

Benchmark Course Portfolio

Z404, Effective Negotiations

Carolyn Wiethoff

Clinical Assistant Professor of Management

Kelley School of Business

Indiana University-Bloomington

Course portfolios may be either “benchmark” portfolios (that take a “snapshot” of a course at a given time), or “inquiry” portfolios (that identify a pedagogical problem to study, implement methods to address the problem, and analyze the results). This is a “benchmark” portfolio. It describes my efforts to implement course components to accomplish two distinct learning goals: content mastery and skill acquisition. The first section of this portfolio describes the course. Second, I present key assignments relevant to each learning goal. I then report on changes in student knowledge and behavior based on graded class components. The final section sets the stage for future measurement and research in this course context.

Course Goals and Rationale

Position of Course Within the Curriculum

This course is a 400-level requirement for all undergraduate Management majors. In addition to Effective Negotiations, all Management majors are required to take two courses: Z440, Human Resource Management, and W430, Organizations and Organizational Change. Students can then choose from three concentrations within the Management Department: Entrepreneurship, International Business, or General Management. Additional courses from these areas complete the major.

Z404 is one of two skill-based courses in the Management Department. The other is Z402, Skills for New Managers, which is an elective in the General Management concentration. Other courses work toward application of knowledge in a variety of business situations, but only these two classes are specifically geared toward developing students’ skills directly.

About the Students

Most students take this class in their senior year, although every section contains a few juniors. The vast majority of students are Business Administration majors, although a few students from different programs (e.g., Music, Telecommunications) also take the course as an elective to bolster their negotiation skills. The Management majors have been admitted into the Kelley School of Business, and as such have met more rigorous academic requirements than those expected elsewhere on campus. The average GPA of students in this course over the past three years has been 3.19. Consequently, they are well-versed in the mechanics of learning new concepts and reporting on them in traditional forums. However, most students have had no coursework in interpersonal communication, conflict resolution, or group dynamics. Moreover, they receive no prior training in one-on-one communication skills, and their level of confidence in these skills is often very low. This means that students must both learn the strategies and

techniques of negotiation and simultaneously be empowered to use those practices in a variety of settings.

Course Goals

- 1) Students will learn the skills necessary to effectively achieve their goals in both distributive and integrative negotiation settings.
- 2) Students will be able to recognize and act to maximize the integrative potential in a negotiation.
- 3) Students will learn to think critically about the elements of a negotiation, including analyses of the other party, the bargaining mix, and the possibility for mutually acceptable risk management strategies such as contingent contracts and solution implementation.

Rationale for Course Goals

The ultimate goal of a degree in Management is to prepare students to effectively direct the activities of others in an organizational setting. However, most undergraduates leave Indiana University without the opportunity to practice management: they have limited chances to supervise others, appropriately use their influence to attain organizational goals, and/or create work relationships that are mutually beneficial and harmonious. Additionally, they rarely have the chance to interact with other companies as a representative of their own organization intent on achieving company goals. Recognizing this deficiency, one of the main goals of Z404 is to provide students with the opportunity to practice one key managerial skill—negotiation—in a variety of simulated environments.

Managers face a variety of negotiation situations in their daily lives. The purpose of this course is to provide students with the skills necessary to achieve their goals in these negotiation situations by focusing on: (a) identification and analysis of the bargaining mix, (b) strategies to prompt cooperation between negotiation partners, and (c) communication skills that can both enact desired goals and preserve positive relationships between parties to a negotiation. To this end, students must be simultaneously focused on two levels of learning. First, it is necessary that they possess a cognitive understanding of the components and tactics of a negotiation, so that they are able to recognize these components when they are encountered. Second, they must possess the skills necessary to enact appropriate and effective agreements. The duality of this learning process creates a classroom environment in which students are challenged to advance on both levels each time the class meets.

Theoretical Underpinnings of the Course

Theoretically, this course draws upon three disciplines: psychology, communication, and conflict management (which may be viewed as a hybrid of the previous two fields). From psychology, students learn principles of motivation and employ cognitive heuristics such as framing and anchoring. The field of communication provides emphasis on message construction and persuasive strategies. Finally, conflict management scholars have long focused on diagnosis of

conflict situations and the potential to achieve “win-win” integrative solutions. Each of these contributes equally to the learning in Z404.

