Bond University

Research Repository

Electronic negotiation

A teaching tool for encouraging student self-reflection

Holtom, Brooks C.; Kenworthy-U'Ren, Amy L.

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Bond University research repository.](#)

Download date: 09 Oct 2020

7-1-2006

Electronic Negotiation: A teaching tool for encouraging student self-reflection

Brooks C. Holtom
Georgetown University, USA

Amy Kenworthy-U'Ren
Bond University, akenwort@bond.edu.au

Recommended Citation
Brooks C. Holtom and Amy Kenworthy-U'Ren. (2006) "Electronic Negotiation: A teaching tool for encouraging student self-reflection" ,, .

http://epublications.bond.edu.au/business_pubs/21

ELECTRONIC NEGOTIATION:

A TEACHING TOOL FOR ENCOURAGING STUDENTS TO "LOOK INTO THE MIRROR"

Brooks C. Holtom

McDonough School of Business

Georgetown University

G-04 Old North

Washington, DC 20057

Phone: 202-687-3794; Fax: 202-687-4031

Email: bch6@msb.edu

Amy L. Kenworthy-U'Ren

3208 Faculty of Business

Bond University

University Drive

The Gold Coast, QLD

Australia 4220

Phone: (61) 7 5595-2241; Fax (61) 7 5595-1160

Email: akenwort@bond.edu.au

Abstract

With the increase in the amount of negotiation taking place electronically, negotiation instructors have a responsibility to prepare students to successfully operate in electronic environments. Consistent with other topics typically treated in negotiations courses, we believe that skills related to electronic negotiation are best taught through firsthand experience and subsequent self-reflection. For the past five years, we have used an electronic negotiation exercise to allow students to gain personal knowledge of the complexities associated with negotiations completed exclusively over the internet. Further, with the use of email and instant messaging, a powerful, positive externality has emerged: a complete transcript of the negotiation encounter. After explaining the preparation and structure of this exercise, we explain how to harness the power of this unique vehicle to lead students to significant insights through self-reflective activities.

Men go abroad to wonder at the heights of mountains, at the huge waves of the sea, at the long courses of the rivers, at the vast compass of the ocean, at the circular motions of the stars, and they pass by themselves without wondering. ~ St. Augustine

For centuries people have traveled the world in search of great wonders. As suggested by St. Augustine, one of the greatest challenges in life and one of the greatest areas of wonder is understanding oneself. Like others who teach negotiation courses (Bunker, Kram, & Ting 2002), we often encounter students who appear to have minimal self-reflective skills.[1] This paucity of skills often results in overconfidence about their ability to navigate the negotiation process. Because thoughtful reflection is critical for correctly calibrating confidence as well as coming to understand others—two key skills in negotiation—we have become strong advocates of teaching tools aimed at increasing negotiation students' self-awareness and their need for self-development.

In this paper, we describe one such teaching tool: electronic negotiation. Although there are a number of teaching tools that will assist in the development of students' reflective skills, this one has been particularly effective in our classes. We have been using the electronic negotiation exercise for the past five years. We continue to use it because it addresses one of our primary challenges as negotiation instructors—creating a learning context for students where they are encouraged to expand their underdeveloped set of self-reflective skills. This experiential exercise, a cross-cultural negotiation simulation run solely over e-mail, is the basis

---

[1] Throughout the remainder of this paper, we use the terms "faculty members" and "students," however, we firmly believe that the teaching tool we describe is equally applicable to negotiation training programs (where the more appropriate terms would be "trainers" and "participants").

for a series of reflection dialogues we use to encourage introspection and self-development on the part of our students (and ourselves). We refer to the reflective component of our classes as an opportunity for students to "look into the mirror" —to engage in a process of learning about themselves, both as negotiators and as individuals, in ways they have probably never done before.

We begin with an overview of our cross-cultural electronic negotiation exercise—our goals and the design of the experience to meet them. Next we describe how to run the exercise, including a list of helpful hints gleaned from years of practice. Then we review the range of results realized and the approach we take in debriefing the exercise. After that we summarize our findings and discuss their implications. Finally, we share ideas about how others might further develop or extend this exercise to meet their teaching objectives.

Goals of This Exercise

As McKersie and Fonstad (1997) noted, the increasing use of email for negotiation requires that we, as instructors, prepare students to perform better in that environment. Our first goal in setting up this exercise was to create a situation where electronic negotiation would be necessary (e.g., the parties would be separated geographically). Otherwise, we feared that students on the same campus could circumvent one of the key points of the exercise by arranging to speak face to face.

Next, we sought to inject a sense of realism that can wane over the course of a semester as students in class get to know each other well (Lempereur 2002). We hoped that matching our students with students unfamiliar to them at another university would accomplish this goal. To further enhance the realism, we sought a way to reduce our direct influence on the process and

outcomes. In other words, most of us try to model the behavior of a principled negotiator in class by adopting a very cooperative approach in discussions (Lempereur 2002). Consequently, as we observe students negotiating in class, it is possible that some of them will mimic our examples. Removing the professor from the environment during the course of the negotiation has the potential to increase perceived realism. Further, after having used cases that ask students to play the role of someone from another culture, we thought we could increase the authenticity of an international case by actually negotiating with someone from another culture.

Finally, we wanted to expose students to the complexities of asynchronous communications (Weiss 2005) so that they would see both the advantages (e.g., ability to cool off, edit thoughts before presenting, make calculations and strategize openly) and disadvantages (e.g., lack of nonverbal cues, frustration while waiting for/hoping for/wondering about a response, anxiety that builds between responses) of this format.

Note here that we did not initially anticipate the benefit of having the complete transcript of the negotiation encounter. That insight came as one of us was debriefing the exercise in class the first year and a student pulled out a transcript of her electronic negotiation to emphasize a key point. This was our "eureka" moment in this process. Since then, we have required that all students keep and submit a complete transcript of their negotiation. This tool has increased the value of the exercise and shifted our primary goal to focus on the insights to be gained from self-reflection—one that is less biased by memory and more rooted in reality.

