

Using Role-Play in Online Negotiation Teaching

*David Matz & Noam Ebner**

Editors' Note: Matz and Ebner consider the impending collision between teachers' strong desire to use role-play and other simulation exercises, and the rise of online teaching, in which the students may never see each other. Can the advantages of simulation teaching and the advantages of online teaching be brought together to improve both?

Introduction

If there is a trend in higher education in which all arrows point in the same direction, it is the growth of online education. While distance learning has been available, in various forms, for the past 200 years (see Holmberg 2005), the accessibility provided by the Internet has created a boom over the past decade.¹

This trend has not skipped over the fields which most commonly serve as homes for negotiation courses: management and dispute/conflict resolution programs. Business degrees are among the most commonly offered online degrees, and conflict resolution programs are also increasingly going online, in their entirety or through offering individual courses.

Negotiation courses' third natural home, law schools, have so far largely resisted the surge towards online education, primarily due to objections raised by the American Bar Association and other bar associations around the world. But this is changing. With the advent of accredited online law schools in the United States and Australia, and with shifting global trends both in education and in the way

* **David Matz** is a professor in the Graduate Programs in Dispute Resolution at the University of Massachusetts/Boston in Boston, Massachusetts and principal at The Mediation Group in Brookline, Massachusetts. His email address is davidematz@gmail.com. **Noam Ebner** is an assistant professor at the Werner Institute at Creighton University's School of Law, where he chairs the online masters program in Negotiation and Dispute Resolution. His email address is noamebner@creighton.edu.

people view technology, law schools are beginning to offer courses online.

In short, if you are a negotiation teacher and you are not yet teaching online, chances are that you will be. This will be a matter of choice for some, of circumstance for others, and perhaps of downright coercion for a few – but, in any event, it is coming.

For most negotiation teachers, role-play² is a crucial tool. Whether this is due to teachers' association of learning benefits with this method (Ebner and Kovach, *Simulation 2.0*, in this volume), to their appreciation for the motivational benefits associated with it (Druckman and Ebner, *Enhancing Concept Learning*, in this volume), or simply to the fact that this is the way teachers have been doing it for so long, simulations enjoy a reserved table in the restaurant of negotiation course design.

Role-Play – Online? Really?

The centrality of role-play in negotiation pedagogy presents significant challenges when viewed through the perspective of online teaching. Here is a loose framing of some of these challenges:

- **Transferability:** Can negotiating in an online venue prepare students to negotiate at the (real) table? No matter which medium (text, audio, video) is chosen for conducting simulations at-a-distance, aren't the negotiation dynamics inevitably distorted by the medium through which they are conducted (Ebner et al. 2009)?
- **Limited skills-building:** What is the value of a teaching process in which key elements of human interaction, such as personal presence, tone and contextual cues, are diminished if not eliminated? How can we teach students to communicate if many elements of communication are eliminated?
- **Administration:** In the face-to-face classroom, there is nothing simpler than saying "Everybody – grab an Other" and handing each party a sheet of paper. How does one set up simulations at-a-distance, without a great deal of technical know-how and a prohibitive investment of time?
- **Control:** Engaging participants in role-play and maintaining the simulation "bubble" around the exercise is difficult enough in the classroom. How can teachers ensure that students participate in the role-play, take it seriously and dedicate the necessary amount of time and effort to it, when they and the negotiating students are all at a distance from each other?
- **Observation and debrief:** Teachers accustomed to running the "role-play relay" between several simulating groups, observing the negotiation dynamics and elements playing out in each one, and connecting classroom points to very specific

occurrences in the simulations might wonder how, in the online environment, can they observe students' experiences in a way that will allow them to add value by providing guidance, insight and assessment?

These are the primary questions we have heard in thinking about teaching role-plays online. And we would add two more:

- Advantages: Is online teaching of role-plays in some ways *better* than teaching them live?
- Compensation: If some things are lost in online role-play teaching, are there ways to compensate for these losses?

To answer these questions, we did three things. First, we reviewed the literature focused on online teaching in general, and on online teaching of analogous skills (e.g., interviewing.) Second, we interviewed thirteen teachers teaching negotiation online – asking them what they do with regards to role-play, how well it works, and what they would like to do. We rounded this out by holding discussions with several students who have taken part in role-plays in the course of studying negotiation online. Finally, we consulted our own imaginations as teachers, teachers with some experience in the online teaching world. This chapter is a report of our findings.³

Teachers Talk

Many of the insights gained from our interviews with teachers will be incorporated later on. However, at this stage, two important findings regarding teachers should be made:

- 1) Several teachers (around one-fifth of those we spoke to) reported that they did not use simulations when teaching negotiation at a distance – although they would (and do) employ it while teaching similar courses face-to-face. Teachers stressed different reasons for avoiding role-play, reasons mentioned in the questions listed above, with the difficulty of following the role-play and giving feedback topping the list.
- 2) Teachers employ different media for conducting role-plays, as will be discussed below. However, we found that besides the question of “which medium should we use?” teachers had different approaches to the question of “does it *matter* what media we use?” Some teachers chose (or developed) a specific media platform in order to utilize its characteristics for pedagogical goals. For example, some teachers require students to negotiate by email (in order to keep a clear record of the conversation for debrief purposes); others prefer to use discussion forums, so as to enable viewing by a larger group and to allow multiple modes of student input. However, other teachers are indifferent to the communication

method employed, so long as the simulation is completed. From their point of view, choice of method is up to students, and is a matter of convenience and familiarity; students can speak over the phone, communicate by email, or meet in person to negotiate over a cup of coffee if they are fortunate enough to share a locale.

The first finding – that some teachers shy away from using role-plays in courses taught at-a-distance – reinforced our motivation to write this piece. We hope that by providing some answers to the “how” questions, negotiation teachers will be able to choose to incorporate role-plays without concern about distance, or the online environment, hampering use of this method. Moreover, we will go beyond that to suggest some teaching benefits *unique* to online role-play, which might encourage teachers to dedicate time to online role-play – even in blended (online and face-to-face) and face-to-face classes.

