TEACHING NEGOTIATION

FREE REPORT

UNDERSTANDING THE IMPACT OF ROLE-PLAY SIMULATIONS

About the Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School

Widely recognized as the preeminent leader in the field of negotiation and negotiation research, the Program on Negotiation (PON) is an interdisciplinary, multi-university research center based at Harvard Law School. Offering timely executive education programs, teaching negotiation resources, the *Negotiation Briefings* newsletter and *Negotiation* Journal, special community events, and webinars, PON is a one-stop resource for both aspiring and accomplished negotiators.

Our faculty have negotiated peace treaties, brokered multi-billion dollar deals, and hammered out high-stakes agreements around the globe. They are prominent authors, leading researchers, and distinguished professors—many of whom have originated the negotiation strategies used by many of the world's must successful leaders…and they teach at PON's renowned programs:

- Negotiation and Leadership
- Harvard Negotiation Institute Summer Programs
- PON Seminars
- Negotiation Master Class

Learn more or register at pon.harvard.edu/executive-education/

Negotiation Briefings, which serves as the basis for this special report, draws on ideas from leading authorities and scholars in the field of negotiation to help you realize greater success within your team, and with your counterparts, peers and employees.

Learn more or subscribe at pon.harvard.edu/publications/

Table of Contents

Your comprehensive, one-stop resource for negotiation teaching materials

The Teaching Negotiation Resource Center offers a wide range of negotiation resources for teaching, corporate training, mediating, facilitating, and enhancing your own negotiation skills.

Role-Play Simulations

Tried, tested, and true: More than 200 role-play simulations put participants squarely in the action, allowing them to experience hypothetical scenarios and test-drive dispute resolution techniques and strategies.

Videos

Watch and learn: Engaging videos examine key aspects of negotiation and dispute resolution. Many are designed to accompany other Teaching Negotiation Resource Center materials, while others are stand-alone resources.

Plus Case Studies inspired by PON Great Negotiator Award recipients, including Richard Holbrooke, Lakhdar Brahimi, Stuart Eizenstat, George Mitchell, and Charlene Barshefsky.

PROGRAM ON NEGOTIATION
HARVARD LAW SCHOOL

VE RI TAS

For a full list of materials, including detailed descriptions, visit
pon.harvard.edu/store

Shaping the context, meaning, and effectiveness of negotiation simulations: teaching and training insights.

A COMMON QUESTION AMONG NEGOTIATION EDUCATORS who use role-plays or simulations is how "realistic" these exercises should be, and how this affects student learning. For instance, should instructors select simulations that re-create as closely as possible the participants' real-life negotiation contexts and dynamics, such as telecommunications contract simulations with telecommunications contract negotiators and plea bargain negotiations with criminal defense attorneys? Or should they avoid simulations that may seem too close to home?

Familiar contextual reality

Many educational theorists believe that learning is context-dependent. In other words, the nature of a student's learning depends on the context in which the learning takes place. From this perspective, authentic activities—or learning activities that re-create as closely as possible the key dynamics and challenges of real-world activities—are critical to making learning relevant.

But what does it mean to make a negotiation exercise "authentic"? One approach is to select exercises in which the parties, issues, and factual contexts replicate as closely as possible the negotiations with which participants are familiar. This is most easily done with a relatively homogenous participant group- for instance, litigation attorneys, middle-school teachers, environmental activists, financial services sales representatives, or congressional representatives—who are likely to share some common negotiation experiences.

Contextually familiar simulations may help spark motivation, overcome objections about relevance, and—ideally—offer an opportunity to practice and develop skills that can be put to immediate practical use. Moreover, offering participants the opportunity to negotiate simulations contextually relevant to their own lives may assist with "low-road" learning transfer—that is, the triggering of reflexive, semi-automatic responses in conditions sufficiently similar to the learning conditions without the need for mindful application of abstract principles. Examples of teaching for low-road transfer include the use of practice dummies in a cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) class (intended to prepare participants to perform CPR on humans) or moot court exercises in law school (intended to prepare future lawyers to argue effectively in a real court).