Use of the transcript has opened a number of doors for us regarding reflection, as it has increased the saliency and applicability of theoretical concepts by making them "real" for students. One of the frameworks that has "come alive" for students through reflection and careful examination of the transcripts is Thompson and Nadler's (2002) e-mail negotiation biases

(e.g., temporal synchrony bias, burned bridge bias).[2] Another concept that students appear to more readily grasp in this format is the idea that people tend to communicate differently (e.g., more direct, more competitive, more critical) over email than they would in face-to-face situations (Kurtzberg, Naquin, & Belkin 2005; Valley 2000)

Design of the Exercise

During the first two years, we used the Beverly Frills – Frigo exercise (an adapted version of an A-E-I paradigm case; see Bazerman & Neale 1991, p.17, for discussion of this paradigm). Then we shifted to using a modified version of the Les Florets case (Goldberg 1999; available from the Dispute Resolution Research Center at Northwestern University). Both cases are described briefly below. After introducing them, we will explain why we shifted.

Exercise: Beverly Frills – Frigo

The Beverly Frills – Frigo case is a classic buyer-seller exercise. The purchasing manager for Beverly Frills, an exclusive store selling household equipment, wants to negotiate a contract with the sales manager of Frigo, which is a producer of large, expensive refrigerators.

There are three terms to be negotiated: delivery date, number of product variations, and payment terms. The Beverly Frills manager naturally wants to have the product as soon as possible with the highest possible number of product variations while paying at the latest possible date. The Frigo manager, in contrast, wants to deliver at the latest reasonable date, with no product variation, and immediate payment.

---

[2] See a discussion of student reflections related to Thompson & Nadler's (2002) biases in the Findings and Implications section of this paper.

Many times students assume that each of these issues is equally important to the other party—though they know from a payout matrix that the issues are not equally important to them. If students are able to identify the differences between the two parties' preferences, then they will be able to logroll the issues and expand the pie—though not all do so successfully. Because the case is quantifiable, by the end of the debrief students clearly see the value to be created by being able to understand and prioritize the interests of both sides. The route students take to achieve an agreement varies. Some will attempt to negotiate item by item—an approach that rarely yields superior joint outcomes. Others will make single package offers incorporating all three terms. Others still will make offer multiple packages simultaneously, which is generally the most efficient and effective approach. By iterating multiple times with offers and counter-offers, students are often able to maximize their points. Little creativity is required and the haggling script noted by Valley (2000) is often observed.

Exercises: Les Florets

Les Florets is a two-party, quantified transactional negotiation with integrative potential. The owners of a restaurant would like to sell it. The operators of a large restaurant chain would like to buy it. The restaurant owners are tired of the responsibilities of ownership and want to take a one-year sailing trip around the world while they are young enough and in good enough health to enjoy such a trip. The restaurant company is in the midst of a strategic expansion (buying restaurants and operating them).

The critical learning point in the case is that there is no overlapping bargaining range unless the two parties use their information creatively to develop overlap. It is a very helpful case for demonstrating the importance of an integrative approach. Unless they share information

about their long-term goals, there is no deal possible. Further, the case is interest driven on both sides. But interestingly, the restaurant owners have set a price for the restaurant based on their assessment of their financial needs for their sailing trip. In contrast, the restaurant company valued the restaurant based on their perception of its value, which is strongly influenced by their BATNA (the costs associated with building and opening a new restaurant in the area).

If the students do not share information about their underlying interests (e.g., restaurant owners' interest in the sailing trip), it is extremely unlikely that they will be able to craft an acceptable agreement. Further communication around the interests will uncover ways to meet joint objectives (e.g., the restaurant owners need money or employment security upon return— which can link nicely to the restaurant company's need to find good managers to enable their successful expansion).

We prefer Les Florets over Beverly Frills because it leads to more creative and divergent results—especially if some students follow a haggling script. Impasse is the most likely result when students only discuss money with Les Florets whereas students could fall into a good solution in Beverly Frills through multiple offer/counteroffer sequences focused only on money.

Running the Exercise

Every year, we run this negotiation with undergraduate students enrolled in negotiation classes on opposite sides of the world. One of the classes is a 14-week negotiation course held in a small private university in Australia. The other class is a one-week advanced international negotiations course taught in northern France (though we have also run the exercise in a 15-week U.S. university negotiation course). The one-week course puts time constraints on the exercise. If there were no such constraints, we would offer a full week to complete the exercise as it

typically takes students multiple "conversations" or "meetings" to resolve the case. Students have reported spending between 1 to 8 hours on the negotiation.

Ideally, we would have a similar number of students enrolled in each course as we assign students to a role and then present them with the email address of their negotiation counterpart(s). Since there are always some discrepancies between the class sizes (which have ranged from 25 to 66), we assign students from the larger course into negotiation pairs, taking on the roles of either co-buyers or co-sellers for their respective company. We give students in these partnerships the option of either sitting together as they e-mail or asking all parties involved in the negotiation to use the "reply to all" key. Students in each class take on one role, with every student in the class given the same confidential instructions sheet. By only presenting one side of the case to students from the same university, unintended disclosure of confidential information is minimized. Also, since we have customized the case to the local context (e.g., locating a "Les Florets" restaurant on the "Gold Coast" of Australia with local currency and valuation information), we have not varied the roles between the schools.

Over the years, we have found that it is important to clarify many details for students—especially when the case is international in nature and this is their first exposure to these complexities. Otherwise, technical difficulties can derail them. Following are lists of helpful hints for students (followed by the specific suggestion we provided to our students) and instructors.

Helpful hints for students

- *Be explicit about who should initiate the communication and when.* ("Students at IESEG in Lille, France will send emails to begin the conversation. This should take place on Tuesday,

March 15, 2005 by 10 p.m. (Lille, France time). This means that students at Bond University in Australia should expect to see an email on Wednesday, March 16, 2005 by 7 a.m.")

➤ *Set a clear stopping point.* ("Negotiations must be _completed_ by 7:00 a.m. (Lille, France time) and 4:00 p.m. (Gold Coast, Australia time) on Friday, March 18, 2005. Note the 9 hour time difference will impact when you are able to email each other – please plan accordingly.")

➤ *Provide suggestions regarding technology and coordination details.* ("It may help to set up "times" for negotiation where parties on both sides are sitting at their computers. You may use instant messaging if both parties have access, can agree upon an available time, and are comfortable using that medium.")

➤ *Clarify who will be at the table in each negotiation dyad.* ("In some of the negotiations there will be teams of students working together on one of the sides (e.g., a 2-on-1). As a result, please hit 'reply to all' every time you respond to an email.")

