

Conflict and Negotiation: Theories & Practice

COM 691 – Spring 2012 SLN 74139

Thursdays 3:15 - 6:00 p.m.

Stauffer 431

Professor Contact Information

Dr. Jess K. Alberts

Email: Jess.Alberts@asu.edu

Phone/voice mail: (480) 965-7141 or 375-1595 (cell)

T 3- 4:00 p.m., TH 2-3:00 p.m. & by appt.

Office: Stauffer 4??

Seminar Assistant Contact Information

Mike ZirulniK

mzirulni@asu.edu

Course Description

In this seminar, we will focus on the theory and practice of negotiation as well as how theory and practice impact one another. Course readings, including both academic and research-based applied texts, will address principles of conflict and negotiation, ethics, and the impact of sex and ethnicity on practice, among other topics. In addition, you will be required to engage in a variety of applied negotiation activities. You also will be asked to reflect on your experiences and the relevance of theory to your experiences (and vice versa) in written assignments and class discussions.

I see this seminar as a space in which participants can reflect upon the material and its implications for their own lives, as well as analyze how scholarship can help us to better understand and create recommendations for practitioners.

This class is a graduate seminar; thus, students will spend significant time reading and analyzing advanced texts, generating discussion based upon the texts, and bringing in their own ideas from outside research. As the instructor, I will (try to!) spend relatively little time lecturing, but will rather act as a moderator of the discussion and sounding board for student reflections and research.

Course Readings:

Articles and Book Chapters

The articles and chapters are available on the blackboard site for the class. (See course schedule below for citations.)

Books:

Babcock, L., & Laschever, S. (2003). *Women don't ask: Negotiation and the gender divide*. Princeton, NJ: University of Princeton. .

Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. 3rd ed. NY: Penguin Books, 2011.

Shell, G. R. (2006). *Bargaining for advantage: Negotiation strategies for reasonable people*. NY: Penguin. (Available in hard & paperback as well as Adobe Reader).

M. Deutsch, & Coleman, P. T. (2006). *The handbook of conflict resolution*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. (**Recommended – not required.**)

Ury, William. (1993). *Getting past no: Negotiating with difficult people*. NY: Bantam Books,

Most if not all of these books can be purchased inexpensively online or in used bookstores.

Class requirements (out of 500 pts total):

1. Reflection Papers (6 X 25 points each, up to 150 points total): As part of the “practice” portion of this class, you will engage in six negotiation activities. In addition, you will write 6 brief (3-to-5 page) reflection papers on your negotiation activities. You will be provided with a list of questions to help spur your reflections, and you will be expected to address relevant research/theory/concepts in the papers as they relate to your experiences with negotiation.

2. Final Project/Paper and Presentation (up to 200 pts). For your final project/paper, you have several choices. You may:

A. **Write a paper in which you evaluate and critique prevailing advice on negotiation** (e.g., Fisher & Ury or Babcock). For this paper, you will need to

1. Examine the theoretical underpinnings of the offered advice (e.g., principled negotiation; Babcock's recommendations for women's negotiating style, etc.),
2. Examine any existing critiques of the advice and/or contradictory advice offered by other experts,
3. Provide a critique of its strengths and weaknesses and, finally,
4. Offer your own recommendations based on your research (which may include endorsing current practice).

B. **Pick an aspect of negotiation** (such as the use of competitive tactics by women in sales-related contexts or Babcock's assertions regarding women's negotiation practices), **and after conducting a literature review propose a study that includes**

1. A literature review and rationale statement for the study

2. Research questions/hypotheses (along with a rationale for each)
3. A method section to test a theory or answer a question(s).

3. Class Participation (up to 150 pts total).

Class participation refers to your performance in developing discussion questions for your assigned reading(s) and your ability to participate thoughtfully and appropriately during class discussion. The evaluation of your performance depends upon

1. The quality of the discussion questions you develop, your responsibility in posting your discussion questions to the class blackboard site no later than the Sunday before the class in which your readings will be discussed, and your ability to contribute in-depth analysis and insight into your assigned readings.
2. The quality of your overall class participation. Students are expected to complete assigned readings before class and verbally participate in seminar discussions in an enthusiastic and informed manner. To do so, students should make notes as they read about questions and issues they may pursue in the seminar discussion. To participate, students can offer (among other things):
 - a simple factual question
 - a point which reveals a methodological assumption
 - a critique of a research piece
 - a strong point which merits our admiration
 - a clarification that will help everyone to understand a class concept better
 - an application to your research project or to some other personal experience.