While personally relevant simulations may allow students to practice in an authentic and realistic context, however, that very reality may also create a barrier to behavioral change. When simulated negotiations are too factually similar to students' own real-life negotiations, the students may focus so much on the degree to which the simulation is consistent or inconsistent with their own experience (or on "relevant" facts omitted from the simulation) that they miss the deeper learning points (Susskind and Corburn 2000). Moreover, a familiar factual context may trigger familiar assumptions and schemas, causing students to fall into established behavior patterns. One instructor offers a striking example from an extended crisis negotiation simulation in a peace studies workshop. In the heat of the final days in this simulation, one participant reacted as if he were back in the war zone of his home country, blurting out, "When they go for the carrot, you beat them with the stick." (Timura 2004).

Less dramatically, personally relevant simulations may inhibit some learners—whether students in an academic course or professionals in a continuing education workshop—from experimenting with unfamiliar approaches, due to lack of psychological distance, fear of embarrassment in front of peers, and/or strategic concerns. Imagine a joint labor-management training conducted prior to real labor negotiations, for example: participants may be reluctant to engage in a simulation that could reveal strategic information relevant to the real negotiation. In such cases, "pseudo-real" simulations that retain some

of the relevant dynamics but sufficiently alter the factual content and context can be a helpful approach (Ebner and Efron 2005), along with careful cultivation of a safe, constructive learning environment.

In addition, embedding participants solely in contextually familiar simulations may cause them to miss some of the deeper insights of analogical learning. Several recent studies (Nadler et al. 2003; Houde 2007; Moran et al. 2008) have demonstrated the power of analogical learning to help participants extract abstract principles and schemas and to transfer them to new situations (see the article on "Maximizing the Value of Experiential Exercises through Observational and Analogical Learning" elsewhere in this newsletter). While contextually specific training may help prepare participants to negotiate in that particular context, its sole use may not prepare them for high-road transfer—that is, the ability to abstract, understand, and apply general negotiation principles to a different context.

Unfamiliar contextual reality

Another approach to creating contextual reality in a negotiation simulation is to base the simulation as closely as possible on an actual negotiation—for instance, by incorporating aspects of the real factual background, issues, and stakeholder roles—even if that particular type of negotiation is not personally familiar to the students. Business students or executives might, for instance, participate in a simulation based on a real international merger negotiation between automobile manufacturers, even if they have no experience with the automobile industry or with merger negotiations (Weiss 2008). High-school or college students might engage in simulations based directly on historical group conflicts far removed from their personal lives, such as the Peloponnesian War in ancient Greece, the labor-management conflicts during the late-19th-century birth of the U.S. labor movement, or the community conflicts over land, reconciliation, and survival in post-genocide Rwanda. The contextual reality of such simulations can be heightened through the incorporation of primary source materials from the actual negotiations, such as treaties, contracts, personal correspondence, or media reports (Ebner and Efron 2005; Elliot et al 2002).

Few significant real-world negotiations are conducted solely in the space of a typical class or workshop period. To combat the artificiality of classroom times and locations, some instructors encourage students to conduct preliminary and/or full negotiations outside of class (Watkins 2007; Weiss 2008). In addition to freeing up class time for other activities, this gives students an opportunity to experience the realities of various communication media, such as telephone and email, to negotiate relatively free of the time constraints and distractions that typically accompany in-class simulations, and to practice time and process management. Extensive negotiations conducted over days, weeks, or even months also expose students to the realities of "away-from-the-table" moves such as coalition-building (Watkins 2007; Weiss 2008; Susskind et al. 2005).

The use of contextually realistic but unfamiliar simulations can help address some of the risks of familiar simulation contexts described above, such as the potential for students to be distracted by the factual details and the possibility that a familiar context will trigger habitual behaviors. Moreover, reality-based but unfamiliar simulations have the added benefit of helping students better understand the context (e.g. the industry, culture, environment, sources of conflict, and so forth) in which they are set—which may be an additional learning goal for the course (Weiss 2008).

One potential problem with reality-based simulations is that, if participants know the historical outcome, they may simply re-enact what happened. This can make the simulation more of a history or acting lesson than a negotiation exercise. As with contextually familiar simulations, some educators use "pseudo-real" simulations (Ebner and Efron 2005) to address this problem. Using historical and current events, they develop simulations that are realistic enough to be familiar to students and yet different enough that students can concentrate on what could happen rather than what they think is inevitable given past experience. Other educators may refrain from informing students that their simulation is fact-based—or from telling them the historical outcome—until the simulation is over. In some circumstances, simply encouraging students to ignore what really happened and to focus on negotiating the best possible outcome will suffice. When the problem of mechanically re-enacting an outcome can be

avoided, the process of "re-negotiating" an actual historical dispute may lead to insights about the non-inevitability of certain negotiation outcomes, and about the relationships among process, relationship, and outcome.

