Negotiating with a higher status counterpart triggers envy, and that envy promotes deception by increasing perceived gains and decreasing psychological costs of engaging in deceptive behavior.

When, why, and/or for whom is this more or less likely to be the case: People who are high in emotional intelligence show this effect less than people who are low in emotional intelligence.

Why does it depend on this: Emotional intelligence is relevant for becoming aware of possessing emotions (such as envy) and effectively managing its enactment in a way that might lessen the negative impact of emotions.

To help build support and/or to generate ideas for your paper, I recommend the following journals that often publish work related to negotiation. You are by no means limited to these sources. I provide them as a place to start.

Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes

Journal of Applied Psychology

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology

Journal of Experimental Psychology

Academy of Management Journal

International Journal of Conflict Management

Journal of Conflict Resolution

Negotiation Journal

Example negotiation research paper outline:

Note: Your group's paper need not take the exact form provided below. However, it should be organized similarly and in such a way that it is logical in the context of the analysis and recommendations.

Title page

- Title of paper, class, professor, date, authors

Introduction to the topic and research question.

- Explain your topic of focus and research questions. Explain how it relates to some important outcome in negotiation (e.g., value creation, value claiming, perspective taking, trust, conflict management, outcome satisfaction, negotiation confidence, negotiation persistence, etc). This helps to answer the question of why this is an important thing to study.
- Describe the issue, problem, challenge, opportunity, threat, etc. that is the focus of your analysis.

Build the logic for your hypothesis.

- Your research question might be broad (e.g., which personality traits facilitate /hinder value creation). This is where you narrow your focus to the specific focus of your testable hypothesis (e.g., neuroticism, dominance).
- This is where you integrate the knowledge you've gained about the topic from course content, class and outside readings, and research to explain the logic and support for your hypothesis. You want to answer the why question here—why would your hypothesis be the case? *Note – there may be more than one reason for why you think a certain relationship or effect exists. This is ok. You need to clearly lay out at least one reason, but you can specify more than one reason. If you specify more than reason, push yourself to think about when or for whom you think one reason might be more relevant than another*
- There are critical ways in which a testable hypothesis differs from a mere conjecture or opinion. First, a testable hypothesis is verifiable; it is testable – hence the name. Testing the hypothesis is beyond the scope and requirements of this course. However, the key is, that it could be tested. A testable hypothesis is a comparative statement. See examples:
 - Making a first offer improves a negotiator's performance compared to receiving a first offer.
 - Negotiators who are in good moods create more value than negotiators who are in bad moods.
 - A negotiator's perception of her counterpart's trustworthiness influences the value created more than does the negotiator's perception of her counterpart's competence. (I don't know whether this is true or not – but it is a "testable hypothesis.")
- You will need to state your testable hypothesis specifically. Indicate it as follows: (see example below)
 - **Testable hypothesis 1:** People are more likely to behave unethically in a negotiation (e.g., lying) when they are negotiating with a higher status counterpart than a lower status counterpart.

On what does the hypothesis depend? How could it be challenged?

- Here is where you should address the moderators (a fancy word for saying on what factors your hypothesis depends). For instance, when is your hypothesis more likely to be the case and when is it less likely to be the case? For whom is it more likely to be the case and for

whom is it less likely to be case?

- Given your rationale for why you think a relationship or an effect exists (e.g., given your rationale for why negotiating with a higher status counterpart would lead to more lying/unethical behavior in a negotiation), you should be able to state when, for whom, and/or under what circumstances your testable hypothesis is more likely to be true, and when, for whom, and/or under what circumstances is it less likely to be true.
- As you lay out explicitly when, for whom, and/or under what circumstances your testable hypothesis is likely to be more likely to be true and when, for whom, and/or under what circumstances is it less likely to be true, you should clearly articulate why you believe your testable hypothesis depends on this or these specific factors.
- Explain how someone could challenge your hypothesis. Be the Devil's advocate and argue the opposite. This will help to reveal the conditions on which your testable hypothesis depends.
- For each factor on which your hypothesis depends, you should explicitly state your "Refined testable hypothesis." See example below:
 - **Refined testable hypothesis 1:** The positive effect of negotiating with a higher status (compared to a similar status counterpart) on lying in negotiation is stronger for people who are lower in emotional intelligence than for people who are higher in emotional intelligence.

Recommendations and conclusion

- To conclude the paper, imagine that your testable hypothesis was supported. What practical advice would you offer negotiators? How could negotiators take your insights and improve their negotiation experience and/or outcomes?

References, appendices, etc.

- Cite all your source materials in text and in the reference section. The particular citation/reference method is up to you. (If you need assistance with formatting citations, I have found this website to be a useful resource: <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>). Please note, I care much more about whether you cite work than how you cite work so don't let frustration about figuring out the best way to cite a reference lead you not to cite the reference.
- Appendices, Data tables, Graphs, Charts, Figures, Interview questions and answer excerpts (if applicable)
- Questions about reputable references? Ask me or the school's great librarians.