The second finding, regarding the range of different media teachers employ, led us to structure this piece according to different types of media. The three primary technology categories that teachers are currently using for conducting role-play are text, audio and video. We have organized the report so that a teacher can review each technology and decide if there is something in it that he/she would like to try. For each technology, we have tried to address each phase of role-play teaching:

- organizing the role-play (distributing the parts, pairing the teams, etc);
- conducting the negotiation;
- evaluation by students of their work;
- evaluation by faculty of student work;
- teaching a class about the role-play;
- evaluating the role-play as a learning experience.

And finally, going beyond the three technology categories, we took a stab at predicting where imagination and technology might be going in teaching role-plays online in the future.

Text-Based Teaching

Many of the teachers we interviewed relied either solely or largely on text when they taught role-plays online. By text they meant email (inside their course management system or through students’ own email), threaded forum posting, instant-messaging, or documents posted online. While some teachers reported using a synchronous method such as a dedicated chat room, most teachers tended to employ asynchronous communication, through email or a dedicated discussion forum thread.

Setting Up

Setting up text-based role-plays is easily done, more easily than neophytes tend to expect. Much as in face-to-face settings, some teachers prefer to decide the pairing up by themselves, and others leave it for students to decide. Students receive their role-play instructions, either via email or via some function of the course management system. Either way allows for giving all students designated as Party A quick access to that party's role information. Teachers might set up a dedicated forum or email list, allowing students playing the same role to discuss issues with each other at the preparation stage (McKersie and Fonstad 1997).

Conducting the Role-Play

The most common criticisms raised regarding the asynchronous, text-based role-play approach are that the players have no experience observing body language, have only a diluted sense of the personality of the Other, and thus only a dim sense of relationship; in short, they miss large parts not only of what is most beneficial, even central, to face-to-face negotiation, but of what is beneficial in live role-plays.

Two students added another dimension. They said that when the course was a hybrid (incorporating both online and face-to-face elements), they found text-based role-plays to be troubling. As they knew the Other from classroom interaction, they found themselves imagining what that person would be thinking and they missed his/her personality. But when the course was solely online, they found that text-based role-play gave them the comfortable opportunity to imagine a full personality for the Other.

Some students have observed that text-based role-playing is not only less intense than live role-playing, but that they tend to multi-task (checking their Facebook accounts while waiting for the Other to respond), causing them to give less thought to the next move. Others have commented conversely, saying that participating in the role-play according to their own schedule allows them to clear time to concentrate. We would observe that the potential for distraction is more likely in synchronous text-based negotiation if scheduling has not taken account of students' home schedules (though this is difficult to do with students in different time zones), and particularly if the teacher is not "present" in some way, observing the simulation's development.

The challenges to relationship posed by the text medium offer teachers two distinct paths; one is to focus on them as content-matter in their own right, opening room for discussion of best practices in real-life e-negotiation situations, and for discussion of the role of relationships in face-to-face negotiating. Some teachers, for example, direct students to focus the first part of the negotiation on

getting acquainted online. They suggest that students introduce themselves, in role, and try and get to know the other through questions. These tactics, or variations on them, might also be useful in real-life online negotiations. Another approach is to try to mitigate these challenges in order to allow students to practice traditional negotiation skills without the online medium getting in the way.⁴ Adopting this approach, teachers might have students introduce themselves (for real, out-of-role), and perhaps exchange pictures of themselves, before initiating the actual role-play; this has the effect of eliminating perceived distance, and of humanizing students playing opposite each other. A couple of teachers noted that they sometimes simply instruct students to ignore the online medium, and picture the role-play as taking place across a table (although they are aware of the difficulties this suggestion poses).⁵

Some argue that there are additional advantages of text role-playing over face-to-face. The latter, in this view, puts *too much* emphasis on the interplay of personalities, diminishing the ability of students to focus on strategy and the use of concepts in action. Some students feel intimidated by (or overly engaged by) the presence of the Other, and thus feel less able to think “on their feet.” Using only text, student learning is enhanced by the asynchronicity, leaving them time to assess the negotiating situation and to formulate a next move.

Some teachers are concerned that live cross-cultural role-play (negotiating with someone who really is from another culture) runs the risk of over-emphasizing cultural stereotyping. In this view, students using such stereotypes can find it more difficult to envision and use the flexibility that we know exists within them. The use of text can mask those characteristics of the Other that might give rise to such stereotyping, and thus enable the student to focus only on the negotiating behavior itself, not on his/her own cultural expectations. (Students have asserted the same masking effect even when negotiating within one culture, reducing dynamics such as bias and intimidation.) Taking this a step further, some students find that by mid-way in a term they know many of their classmates so well that negotiating in new roles is increasingly, and perhaps distortingly, influenced by what they already know about the Other (see Coben, Honeyman, and Press, *Straight Off the Deep End*, in this volume); a text-based role-play can be arranged so that students negotiate anonymously. (For more on the effects of computer-mediated communication in cross-cultural negotiation, see Kersten, Koszegi, and Vetschera 2003.)

A modest further advantage of online role-play teaching is that the professor can modify the instructions during the role-play by sending all students – or all students playing one side – a notice

(e.g., one side's best alternative to a negotiated agreement (BATNA) just declined in value).

Finally, text role-play, as we have mentioned, allows students to practice text-based negotiation, an interaction that is becoming ubiquitous in the real world but is still not given enough attention in negotiation courses. For example, students need to practice the art of asynchronous communication, and be familiar with media effects associated with the scarcity of contextual clues, such as the absence of tone of voice, body language, etc. (Ebner et al. 2009).

Observing Role-Play

The value of teaching role-play via text is pronounced for the process of observing the role-play as it unfolds, and providing input. During the role-play the teacher can tune in to one or both sides; can comment as the role-play evolves, to both sides or one; and other students also can observe the negotiation as it proceeds, and they too can comment. This affords an online approximation of a live fishbowl, with the advantage that the comment can be made public to the whole group or just "whispered" to one negotiator. This online fishbowl, when conducted asynchronously, enjoys additional benefits: students – participants and observers – can carry on conversations on the sidelines, and can relate what is going on in the role-play to reading material (Douglas and Johnson 2008; Douglas and Johnson 2009).