Attempting to leverage the power of both authentic activity and analogical learning, one instructor advocates for "analogical situated learning," in which students learn through a realistic simulation that is removed from their own past experience. A different approach to bringing unfamiliar contextual reality into the negotiation classroom is to invite real negotiators as guests. In addition to telling "war stories," guests can act as simulation observers, coaches, and participants (Ramus 2003). In one course, the instructor divides his students into teams who interview one of two expert negotiators about his/her perspective, preparation, and strategy. After this preparation, students observe a simulated negotiation between the two experts, both of whom have negotiated similar issues in real life. Here, students learn by acting as consultants and observers rather than as negotiators (Groth and Glevol 2007). The expert negotiators may bring a level of reality to the simulations that students cannot, and empirical research suggests that observation can help students develop behavioral skills more effectively than role-playing alone (Nadler et al. 2003).

Emotional and motivational reality

Content and context are not the only aspects of reality. Human emotions and motivations are another significant factor in "real" negotiations. Although students may want to perform well in classroom exercises in order to salvage their egos or impress their classmates, the motivation and emotions associated with tangible negotiation stakes—whether substantive or interpersonal-may be reduced or missing altogether in simulated negotiations.

Some instructors attempt to generate realistic emotional involvement by using complex, lengthy "mega-simulations"—sometimes taking weeks or months to run. Students can become so invested in the experience and so fully involved in their roles that their psychological and physical experience—the emotions, the stress, the motivation, even the exhaustion—approximates that of parties to a real (non-simulated) negotiation (Weiss 2008). Such an approach may generate both contextual and emotional reality.

Many instructors do not have the time or resources to devote to such intensive simulations, however, and therefore attempt to add doses of "emotional reality" to shorter, more artificial classroom exercises by including real stakes. One such approach is to competitively grade students so that their grade is a factor of how well they perform in negotiations relative to other students (see Moffitt 2004; Volkema 1991) or even how well they negotiate with their instructor (Byrnes 1990). Another is to impose a "player's fee" in which dollar amounts are assigned to each simulation used in the course and students can gain or lose actual money (Volkema 2007). Conceivably, to the extent that the addition of tangible stakes such as grades or money helps generate emotions and/or motivation comparable to those that students might experience in analogous real-world negotiations, this may add an authentic dimension to the exercises. On the other hand, the competitiveness and/or stress such approaches might induce could create an educational liability if they simply trigger old habits learned from past experience and put students on the defensive if they are unsuccessful. If students become too caught up in short-term concerns with winning, they may forfeit opportunities to take risks by experimenting with unfamiliar skills and tactics, and thus have a harder time learning to change their tacit negotiation knowledge (Patton 2000). Putting grades, money, or other tangible resources at stake in student negotiation simulations may also raise ethical concerns (see Lewicki 1991), privilege distributive approaches and short-term gains over value-creating approaches and long-term interests (Moffitt 2004), and perpetuate a dependent student-teacher power dynamic (Schneider and Macfarlane 2003).

Another approach is to attempt to generate particular (and of course real) emotions through artificially structured simulations. For instance, in the French collective bargaining simulation "The Visiting Rooms" (Thomas Guedj, 1998), participants on one side are instructed to use specific inflammatory statements during the negotiation with the express goal of generating (and later analyzing) a realistic emotional response in their counterparts (Lempereur 2004). Daniel Shapiro, co-author of *Beyond Reason: Using Emotions as You Negotiate,* frequently uses exercises designed to elicit particular emotions. During a stylized negotiation exercise at the 2008 World Economic Forum, for instance, he offered a select

group of participants special privileges (such as access to a private room with champagne and gourmet chocolate and the ability to redefine the rules of the exercise) in order to create a status hierarchy. The status hierarchy, in turn, generated powerful emotions (jealousy, anger, pride, guilt, resentment) among the participants. Shapiro focused the debriefing on the effects of these emotions on participants' subsequent negotiation behavior.

Optimally, the emotional component of such exercises will help generate powerful and memorable learning. On the other hand, there is a risk that such exercises do not generate the intended emotions—or that the emotional impact is so powerful that students become angry or upset with the instructor for what they see as an unfairly manipulative exercise—or with each other for behaviors resulting from powerful emotions. Clearly, any exercises intended to generate particular emotions should be very carefully designed and administered.