Course Assignments and Components

The course is divided into three main components. First, students learn the basics of distributive, or “win-lose” negotiations. Second, students learn the fundamentals of integrative, or “win-win” negotiations. This is the largest course component. Finally, students engage in group-level negotiations to experience the dynamics of multiple party conflicts. The course also covers international negotiations, negotiations with “difficult people,” and the fundamentals of persuasive communication (including framing, perceptual differences, etc.) that color every negotiation encounter.

Required Reading

Two textbooks are required for the course. They are:

Lewicki, R. J., Saunders, D. M., & Minton, J. W. (2001). Essentials of Negotiation (2nd Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

This is a relatively short (250 page) textbook that serves to (a) introduce major principles of communication and negotiation, and (b) provide students with the vocabulary necessary to discuss components of a negotiation. It contributes to students’ acquisition of course content.

Lewicki, R. J., Saunders, D. M., Minton, J. W., & Barry, B. (2003). Negotiation: Readings, Exercises, and Cases (4th Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

As the authorship of this book indicates, it is the intended companion for the Essentials of Negotiation text. In addition to readings that are more practical or “prescriptive” in nature, this book contains a wealth of cases and exercises that give students the opportunity to practice, via role plays, their negotiation skills.

I selected these books to provide students with a written resource for each of the learning components of the class (cognitive and experiential/skill building).

Graded Components

Assignments for this course include the following:

Content Learning	Skill Building
Weekly quizzes over the assigned reading to encourage students to retain key concepts	Daily class participation, including acting in negotiation role plays, observing peers in negotiation interactions, and debriefing these exercises to glean insight about the negotiation process

Content Learning	Skill Building
Daily in-class summaries (by students) of the readings, to ensure student understanding and initiate clarifying discussions	Graded out-of-class negotiations in which students are evaluated on how well they achieved their objectives.
Evaluation papers written after each graded negotiation in which students reflect on their behaviors and evaluate them against textbook principles.	Evaluation papers written after each graded assignment in which students critically analyze their performance in a negotiation and identify areas for future improvement.

	<u>Percent.</u>	<u>Points</u>
Graded Negotiation #1/Paper	10%	20
Graded Negotiation #2/Paper	15%	30
Graded Negotiation #3/Paper	15%	30
Graded Negotiation #4/Paper	20%	40
Reputation Index	5%	10
Quizzes	15%	30
Participation	20%	40
	100%	200

Teaching Methods Employed

As this summary indicates, this class involves very limited lectures. Instead, students participate in activities during every class period that are designed to enhance both their cognitive understanding of negotiation dynamics and their ability to successfully achieve their goals in light of these dynamics. I believe that students cannot learn skills via lecture; instead, they must experience negotiation first-hand in order to become proficient.

In-Class Activities

Students engage in structured role-play negotiation activities in most class meetings. Those class meetings in which students do not negotiate contain analyses of video and written cases relating to negotiation or discussion/debrief of graded negotiations conducted outside of class. The following assignments are illustrative:

Salary Negotiation: Students engage in this three-person, three-round exercise as they are making the transition from distributive to integrative negotiation. Each student takes turns playing one of three roles – manager, employee, or observer – such that every student plays every role. The role plays consist of three different scenarios in which an employee is approaching his/her supervisor to request a salary increase. Salary discussions are, by their very nature, distributive negotiations. However, the students recognize in this exercise that their relationship with their superior is a critical component, and consequently they must change their negotiating styles to reflect this less competitive, more relationship-focused situation. The primary role of the observer is to be the “relationship barometer,” feeding back information to

the other parties regarding how their negotiation techniques are positively or negatively influencing the long-term relationship between the parties. My debrief of this assignment focuses on the importance of maintaining positive relationships during a negotiation, and the new dynamics introduced to negotiation when relationship issues are primary. This serves as an important transition and introduction to the practice of integrative, win-win negotiations.

Best Books: This role play is between an agent for a best-selling author (Paige Turner) and a publishing company (Best Books). There are a number of issues on the table wherein the parties' goals are in direct conflict, but a few where they agree. The purpose of this exercise is to reach an agreement in which each side gives up something of lower importance in order to gain something of higher importance. This "logrolling" strategy requires students to understand (a) how to effectively plan and prioritize the issues on the table, and (b) how to ask probing questions to determine what issues are of primary importance to the other negotiator.