➤ *Remind students about the necessity of creating the negotiation transcript for later analysis. ("*Students MUST turn in an electronic copy of their email negotiations. Keep a continuous record of your negotiations by hitting "reply" to each message. Please note that if you are negotiating with a pair of students, you will need to hit "reply to all" to keep both of the students in the loop.")

➤ *Remind students about the time difference on multiple occasions.* ("The Gold Coast of Australia (Brisbane) is 9 hours ahead of Lille, France.")

➤ *Clarify the common currency. ("*Monetary amounts are in Australian (AUD) dollars.")

Helpful hints for Instructors

➢ Develop a list of the students' preferred email address in advance of issuing the assignment. Have students verify that their addresses are correctly listed.

➢ Carefully account for time differences, holidays and other possible time-based barriers to completing the assignment.

➢ Be sure to customize the negotiation roles so that they make sense to readers in the different roles (e.g., adopt a common currency). Adding local language or geographic elements may enhance the realistic feel of the negotiation.

➢ Be strict with the deadlines. Students who leave all the work until the last day/night may experience difficulty coordinating their schedules or coming to closure and, consequently, may ask for extensions or have a high probability of impasse. Relaxing the rules reduces the lessons to be learned.

➢ Expect a lot of finger pointing and criticism of the "other" school's students (Lempereur 2002). Respond with respect for the other instructor and students—effectively modeling the most productive mindset for resolving complex, cross-cultural differences. Avoid being defensive of "your" students.

➢ Require students to submit the entire electronic negotiation transcript in hard copy. This will reduce issues related to finger pointing and criticism. Frame this component of the negotiation as a protective device for everyone involved, highlighting the fact that all electronic negotiations are permanently recorded (date and time) and, as such, students need to prepare carefully and start early.

➢ Check your email often. Students who are having trouble contacting the other negotiators (e.g., emails bouncing back, no response for 1-2 days) should be encouraged to email you

immediately. If both instructors are checking email regularly, problems are typically solved within 12-24 hours.

➢ Have personal contact information (email and phone, preferably mobile or cell phone numbers) for all of your students. There are usually 1 or 2 students who will need to be contacted quickly to ascertain the status of their email accounts or their participation in the negotiation (i.e., intention to participate).

➢ Frame the exercise as an innovative and unique opportunity. With the proper framing, this exercise can serve as the capstone negotiation for an experientially-based course on negotiations. Students are usually very excited about negotiating with a complete stranger who is situated on the other side of the world. They often view the exercise as a practical trial of their skills, similar to negotiation situations they will face as they progress through their careers.

➢ Allow students to opt out of the exercise. There will be the occasional student who simply does not have the time to commit to this negotiation. With a positive frame (as discussed above), most students want to participate. There have been instances where students simply did not have sufficient time to dedicate to this exercise given the short timeframe and rigid constraints (e.g., a student traveling to a wedding where there was neither internet access nor time available). In such instances, students will do more damage than good if they are forced to participate (negatively impacting their negotiation counterparts). Students in this situation are required to make up the exercise at a later date, ideally before all of the debriefing sessions are completed.

Results

In the Beverly Frills exercise, students calculate the point values they achieved for their role. We then provide information so they can correctly compute the points for their counterpart. Then we ask them to report both scores and their sum on the chalkboard in the front of class. This presentation lends itself to an easy visual analysis of the best individual and joint outcomes. The results ranged from low total point values to pareto optimal outcomes. Impasse rates ranged from 25-40%.

In the Les Florets exercise, we ask students to simply note the dollar value of the transaction. Students chafe at this because so many achieved complex integrative deals. Students always ask if they can put additional details. After getting the attention of the class, we ask if anyone would like to report additional elements of their deals. Students flood back to the board to record their novel ideas. Interestingly, though the case is more complex, impasse rates have been somewhat lower (15-20%). Moreover, this rate of impasse is slightly lower than the rates observed when this same exercise has been run in a face-to-face format with undergraduate students. In short, our experience seems to square with work done by Croson (1999) who found that computer-mediated agreements are somewhat more integrative than those negotiated face to face, suggesting that there is no decrease in effectiveness when negotiating long distance using information technology.

Debriefing and Assessment

Social psychology lies at the heart of all negotiations. As negotiations relate essentially to the dynamics of social interaction, the ability to understand egocentrism, motivation, perception, emotion, ethics, and cultural issues is critical to negotiation success (Bazerman, Curhan, Moore, & Valley 2000). As educators, we would be remiss if we did not discuss the

impact of these social psychological processes on negotiations. To provide this social psychological foundation for our courses, we start the semester with an historical development of social psychological literature on conflict resolution (e.g., Deutsch 2002). We then discuss how social psychological processes operate and can affect negotiation outcomes.

Pre-Exercise Self-Reflection

Before we use the cross-cultural electronic negotiation, we give our students short exercises in reflection. In doing this, we try to focus their attention on the social psychological processes involved in negotiation. One way we do this is through the use of an instrument designed to assess their preferred bargaining style(s) at the start of the semester. The five styles are commonly referred to as competing, collaborating, compromising, avoiding, and accommodating. There are a number of instruments designed for this type of analysis. There is also some debate regarding the validity of personality tests in general. However, we believe that such a tool is helpful in providing a framework for reflection and analysis. We use the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument (TKI). In our experience, we find it useful to encourage students to engage in personal reflection and self-assessment early in our courses. Once the students have completed the instrument, we typically present them with the Wharton-TKI Bargaining Styles Grid (as described in Shell 2001) so they can compare their scores to those of a large global sample of executives. We find that students enjoy the comparison, providing a useful first step in the process of self-discovery.

Immediately before this negotiation exercise takes place, we ask the students to engage in a reflective exercise aimed at uncovering assumptions about the upcoming negotiation over the internet. We ask them to respond to two simple points: "(1) Please list and describe three

emotions you feel when you think about the upcoming negotiation (e.g., fear, anxiety, excitement). Be sure to explain why you are feeling each emotion. (2) Please list four word that might describe the person/people you are about to negotiate with (e.g., principled, difficult, friendly). For example, what word would you put at the end of the following sentence, 'This person will most likely be _____.' Please explain why you think each word may be appropriate." These assumptions are given back to the students during their post-negotiation debrief as well as a tool for encouraging pre-negotiation insight.