Some benefits and limitations of artifice

While contextually and/or emotionally realistic simulations carry a number of learning benefits, there are also some benefits in a certain level of artifice in negotiation simulations. Beyond the logistical benefits (for instance, artificially simplified and shortened simulations are easier to run and debrief in a typical class period than many of their more realistic counterparts), intentionally artificial simulations can help promote both analytical and behavioral skills.

A common purpose of stylized negotiation exercises is to highlight certain dynamics and principles in relatively neutral, unfamiliar environment. For example, many instructors use variations of the iterated prisoner's dilemma, such as the Oil Pricing Exercise or the Pepulator Pricing Exercise, to illustrate the tensions between competition and cooperation, between short-term and long-term gains, and between intra- and inter-team negotiations. The artificial context (in which teams of participants set monthly prices for barrels of oil or fictional "pepulators", with a limited set of pricing options and fixed profits based on their competitors' price) helps participants reflect on the process rather than on the facts (see Patton 2000). Another exercise, Parker-Gibson, artificially suppresses numerous potential issues associated with a real estate transaction in order to illustrate the dynamics of single-issue, distributive bargaining (Wheeler 2000).

MIT professor Larry Susskind frequently designs games and simulations to restrict narrative content and assign specified choices in moves to ensure that particular negotiation concepts and skills are learned and developed (Susskind and Corburn 2000). Building on Kurt Lewin's famous phrase that "there is nothing so practical as a good theory," these games are designed to elicit specific negotiation dynamics and thereby illustrate particular aspects of negotiation theory, rather than teaching students anything about the historical, political, or professional context in which the games are set.

Simulations designed to elicit particular dynamics can be particularly conducive to harnessing the power of analogical learning, discussed above. For instance, students who participate in multiple simplified simulations that highlight logrolling opportunities can compare and contrast their experiences, which can help them extract an understanding of logrolling principles (Moran et al. 2008). While such analogical learning is possible with more realistic simulations as well, simulations artificially designed to elicit the relevant dynamic can help students focus on the desired principle, as well as avoiding the distractions of familiar reality and the typical complexity of unfamiliar reality.

In addition to helping highlight particular negotiation dynamics or concepts, artifice can help learners isolate and develop particular behavioral skills. Research in behavioral decision-making shows that many people do not negotiate optimally even when they have an analytic understanding of negotiation's best practices (Bazerman et al. 2000). Simple games and de-contextualized simulations can help break negotiation into isolated concepts, skills, and processes that are practiced until they become new habits, just as musicians practice scales to improve accuracy and dexterity and athletes repeat practice drills. For example, one instructor uses an exercise in which students practice useful phrases in a call and response until these phrases become a comfortable part of the student's response in negotiation discussions (Barkai 2003). Applying research from cognitive psychology, Gerald Williams and Larry Farmer teach negotiation through "deliberate practice," in which students learn through clearly defined and achievable tasks, immediate feedback, error correction, and repetition (Williams et al. 2008). Repeating and recording simulations uses the artifice of multiple tries rather than the one-shot deal of a real negotiation.

Of course, stylized negotiation exercises have their limitations as well—primarily, the flip side of realistic simulations' benefits. Students might object to their lack of relevance, might feel less motivated to participate, and might have difficulty making connections between these exercises and their own real-life negotiations (and thus might struggle to transfer their learning). Moreover, highly artificial simulations do not offer students realistic insights into the context in which they are set and likely will not fully prepare them to grapple with the scope and complexity of real negotiations.

Conclusion

While negotiation students often assume they will learn best from simulations set in a realistic and familiar context, that very familiarity can sometimes create obstacles to learning. Some level of artifice can be helpful in highlighting specific dynamics as well as in helping free students from contextually-triggered habits, emotions, and reactions. Simulations that add the realism of negotiation contexts and/or emotive dimensions of risk and competition, however, can provide authentic learning activities that help students analytically and tacitly develop relevant skills.

At the same time, learning objectives do not necessarily force a choice between reality and artifice. For instance, pseudo-real simulations can blend the benefits and help mitigate the liabilities of using fact and fiction. Analogical situated learning emphasizes the realism of underlying structural elements in negotiation while adding narrative or contextual content that might seem artificial or unfamiliar to the students. And of course, instructors can use a combination of artificial and realistic simulations in order to achieve a range of learning goals. Ultimately, both reality and artifice can be effective in teaching negotiation through simulations, and the appropriate levels and types of each depends on the learning objectives.

