

COURSE INFORMATION

Effective Negotiating

<u>Instructor:</u>	C. Chet Miller
<u>Office:</u>	325E Melcher Hall
<u>Office Phone:</u>	713-743-2601
<u>E-mail:</u>	chet.miller@bauer.uh.edu
<u>Administrative Assistant:</u>	Sonnie Curry (713-743-4650)

Description and Purpose:

Effective negotiating is crucial for success in any managerial, leadership, or professional role. For some roles, formal negotiations are required in order to create durable agreements such as those seen in sales contracts, strategic alliances, and transfer pricing. For other roles, informal negotiations are more important because differences between/among co-workers, departments, business units, and organizations must be bridged through influence rather than formal authority.

The negotiations course is focused on concepts, tools, and techniques that can be used to create effective formal and informal agreements. Fundamental challenges of distributive (i.e., competitive) and integrative (i.e., cooperative) negotiating are examined, as are issues related to coalition formation, irrational escalation of commitment, and ethics. Attention is also given to issues that can plague bargaining in a culturally diverse environment. In-class exercises are emphasized in order to develop specific skills. At the end of the course, each class member should be able to better diagnose negotiation situations and adopt effective strategies and tactics for those situations.

Reading Materials

Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement without Giving In (available from the UH bookstore)

Negotiations Readings Packet (available through UH electronic library resources)

Negotiations Materials Packet (available through Study.Net)

Evaluation System

Participation

Learning in this course occurs primarily through in-class simulations (i.e., exercises). Thus, effective participation in exercises is critical. In order to promote such participation, each class member's energy and contributions will be assessed for most exercises. These assessments will be peer based; i.e., the peer(s) with whom a class member works in a given exercise will provide judgments for that exercise. An example of the rating form to be used in the peer assessments is included in this packet (see Attachment).

Outcomes of negotiation exercises will also be assessed. The quality of the negotiated agreement will be judged by the instructor in light of the goals provided for each exercise.

Effective participation during general class discussion of exercises and readings is also very important (for creating colleague-to-colleague learning and a lively classroom environment). Contributions to these discussions will be assessed by the instructor. Important dimensions of performance are listed below.

- Prudent listening – Are you carefully listening to your colleagues' comments?
- Interaction – Are you demonstrating a willingness to interact with your colleagues?
- Relevance – Are you providing rich insights related to the issues being discussed?
- Understanding – Are you generally enhancing your colleagues' learning experience?

There is an attendance policy. No member of the class may miss more than two class sessions without penalty. Missing more than two class sessions will result in a penalty of one grade level for the course (e.g., a shift from A- to B+) (additional absences will result in additional penalties). If a class member must miss a class session, it is his/her responsibility to notify the instructor at least 24 hours before the relevant session. This policy is crucial for high-quality experiential learning from the exercises and for smooth logistics related to those exercises.

Critiques by Individuals (Two)

For two key negotiation exercises, each member of the class will critique his/her own negotiating strategies/tactics/behaviors as well as those of peers with whom he/she negotiated. In these critiques, the debriefings of the exercises as well as concepts and frameworks found in our readings will provide the evaluation criteria. Rich use of the debriefing material as well as the relevant outside reading material will be critical for success in these important assignments.

The first critique assignment will involve the negotiation focused on acquiring rights for a television show. The negotiation will take place on February 15th and the critiques will be due on February 29th. The second critique assignment will involve the negotiation focused on an airline acquisition. This negotiation will take place on March 28th and the critiques will be due on April 11th.

The critiques should be no more than 1800 words (approximately three single-spaced pages in length (based on one-inch margins and 12 point Times-Roman font or equivalent)). Tables, figures, and appendices do not count against the page limit.

Critiques by Teams (One)

As part of bringing together various elements of the course, negotiating teams will offer critiques based on an end-of-semester negotiation. Further instructions for this project will be delivered at the time of the negotiation. The due date is May 2nd.

Total Potential Points:

Participation	100 points (33.3 points for each of three components)
Individual Critique 1	100 points
Individual Critique 2	100 points
Team Critique	100 points

	400 points

The final grade will be based on the following scheme:

A	93-100%
A-	90-92%
B+	87-89%
B	83-86%
B-	80-82%
C+	77-79%
C	73-76%
C-	70-72%
D	60-69%
F	00-59%

Administrative Details

While I fully intend to follow the roadmap delivered through this course document, I do reserve the right to make any changes that might enhance our collective learning experience.

I do not anticipate any issues with academic honesty. Such issues are rare among graduate students at quality schools. Even so, I will remind everyone that UH has a strong policy governing honesty (see the Student Handbook).

I will make reasonable accommodations for any students with documented disabilities.

In order to maintain a level playing field for all members of the class, I will penalize late written assignments.