Summary and Rationale for Graded Role Plays

While in-class negotiations are intended as learning-based, "practice" assignments, students conduct four negotiations on their own outside of class for which they receive individual grades. Each student's

Topic	Role Play	Rationale
Distributive Negotiation	Coffee Contract	Negotiation between a coffee supplier and a hotel manager over the price of coffee. Outcomes are evaluated based on the price obtained.
Integrative Negotiation	Windy City Theater	Negotiation between a representative of a traveling Broadway theater company and a theater manager over the specifications of the company's performance. Outcomes are evaluated based on the total value the two negotiators can create together in a win-win situation.
Group Negotiation	Architectural Firm	Three-person negotiation between partners in an architectural firm over what components will be built into two houses. Outcomes are evaluated based on (a) the total value the three negotiators create together, and (b) the individual profit obtained by each.
Problem Negotiation	"Where's Alvin"	Negotiation between an employee who has stolen proprietary software and his/her manager who is charged with retrieving it. Outcomes are not evaluated or ranked because it is impossible to determine when one solution is "better" than another. However, students must grapple with a variety of ethical issues in this often-emotional exchange, and reflect on their choices in a final paper. They are evaluated based on their articulation and critique of their own ethical reasoning.

Summary and Rationale for Reading Quizzes

Reading quizzes were given both in-class and on Oncourse, Indiana University's online forum for class discussion, assignment posting, testing, etc. They consisted of true/false, multiple choice, and fill-in questions designed to test students' comprehension of assigned readings.

Outcomes

This portfolio measures student outcomes in two ways. First, I will report on students' acquisition of cognitive skills, particularly the lexicon of negotiation, as measured by components of their graded role play papers. Second, I will report on students' skill development as measured by outcomes of their in-class and graded negotiations, self-assessments of changes in negotiation style over the course of the class, and Oncourse discussion forum postings reflecting enhanced efficacy and skill in negotiations taking place outside of class.

Cognitive Development

At the end of each graded negotiation, students prepared a self-reflective paper in response to the following assignment:

The accompanying paper should focus on preparation and goal setting for the role play, an analysis of the actual negotiating events, and a justification of the results achieved. A good paper will address:

- the preparation and planning process that you used to get ready for the negotiation, including your goals/objectives;
- a description of the actual progression of events and how the negotiation evolved;
- the solution you achieved, relative to the goals you set in planning and preparation, and how you "defend" your solution against your earlier goals/objectives (for example, how would you sell your solution to your boss);
- an evaluation of your own performance in the negotiation; and
- a summary of what you learned from the exercise (or what you didn't learn, and why not).

When grading these papers, I consider thoroughness of the planning process, insightfulness of students' rationale for their final agreement, and completeness of their self-assessment.

The first appendix contains Student A's paper from the first graded role play. This paper received an overall grade of B-. While the student does a good job discussing her planning process and detailing the negotiation, her self-reflection is weak and she does not appear to have focused attention on what she could/should have learned from this assignment.

Appendix B contains Student A's final paper. This paper received an overall grade of A. As you can see, this student made significant strides in evaluating her strengths and weaknesses, and spent a great deal of time applying skills learned in the course to her current situation and future career aspirations.

Negotiation Skills

In-class, it was readily apparent that students achieved significant gains in their negotiation skills. At first, they had difficulty even negotiating something as simple as the price of a car; approximately 1/3 of the students did not achieve consensus on this exercise. By the end of the semester, students were negotiating sophisticated, detailed contracts that required them to manage and prioritize multiple issues simultaneously, and arrange trade-offs for mutual gain.