Debrief and Assessment

Following the electronic negotiation simulation, we ask the students to prepare a journal entry that examines a number of key topics from the course. We then run an entire class session dedicated to students discussing their journals in a full class negotiation dialogue and debrief. Related to the content of their journals, we first ask them to revisit their bargaining style preferences and apply them to the transcripts of their electronic negotiations. We ask them to consider how their preferred style(s) influenced the way they managed the e-mail negotiation. For example, if they have a strong predisposition toward accommodation, did they spend a lot of time discussing relationship issues, possibly to the point of frustrating the other side? How did they manage the logrolling process? Did they give too much too early? How did their concessions compare to those of the other side? Each preferred bargaining style has both strengths and weaknesses;[3] we encourage students to search for both as they examine and reflect upon their e-mail transcripts.

---

[3] For a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses associated with each bargaining style, see Lewicki, Saunders, and Barry (2006).

Understanding ourselves and others is a central tenet of persuasion, and, as such, persuasion is the second topic we ask them to write about. There is little doubt that persuasion is one of the keys to achieving desired outcomes in negotiation (Cialdini 1993). In today's world, businesspeople must be effective at persuading others over electronic mediums of communication (Hobson 1999). When debriefing the electronic negotiation with our students, we ask students to reflect upon three points raised by Watkins (2001) in his discussion of effective persuasion at a distance. We ask students to critically reflect on their abilities to focus and repeat important communications, to simplify difficult concepts in accurate ways (watching out for oversimplification), and to build personal credibility. We frame these questions for the written journal entry by reporting the results of an empirical study by Weisband and Atwater (1999). Their study found that, when compared to face-to-face settings, students have irrationally high self-assessment ratings in electronic interactions. This suggests a tendency for inflation bias when performing tasks electronically.

The Next Step: Using Negotiation Transcripts

Another approach we use to encourage student reflection on the electronic negotiation experience is a discussion of Cohen's (2002) five topics related to negotiation (deception, disclosure, fairness, fidelity, and respect).[4] Students are asked to carefully review their own negotiation transcripts, highlighting and then reflecting in another journal entry upon the five topics. For example, students are asked to consider the extent to which they felt deceived (we

---

[4] In his 2002 paper, Cohen argues that the first four topics are discussed in most negotiation courses but that negotiation instructors and practitioners often overlook a fifth important topic grounded in ethics – the topic of respect.

ask this before they are given the other side's confidential information as well as after they read it) and the extent to which they knowingly used deception. An interesting follow up to that question is when we put students in teams of two, each student then reads through another students' email negotiation transcript and gives feedback. With respect to deception, students are often shocked when another student points out that they did, in fact, deceive the other side at points during the negotiation. This type of assisted reflection has been very useful in the process of self-discovery for our students, providing a glimpse of how different our view of ourselves can be from the views of others around us.

From this intra-class dyadic feedback, we have anecdotally deduced some common themes stemming from these discussions. For many of our students, the following insights have been particularly strong (and are only realized after someone else has read through their transcript) and tend to be consistent across student cohorts, regardless of the year, size of the class, or demographics of the students in the classes. Common student insights elicited once the transcripts have been shared are:

- *Someone else reading through my transcript will be an easy process as we are all perfectly objective and rational individuals.* In fact, most students are visibly distraught by the number of points raised and biases uncovered by the other person reading through their transcript in their reflection dyad.

- *Perceptions of self perfectly represent those of the people I interact with.* Again, most students have a difficult time trying to "step into the shoes" of the other side, to see how one of their own statements might be interpreted as competitive or aggressive by the other side, even when it was not written with that intention.

- *Personal credibility, fairness, and an ethical approach to the negotiation are assumed and enacted by all.* Students tend to be relatively overconfident about their credibility and trustworthiness, to the extent that very few of them attempt to establish genuine rapport as a form of relationship building.

In terms of grading, instructors have wide latitude in how much to weight these writing exercises. Because we view this case as one of the course cornerstones for self-development, we have generally allocated a relatively high weight to these particular journal entries (ranging from 20-40% of the final grade). Integration of negotiation theory and depth of personal insight demonstrated are the two factors that most influence the students' grades.

Findings and Implications

Electronic Communications

Halyard and Pridmore (2000) raise the issue that e-learning and e-teaching have impacted both how we teach and how students learn; as they put it, "the internet is a student's third hand" (p.440). Students' high levels of comfort with electronic communication may explain why research has shown positive, critical-thinking-based results from the inclusion of internet-based communication in the classroom (Dutt-Doner & Powers 2000) and higher overall rates of participation in class discussions when compared to those in face-to-face settings (Dubrovsky, Kiesler, & Sethna 1991; Kahmi-Stein 2000). Moreover, understanding issues related to the use of e-mail as a form of electronic communication continues to be a primary agenda item for business owners and employees (Kovach, Conner, Livneh, Scallan, & Schwartz 2000). Therefore, to educate our students in a comprehensive manner, negotiation courses must include

the topic of electronic negotiations with particular focus on email as a communication medium (McKersie & Fonstad, 1997).

In our classes, we have our students participate in the e-mail negotiation before we discuss research on electronic communication. Like others, we find that learning is much richer for students in negotiation when we follow an inductive approach of "involving, showing, and telling" where the first step is "simulation" (to involve students in negotiation simulations), the second step is "debriefing" (to interactively debrief the experience with the students, which may involve connection with theoretical concepts), and the final step is "summarizing" (to extend the debrief to a faculty member led discussion of how students' experiences relate to and reflect relevant theories) (Lempereur, 2002 p.17-18). This process is strikingly different from that of a typical training program where a "telling, showing, and then involving" process is the norm. We find that when we start with the actual simulation (e-mail negotiation), students tend to rely solely on their familiarity with e-mail and their relatively overconfident mindsets toward the ease of internet-based negotiating (Lempereur 2002). Once the negotiation is complete, we share findings from extant research.

Research on the topic of email negotiation is fast emerging given the unprecedented and exponential growth in email communication.[5] In our debrief, we discuss two types of literature with our students. First, we present findings from empirical research in the domain, encouraging students to critically evaluate the findings in light of their electronic negotiation experiences.

---

[5] For a thorough review of this research, see Thompson and Nadler (2002). We also highly recommend the work of Gregory Kersten; an excellent place to access research from Gregory and his colleagues is the InterNeg Research Centre (http://interneg.concordia.ca/).