Formatting and length

- A compelling, thorough analysis does not equate to a long-winded one. I have found through experience that clarity of thought results in conciseness, and, thus, agree with Shakespeare's observation that "brevity is the soul of wit." Thus, this analysis is limited to 4-6 pages (excluding the reference list). Papers should be formatted as follows: Double-spaced, 1-inch margins, Times New Roman font.

Deliverables and Due Dates

Final paper:

- A final paper due by **Friday, December 6 by 11:59pm.**
- Upload one copy of the paper with each team member's name on it to Canvas > Assignments > Negotiation Research Project: Final Paper. Only upload Word or PDF files.

Poster and poster showcase.

I'm continually impressed with the hypotheses that people generate. The poster showcase is the opportunity for everyone to present and share their hypotheses and research. You will make a poster that displays a summary of your research and hypothesis(es). The goal is to provide an easily digestible snapshot of the idea and the research behind it. Students will be able to discuss, ask questions about, and (possibly) challenge each other's hypotheses.

You will need to bring a poster of a visually appealing size to class on **Thursday, December 5, 2019** - You will also need to upload a picture or pdf copy of the poster to Canvas by **Friday, December 6, 2018 at 11:59pm.**

Canvas > Assignments > Negotiation Research Project: Poster

Grading. Posters will be graded on a 1-5 scale, where 5=excellent, 4=good, 3=satisfactory, 2=unsatisfactory, and 1=poor. Note that 5s will be rare; they are reserved for truly top-notch assignments.

COURSE SCHEDULE**Topic: Introduction to Negotiations****Week 1**

Date: Tuesday, August 27

Exercise: Kukui Nuts

Date: Thursday, August 29

Debrief/discussion: Planning and Negotiation Basics, more introduction about the class.

Readings:

- Start reading Getting to Yes

Assignments/due dates

- Turn in signed copy of Negotiation Non-Disclosure Form in class on Thursday, August 29

Theme: Negotiation strategy**Week 2: Negotiation basics and structure**

Date: Tuesday, September 3

Exercise: Biopharm-Seitek

Date: Thursday, September 5

Debrief, class discussion, lecture

Readings for the week:

- Six habits of merely effective negotiators (James K. Sebenius)
- The negotiation checklist: How to win the battle before it begins (Tony Simons & Thomas Tripp)

Assignments/due dates.

Planning document: If submitting, due by 10:30am on Tuesday, September 3.

Post negotiation evaluation. Due by 11:59pm on Tuesday, September 3.

Week 3: Creating and Claiming Value: Part 1

Date: Tuesday, September 10

Exercise: New Recruit (Option 1 for Negotiation Analysis Paper)

Date: Thursday, September 12

Debrief, class discussion, lecture

Readings for the week

- Creating and Claiming Value: the value of exchange (Pages: 29-42). *Excerpt from Getting (More of) What You Want (Margaret Neale & Thomas Lys)*
- Should You Make the First Offer? (Adam Galinsky)

Assignments/due dates.

Planning document: If submitting, due by 10:30am on Tuesday, September 10.

Post negotiation evaluation. Due by 11:59pm on Tuesday, September 10.

Week 4: Creating and Claiming Value: Part 2

Date: Tuesday, September 17

Exercise: Texoil (Option 2 for Negotiation Analysis Paper).

Date: Thursday, September 19

Debrief, class discussion, lecture

Readings for the week

- Putting More on the Table: How Making Multiple Offers Can Increase the Final Value of the Deal (Victoria Medvec & Adam Galinsky)
- Value creating: the integrative potential in negotiations (Pages 43-56) *Excerpt from Getting (More of) What You Want (Margaret Neale & Thomas Lys)*

Assignments/due dates

Planning document: If submitting, due by 10:30am on Tuesday, September 17

Post negotiation evaluation. Due by 11:59pm on Tuesday, September 17

Week 5: Agents, trust, and contingencies: Part 1

Date: Tuesday, September 24

Exercise: Starlet

Date: Thursday, September 26

Debrief, class discussion, lecture

Readings for the week

- Betting on the Future: The Virtues of Contingent Contracts (Max H. Bazerman & James J. Gillespie)

Assignments/due dates.

Planning document: If submitting, due by 10:30am on Tuesday, September 24.

Post negotiation evaluation. Due by 11:59pm on Tuesday, September 24.

Negotiation Analysis Paper on either New Recruit (Option 1) or Texoil (Option 2) due Tuesday, September 24 at 11:59pm

Week 6: Agents, trust, and contingencies: Part 2

Date: Tuesday, October 1

Exercise: Bullard Houses (Option 3 for Negotiation Analysis Paper)

Date: Thursday, October 3

Debrief, class discussion, lecture

Readings for the week

- Bargaining with the Devil without losing your soul: Ethics in negotiation (pages 196-228) *Excerpt from Bargaining for Advantage (G. Richard Shell)*
- Negotiating with liars (Robert Adler)

Assignments/due dates.