By Alexandra Crampton and Melissa Manwaring.

Transforming high-stakes policy negotiations: understanding the impact of role-play simulations.

AT A RECENT MEETING AT SCIENCES PO IN PARIS, scholars and practitioners from a number of countries heard about a very elaborate game in which more than 150 students played the parts of climate change negotiators from all over the world. We watched a video highlighting their intense and emotional interactions on the "last night" before their version of the Copenhagen climate change negotiations came to an end. Some of the students were present; recounting their frustration at not being able to come up with an agreement that would demonstrate to the real climate change negotiators (one of whom was present) what they could have and should have accomplished. The person behind this game, Professor Bruno Latour, had convinced the students that their simulated success might influence subsequent rounds of actual climate negotiations. No wonder they were frustrated.

Ways games can inform and alter high-stakes negotiations

There are various ways games can be used to inform, and even alter, high-stakes policy negotiations. I'm going to describe several of them below, but this only works when the actual negotiators take part in the game in advance of undertaking their own "real life" interactions. I'm not convinced that the results of role-play simulations involving students or other stand-ins will mean much to senior government representatives. I say this for three reasons:

First, real life negotiators are under enormous pressure to "stick to the script" worked out in national capitals before they are sent off to an international venue. Every word in the formal statements they present is carefully measured to satisfy competing constituencies at home. Negotiators do not have the authority to depart from these scripts. Students, on the other hand, are under no such pressure. Even when games provide Confidential Instructions meant to mimic "back-table" demands from various internal constituencies, students don't feel the same pressure that real negotiators feel.

Second, real life negotiators care about their long-term careers. They are less likely to get caught up in the spirit of a last-minute or all-night negotiating session

in which students throw out the rule book in an effort to reward everyone's hard work or show (their teachers) they can reach agreement. Experienced negotiators have been down the same road many times. Larger principles—like national sovereignty and the obligations of the North to assist the nations of the South before asking the developing world to take on more responsibilities—outweigh any short-term considerations or the pressures of the moment.

Finally, particularly articulate and persuasive students can win over a crowd regardless of the (relatively less politically powerful) role they have been assigned. In real-life negotiations, this is much less likely to happen. However creative the agreement might be that students are able to reach at the end of a role-play, it is not likely to be taken seriously by the real-life negotiators in such situations.

Role-play simulations can be used in three ways

First, they can be used to give students a chance to experience situations in which they might someday find themselves, offering a quasi-realistic chance to apply what they have learned in class. When used properly, with the help of skilled instructors, role-play simulations can be very effective educational tools.

Role-play simulations can also be used as part of a research agenda (especially in the negotiation field). In the same way carefully structured laboratory experiments (involving students) are often used to test psychological hypotheses, role-play simulations, run repeatedly with similar sets of players— some of whom are instructed behind-the-scenes to try different negotiating techniques—are being used to determine the efficacy of various negotiating strategies. In my own work, we are using role-play simulations in coastal communities to see whether a particular approach to adaptation planning is likely to change public perceptions about the best ways of responding to climate change risks. (Susskind and Paul, "Winning Public Support for Addressing Climate Change," Solutions Magazine, 2010, pp. 44–48). Role-play simulations work as a research tool when a game creates a context that can be held constant, while carefully instructed (and matched) participants try different negotiation strategies.

The third use of role-play simulations, that I want to focus on in the rest of this piece, is as an intervention tool in real-life negotiations. While there may be some

overlap with the first two uses, interventions of the sort I am about to describe take an enormous amount of work to arrange and are almost always "one-off."

Negotiated rule-making

The United States Environmental Protection Agency decided to experiment with a new way of involving stakeholders in the process of drafting regulations. They called this Negotiated Rule-making or "Reg-Neg." (Phillip Harter, "Negotiating Regulation: A Cure for the Malaise," 71 Georgetown Law Journal, l: 1982). Without going into too much detail, their basic idea was to recruit a cross-section of relevant stakeholders, with the help of a professional mediator, and see if all the parties likely to complain about any new environmental regulation the Agency issued could reach agreement on what they thought the new regulations should require. After a quite a few successful experiments (Jody Freeman and Laura Langbein, "Regulatory Negotiation and the Legitimacy Benefit," New York University Environmental Law Journal, 9 (2000) pp. 60–151), the U.S. Congress decided to change America's Administrative Procedure Act so that negotiated rule making is now a normal option.