But clearly the most dramatic advantage of teaching role-playing via text is the automatic creation of a full transcript. As this can be reviewed by a participant, by other students, and by the faculty, it enhances precision in reflection. Its presence eliminates the problem of faulty memory inherent in reviewing live role-plays.⁶ The transcript introduces the need for a fundamentally new skill for teachers: learning, and teaching students, how to learn from a transcript. This will begin with helping students recognize in print the negotiating ideas taught in class, or via the reading, prior to the role-play. It will also need to focus on their absence. It will provide the opportunity to focus on interactivity: how did each student respond to the move of the other. One professor asks students to identify in the transcript emotionally significant moments that made a difference in how things proceeded. Another gives a list of terms, asking students to identify sentences or message interchanges exemplifying these terms. The transcript will enable a teacher to call attention to patterns of behavior over time, by either the student or the Other. It also will provide fine grist for a final paper. Transcript analysis is, however, very time-consuming for the student and the teacher, so scheduling needs to be done with care.

Debriefing of a text role-play can be done in many ways, including:

- A threaded discussion, where all students discuss their own experience with it, or all discuss one example selected by the teacher. The focus for this can be one transcript. It might also be a PowerPoint created by a student acting as observer and note taker in a text-based role-play.
- A written assignment in which students comment on their own negotiation transcripts, or those of others, relating interactions to specific negotiation concepts.
- A forum/paper in which students compare two negotiation processes.
- A discussion forum in which the teacher opens thematic discussion threads, each focusing on a different negotiation concept.
- A review by a (rather ambitious) teacher of all text negotiations looking for patterns and characteristic problems or surprises.

Role-Play Online: Audio

Most online courses incorporate some means for real-time audio conversation. This might be part of the course management system, or rely on external software. It might enable a teacher or student to speak to the whole class, the teacher to speak to individual students, individual students to talk to each other, and students to speak in a group. Each of these communication channels is useful for teaching role-play.

Some course management systems incorporate an integral audio or Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) – technologies for delivery of voice communication over the Internet. Familiar examples of freely accessible VoIP applications include Skype and Google Talk. However, as most course management platforms are still text-oriented, many institutions offer teachers use of other software such as webconferencing platforms (e.g, WebEx, WIMBA, Elluminate). Of course, to use audio communication, one is not limited to software platforms provided by the university, or, indeed, to software platforms at all. One can use telephone, VoIP, or other commercial communication systems like ooVoo. Each has advantages: telephone is ubiquitous; Skype is free; ooVoo allows three or more parties to communicate simultaneously.

As discussed below, audio is not usually used as a stand-alone medium for role-play. The teachers we interviewed who use online audio, always combine it with various text elements.

Setting Up

At the organizing and set-up phase of a role-play, the audio feature adds little. Distributing role-play instructions, setting up teams,

handing out roles, and answering questions can all be done just as well or better with text.

Conducting the Role-Play

However, conducting the role-play itself is a different matter; here the audio medium enjoys several important advantages.

Audio communication is almost always synchronous. It privileges those students who are most comfortable in oral interchange, though without each seeing the other there is still some protection for the shy or the anxious. Of course, there are media effects to be anticipated, such as increased contentiousness in contrast to face-to-face interactions (Drolet and Morris 2000), and reduced trust, (Raiffa 1982) perhaps producing a higher rate of impasse outcomes. However, when compared to text interactions, audio enjoys two major advantages. First, it includes voice tone, inflections, and the “music” of voice in general, all of which are the source of many of our conversational inferences, often made without the listener being aware of it (Tannen 1986). In addition, the synchronous conversation, combined with the audio message exchange contributes to a stronger sense of the social presence of the Other. As a result, these media effects will distort less than those encountered in text-based communication, leading to the conclusion that adding audio to the conduct of the role-play goes a long way toward re-introducing the feel of a face-to-face role-play.

An online technique teachers might consider employing would be to combine audio communication with use of a whiteboard (an online shared screen, often found in video- and data-conferencing software, which allows all viewers to view (and in some cases post and even mark up in real time) files such as documents and presentations). It is our experience that when data is presented visually and audibly, the impact is greater than when presented only audibly. Thus if students are taught to use whiteboard to record the pattern of offers and concessions, or to keep a list of the topics being negotiated, the negotiation will be different. The range of these differences is far from clear, but, for example, when engaging in Prisoner’s Dilemma-type simulations, such as PEPULATOR, OIL PRICING, or PASTA WARS students are clearly more competitive when they see the comparative score unfolding on a blackboard than when that visual aid is not used. Similarly, the visual components would allow one-text editing, detail clarification (e.g., including pictures, maps and charts) and increased social presence of the negotiators. One teacher who uses webconferencing for conducting an audio-oriented *facilitation* role-play told us that his students *always* used some of the additional features of the platform – whiteboard, document uploading, etc. – to add a visual component. In a facilitation, of course, “making things visible” comes as

naturally as breathing. Negotiation teachers who have used this report lower rates of student initiated usage. An additional issue to consider in this regard is students' familiarity with the tools at hand. The teacher told us that the degree to which students utilized these visual elements differed, based on their familiarity with the tools – including the degree to which they had read the tutorials provided and conducted trial runs. This would seem to support the suggestion that negotiation teachers should not only point out the visual potentialities of the platform (and perhaps explicitly recommending or assigning their use), but also help those students get accustomed to using them through written or videorecorded tutorials and perhaps a facilitated practice session.

As with any synchronous technique, if the course is fully online there is the likelihood that students will be in different time zones, and if the differences are extreme, scheduling audio conversations can be a hurdle.

Debriefing

The debriefing of traditional face-to-face role-playing ordinarily ignores certain dimensions related to communication, such as: voice, tone, pace and vocabulary. This is because much of our interpretation of such matters is unconscious and because we have no record, other than memory, to refer to. Online audio (so long as it is more advanced than telephone communication) will often have a recording device built in. Thus the students can review their own performance, the teacher can review the record, and the teacher can use all or part of the record in a subsequent class.