The failure to participate orally OR (even more so) dominating the conversation are both cause for a loss of participation points. It is vitally important that ALL students have the opportunity to participate; therefore, it is incumbent upon those of us who tend to talk sooner, faster and more to withhold comment and create space for students who need more time and space to formulate their comments.

Finally, respect for others and their ideas is of paramount importance to me. I am a strong believer in the practice of civility and professionalism in the classroom. Thus, I do not tolerate condescending verbal or nonverbal behavior directed toward others in the classroom. Such behavior will result in a loss of participation points, at a minimum, or removal from the class, at a maximum.

Assignments, Due Dates & Incompletes: Assignments are due at the beginning of class. A late written assignment will be penalized up to 10% for each day it is late. All assignments must be completed in order to pass the course. Incompletes can only be given to students who: 1) have finished more than half the coursework, 2) experience serious illness or personal emergency, 3) negotiate the incomplete before April 1st. It is in students' best interest to let me know, in advance, if they will have problems completing an assignment on time.

Unique Academic Needs: Students with special academic needs who desire special

assignment considerations can be accommodated. Students should document their needs with the University's Disability Resources Center and see me within the first two weeks of class to discuss options.

Plagiarism/Academic Dishonesty: While it is appropriate that several graduate school papers overlap in conceptual focus, students' 691 research projects should be original work devised for this class. If students plan on using material prepared for a different course in 691 assignments, please consult with me regarding the appropriateness of doing so. In this graduate course, students are expected to know APA style for citing outside sources. Plagiarism is one of the most serious ethical missteps a scholar can make, so it is imperative to give credit where credit is due. Please see the academic integrity policy at <http://com.pp.asu.edu/academic/acadintpol.html> for more information on academic dishonesty, or ask for a copy if you are unable to access it through the web.

CLASS SCHEDULE AND READINGS

Schedule subject to change via an announcement in class or discussion board

Week 1 Jan 5 *Introduction to the Course*

Week 2 Jan 12 *Conflict Theories*

Deutsch, M. (2006). Cooperation and competition. In M. Deutsch & P. T. Coleman (Eds.) *The handbook of conflict resolution* (pp. 23-42). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Coleman, P. T. (2006). Power and conflict. In M. Deutsch & P. T. Coleman (Eds.) *The handbook of conflict resolution* (pp. 120-143). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dweck, C. S., & Ehrlinger, J. (2006). *Implicit theories and conflict resolution*. In M. Deutsch & P. T. Coleman (Eds.) *The handbook of conflict resolution* (pp. 317-330). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Week 3 Jan 19 *Negotiation Theory*

Shell, G. R. (2006). *Bargaining for advantage: Negotiation strategies for reasonable people*. NY: Penguin. (Available in hard & paperback as well as Adobe Reader).

Week 4 Jan 26 *The Practice Of Negotiating I*

Guest Lecturer: Art Hinshaw, ASU Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law

Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. 2nd ed. NY: Penguin Books, 1991.

Paese, P. W. & Gilin, D. A., (2000). When an adversary is caught telling the truth: Reciprocal cooperation versus self-interest in distributive bargaining. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 79-90.

Wheeler, M. (December 8, 2003). *Is that really your best offer?*
<http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/3819.html>

Week 5 Feb 2 **Sex/Gender & Negotiating 1**

Babcock, L., & Laschever, S. (2003). *Women don't ask: Negotiation and the gender divide*. Princeton, NJ: University of Princeton.

Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & Lai, L. (2007). Social incentives for gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiation: Sometimes it does hurt to ask. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 103, 84-103

Small, D., Gelfand, M., Babcock, L., & Gettman, H. (2007). Who goes to the bargaining Table? The influence of gender and framing on the initiation of negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(4), 600-613.