Along the way, several of us made a game called Dirty Stuff (downloadable from the PON Clearinghouse) for the participants in each new negotiated rule-making to play the night before their first formal negotiating session. The game takes several hours to play. Participants are asked to begin by reading both General Instructions (that set the stage) and Confidential Instructions (to ensure that they play their assigned role in the same way that "real" participants in that role would proceed). Typically, they are asked to play a role quite different from their real-life role (so no one has to worry that they will inadvertently reveal what they intend to do when the formal negotiations begin the next day). The results are profound. During the debriefings of the Dirty Stuff game, participants almost always note the opportunities for cooperation (and not just competition) they now see on the horizon. During the actual negotiations, I have often heard participants refer to what happened in the game. They do this when they want to gently chide their real-life negotiating partners to work harder to reach a mutually advantageous agreement. The game provides a common language. It allows newcomers to get a sense of what lies ahead, thereby increasing their comfort

level. It hints at a range of possible options that the parties might never discover under normal circumstances, in much the way that Bruno Latour was hoping the Climate Change game would. The key, though, is that the actual negotiators must play the game together and talk together about the results with the help of a trained facilitator.

Learning to find room to maneuver through informal problem-solving

Here's a second example. The participants in a global treaty negotiation concerning Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) were convinced by one of their members to meet before the official opening of their formal talks, to play a game. We had designed a game, called the Global Management of Organochlorines, otherwise known as the Chlorine Game (which can be downloaded from the PON Clearinghouse with the relevant teaching notes) simulating a treaty-making effort a lot like the POPs negotiation. While I was not present at that event, it is my understanding, from talking to several of the participants, that the game helped those unfamiliar with the dynamics of global treaty-negotiation to get their footing. It also made clear that the negotiators, even thought they were under strict orders from their home countries, could find room to maneuver if they shifted into an informal problem-solving mode prior to making formal demands or commitments. (For more on global environmental treaty-making see Lawrence Susskind, Environmental Diplomacy, Oxford University Press, 1995.)

The Consensus Building Institute, the not-for-profit mediating organization in Cambridge, Massachusetts, that I founded twenty years ago, has run role-play simulations for a variety of national and international agencies and organizations preparing to engage in national and global treaty negotiations. (David Plumb, Elizabeth Fierman, and Todd Schenk, "Role-Play Simulations and Managing Climate Change Risks," Cambridge, MA, Consensus Building Institute). In my new book with Shafiqul Islam, entitled, Water Diplomacy, Resources for the Future, 2012, we include four linked games we use each year at the Water Diplomacy Workshop to train senior water professionals so that they can use these games in their countries to help those involved in upcoming transboundary water negotiations approach them in a more collaborative way.

Role-play simulations can be used as a means of intervening in real-life negotiations, but only if they are:

1. crafted in a very realistic way;
2. presented by a skilled instructor who can help the participants reflect on their results together;
3. include both General and Confidential Instructions so that participants feel the strong pressure to stick with the script that they will feel in real life; and
4. invited by the participants in real-life negotiations because those individuals want an opportunity to explore options that might otherwise never get considered.

This article also appeared on the Consensus Building Approach website.

By Lawrence Susskind.

The enduring effects of classic negotiation games: lessons learned from the best-sellers.

WHY ARE SOME NEGOTIATION EXERCISES STILL USED in a great many university classes even twenty years after they were written? In an effort to understand more about the enduring quality of some classic teaching materials, we asked faculty affiliated with PON to explain why they think some role-play simulations remain bestsellers in the Teaching Negotiation Resource Center (TNRC) year after year.

The people we interviewed are faculty who wrote popular cases for very different reasons. Bruce Patton, co-founder of the Harvard Negotiation Project, and one of the authors of *Sally Soprano*, described the most important learning points that students can learn by playing this game in a basic negotiation course. The exercise challenges students to figure out what they can do when their BATNA is weak. It also teaches students to think about the errors people might make in setting their aspirations lower than they need to. Finally, and most important, it helps students in less than an hour explore the essential differences between principled negotiation and positional bargaining.

Lawrence Susskind, co-founder of PON and professor at MIT, wrote two popular multi-party negotiations, *Harborco* and the *World Trade Center* game. He credits *Harborco*'s success to the fact that it approximates a multi-party negotiation that students can play in a very short period of time with scoreable results. It also teaches students how to respond to spoilers and how to deal with blocking coalitions.