Students might be asked to keep a log (including time-stamps) of turning points, emotional outbreaks or any other elements teachers choose to focus on. There is, of course, a history of teachers having students tape-recording their face-to-face negotiations for review; we can now do this in role-play at a distance.

Whatever the method of recording used, teacher review of such records is a very time consuming process, and we are unaware of any readily available software designed to assist in identifying cognitive moves or tonal styles. Creating such software would be a great step forward in helping role-play reviewers focus on previously unattended communication.

A teacher can, however, take one or a few such audio records and play them at the next synchronous class (on- or off-line), stopping and starting, in a kind of post-hoc fishbowl process. In addition, teachers can post recordings of several negotiations online following the simulation, asking students to choose one simulation in which they did not take part, and provide insight and feedback.

And, finally, the ambitious teacher can review all the recordings to see if there are patterns in the ways students are learning the

material or participating in the role-play. This can be valuable as part of a class in that course, and as grounding for teaching the class (and using that role-play) in the future.

Role-Play Online: Video

Video has made its way into face-to-face classrooms in many ways over the past few years. Many teachers show students professionally prepared videos of negotiations, and others have their students videorecord their own role-plays. There is, in addition, very good – if not very easy to use – software that helps the students and teachers assess the videos the students record. However, of the teachers we spoke to, we found no teacher using real-time, interactive video for role-plays on line. Or, to be more exact – while some teachers allow their students to interact through video, and still others wish they had the technical ability to incorporate this method, none of the online teachers assign students to role-play specifically through use of video-conferencing. Four reasons seem to stand out as driving this slow transition to video:

- 1) Some teachers do not feel themselves technologically competent to figure out how to conduct role-plays through this medium, let alone set them up and administer them.
- 2) Some teachers worry that some students will not be technologically adept, causing them to gain less from the simulation as well as placing a burden on the Other and on their teacher.
- 3) Some teachers are very concerned about the lack of direct teacher observation of the interactions in real-time, and feel as if the use of video-conferencing does not allow them the opportunity to provide helpful feedback and input.
- 4) Some teachers commented that the freeware videoconferencing platforms available on the market today are not high-quality, and are not reliable. Conversations get cut off; video comes out unclear or out of synch with audio.

Interestingly, this last concern did not seem to be of primary concern for most teachers regarding video. We will relate to it first, however, as we feel it might now be a secondary concern that will raise its head once some of the other concerns are dispelled.

There is some truth to the quality and reliability concerns; despite everything futurists and dot-coms have been promising for years, the “video phone,” even in its computer version, is far from ubiquitous. This directly affects the average student’s skill and familiarity with the available platforms. True, this might be solved by having universities provide students with access to video-conferencing services using high-end technology, providing good quality and reliability; however, this is still too expensive for most universities.

Moreover, the high-end technology on the market is aimed primarily for conference-room-to-conference-room communication, and does not provide a complete answer for the needs of online education, requiring that students be able to operate from home. Even if universities would purchase comprehensive video-conferencing platforms to be used by students at home, the quality and reliability is then lowered by low-quality end-user hardware (webcams, computer systems) and software (operating systems, webcam and audio drivers, etc.) and by end-users' bandwidth limitations.

As new uses for videoconferencing take root at the personal and small business level (examples related to our field that come to mind are teletherapy, online mediation and telecoaching), the demand for inexpensive, reliable video technology using personal computers should, as with other communications technologies, improve quality, bring down cost and drive solutions to work around bandwidth limitations. When will this happen? Probably soon is a safe, if amorphous, bet.

As we have said, when reliable video is available, some of the concerns regarding online role-play will disappear. Let us discuss some of the top-level concerns raised earlier, and then move on to make suggestions for incorporating the use of video in role-plays.

Teachers' Familiarity and Competence with the Medium

This is, of course, an important concern. It involves both capability (to deal with the medium, conduct the simulation through it, explain it to students, and field any questions they may have) and also, perhaps, identity and image (teaching in an unfamiliar environment is a risky step where the student may be more adept than the teacher.) The good news is, using simple videoconferencing programs (such as Skype or ooVoo) is simpler than many people imagine. Teachers can practice with a friend, or even on their own. One need not be an expert: competence with the basics is good enough. Additionally, there is a decent chance that in any university there is someone in the IT support department who can tutor faculty.

Students' Familiarity and Competence with the Medium

Most online programs are currently text-based; even those that incorporate video are primarily concerned with teacher-student video (pre-recorded or live video-lectures). As a result, even for many students in online programs, video is the "final frontier" of communication. In our experience and that of the one teacher we spoke to who did incorporate videoconferencing in his course, it would seem that providing students with guidance and training is vital. It is unwise to toss students into the water by telling them "download this program, and interact through it." Student

participation is directly related to student preparation for interacting through the medium: provide students with an introduction to the software, a link to its help and frequently asked questions (FAQs) pages; if possible, prepare a tutorial, using a text document, a presentation with screen shots, or a video-recorded tutorial including screen captures. Perhaps one can have someone from the university's instructional design or information technology support departments construct and/or conduct the training.

One concern related to students' skill is the concern that their lack of familiarity with the medium stems from their lack of proper equipment for video-conferencing. Assigning a video-conference role-play might stress economic differences in class or put an unnecessary financial burden on students. This concern is certainly worth considering on a case-to-case basis, particularly when deliberating whether to assign an online role-play to students in a face-to-face class. If students are already studying in an online program, chances are that this concern is minimal.

Lack of Real-Time Feedback

We heard from several teachers that lack of real-time feedback is the primary reason they avoid using video for role-play. On this issue, we would make two comments.

First, the issue of real-time intervention and feedback is an issue of pedagogy and teaching style; many teachers prefer not to intervene even when they are physically able to, and there are many ways of debriefing an exercise that do not include an immediate gathering of the group for discussion. Teachers might use this opportunity of exploring role-play in a new environment to experiment with methods of giving input which they have not previously tried. Teachers who usually observe every phase of a role-play and lead the debrief might experiment with methods for student self-debrief, or peer-debrief. Teachers used to giving immediate feedback might experiment with delayed feedback, given after viewing a recording of the role-play or part of it.