Specifically, we refer to several of the findings from Thompson and Nadler's (2002) summary of research on electronic negotiation:

1. e-mail negotiations tend to have much less "schmoozing" than face-to-face negotiations, resulting in less relationship building and more task-focused communication (with less overall rapport reported between parties);

2. rapport helps to engender positive emotion and trust;

3. brief telephone calls prior to negotiating will help to develop cooperative relationships, positive emotions, and trust, thus leading to higher outcomes than strictly e-mail based negotiations;

4. there is more negative affect, less rapport, and a higher impasse rate in e-mail negotiations where the other negotiator is perceived as an outgroup member than there is in those between perceived ingroups (most students perceive the other side an outgroup member, with the other students in the same classroom, representing the same side in this case as the ingroup);

5. males negotiating with males tend to have less cooperative negotiations than mixed sex dyads; and

6. e-mail negotiations increase multi-issue offers (when compared to face-to-face negotiations).

We also discuss the e-mail negotiation biases Thompson and Nadler (2002) have uncovered in their research (students tend to find this discussion more compelling and "sexy" than the empirical findings listed above). The *temporal synchrony bias* is "the tendency for negotiators to behave as if they are in a synchronous situation when in fact, they are not" (p.117). We see this in almost every dyad that participates in the electronic negotiation. Our students get

frustrated with the lack of predictability in response time and the uneven flow of communication. Students expect a patterned, stable, synchronous set of communications; for most e-mail negotiations that level of stability simply does not exist. The most common response from our students is frustration with the process—a powerful negative emotion that students are not likely to forget. Examples of student reflections related to the temporal synchrony bias are:

- *"Frustration... we were not able to coordinate a time for a discussion (I wanted to do instant messaging) and then we didn't get a reply from the other negotiator for a full day" (Kayla)*

- *"Frustration. We could only read short text responses...so, much meaning was lost and we would often misunderstand each other because we were only reading words and that was frustrating!" (Gaby)*

- *"Frustration...it went WAY TOO SLOW!!!" (Matthias)*

- *"Impatience. I felt like the emails only covered one aspect of the negotiation at a time and there was too much time in between emails (given our time constraints to get it done)." (Kim)*

- *"I experienced a lot of tiredness as we had to get up at 6am on both Thursday and Friday in the hope of actually emailing directly back-and-forth with the person on the other side" (Lisa)*

- *"Talk about painful! We spent 7 hours in the chat and we were going nowhere... Finally, something clicked." (José)*

The *burned bridge bias* is the "tendency for e-negotiators to engage in risky interpersonal behaviors in an impoverished medium that they would not engage in when interacting face-to-

face" (p.118). Our students often report the presence of this bias in conjunction with another

bias, the *squeaky wheel bias*. The squeaky wheel bias is basically the tendency to use an

"aversive emotional style" (p.118) over e-mail when a positive emotional style is the individual's

preferred style in face-to-face negotiations. Many of our students report these biases and explain

them as an extension of negotiating with people they do not know from the other side of the

planet. Students often talk about their lack of relationship and, more importantly, their lack of

interest in establishing a relationship with the other party, thus leading them to be more

competitive, less cooperative, direct, and aggressive with their communications. Frustration is

discussed as one of the catalysts for intimidation and aggression, with students justifying their

behaviors as required responses to communications from their negotiation counterparts.

Examples of student comments reflecting these biases are:

- *"The other side offered me a deal and I accepted...they then came back to me and said the deal was not possible. I got really angry at their dishonesty saying something pathetic like 'we can't sign a contract for this' so I started playing hardball back." (Lauren)*

- *"I felt that they were being stubborn. They represent a successful management company and I think the part went to their heads...they assumed that they were correct about everything and became arrogant. I then had to respond in a similar fashion." (Tim)*

- *"I thought they'd be pushy and they were. I had to adopt an aggressive approach as a result." (Anastasia)*

- *"There was a lot of boulwarism ["take it or leave it" type statements] in this negotiation...They used bullying behaviors with "final offer" stuff and lied to me*

about prices. I had to become competitive to survive. It was obviously a seriously

competitive negotiation that we each wanted to win." (Kimberly)

- *"She was really tough and didn't want to take any of the offers we were making.*
  Once that started, we realized that we didn't want her to for us as an employee so we
  didn't offer that concession (it became personal)." (Rajeev)

The *sinister attribution bias* is a tendency to misattribute behaviors to personal rather than situational factors. Thompson and Nadler (2002) describe this bias as "a type of mutation of the fundamental attribution error, wherein attributions of the other person's behavior are not only dispositional, but also diabolical" (p.119). As stated above, there is evidence indicating that people do, in fact, tend to be more competitive, expressing higher levels of negative emotion during e-mail negotiations than those in face-to-face settings. This bias, however, *irrationally* distorts an individual's perception of the other negotiator's competitive and aggressive behavior. Relating this back to our earlier points, we have found anecdotally that once our students begin to blame the other negotiator for a downward communication spiral, the sinister attribution bias kicks in and impasse becomes the most likely outcome.

- *"Frustration! They simply couldn't understand what a time difference was… they*
  kept thinking that 6-8am on the Gold Coast was 6-8pm – it was such an obvious
  mistake that I was SURE they did it intentionally to mess with me… I mean, come on!
  There are twelve hours not accounted for and the time difference was very clearly
  stated!" (Sam)

- *"I found them to be tough, stubborn and competitive... not to mention suspicious of me. Their questions always seemed like personal attacks rather than genuine questions. This made the negotiation extremely difficult." (Nic)*
- *"He was such a manipulator... never responding directly to our questions and always trying to make us uncomfortable when we made a mistake." (Marie)*

When we report the research on trust in electronic negotiations, there are few surprises for the students (e.g., online negotiations are associated with lower levels of both pre- and post-negotiation trust than face-to-face negotiations (Naquin & Paulson 2003)). It also comes as no surprise to them that the absence of rapport building, coupled with a focus on rules building (e.g., communicating "how" and "when" directives to the other party), results in highly negatively perceived electronic negotiations (Paulson & Naquin 2004).