Jeswald Salacuse, Professor of Law at the Fletcher School, wrote the *Enco* and *MedLee* simulations for students studying international business negotiation. His purpose was to show students how they can handle the challenges involved in preparing for and carrying out cross-cultural negotiations. These two games highlight the divergent assumptions and perspectives that often arise from cultural differences.

Many of the Teaching Negotiation Resource Center bestsellers underscore discrete teaching lessons that are central to interest-based negotiation. Bruce Patton talks about the importance and difficulty of creating two plausible and coherent, yet clashing viewpoints. "Enduring cases have to tell a persuasive, internally consistent story from each party's point of view. But the two are very much at odds; so, when you read both, you get different 'ah has.'" He emphasized that writing "cases that sing" is not as easy as some people might assume. He attributes the success of the cases he's worked on to a process of rigorous evaluation and revision. A number of interviewees referred to the thoroughness required to write a good teaching game. The designer has to make sure that there are no holes or information that one side knows that the other should not.

Daniel Shapiro, Associate Director of the Harvard Negotiation Project, described some of the classic cases as both accessible and sophisticated. "Some of the classic PON cases, like *Sally Soprano* and *Oil Pricing*, boil very complex dynamics down to essential structures. That is their gift. *Sally Soprano* has an elegant structure that more clearly than any other case raises the critical elements of interest-based negotiation. The participant can immediately see during a debrief what the benefits of interest-based negotiation are over a more adversarial process."

Robert Bordone, Director of the Harvard Negotiation and Mediation Clinical Program, pointed out a pedagogical advantage to an exercise like *Sally Soprano*.

"Since most people don't know anything about opera, they will not be able to fight about content. Instead they'll talk more about behaviors and moves, and not the details of what is right." For his basic negotiation courses, he tries to use exercises that take students out of the context with which they are most familiar. He wants to make sure they focus on skill building and behaviors that work.

Michael Wheeler, Professor of Management Practice at Harvard Business School, discussed his top PON Teaching Negotiation Resource Center sellers *Appleton vs. Baker* and *Tendley Contract*, explaining that classic cases are crisp, but contextually rich, and allow the instructor to extract concrete lessons about the fundamentals of negotiation. In particular, when taught in sequence, Wheeler said, "the instructor can use these two cases as prototypes for comparison and synthesis." One practical consideration is the strict time budget instructors often have to work with. These classic games have rich teachable lessons that can be developed within very strict time constraints.

Jeswald Salacuse credited many cases' enduring popularity to the accompanying teaching notes that offer well-crafted and extensive advice on how to organize class discussions. Similarly, Robert Bordone credited part of *Powerscreen*'s popularity to the optional supplements that the Teaching Negotiation Resource Center provides, like the Seven Element Prep Sheet, that make it easier for instructors to get to the most important lessons and insights that are aiming to convey.

Some interviewees suggested that the exercises listed above might continue to be popular because teachers prefer to keep using the cases they know. As their mastery of the teaching material improves so does the impact they have on their students. When a game or an exercise works well, there is often little incentive to seek out others.

Looking Ahead

Although a number of the Teaching Negotiation Resource Center bestsellers have anchored the teaching of interest-based negotiation thus far, a number of interviewees point to the fact that the field has broadened and deepened rather substantially since the classics games and exercises were written. Many of the most popular cases tend to be used in basic negotiation courses, but now more

schools and training programs want to move on to advanced instruction. New frames for understanding other features of negotiation will require new cases to teach new skills.

Lawrence Susskind described identity- and value-based conflicts as one focus for advanced negotiation instruction. Interests are tradable, but values and identity are not. He asked, "What do you do when the outcome of a dispute resolution effort is not likely to be resolution? Can we teach students how to reconcile conflicting interests when conflicting values are at stake? All the introductory tools we have given them that assume interests can be traded to produce resolution don't apply in a values-based or identity-based context. PON currently has diverse values-based mediation exercises and is developing others.

By Carrie O'Neil.

Author Biographies

Lawrence E. Susskind

Lawrence Susskind joined the faculty of the MIT Department of Urban Studies and Planning in 1971. He teaches negotiation as well as a number of other advanced subjects and runs a research program as Director of the MIT-Harvard Public Disputes Program. He has supervised more than 60 doctoral students who now work around the world in academia, government and the private sector. He is one of the founders and directors of the Program on Negotiation (PON) at Harvard Law School where he is Vice-Chair, Education. Professor Susskind created the Consensus Building Institute (www.cbuilding.org) in 1993 and has been delivering tailored learning and organizational development solutions on a worldwide basis ever since.