The students were encouraged to take lessons learned from the class and apply them to their “real world” situations. This resulted in some interesting exchanges, both in class and in the class’ online forum, as students strategized together to find ways to buy cars, obtain favorable leases and sublease arrangements, and negotiate job offers. Here is one representative exchange from the online discussion forum (comments are presented exactly the way that students offered them):

Student 1: *I'm graduating this Dec, and my apartment lease will expire this year in June. My apartment complex is pretty strict about not giving out half year leases. They also want all contracts to end of summer, when new students are in town. Since I have stayed here two years in a row, I want them to let me lease for another half year (June to December). Do you think I have a strong position? What strategies do you recommend that I use?*

Student 2: *In a situation like this, it seems that they hold all the cards, since their leases expire just when the market for buyers is at it's peak. I suggest starting early with negotiations. Waiting till the end of the lease puts pressure on you to close, not them. You may be able to get them to agree to a lease extension till the end of the first semester. They might like this, as opposed to the uncertainty of finding a new buyer. However, your best bet, and the most likely outcome, is going to be your arranging for someone to take over your lease entirely after you leave, and leasing the apartment for another year. If you can find a person willing to do so, and can have them agree to this in writing before hand, you can leave in Dec. without having to worry about legal consequences (as the other person is the one who is bound by the contract). Agfain, start early. The worst thing is for you to be pressed for time at the end. Good luck!*

Student 3: *Is there anyone you know that could lease it in the spring for you? Someone who is overseas in the fall but needs a place to live in the spring? I also know that the university commons does 5 month leases if that is a last resort. My suggestion would be to try to locate someone who is traveling abroad in the fall but returning to school in the spring. You can contact the overseas studies department in Franklin Hall and maybe they can contact you with someone. If I think of anything else I will let you know. Best of luck!*

Student 1: *Hi everybody, Thank you for the advices. I went in last week and ask for the six month lease extension. I basically said that I've been living there for two years, I think the apartment and the staff are wonderful. I also said that I have many Indonesian friends that might be interested in living in this apartment area. I kind of implying that they will gain more advantage in forming a good relationship with me than to offend me. After they agree to let me stay for another half year, I felt there was a shift of power, so I ask them for free carpet cleaning. Guess what, they gave it to me. I signed the new contract and ask them to write down "free*

carpet cleaning" on the contract so that they could not back off later. Anyway, everything ended up well. Thanks class for your advices

Lessons Learned

At the end of the term, I asked students to evaluate each exercise to determine which they thought were of most value. Based on their feedback, I am keeping the first two graded role plays, but replacing the group role play with something less quantitative to promote students' negotiation of intangible, relationship/power-oriented variables. Similarly, the final assignment was more of an exercise in conflict management than a true "negotiation", and consequently I will approach this differently in future classes. Simply put, I felt that the students learned a great deal about negotiation, but not as much about managing conflict generally as I would have liked. I plan to begin the class next time by focusing on conflict more generally, and then presenting negotiation more appropriately as one possible method of conflict resolution.

Second, while I feel that students' self-reflective papers are certainly valuable tools in skill development, they may be an inadequate measure of their actual abilities to negotiate. Self-perception is often robust, but just as often fraught with perceptual errors. For the next offering of this class, I will incorporate at least one videotaped negotiation experience and require students to watch themselves negotiating and critique their performance. I believe this will allow them more insights into the negotiation style they develop through the course of the semester in this class.

Finally, I would like to encourage students to incorporate more outside experiences into the course. I was excited and energized by the students' discussions of "real life" negotiations, and excited by the ways that they applied course content to solve their negotiation-related problems. I believe making students do more of this "connection" between the class and their own conflicts will both provide a rich perspective on theories and practices of negotiation, and enhance their own self-efficacy for negotiation.

Preparation and Planning

My planning process started with reading through the material and determining which of the 11 elements of the negotiation were most crucial. I based this decision on two things: 1) the amount of points awarded for successfully negotiating that element 2) the incremental difference between levels in that element. After weighing out all the elements based on points, I determined that Director's Base Salary, Post-Production Schedule, Male Lead, and Editorial Control were what I considered to be the most important elements of my side of the negotiation. I then decided that I would like to have higher point totals in these categories, and I would make up for that by allowing my partner to gain points in the other categories. I also was hoping that some of the categories lined up so that we both got a lot of points for wanting the same level. Next, I set opening, target, and resistance points for all elements. Although I was planning to make concessions in a few categories that were less important to me, I was also determined to not go below my resistance points with these issues.