Planning document: If submitting, due by 10:30 on Tuesday, October 1

Post negotiation evaluation. Due by 11:59pm on Tuesday, October 3

Week 7: Exam

Note: There is no negotiation exercise this week. There is an in-class exam on Tuesday, October 8

Date: Tuesday, October 8

In class exam – attendance is mandatory

Date: Thursday, October 10

NO CLASS (Fall Break)

Readings for the week

- None

In Class Exam on Tuesday, October 8

Week 8: Relationships and conflict resolution: Part 1

Date: Tuesday, October 15

Exercise: Viking Investments (Option 4 for Negotiation Analysis Paper)

Date: Thursday, October 17

Debrief, class discussion, lecture

Readings for the week

- Putting on the pressure: How to use threats at the bargaining table (Adam Galinsky & Katie Liljenquist)

Assignments/due dates.

Planning document: If submitting, due by 10:30am on Tuesday, October 15

Post negotiation evaluation. Due by 11:59pm on Tuesday, October 17

Week 9: Relationships and conflict resolution: Part 2

Date: Tuesday, October 22

Exercise: Telepro

Date: Thursday, October 24

Debrief, class discussion, lecture

Readings for the week

- None

Assignments/due dates.

Planning document: No planning document this week

Post negotiation evaluation. Due by 11:59pm on Tuesday, October 22

Negotiation Analysis Paper on either Bullard Houses (Option 3) or Viking Investments (Option 4) due Tuesday, Oct 22 at 11:59pm

Theme: Negotiating beyond dyads: Coalitions and collective action**Week 10: Negotiating beyond dyads: Coalitions and collective action: Part 1**

Date: Tuesday, October 29

Exercise: OPEQ (Nothing to prepare ahead of time)

Date: Thursday, October 31

Debrief, class discussion, lecture

Readings for these weeks:

- Why It's So Hard to Be Fair (Joel Brockner)
- The Harder They Fall (Roderick M. Kramer)

- Harnessing the Science of Persuasion (Robert Cialdini)
- The sixth foundation: Leverage (pages 89-113) *Excerpt from Bargaining for Advantage* (G. Richard Shell)

(Not required, but if you want to go deeper into this topic, I recommend the following books:

- The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups by Mancur Olson
- Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action by Elinor Ostrom

Assignments/due dates.

Planning document: No planning document this week

Post negotiation evaluation. Due by 11:59pm on Tuesday, October 29.

Week 11: Negotiating beyond dyads: Coalitions and collective action: Part 2

Date: Tuesday, November 5

Exercise: Three-way organization

Date: Thursday, November 7

Debrief, class discussion, lecture

Assignments/due dates

Planning document: No planning document this week

Post negotiation evaluation. Due by 11:59pm on Tuesday, November 7

Theme: Negotiating across cultures

Week 12: Negotiating across cultures: Part 1

Date: Tuesday, November 12

Exercise: Alpha-Beta

Date: Thursday, November 14

Debrief, class discussion, lecture

Readings for this week: None

Assignments/due dates.

Planning document: If submitting, due by 10:30am on Tuesday, November 12

Post negotiation evaluation. Due by 11:59pm on Tuesday, November 12.

Week 13: Negotiating across cultures: Part 2

Date: Tuesday, November 19

Exercise: Mouse

Date: Thursday, November 21
Debrief, class discussion, lecture

Readings for this week:

- Negotiating group decisions (Jeanne Brett)

Assignments/due dates.

Planning document: If submitting, due by 10:30am on Tuesday, November 17

Post negotiation evaluation. Due by 11:59pm on Tuesday, November 17

Theme: Special topic: Electronic negotiations (Thanksgiving and course wrap-up)

Weeks 14-15: Electronic negotiations

Date: Tuesday, November 26

Exercise: Moms.com

Note. This negotiation is done electronically. Transcripts/screenshots of the negotiation and the negotiation deal sheet need to be submitted by Wednesday, November 27 at 11:59pm.

You may conduct the negotiation at any point (and in location) before this.

Date: Thursday, November 28

NO CLASS (Thanksgiving break)

Date: Tuesday, December 3

Debrief, class discussion, lecture + Course wrap up

Readings for the week

- How to negotiate when you are (literally) far apart (Roderick Swaab & Adam Galinsky)
- Egocentrism over email: Can we communicate as well as we think? (Kruger, Epley, Parker, & Ng) [Find article on Canvas]

Assignments/due dates.

Planning document: If submitting, due by 10:30am on Tuesday, November 26

Post negotiation evaluation. Due by 11:59pm on Wednesday, November 27.

Transcript/screenshots + deal sheet: Due by 11:59pm on Wednesday, Nov 27

****Class contribution survey: Opens on December 3 at 10:30am. It is due by Thursday, December 5 at 11:59pm.****

Poster Showcase of Novel Negotiation Research Papers

Week 16: Poster showcase of novel negotiation research papers

Date: Thursday, December 5

- Bring large poster or other useful visual to class on Thursday, December 5.
- Upload a photo or pdf copy of poster/visual to Canvas by 11:59pm on Thursday, December 6.

Everyone in the group is required to attend. Attendance is mandatory as it would be for a negotiation exercise

Novel negotiation research paper. Paper due on Friday, December 6 by 11:59pm. One person from the group upload to Canvas. Make sure everyone's name is on the paper. Upload Word or PDF copies only.