Melissa Manwaring

Melissa Manwaring is a lecturer in the Management Division at Babson College, where she has taught negotiation in the graduate program since 2002 and co-developed the inaugural Fast Track MBA (hybrid online / face-to-face) negotiation course in 2008. She also serves as Babson's Director of Institutional Assessment operating as campus-wide director of learning assessment. She has

published a number of negotiation-related articles and book chapters and serves on the editorial board of Negotiation Journal.

Prior to joining Babson full-time, Melissa served as the Director of Curriculum Development at the Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School, where she developed negotiation-related teaching materials, consulted with educators on curriculum design, and co-founded NP@PON, an international, inter-disciplinary negotiation pedagogy initiative. She originally studied negotiation theory at Harvard Law School and was trained as a mediator through the Harvard Mediation Program.

Alexandra Crampton

Dr. Crampton is an Assistant Professor at Marquette University. She received her doctorate in the University of Michigan's Joint Program in Social Work and Social Science in December 2007. Her research examines the meanings and outcomes of domestic and international interventions used to help vulnerable populations. Her dissertation focused on elder mediation pilot projects in the United States and Ghana. Current work includes exploring the ethics, politics, and social practices of "doing good" through professional and informal interventions.

Dr. Crampton has worked in the field of alternative dispute resolution for several years, and was a graduate research fellow in the Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School from 2006–07.

Carrie O'Neil

Carrie O'Neil is a Senior Training Specialist at The Institute for Inclusive Security, where she designs and leads trainings for leaders from civil society, government, and academia and manages the annual colloquium for women peace builders.

Previously, Carrie worked for the Reflecting on Peace Practice Program at CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, convening consultations, researching, and writing about peace building best practices. She holds a master's in public administration in human rights and international conflict resolution from the School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, a master's in education from Harvard Graduate School of Education in Adult Development, and a bachelor's in English from Dartmouth College.

ATTEND an upcoming Executive Education program

Negotiation and Leadership: Dealing with Difficult People and Problems

Designed to accelerate your negotiation capabilities, this three-day offering examines core decision-making challenges, analyzes complex negotiation scenarios, and provides a range of competitive and cooperative negotiation strategies. You will emerge well prepared to achieve better outcomes at the bargaining table, every time.

In-Depth, One-Day Sessions

Groundbreaking ideas, global insights, and innovative strategies — all taught by the experts who literally wrote the book on them.

Harvard Negotiation Institute's Summer Programs

Ranging in duration from two to five days, each program focuses on a critical aspect of negotiation.

- ▶ Negotiation Workshop: Strategies, Tools, and Skills for Success
- ▶ Mediating Disputes
- ▶ Negotiation Workshop: Improving Your Negotiation Effectiveness
- ▶ Intensive Negotiations for Lawyers and Executives
- ▶ Advanced Negotiation: Making Difficult Conversations More Productive
- ▶ Secrets of Successful Deal Making

For an updated listing of programs, including dates and locations, or to download a complete program guide, visit www.pon.harvard.edu.

SUBSCRIBE to *Negotiation Briefings*, the monthly newsletter

Drawing on ideas from leading authorities and scholars in the field of negotiation, this timely publication provides proven strategies and techniques aimed at improving your ability to get deals done, solve problems, preserve relationships, and manage conflict.

To learn more or subscribe, call +1 800-391-8629 (outside the U.S., dial +1 301-528-2676), email negotiation@law.harvard.edu, or visit www.pon.harvard.edu.

EDUCATE yourself and others on key negotiation topics

Access teaching materials and publications in the Teaching Negotiation Resource Center, including role-play simulations, videos, books, periodicals, and case studies. Most materials are designed for use by college faculty, corporate trainers, mediators, and facilitators, as well as individuals who seek to enhance their negotiation skills and knowledge.

To view all teaching materials and publications, visit www.pon.harvard.edu/store.

READ the *Negotiation Journal*

This quarterly publication is committed to the development of better strategies for resolving differences through the give-and-take process of negotiation. *Negotiation Journal*'s eclectic, multidisciplinary approach reinforces its reputation as an invaluable international resource for anyone interested in the practice and analysis of negotiation, mediation, and conflict resolution.

To learn more or subscribe, visit www.pon.harvard.edu/publications/.