In future simulations we run, we will also discuss the recent findings of Kurtzberg, Naquin, and Belkin (2005). Kurtzberg, et al. (2005) conducted three studies examining the relationship between email communication and performance evaluation. The authors consistently found that evaluations of the other negotiator were significantly less positive over email than they were using a paper-based written format (in two of the studies, participants rated a negotiation teammate and in the third study they rated the performance of a negotiator as seen in a video recorded reenactment). This outcome was explained by a reduction in perceived social obligation over email—participants who evaluated another negotiator using an email medium were less likely to feel "obligated" to the other person than those who were writing paper-based evaluations. This research certainly fits with our anecdotal evidence that students tend to be very critical of their negotiation counterparts in electronic negotiations.

Once we have reviewed the empirical literature with our students, we briefly turn to the executive practitioner literature where "tips" for negotiating online are presented[6]. We find it useful to pool tips from different sources and to present them as discussion points for students in our classes. Some of the questions we raise at this point include, how do the tips relate to what they experienced in their negotiations? How could knowledge of the empirical literature on e-mail negotiation have helped their negotiation? Why would knowing some of the tips for negotiating over the internet have helped them attain better outcomes? What lessons will they take away from this exercise and why?

The assumptions commonly made by students as they reflect on this negotiation include:

- Negotiation over the internet will be quick (average time required for students is 3.5 hours over instant messaging and 3 days over email for a case that typically takes 35 minutes in a face-to-face setting).

- E-mail negotiations do not require as much planning as face-to-face negotiations do since there will be time between communications to think and prepare.

- The other negotiator will be continuously available during the 3-4 day negotiation period (with a 9 hour time difference, students quickly become aware of the logistical constraints placed on the pattern of responses).

Cross Cultural Insights

---

[6] Some examples include Morris (1999) "Email and the Schmooze Factor"; Casperson (2000) "Business E-Etiquette: How to Use Electronic Communication to Turn Prospects into Clients"; Valley (2000) "The Electronic Negotiator"; Halpern (2001) "Email Do's and Don'ts"; and McGinn & Wilson (2004) "How to Negotiate Successfully Online."

One of our goals as negotiation teachers, and negotiators ourselves, is to understand how culture impacts negotiation planning, process, and outcomes. While we believe that the electronic negotiation experience is sufficiently rich to warrant using it in classes that do not have a cross-cultural focus, we do believe that this approach is especially rich in an international context. The strengths of this approach are obvious—we live in a world where negotiations increasingly involve people from different cultures. Negotiators should, as a result, develop an understanding of not only what cultural differences may exist between parties but also how existing differences may impact the inherently interpersonal process of negotiation. Such knowledge is difficult to attain, as most cultural differences stem from deeply held values – values that contribute to our perceptions of right and wrong. These perceptions cause conflict, as conflicts typically stem from differences of understanding and mixed interpretations of experience (Kahane 2003). Conflict stemming from cultural differences can be a very powerful and informative experience. As many of us teach our students, conflict is not inherently bad, it is poor handling of conflict (e.g., ignoring it, poorly processing it) that leads to impasse and damaged relationships.

One way we like to approach the topic of culture in our classes is to first ask students to define what culture is not. We use Avruch's (2000) article as a springboard for this discussion, raising his six points, that "culture is not: a homogeneous, essentialized, uniformly distributed, customary, timeless, and stable" phenomenon (p.343). This type of discussion stimulates an awakening for most students – a realization that culture is not a thing, it can not be rigidly defined and is not a stable trait. In our discussions, we describe culture as a "lens" through which we view the world around us (Avruch 2000). We ask our students to define their own lenses, and to search for similarities and differences with those who are from the same regional

and national areas. Reflecting on their cultural lenses, students typically expose a shared set of assumptions going into their negotiation (before they negotiate, we ask them to describe three emotions that they feel about the upcoming negotiation and to list and explain four descriptor terms that they think will apply to the person/people they are going to negotiate with):

- *Students in France must be French and students in Australia must be Australian.* In fact, our Universities have unusually high percentages of international students, with only 40% of the students in France being French, and less than 40% of the students in Australia being Australian. Student quotes frequently expose this belief:

  ➢ *"As the students are French, there will be language problems" (Samuel)*

  ➢ *"French people are arrogant and competitive, I know they are stereotypes but I've experienced them personally" (Jono)*

  ➢ *"Ambitious. Anglo people tend to care so much about money; they always try to get a win-lose out of a negotiation." (Luis)*

  ➢ *"I think they'll be relaxed, as Australians have the reputation for 'no worries, mate' mindsets." (Delannoy)*

- *Any differences in cultural values will be minimal and for those that do exist, they will follow prevailing generalizations.* Most of our students never discuss culture or country of origin with their negotiation counterparts; rather, they make assumptions about who the other person is based on their current location.

  ➢ *"They'll be open-minded like us. As it is an international negotiation with people from different cultures and countries, they'll want to get a win-win." (Maria)*

  ➢ *"The negotiators will be well-educated and it will stay polite as we are all from places that support collaborative outcomes." (Alexandre)*

> ➤ *"With respect to values, they will be open-minded like me. It helps when people are from different countries to make interesting negotiations as long as we understand each other—that shouldn't be a problem with this group." (Amielie)*

- *Word choice is not an issue as there will be very few, if any, differences in interpretation.* The students' rationale here is that the negotiations are all in English, how could there possibly be the problem with that?

> ➤ *"I'm going to be polite because my native language isn't English. I don't think there will be any problems with it because we're writing everything and I'll have the time to read things over." (Mirowaka)*

> ➤ *"There shouldn't be any problems...we all speak English and that's all that matters" (Temnet)*

When asked to discuss the lessons learned by participating in the negotiations, the students widely agree on the following points:

- *Negotiating across time and national boundaries can induce strong emotions including anger, frustration, and disappointment.* Many students reflect on the fact that even though their partner is not physically present, and even though they anticipate cultural differences, they often experience the same wide range of emotions present in face-to-face negotiations. These emotions may be even more salient than usual because vital cues for sense making are missing, often resulting in heightened anxiety. Awareness of the need to monitor and manage these emotions becomes a critical lesson learned.

- *Communication barriers stem from many sources—not simply words.* Students were frequently frustrated by the many potential communication barriers. One of the key takeaways from the debrief is the need to be clear and accurate in communicating

interests—not simply positions (Fisher, Ury & Patton, 1991)—which, of course, requires some level of trust.

- *Trust is fragile and especially so when you have never met someone.* In this case, simple acts build or erode trust. Many students comment that waiting for 15 minutes for someone to log on to instant messenger felt like an eternity. They become more aware of the importance of building trust by being reliable, predictable, punctual, and polite as well as making and keeping promises.