Second, familiarity with video-conferencing software might allow the teacher to choose the platform that is most suited to his or her intervention/debriefing style, as well as to use it in the most beneficial way possible. For example, some platforms allow for three-way video calls, allowing the teacher to be present in real time. In order to reduce the teacher's presence, and its artificial effect on the negotiation, the teacher might let students know that s/he is there, but not turn on a webcam.

Some videoconferencing platforms allow for videorecording and archiving of the entire interaction, forming a video transcript of the negotiation to be debriefed in the ways we have suggested above in the discussion of text-based teaching.

Setting Up

As we have discussed above regarding audio role-plays, video role-plays are best set up through other methods, primarily text. The text material can include a link leading students into the video meeting-room, or a link to the site where the software platform can be downloaded and installed. Instructions and tutorials can also be sent as attachments.

Conducting the Role-Play

Conducting the role-play is of course the phase in which the use of video is most significant. Commercial teleconferencing has reached a level that ordinarily reduces or even eliminates awareness of the intervening technology. But not all the problems are solved. The presence of the camera will influence all but the most self-assured students, though many relax after a while. This sensitivity is enhanced with the awareness that a recording of the interchange may be used by the faculty member later. It will constitute a breakthrough of some significance when the two parties to a negotiation have lunch “together” via video. If the technology is truly flexible (like Skype) then both sides can schedule more than one session as easily as scheduling multiple session phone calls. (Though, again, time zone differences may intrude.)

Debriefing

Video can also be used as a tool for debrief, with students asked to watch others’ negotiations, to compare specific moments or dynamics, etc., as described above regarding use of various types of transcripts. Teachers able to master basic video-editing tools can splice together important moments to show in class, or create a single video clip incorporating scenes from several negotiations (particularly enterprising teachers can incorporate “We Can Work it Out” as background music).

The Future

Though considerable research about the process of negotiation has filled journals and books over the last twenty years, the basic content of negotiation teaching has stayed stable. It may be, however, that this is about to change. One major influence will be the set of conferences of which this publication is a part (see Honeyman and Coben, *Half-Way to a Second Generation*, in this volume). Another may be the impact of online teaching on the process of teaching itself.

Though we have tried to be clear in this chapter about the challenges inherent in online role-play teaching, we have also tried to be clear that for some purposes online is already also better than face-to-face. Now, we would like to describe some learning advantages of teaching role-plays online: coming soon to a computer near you.

The Record

Although audio and video equipment have long given students a chance to hear/see how they “really” perform, and to get around all the issues of working from memory, they have been awkward to use for focused teaching on skills. Online technology may develop to solve this problem.

An online role-play done via audio or video can be recorded by just pressing the buttons on the computer. The quality and reliability of the video is still variable, but there is little doubt that this technology will improve dramatically in the next five years. A role-play done via text, of course, automatically creates a transcript of both sides’ participation, which can be archived, edited or exported, depending which text platform was employed.

There is, however, the question of how to use these records, whether video, audio or text. The old-fashioned way still has value: student (with his/her Other, with other students, with the teacher, with someone unfamiliar with the role-play, etc.) reviews the record and seeks out important insights. Those insights can come from the observer’s own sense of what is important in the record, from the teacher’s agenda of negotiation concepts (e.g., what reframing occurred and how effective was it?), or from a more generic set of foci (e.g., were there turning points? were there messages sent but not received?). These insights can then be shared with the class via the whiteboard or conversion to a PowerPoint slide.

Some computer technology has already been developed in order to help with this task. Video annotation software such as MediaNotes⁷ allows the teacher to specify things to look for, and then allows the student to find those significant moments in the video and to enter comments in the margin (see Williams, Farmer, and Manwaring 2008). The student can send his/her notes to the teacher; the teacher can enter comments on the student’s comments and send them back, etc. Indeed this approach allows teacher-student dialog about both the student’s quality of analysis and the student’s quality of negotiating performance. Though its payoffs are significant, MediaNotes can still be cumbersome to use.

As technology makes it easier to access moments and patterns in the records of the role-plays, questions will arise: What do we want students to focus on? What do we want to highlight? We do have a vocabulary for such effort (e.g., reframing, options) but these tend to focus on specific moments. There is of course great value in such focus, and the field of microteaching has been developed to exploit that. But this approach does not capture that part of the reality of negotiating that involves patterns of behavior, a gestalt, an attitude. How can the record be exploited to explore the creation, destruction, or repair of trust? To consider relationship building in general? If a core idea in our canon has to do with the interaction of collaboration

and distribution, how can we use the record of a role-play to capture that interaction and how it is managed over time? Put another way, a strategy aimed at collaboration will at any given moment have to take into account the past and the future in deciding on the present: can a record be used to help students see how their behavior reflected, well or poorly, this continuum?

In the future, as software develops for measuring variables in human interactions, it might be possible to assess some of these notions. A “trust barometer” might serve to assess parties’ comfort with taking risks on each other’s reciprocal actions; a relationship thermometer might be able to score a party’s attitude towards another and a “cooperation gauge” might measure collaboration. These tools might develop out of existing codings and instruments used in content analysis. In audio records, they may benefit from developments in assessing the psychological state of a speaker based on voice analysis. In video records, software for body language analysis might add yet another layer of meaning.⁸ A technological generation down the line, integration software might be able to compare these three archives of meaning, decoding interactions at a very sophisticated level.

Asynchronicity

Students studying negotiation together at a distance are, in many cases, separated not only by distance but also by time. Many learning activities are structured so that students can access and engage in them at their own convenience – unencumbered by the need to be accessible and dedicated to the course at a specific time or place. This characteristic of asynchronicity is where much of the appeal, and promise, of distance education lies. But it certainly poses challenges to teachers used to classroom teaching. In traditional negotiation courses, perhaps the most “synchronous” activity, the one which is nearly impossible to “make up” by any alternative method is participating in role-plays (indeed, this serves as the justification for many negotiation teachers’ strict class-attendance policies). Does this imply that in teaching at a distance, teachers need to find a method to replicate this synchronicity when conducting role-plays? Or – might there be value in asynchronicity?