Course Schedule and Assignments

<u>Session</u>	<u>Readings</u>	<u>Exercises</u>
January 25 (1) <i>(Fundamentals of Negotiating)</i>	Selecting a Strategy (Lewicki et al., 1996, <i>Think Before You Speak</i>) The Negotiation Checklist (Simons & Tripp, 1997, <i>Cornell Administrative Quarterly</i>)	Recruitment of a New Employee Sale of a Wind Energy Unit
February 1 (2) <i>(Distributive Negotiating)</i>	Strategy and Tactics of Distributive Bargaining (Lewicki et al., 2010, <i>Negotiation</i>)	Intra-firm Technology Transfer
February 8 (3) <i>(Integrative Negotiating)</i>	Don't Bargain Over Positions (Fisher et al., 2011, <i>Getting to Yes</i>) Separate the People from the Problem (Fisher et al., 2011, <i>Getting to Yes</i>) Focus on Interests, Not Positions (Fisher et al., 2011, <i>Getting to Yes</i>)	Real-estate Development
February 15 (4) <i>(Advanced Integration)</i>	Invent Options for Mutual Gain (Fisher et al., 2011, <i>Getting to Yes</i>) Insist on Using Objective Criteria (Fisher et al., 2011, <i>Getting to Yes</i>) Harnessing the Science of Persuasion (Cialdini, 2001, <i>Harvard Business Review</i>)	Rights Acquisition for a TV Show
February 22 (5) <i>(Learning Consolidation Session)</i>	None	None
February 29 (6) <i>(Dynamics of Coalitions)</i>	Multiple Parties, Coalitions, and Teams (Thompson, 2014, <i>Mind and Heart of the Negotiator</i>) Three Keys to Navigating Multiparty Negotiations (Mannix, 2006, <i>Negotiation Newsletter</i>)	Creation of a Deep Water Port
March 7 (7) <i>(Difficult Multi-party Negotiations)</i>	When Winning Is Everything (Malhotra et al., 2008, <i>Harvard Business Review</i>) Negotiating Rationally (Neale & Bazerman, 1992, <i>Academy of Management Executive</i>) Beware Your Counterpart's Biases (Bazerman, 2005, <i>Negotiation Newsletter</i>)	Strategic Alliances
March 21 (8) <i>(Negotiation Issues)</i>	Negotiation ... (Craver, 2005, <i>The Negotiator Magazine</i>) Negotiating with ... (Adler, 2007, <i>MIT Sloan Management Review</i>) Non-verbal Communication and ... (Thompson, 2014, <i>Mind and Heart of the Negotiator</i>)	Real-estate Acquisition
March 28 (9) <i>(Advanced Strategic Negotiating)</i>	What If They Won't Play (Fisher et al., 2011, <i>Getting to Yes</i>) What If They Use Dirty Tricks (Fisher et al., 2011, <i>Getting to Yes</i>) Six Habits of Merely Effective Negotiators (Sebenius, 2001, <i>Harvard Business Review</i>)	Purchase of an Airline
April 4 (10) <i>(Learning Consolidation Session)</i>	None	None
April 11 (11) <i>(Cultural Issues)</i>	Culture and Negotiation (Brett, 2014, <i>Negotiating Globally</i>) Getting to Sí, Ja, Oui, Hai, and Da (Meyer, 2015, <i>Harvard Business Review</i>)	Cultural Challenges
April 18 (12) <i>(Difficult Two-party Negotiations)</i>	What If They Are More Powerful (Fisher et al., 2011, <i>Getting to Yes</i>) Getting Past Yes (Ertel, 2004, <i>Harvard Business Review</i>)	Supplier Relations
April 25 (13) <i>(Negotiating through Action)</i>	Social Dilemmas (Brett, 2014, <i>Negotiating Globally</i>)	Production Choices
May 2 (14) <i>(Learning Consolidation Session and Course Wrap-up)</i>	None	None

ATTACHMENT

EXAMPLE OF PEER ASSESSMENT FORM

MANA 7397

Your Name: _____
Colleague's Name: _____
Exercise Name: _____

The person I am rating was a *teammate/on the other team* (circle one).

Please respond to each of the items that follow using the seven-point scale provided. When making your judgments, do not consider whether you obtained all of the outcomes you wanted at the start of the exercise.

- | | Disagree | Agree |
|--|----------|-------------|
| 1. The individual seemed to be properly prepared. | 1 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 2. The individual made substantive contributions to the conversation. | 1 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 3. The individual paid close attention to the exercise as it unfolded. | 1 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 4. The individual was an active participant in the exercise. | 1 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 5. The individual followed the instructions given in terms of overall approach to negotiating (i.e., used a competitive, distributive approach if asked to do so or used a cooperative, integrative approach if asked to do so). | 1 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 6. I would feel comfortable with this individual as a teammate in a real-world negotiation with much at stake (answer only if the person was a teammate). | 1 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

Comments (optional):

About the Instructor

C. Chet Miller

C.T. Bauer Professor of Organizational Studies

Since working as a shift manager and subsequently completing his graduate studies, Dr. Miller has taught full-time at Baylor University, Wake Forest University, and the University of Houston. At Baylor, he served as Director of the Center for Executive Education. At Wake Forest, he served as Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and as Academic Director for the Executive MBA Program. Dr. Miller is an active member of the Academy of Management and the Strategic Management Society. Awards and honors include: Outstanding Young Researcher Award (Baylor University); Best Research Award (Academy of Management Review); and teaching awards from Wake Forest University, the University of Houston, and Duke University (he has been a guest instructor at Duke).

Dr. Miller has worked with a number of managers and executives. Through management development programs, he has contributed to the advancement of individuals from such organizations as ABB, Bank of America, Krispy Kreme, La Farge, Red Hat, State Farm Insurance, and the United States Postal Service. His focus has been change leadership, strategic visioning, and high-involvement approaches to managing people.

Dr. Miller's published research focuses on the functioning of executive teams, the design of organizational structures and management systems, and the design of strategic decision processes. His work has appeared in *Organization Science*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Academy of Management Executive*, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Journal of Management*, and *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*.