Getting Started at Your Institution

On the basis of our experience using electronic negotiations as a basis for encouraging self-development for our students, we highly recommend it to you. The steps to getting started are relatively straightforward.

1. Identify a colleague teaching a similar course in another university with some overlap in the schedule. We would advocate not mixing degree types (e.g., undergraduates negotiating with MBAs at another school) or primary language of instruction. However, despite these minor limitations, we do not believe it will be difficult to connect with friends or acquaintances at conferences (e.g., Academy of Management, Conflict Management Division; International Association for Conflict Management) to propose such a collaboration.

2. Choose a case that offers an opportunity for students to go beyond a simple, point-driven framework. We have used Les Florets with success for three years but are confident that many other cases could be used effectively.

3. Work out the timing of the exercise in advance of the teaching term so that students will know about the exercise from the start and look forward to it as a "real test" of their negotiating abilities developed during the course.

4. Collect contact information from students and confirm that email addresses are correct before creating and distributing the pairings to students. This is a step that caused us some difficulty the first time we ran the exercise. Losing two days out of four for the exercise can frustrate students.

5. Provide detailed instructions to students (incorporating helpful hints noted previously). The less ambiguity around the logistics there is the better students will be able to focus on the task of reaching an agreement.

6. Anticipate a few surprises and be available to help students overcome logistical or technological challenges—especially at the start of the exercise.

Extending This Exercise

As we hope is clear from our discussion, this exercise has evolved somewhat over time. We believe that the model is sufficiently simple to allow a number of adaptations or innovations. Following are a number of ideas we have considered to emphasize distinct aspects of the exercise.

The first idea builds on research looking at personal disclosure in electronic negotiation. It is not uncommon for email negotiators to lack trust or have misperceptions about the other party (Landry 2000). In researching ways to overcome this challenge, Moore, Kurtzberg and Thompson (1999) found that people who engaged in mutual self-disclosure with their counterparts were more likely to come to agreement. Their manipulation for self-disclosure was

very simple: a picture, small biography, and short get-acquainted exchange. This idea could be implemented a couple ways to provide students with ports for comparison. One way would be to provide slightly different instructions to half of the students in each class. One set of instructions would include encouragement to share a picture, biography and get-acquainted exchange. The other set would not. The pairings for the negotiation should match students with the "personal disclosure" instruction set. Comparing the impasse rate between students who engaged in personal disclosure with those who did not would be one way of measuring its impact. Clearly one twist would be to pair students with personal disclosure instructions with students without personal disclosure instructions at the other school. Looking for patterns of reciprocity is just one obvious outcome to examine.

A second idea for future iterations of the exercise would be to encourage students to explicitly share information about their anger or happiness in the course of the negotiation. Three experiments using computer-mediated negotiation by van Kleef, De Dreu and Manstead (2004) suggest that negotiators are especially influenced by their opponent's emotions when they are motivated and able to consider them. The transcript of the exchange will allow students to analyze the impact of such statements on their counterpart.

A third idea builds on the cross-cultural possibilities for this exercise. Kersten, Koszegi and Vetschera (2002) found that differences exist in the way negotiators from different cultures approach negotiations, particularly in the expectations they form before actual bargaining begins. By administering questionnaires assessing students' expectations in advance of the exercise and later comparing them to the outcomes obtained both inter- and intra-class (we have only run intra-class dialogues to date because of our time constraints, and while we encourage students to engage in an email-based reflective dialogue with the other party after the negotiation, we do not

monitor this process at all), a high level of cross-cultural discussion and understanding may result.

Conclusion: Looking into the Mirror to Encourage Learning

The use of the electronic negotiation as a tool for encouraging meaningful student reflection provides a number of benefits. First, the negotiation process is asynchronous – it is typically characterized by multiple, time-delayed negotiation sessions or episodes. This process permits students to not only reflect on their recent experiences and update their mental models before responding (a clear benefit for most), but also engages students in the real-time challenges and frequent frustrations of asynchronous communication environments. Second, email is increasingly used as a primary medium for negotiations, yet the medium itself often influences negotiations in ways that many people do not recognize. Hence, gaining experience negotiating in this context is valuable. Third, the geographic distance component introduces additional complexity that better represents organizational realities than many in-class, student-on-student negotiation exercises do. In this exercise, students are negotiating with counterparts they have never met and, in some cases, are people originally from geographic locations on the other side of the world. This effectively eliminates the element of "safety" associated with negotiating with a classmate or someone else from the university campus (i.e., the firmly-entrenched perceptual biases and comforts of negotiating with someone you know). Finally, the email or instant messaging process produces a transcript that can be analyzed post-negotiation.

When students reflect upon their transcripts, they often observe the critical junctures or inflection points in the process. When they do, they gain insight into the importance of strategic improvisation—dealing with the unexpected, responding in the moment, and adapting effectively

to sudden changes (Balachandra, Crossan, Devin, Leary & Patton 2005). While students are not able to go back and "fix" their possible errors, they gain a heightened awareness of the need to formulate and then adapt strategy throughout the negotiation process. They are also sensitized to the power of language and the importance of word choice (Sokolova, Szpakowicz & Nastase 2004). Additionally, students discover missed opportunities—ideas offered by either side that presented possibilities to create value that were not recognized in the moment. Coupling these ideas with the creative solutions obtained by other students will help students gain confidence in their ability to identify opportunities and suggest alternatives that create value in the future.

While there are a couple of extra steps beyond the normal classroom case involved in setting up a cross-cultural electronic negotiation experience for your students, we have found that students regularly rate this as one of their most valuable learning experiences. As one student stated in an unsolicited email to one of the authors just before he graduated (one year after the class was completed):

"The cross-cultural negotiation exercise made me feel anxious, excited, worried, hopeful, challenged, interested, confident and yet afraid… all in one exercise. I planned more for that negotiation than I did for any of the other negotiations in class and the results paid off. I learned a lot about myself, from how wrong I could be about cultural ignorance and stereotypes (my negotiation counterpart wasn't even from the other country) to how competitive I get and how easy it is for me to misinterpret others' communications (not to mention thinking that my own words and thoughts were clear when they were not). Thank you for that experience. It felt really real-world. I can honestly say that it was one of the most challenging things I did during my time at University and one of the things that I learned the most from."