In teaching at a distance, teachers can choose between various media, offering different degrees of synchronicity. A streaming video web-cast of two students simulating a negotiation, which the entire class must watch in real-time, might be the most synchronous method, whereas students engaging in a simulation through email exchange is a decidedly asynchronous method.

Classroom teachers of negotiation are familiar with the advantages of synchronous role-play. This tries to simulate the interpersonal interaction of a live negotiation: the multiple cues and clues;

the subtleties of personality; the impact of personality on process and relationship. Perhaps most important, it simulates the task of being able to respond immediately to the last thing the opponent said or did. It thus emphasizes quickness and spontaneity, and it gives a student a feel for his/her own personality when challenged by such immediacy. This immediacy is useful in that it gives a student an insight into him/herself and it gives practice in learning to be responsive quickly.

These elements of spontaneity and quickness are neutralized when the simulation is performed asynchronously. However, teachers might find new potential gains enabled by asynchronous role-play that have remained largely untapped in the traditional classroom role-play. Asynchronicity, inherent in many forms of communication through text (including email, forum posting, document exchange, etc.), gives the respondent an opportunity to think before responding. It separates the stare of the other from the time to consider the right response. And in doing so it can give a student the opportunity to reflect on what has been taught in class, absorbed from the readings (or perhaps do or re-do the readings), and to decide among various alternative moves. Indeed a teacher may exploit this interval between a student receiving an email and sending a response by requiring a journal submission describing the choices the student sees as available and the decision process he/she uses to select among them. The teacher may even respond to the student's journal, all before the student actually does respond to the other. Other students can also make suggestions on tactics, provide additional reading material, or just give moral support. This approach will privilege the cognitive process within the role-playing process. (For suggestions on using these methods and others in online fishbowl simulations, see Douglas and Johnson 2008; Douglas and Johnson 2009.)

A variation on this approach, already used by one of us (Ebner, with Bernie Mayer and Eileen Barker), is a form of microteaching (or of teaching micro-skills) in which the teacher provides the negotiating problem (in this case, reframing) in online text, and asks each student to reframe it. The student then provides a reframe to the teacher, who responds either with critique or rejoinder that provokes yet further reframing. This process can continue for several rounds. Supporting this teaching is a worksheet provided for the student with a checklist of desirable characteristics for a reframe. Similar processes can be conducted for the reflecting component of active listening, or for teaching the use of "I-messages."

The point of this section has been that teaching by asynchronicity has some advantages over teaching role-play live, and that this approach can help a student when he/she later has to negotiate face-to-face. An added benefit of incorporating asynchronicity in teach-

ing is that it is highly transferrable to real-life situations in which negotiations are conducted asynchronously (e.g., email). Teaching asynchronously can thus simulate “real” negotiating by focusing on issues of pacing, messages inferred from pacing, messages one wants to send via pacing, etc.

Of course, one can incorporate asynchronous methods in face-to-face teaching – the method is not absolutely dependent on the online medium. However, asynchronous methods are usually not incorporated into negotiation courses, as they do not mesh naturally with the classroom flow; online teaching presents us with a natural environment in which to conduct such exercises.

Automated Negotiation Opposite

Another approach (which is not, strictly speaking, restricted to online teaching but which is especially suited to it) is the use of automated negotiation Others. By this we mean any application which simulates a human decision-maker, against which a student can negotiate (analogous to playing chess against a computer). The most impressive of these are done with Flash animation: each student is presented with a basic storyline (e.g., buying an antique clock), after which he/she sees an animation in which the other party speaks, presenting the student with an offer, asking a question, etc. The animation then cuts off, and the student is presented with several choices for his/her next move. After clicking one of these, the animation resumes, with the virtual Other responding to the student’s move. The animation continues until another decision point, at which it cuts off again to give the student a chance to choose his/her next move. The negotiation progresses in that fashion. At different points in the animation, or at the end of the negotiation, the animation can advise the student on the wisdom of each move. The teaching core of this approach lies in the choices provided for the student, the subtlety of the differences among them, and the plausibility of the consequences following from each choice.⁹ These animations might be based on general, everyday scenarios for teaching broad concepts, or serve as an easily-accessible interface with more complex concepts (such as those described by Jones 2009).

Of course, this approach can be used in a live classroom, with teachers asking students to respond to vignettes, and continuing to the next connected vignette based on a pre-constructed model.¹⁰ However, whether done through text or through Flash animation, this exercise is particularly suited to the online environment, in which the student interacts with an artifact and not with live counterparts. Like a role-play, this exercise gives a student the chance to practice both negotiation analysis and decision making without the need to cope with the personality/relationship of the other.

Immersive Media

In addition to text, audio and video individually, the online venue offers technology that uses two or all three of these, and allows parties to feel as if they are actually in some “new” place together with their Other. Parties can be immersed in the sensation of being in a meeting with the Other, so much so that they forget they are at a distance at all.

Some corporate boardrooms provide for webconferencing that reaches this level of immersion. Some communication companies promote the use of holograms as a means of projecting not only audio and video, but also some form of physical presence, immersing parties in the sense of being in the same room with each other.