In order to make sure that I was able to receive high points on the categories that I felt were important, I thought of ways to reframe what he may have perceived as elements that he would want to gain points from. For example, I brainstormed ways to get him excited about the elements that I did not care as much about, and I also thought of arguments for why the negotiation would be more integrative if I was able to benefit more from the categories that I thought were important. Because I had listed Director's Base Salary as more significant than Director's Bonus, I decided to prepare for an argument that made him believe that a significant concession on his part for Directors Base Salary would be made up by a large concession on my part in Director's Bonus. Finally, I was prepared to create a free flow of information and both stress the commonalities between the parties and minimize the differences in an effort to create a fully integrative negotiation. I very much believe that my talents in negotiation lie in distributive negotiations, rather than integrative negotiations. Therefore, it was very much to my advantage to focus on the above-mentioned elements in an effort to avoid my distributive tendencies.

Progression of Events

We began the negotiation by stating the most important elements in the negotiation. As mentioned earlier, the issues that I was most concerned with were Director's Base Salary, Post-Production Schedule, Male Lead, and Editorial Control. After this initial discussion, we decided to begin with Director's Base Salary. Soon after discussing this issue, however, we realized that this element would turn into a very heated issue and therefore chose to move onto smaller issues, such as the actors and assistants. Upon bringing up the issue of the child star, we quickly learned that both sides wanted Jonathan Taylor Thomas. We then moved onto the production assistants and found that the exact same thing happened. Both parties preferred Sandra Neal as the production assistant. Those issues were very easy to settle, but afterwards we moved into areas that required much more cooperation and logrolling. When moving on to Male and Female Lead roles, I was very much in support of hiring both Kevin Costner and Whitney Houston. Although I hoped that, as was the case earlier, he would prefer both actors as well, this was not the case. After going back and forth for a while on which one to settle on, he mentioned that Julia Roberts was a good friend of his. I decided, therefore, that it would probably be in his best interest to hire her, and I would be willing to let this happen if he allowed me to hire Kevin Costner in the

Male Lead role. The issue was quickly settled, and we moved on to the location of the shoot. I was very much in favor of including exotic locations in the shooting of the movie, but my partner was very much against this. In order to be integrative, however, my partner suggested that it would be fair if we used only Hollywood sets for the shoot and, in return, I was able to have 12 months for the Post-Production Schedule. After a short discussion about the Personal Location Budget of the film, we both decided that settling on a level of 650 would be the fairest decision for both parties. We were then ready to discuss the salary and bonus issues. My partner was quick to throw out 1% for the bonus, and I was just as quick to refute this offer. After a little thought, I decided that 1% would be fine as long as I received \$400,000 in salary. This deal seemed fine to me, especially since there was no loss in points between the two. Finally, we moved onto Editorial Control. I was able to reframe this part of the negotiation to look like he needed to make more concessions. I told him that because I was able to give him such a low percentage for the bonus and did not push him to the edge on the salary issue, it would be fair to not let NA have any control in editing. My partner agreed to this, and all issues in the negotiation were settled.

Defense of My Solution

I feel that both parties in this negotiation were extremely integrative and fair. At the same time, however, we both were able to earn points in what we felt were our most crucial issues.

Although I am not sure how the points totaled up for my partner, I do know that we both walked away from the negotiation feeling happy with the results. I believe that this is the way in which all integrative negotiations should end. I was able to protect my interests, gain a large number of points, make concessions in an effort to be fair and integrative, and walk away feeling content. Therefore, I believe the solution ended up being satisfactory for both parties.

Summary of What I Learned

I learned in this negotiation that the most important parts of integrative negotiations are 1) sharing information with other party so they are able to make concessions where it matters, 2) to search for solutions that meet the goals and objectives of both sides and 3) to keep alternatives open at all times, such as concessions in other areas and reserving a heated discussion for later in the negotiation. With these three objectives in mind, this negotiation flowed relatively smoothly and did not take up too much time. I feel the most important part of our negotiation specifically was the fact that, had this been a real life negotiation, we would have easily been able to meet up in the future and speak further without feeling as if we had been cheated in our first negotiation.