As can be seen in this quote, the depth of their analyses and the breadth of their insights often surpass all other negotiation teaching cases we have used. Clearly this is not the only arrow in the thoughtful negotiation professor's quiver, but it is one that consistently hits the bulls-eye for encouraging developmental self-reflection.

REFERENCES

Avruch, K. 2000. Culture and negotiation pedagogy. *Negotiation Journal* 16 (4): 339-346.

Balachandra, L., Crossan, M., Devin, L., Leary, K., and Patton, B. 2005. Improvisation and
teaching negotiation: Developing three essential skills. *Negotiation Journal* 21 (4): 435-
441.

Bazerman, M.H., Curhan, J.R., Moore, D.A., and Valley, K.L. 2000. Negotiation. *Annual Review
of Psychology* 51: 279-314.

Bazerman, M.H. and Neale, M.A. 1991. Negotiator rationality and negotiator cognition: The
interactive roles of prescriptive and descriptive research. *Negotiation Analysis*, P. Young
(Ed.). Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan Press: 109-130.

Bunker, K.A., Kram, K.E., and Ting, S. 2002. The young and the clueless. *Harvard Business
Review* December: 80-87.

Casperson, D.M. 2000. Business E-etiquette: How to use electronic communication to turn
prospects into clients. *Office World News* November: 54-55.

Cialdini, R.B. 1993. *Influence: The psychology of persuasion*. New York: William Morrow.

Cohen, J.R. 2002. The ethics of respect in negotiation. *Negotiation Journal* 18 (2): 115-120.

Croson, R. T. 1999. Look at me when you say that: An electronic negotiation simulation.
Simulation and Gaming 30 (1): 23-37.

Deutsch, M. 2002. Social psychology's contributions to the study of conflict resolution.
Negotiation Journal 18 (4): 307-320.

Dubrovsky, V.J., Kiesler, S., and Sethna, B.N. 1991. The equalization phenomenon: Status
effects in computer-mediated and face-to-face decision-making groups. *Human-
Computer Interaction* 6: 119-146.

Dutt-Doner, K.M. and Powers, S.M. 2000. The use of electronic communication to develop alternative avenues for classroom discussion. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education* 8(2): 153-172.

Fisher, R., Ury, W., and Patton, B. 1991. *Getting to YES: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. 2nd ed. New York: Penguin Books.

Goldberg, S. 1999. Les Florets. *Dispute Resolution Research Center*, Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University.

Halyard, R.A. and Pridmore, B.M. 2000. Changes in teaching in learning – The role of new technology. *Journal of College Science Teaching* 29(6): 440-441.

Halpern, J. 2001. Email do's and don'ts. Available at: *http://www.zevgroup.com/email.html*

Hobson, C.A. 1999. E-Negotiations: Creating a framework for online commercial negotiations. *Negotiation Journal* 15 (3): 201-218.

Kahane, D. 2003. Dispute resolution and the politics of cultural generalization. *Negotiation Journal* 19 (1): 5-27.

Kahmi-Stein, L. 2000. Looking to the future of TESOL teacher education: Web-based bulletin board discussions in a methods course. *TESOL Quarterly* 34: 423-455.

Kersten, G.E., Koszegi, S.T., and Vetschera, R. 2002. The effects of culture in anonymous negotiations: Experiment in four countries. *Proceedings of the 35th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences.*

Kovach, K.A., Conner, S.J., Livneh, T., Scallan, K.M, and Schwartz, R.L. 2000. Electronic communication in the workplace – Something's got to give. *Business Horizons* July-August: 59-64.

Kurtzberg, T.R., Naquin, C.E., and Belkin, L.Y. 2005. Electronic performance appraisals: The effects of e-mail communication on peer ratings in actual and simulated environments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 98(2): 216-226.

Landry, E.M. 2000. Scrolling around the new organization: The potential for conflict in the on-line environment. *Negotiation Journal* 16 (2): 133-143.

Lempereur, A.P. 2002. Updating negotiation teaching through the use of multimedia tools. Paper presented at the International Association for Conflict Management's 15th Annual Conference, Park City, UT, 2002. Available at http://ssrn.com/abstract=3-5201.

Lewicki, R.J., Saunders, D.M., and Barry, B. 2006. *Negotiation*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

McGinn, K.L. and Wilson, E.J. 2004. How to negotiate successfully online. *Negotiation* March: 3-5.

McKersie, R.B., and Fonstad, N.O. 1997. Teaching negotiation theory and skills over the internet. *Negotiation Journal* 13 (4): 363-368.

Moore, D.A., Kurtzberg, T.R., Thompson, L.L. and Morris, M.W. 1999. Long and short routes to success in electronically mediated negotiations: Group affiliations and good vibrations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 77 (1): 22-43.

Morris, M.W. Email and the schmooze factor. 1999. *Stanford Graduate School of Business Research Reports* [http://www.gsb.stanford.edu/research/reports/1999/morris.html]

Naquin, C.E. and Paulson, G.D. 2003. Online bargaining and interpersonal trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88(1): 113-120.

Paulson, G.D. and Naquin, C.E. 2004. Establishing trust via technology: Long distance practices and pitfalls. *International Negotiation* 9: 229-244.

Shell, R.G. 2001. Bargaining styles and negotiation: The Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode
 Instrument in negotiation training. *Negotiation Journal* 17 (2): 155-174.

Sokolova, M., Szpakowicz, S. and Nastase, V. 2004. Language patterns in text messages of
 electronic negotiations: A preliminary study. *InterNeg Research Papers* INR 05/04.

Thompson, L. and Nadler, J. 2002. Negotiating via information technology: Theory and
 application. *Journal of Social Issues* 58(1): 109-124.

Valley, K.L. 2000. The electronic negotiator. *Harvard Business Review* January-February**:** 16-
 17.

van Kleef, G.A., De Dreu, C.K., and Manstead, A.S. 2004. The interpersonal effects of anger and
 happiness in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 86 (1): 57-76.

Watkins, M. 2001. Principles of persuasion. *Negotiation Journal* 17 (2): 115-137.

Weisband, S. and Atwater, L. 1999. Evaluating self and others in electronic and face-to-face
 groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 84(4): 632-639.

Weiss, J. N. 2005. A view through the bubble: Some insights from teaching negotiation online.
 Negotiation Journal 21 (1): 71-83.