Though it will take a while before home webconferencing equipment reaches this level, an immersive negotiation experience can now be attained by interaction in virtual worlds, such as Second Life. Such “worlds” are really software platforms in which users – represented by on-screen bodies called “avatars” – interact with each other in a 3D environment. Participants can interact, explore, manipulate objects, buy and sell virtual or real-world goods and services and much more. When interacting with others, one can see their avatar’s movements, hand motions and gestures, in addition to speaking with them vocally, and add text as well. This all gives a very powerful sense of being “in” the environment – the multiple-sensory illusion fools the brain into perceiving reality. Even the distractions the environment provides add to this sense – while speaking, one can look around, and see other interactions going on, observe people meeting and talking, or just look at the view.¹¹

Negotiating in this environment, one gets a strong feeling of the social presence of the Other, making this experience, in many ways, a good replica of a face-to-face interaction. However, the opportunities provided by the platform go beyond this. Traditional classroom simulations rely on participants pretending that they are characters in a given scenario – even though everything else about the environment screams otherwise. In the end, it is always students, dressed as students, with equipment that students have, in a classroom of some sort, with a piece of paper in their hand, sitting down and talking. If those students are role-playing a car accident conflict scenario, where is the sound of the crash, the smoking vehicles, the flashing lights, the approaching sirens? In a negotiation between two executives on merging their companies, where is the corporate boardroom, the mahogany table or the pricey suits? In most role-play material, these environmental elements are left out; students are not even asked to imagine them. While we will leave the issue of “how real is too real” for other pieces (see Ebner and Efron 2005; Ebner and Kovach, *Simulation 2.0*, in this volume), clearly, creating a realistic environment will engage students’ minds in the situation to

a higher degree, leading to more natural responses and therefore, arguably, to higher levels of transferability. In the virtual world, one can have the students not only role-play a scenario; the scenario can be created around the students. With a click of the teacher's mouse, students role-playing executives can be clothed in fine apparel and have their hair cut to conform to the corporate style of the day. They will then enter an impressive boardroom, and sit on impressive leather seats around a heavy round table. If the teacher has a teaching assistant handy, he or she could enter (in avatar-form) and serve virtual coffee. With this level of immersion, interactions we are used to seeing in the classroom change noticeably. And, perhaps, topics now taught poorly in face-to-face role-plays, like trust and relationships, can take on levels of reality approaching those of real negotiations. (For more on the issue of authenticity in negotiation learning experiences, see Manwaring, McAdoo, and Cheldelin, *Orientation and Disorientation*, in this volume.)

Of course, there is a learning curve and a technology curve involved in getting students accustomed to interacting in a virtual world – and in getting the teacher accustomed to administering these interactions. However, as we found out, it is easier than one may think – and well worth the effort. (For one discussion of using a virtual world platform for negotiation simulations, see Miglino, Di Ferdinando, Rega, and Benincasa 2007; for another description of training in virtual worlds, see Hax 2009.)

Negotiation Support Systems

As the field of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) expands, many interesting software applications are being developed to assist disputing parties. ODR service providers utilize a wide array of technological platforms, based on communication media ranging from simple, forum-type posting boards to real-time broadband video-conferencing. One way of categorizing these platforms (known as Negotiation Support Systems) is to break them down according to their primary function: some platforms are passive conveyers of information or messages; others are a more active participants in the process. This is a question of system choice and design. The first type includes platforms providing communication means ranging from simple message-exchange forms that provide fields for entering information, complaints and offers which will be conveyed to the other side, to dedicated forums or chat rooms in which parties can meet and exchange information and offers. The latter type are platforms designed to support not only communication but decision-making as well; such software aids parties in comparing offers, analyzing their preferences and making suggestions for optimal solutions (Rule 2002; Ponte and Cavenagh 2005; Koeszegi, Srnka, and Pesendorfer 2006; Ebner 2008).

In essence, these platforms are ready-made training-grounds for negotiation teachers wanting students to conduct role-plays online. As noted, they span the technologies we have surveyed in this chapter. Using them would certainly add a jolt of motivation into the course. Additionally, teachers would not have to invest much time in set up, as the platforms are designed specifically for this type of use. Finally, conducting simulations on such platforms allows students to learn negotiation as well as to expand their familiarity and experience with technological tools which may become regular features of the negotiation field in the future.

Teachers can make contact with service providers, asking for cooperation in running a series of simulations with their students in return for good publicity and perhaps feedback on users' experience with the platform. If not, perhaps a low-cost arrangement could be found. (For a description of how both types of platforms described above can be integrated into a course, see Koszegi and Kersten 2003).

Conclusion

Teaching negotiating role-plays online has obvious disadvantages and some surprising advantages. And predicting how technology will evolve is obviously not a secure pastime. But one bet is a good one: online teaching now, and in the foreseeable future, generally requires teachers to become more precise and more reflective about what they want to teach and what they want students to learn. That, we believe, is undeniably a good thing, and may well be the biggest impact of teaching role-plays, and anything else, online.

Notes

The authors wish to thank the negotiation teachers we interviewed, who shared not only their time and ideas but also their enthusiasm and support as this chapter developed. In addition, our thanks to Melissa Manwaring, whose comments on a draft of the chapter were – as always – extremely valuable and much appreciated.

¹ In a 2006 study of enrollment at universities in the United States conducted by the U.S. Dept. of Education, the university with the largest number of enrolled students was an online university (the University of Phoenix). At 150,000 students, this number was over triple the number of students enrolled at the university in second place on this list (U.S. Dept. of Education 2006). Only three years later, this figure has itself tripled, and the same university is closing in on half a million students at the time of writing (Stern 2009). In addition, ninety-six percent of the largest academic institutions in the United States offer, at least, individual online courses (Sloan 2006). Though it is not easy to be precise, the annual rate of growth

in this area is about twenty to thirty percent. With online education continuing to expand despite the financial crash of 2008, and with the Obama administration considering dedicating hundreds of millions of dollars to fund online course creation at the college level, there is no reason to expect this explosive growth trend to end anytime soon (Sloan 2006; Stearn 2009).

² In this chapter, we use the terms “simulation” and “role-play” as generic references to experiential-learning-type activities commonly labeled “simulations,” “games,” “simulation-games,” and “role-play.” We use the term “role-players” or “participants” to denote participants in an activity who operate in simulated environments based on information and instructions they are given. In the literature on simulation-gaming, there is much discussion of the delineation between different types of activities (such as “role-play,” “simulations,” and “games”), the way they are conducted and the pedagogical implications of each one. Our somewhat irreverent interchanging of the terms is not intended to influence the debate on the way these activities are viewed or conducted, or to detract from the importance of refining understanding regarding each individual type. For in-depth discussions of this issue, see Greenblat (1981), Crookall, Oxford, and Saunders (1987) and Ellington, Fowlie, and Gordon (1998).