Appendix B

Student A – Final Role Play

Preparation and Planning

After reading my side of the issue for this negotiation, I felt that my preparation should mostly focus on trying to step into the role that had been described to me. Because there was no data, no specific issues to discuss, or specific set of problems that needed to be solved, I thought it best to decide how my character would behave in various situations. I based my behavior on the guiding principle that Pat was a person who had made grave mistakes in the past, near past, and present. I did not think, despite the “pledge” to join Gambler’s Anonymous, that Pat would behave any differently this time than in the past. The information given to me that pointed towards a possible reform in behavior seemed only excuses in order to justify Pat’s present actions. So, after I had made this decision, I tried to anticipate the opening situation that I would experience as Pat. I assumed that I would not be immediately put on the defense, because Blair was after all my friend. I decided that I would not reveal that I knew anything to begin with, and would try to evade the issue of whether or not I was involved. I did want to cut a deal, but I was not willing to put myself on the line like that right away. I would have to wait to see how tight of a situation Blair was in. The only goal I really wanted to have was to keep my job. I did not want to be fired and so if I had to feign innocence for at least a while (even after the negotiation had ended) I would do it. Pat seems to be a pretty desperate person that lives from incident to incident without much planning.

Progression of Events

When I sat down with Blair, I was quiet and did not volunteer anything. I expected Blair to prompt me with questions. Natalie did not seem very forthcoming either; I do not know if she expected me to say something, but I was the one being interrogated (at least that’s how Pat would see I). After a few questions, though, it became apparent that Blair had told other people on staff, of whom I was not aware, about my past and indicated that she was pressured to do so in order to keep the integrity of her job. I was put off that others knew things about me and it put me on the defense. Because this felt like a breach of confidence, I felt even less inclined to tell the truth. So I asked a few questions about what had been done in the investigation. Blair told me straight out that I was the one that was suspected and it was her that had implicated me. I was even more put on defense. If Blair had not told others about my past, she would not have been forced to implicate me. To move things along, I asked some questions about what was expected to happen to the person who was found guilty. I realized this made me out to be slightly guilty, but technically I had never said anything about myself. I felt Pat was walking a line that seemed familiar. Nothing was going to get accomplished because Blair seemed to be waiting for me to confess. I would not do that, and started to think how I could get the tapes returned, as Blair said if that did not happen she could be fired. Since we were friends, I asked a few questions about what would happen if the tapes were somehow “found.” Obviously, this incriminated me slightly, but I said to her that I would be willing to do a little investigation of my own, perhaps gaining information that other coworkers would be unwilling to present in a confrontational interview. She seemed to think that any way of getting the tapes would be better than nothing, as her job was on the line. However, after I thought I had at least built myself a little possibility of security, Blair admitted that if no one admitted to stealing the tapes, I would be fired anyway because I was the prime suspect. This I did not like, and became defensive. Apparently, my past job was hurting me, so I told her I felt wronged by the firing at my last job. She thought Dallas would be willing to accept a statement that explained my side of the situation

and it would keep my job (at least in the mean time). We agreed that I would do some “investigation” and e-mail her when I came up with the tapes. I would also write a statement to give to Dallas in a sit down meeting, at which Blair would be both present and would argue in my favor. Blair assured me that I would not lost my job with her support. Lastly, I did admit a few times during the talk that I had some reckless tendencies. I told her that I could not lost my job because of my debts, which was true. I made a vow (although I knew in my mind that I was not really committed to it) that I would not only attend Gambler’s Anonymous starting immediately on my own bill, but that Galaxy could be involved in tracking my attendance and progress in the program, as an assurance that I was truly remorseful and wanted to change. Blair mentioned Dallas might impose a leave of absence for this, but that was fine with me. I thought that as Pat had gone far enough and did not want to have to admit to anything else. I did e-mail Natalie as a mock “find” of the tapes, so that our agreement to meet with Dallas and for her to support my job would be sealed.

Solution Achieved

In acting as Pat, I was forced to negotiate in a way that I knew was not what I would personally choose to do. However, I felt obligated to deal with the situation as the role dictated.

Throughout the above progression of events, I tried to maintain an evasive, neutral style because I did not think Pat would come right out to cut a deal. In fact, I think Pat knew that there was no deal to be cut. The way Blair confronted me and made me out to be a prime suspect that would either be fired along with her, I could not find room profit. I spent most of the time trying to save my job, which was my overall goal set out in the beginning. This meant giving up the chance to sell the tapes, but I thought that if I did that I would still be fired. I did not want to have bad standing on my record with two companies, as I would never get another job. Pat is obviously not cut out to run a business alone, so that option just seemed silly. I also thought that I was able to leave a little of my options open, even when I admitted to having “found” the tapes, because I still hadn’t admitted to having stolen them myself and still had the potential negotiation with Dallas.