Week 6 Feb 9 **Sex/Gender & Negotiating 2**

Ayers, I. (1991). Fair driving: Gender and race discrimination in retail car negotiations *104 Harvard Law Review*, 817

Pradel, D.W., Bowles, H.R., & McGinn, K.L. (2005). When does gender matter in negotiation? *Negotiation*, 8, 9-10.

Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & McGinn, K. (2005). Constraints and triggers: Situational mechanics of gender in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(6), 2005, pp. 951-965.

Week 7 Feb 16 **Influence of Culture on Negotiating**

Adair, W., Brett, J., Lempereur, A., Okumura, T., Shikhirev, P., Tinsley, C., & Lytle, A. (2004). Culture and negotiation strategy. *Negotiation Journal*, 20(1), 87-111.

Parker, M. (November 7, 2011). Bridging cultural and technological divides: The role of culture in Email negotiations between American and Chinese negotiators. *Harvard Negotiation Law Review*. <http://www.hnlr.org/?s>

Viergge, M., & Quick, S. (September 1, 2009). Cross-cultural negotiations revisited: Are Asian generations X and Y members negotiating like their elders? *Cross-cultural Management*, 18(3), 3-13-326.

Week 8 Feb 23 **Emotion and Negotiating 1**

Morris, M. W. & Keltner, D. (2000). How emotions work: The social functions of emotional expression in negotiations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22, 1-50.

Week 9 March 1 **Emotion and Negotiating 2**

Brooks, A. W., & Schweitzer, M. E. Can nervous nelly negotiate?: How anxiety causes negotiators to make low first offer, exit early and earn less profit. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115, 43-54.

Lelieveld, G., Van Dijk, E., Van Beest, I., Steinel, W. & Van Kleef, G. A. (2011). Disappointed in you, angry about your offer: Distinct negative emotions induce concessions via different mechanisms. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 47, 635-641.

Overbeck, J. R., Neale, M. A., & Govan, C. L. (2010). I feel, therefore you act: Intrapersonal and interpersonal effects of emotion on negotiation as a function of social power. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 112, 123-139.

Week 10 March 8 **Communicating during Negotiations**

Elfenbein, H.A., Der Foo, M., White, J. & Hoon Tan, H. & Aik, V. C. (2007). Reading your counterpart: The benefit of emotion recognition accuracy for effectiveness in negotiation. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 31, 205-223.

Srivastava, J.& Oza, S. (2006). Effect of response time on perceptions of bargaining outcomes. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33(2), 266-272

Van, Es., R., French, W., & Stellmaszek, F. (2004). Resolving conflicts over ethical issues: Face-to-face versus internet negotiations *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53(1/2), 165-172.

Week 11 March 15 **Practice of Negotiating II**

Ury, William, *Getting past no: Negotiating with difficult people*. NY: Bantam Books, 1993.

Oleklns, M. & Smith, P. L. (2005). Cognitive representations of negotiations. *Australian Journal of Management* 30, 57-76.

March 22 **Springbreak**

Week 12 March 29 ***Ethics and Negotiating 1***

Cheng, Y. K. B. (2011). Power and trust in negotiation and decision-making: A critical evaluation. *Harvard Negotiation Law Review*, <http://www.hnlr.org/?p=207>.

Smith, & Rogers, A. (2000). Ethics related to response to specific situation vignettes: Evidence of gender based differences and occupational socialization. *Journal of Business Ethics* 28: 73–86.

Strudler, A. (2005). On the ethics of deception in negotiation. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 5(4), 508-522.

Week 13 April 5 ***Ethics and Negotiating 2***

Hinshaw, A., & Alberts, J. K. (Forthcoming 2012). Sex differences in ethical decision-making during legal negotiations. *Washington University Law Review*.

Cohen, T. R. (2010). Moral emotions and unethical bargaining: The differential effects of empathy and perspective-taking in deterring deceitful negotiations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94, 569–579.

Tenbrunsel, A. E., & Messick, D. M. Ethical fading: The role of self-deception in unethical behavior. *Social Justice Research* 17(2), 223-236.

Week 14 April 12 ***TBA***

Week 15 April 19 ***Presentation of Papers***