Success of Solution

To be honest, I don’t think Pat has a chance. Either Pat and Blair will be fired together or Pat will swear to attend Gambler’s Anonymous and then fail at that, too. The way I saw it, Pat was destined to fall deeply into debt without a job! Not a great outlook. However, I tried to make the negotiation itself a display of the behavior I would expect from Pat—always trying to perpetuate possible innocence and looking for a way out that is not incriminating. Pat also didn’t seem to have great planning skills, so the way the terms stood at the end of the meeting, Pat was only fooling himself into believing it could be okay. I don’t think it will.

Evaluation of Performance

I was frustrated with this negotiation because it was not really a negotiation. It would be more aptly titled a Role Play. I did not make good decisions, but I only did so because I was trying to be “in character.” So in that respect, I think I did what I set out to. I almost wish I had picked an extreme to go with—to either feign complete innocence and never balk, break down immediately and tell the truth and try to monopolize on Blair’s friendship, or even better to have admitted to having the tapes and threatened that I was a cell phone call away from selling them. That might have been more fun! But Blair’s position really put me in a corner and I felt trapped. So I tried my best to get something out of it for myself. I mostly felt that I didn’t have much to work with.

Changes in Style

The main change I see in my style over the semester is a better ability to plan for unexpected turns. In the beginning, I expected each negotiation to have a specific atmosphere or a certain opening bid. I quickly learned, though, that true preparation means to be able to have contingency plans in the case that the expectations are foiled. During the distributive negotiation part of the class, I learned very quickly that threatening to leave or going with a BATNA was extremely effective. The one negative thing I found about myself (which is related to why my results were always so random!) is that my success in negotiation depends greatly on the style/personality of the other person. When I worked with people who I felt I got along with personally, I did well—even if the negotiation was distributive. If I felt that the person and I did not really have much in common or I didn't really feel compatible with this person, the results were always worse. I guess I am affected greatly by whom it is I'm working with and could perhaps try harder to put personalities aside and focus only on skills, issues, and results.

Future Negotiations

As I stated above, I will continue to work on separating personality from the business that needs to get done. Also, I would like to continue working on my integrative skills. I am stronger in distributive situations; mostly because the nature of a distributive situation makes me more aggressive and passionate. When the situation is integrative, I am more likely to sit back and be less proactive because I don't want to put the other on defense or come across as distributive. Lastly, I would like to simply work on my physical presence at a negotiation. Most people think I am shy if they don't know me, but as soon as they do realize how wrong that is. I think this puts me at a disadvantage sometimes. Often if I feel the other person is shy, I feel frustrated and wish for them to be more outgoing as it tends to loosen up the atmosphere and gets things going on the right foot.

Course Takeaways

Being a musician, business courses tend to be completely out of my experience (sometimes good, sometimes bad). However, this course was particularly fun and applicable to any career. As I talked about above, I learned some things about myself, but in general all of us musicians are pretty "in touch" with how we learn, work, and perform. We don't, however, always get the chance to improve the way we do things. Too often, we accommodate our styles or preferences so as not to create more work for ourselves—and often it pleases our audience to see someone with an "artist's" temperament. I think this course helped me gain confidence, by showing me how to phrase things, how to make a situation seem distributive or integrative (or move between the two as needed). I feel that I could actually walk into a negotiation for a contract or something similar and know how to prepare for it, how to present myself, and how to deal with the twists and turns the deal might take. Musicians are often so under prepared for these kinds of situations that we end up losing. As I hope to work in the administrative side of the Performing Arts world as well as be a performer, I think I have gained a unique experience that will help not only me, but also others on whose behalf I may negotiate. My lofty goal is to be a part of the musicians who are not only great performers, but also smart business people. Having the ability to negotiate successfully and to "walk the walk and talk the talk" I *know* will help me be successful in my field and hopefully encourage others to be smarter musician-businesspeople.