³ Some faculty teach role-play fully online; some teach part of it online and part of it live. We have organized this chapter so a teacher can identify tools to be used in any combination he/she wishes.

⁴ For more on the value of relationship building in the specific context of text-based negotiation, see Ebner et al. 2009. For more on the relational elements of teaching negotiation online, see Bhappu et al. 2009.

⁵ In negotiation, when we discuss relationship we often mean trust. And when we say trust we mean one or more of three things. We mean: 1) that the opposite will tell us the truth; 2) that if we share information, strategically or unintentionally, the opposite will not use that sharing to damage or exploit us; or 3) that if we make a deal, the opposite will comply with it.

At first glance face-to-face negotiating would provide the advantage that one can watch the opposite and draw inferences from body language, tone of voice, etc., but this is questionable: students as role-players are not very good actors when it comes to conveying emotions and personality, so the cues we pick up from them may well be misleading. Moreover, as one goal of role-playing for students is to try new approaches to negotiating, the opposite may well be testing out his/her capacity to lie or puff. The other bases from which we create our willingness to trust (reputation, incremental concessions) are not necessarily different in a face-to-face setting than they are in a text setting. Thus a student may draw a more reliable judgment about trust from text-based negotiating because he/she is less likely to be misled by false clues. Overall, however, though building or acting on trust (in one or more of its forms) can be absolutely essential to effective negotiating, it is probably the most difficult aspect to teach. By, in effect, removing trust from focus in a role-play we are presenting an artificial picture of negotiating, one manufactured for teaching purposes.

⁶ For a good discussion of the value of accurate role-play data, see Peppet 2002.

⁷ For more on this software, see <http://w.cali.org/medianotes/features> (last accessed May 18, 2010).

⁸ For one example of the inroads being made in this area, see this report on work done by researchers at the Department of Artificial Intelligence of the Universidad Politécnica de Madrid's School of Computing and Madrid's Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, who have developed an algorithm that is capable of processing video and recognize – and categorize – their facial expressions in real time. <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/02/080223125318.htm> (last accessed May 18, 2010).

⁹ See <http://www.sfhgroup.com/ca/training/online-training/online-negotiation-course.php> for a description and sample of how this works as produced by the Stitt Feld Handy Group of Toronto.

¹⁰ This might also be done in book form, styled similarly to the Choose Your Own Adventure™ series, and assigned to students for out-of-class work. Another mode of low-tech engagement with a scenario can be found on the BeyondIntractability.org website at <http://www.beyondintractability.org/action/essays.jsp?nid=5124> (last accessed May 19, 2010).

¹¹ We are referring to virtual worlds in which people participate, via their on-screen avatars, in interactions including, *inter alia*, casual conversation, commerce and education. Other virtual worlds have central themes such as worlds that are in essence a platform for a MMPORG (a Massively-Multiplayer Online Roleplaying Game) and are less suitable for online teaching; however, there is a lot to be learned in them. Many of the most popular of these, such as World of Warcraft, though focused on raiding and competition with anonymous strangers around the world, also require an emphasis on team building and maintenance. One program (Heavy Rain), brand new at the time of this writing, though not focused on negotiation at all, suggests how – with enough money – one could make a very powerful interactive negotiation simulation. See http://www.heavyrainps3.com/#/en_US/home for their website demonstration. The authors of this note were unable to test this program themselves as all their younger relatives are of the Wii persuasion and Heavy Rain communes at the altar of PlayStation 3.

References

- Bender, T. 2005. Role-playing in online education: A teaching tool to enhance student engagement and sustained learning. *Innovate* 1(4). Available at http://innovateonline.info/pdf/vol1_issue4/Role_Playing_in_Online_Education:A_Teaching_Tool_to_Enhance_Student_Engagement_and_Sustained_Learning.pdf (last accessed May 19, 2010).
- Bhappu, A., N. Ebner, S. Kaufman, and N. Welsh. 2009. The strategic use of online communication technology to facilitate relational development in executive training courses on negotiation. In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Crookall, D., R. Oxford, and D. Saunders. 1987. Towards a reconceptualization of simulation: From representation to reality. *Simulation/Games for Learning* 17(4): 147-170.

- Douglas, K and B. Johnson. 2008. The online mediation fishbowl: Learning about gender and power in mediation. *Journal of the Australasian Law Teachers Association* 1: 95-109.
- Douglas, K. and B. Johnson. 2009. On-line role plays as authentic assessment: Five models to teach professional interventions. *Proceedings of the ATN assessment conference*, edited by J. Milton, C. Hall, J. Lang, G. Allan and M. Nomikoudis. Melbourne, Australia: RMIT University Learning and Teaching Unit.
- Drolet, A. and M. W. Morris. 2000. Rapport in conflict resolution: Accounting for how nonverbal exchange fosters communication on mutually beneficial settlements to mixed motive conflicts. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 36(1): 26-50.
- Ebner, N. 2008. Online dispute resolution: Applications for e-HRM. In *Encyclopedia of Human Resources Information Systems: Challenges in e-HRM*, edited by T. Torres-Coronas and M. Arias-Oliva. Hershey, PA: Idea Group Reference Publishing.
- Ebner, N., A. Bhappu, J. G. Brown, K. K. Kovach, and A. K. Schneider. 2009. You've got agreement: Negoti@ing via email. In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Ellington, H., J. Fowlie, and M. Gordon. 1998. *Using games and simulations in the classroom*. London: Routledge.
- Greenblat, C. S. 1981. Gaming simulations for teaching and training: An overview. In *Principles and practices of gaming-simulation*, edited by C. S. Greenblat and R. D. Duke. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hax, M. 2009. Negotiation training in Second Life. *CNN iReport* [updated November 12, 2009]. Available at <http://www.ireport.com/docs/DOC-356373>. (last accessed May 19, 2010).
- Holmberg, B. 2005. The evolution, principles and practices of distance education. In *Studies and reports from the Center for Distance Learning Research at the Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg*, edited by U. Bernath, F. W. Busch, D. Garz, A. Hanft, T. Hülsmann, B. Moschner, W. D. Scholz, and O. Zawaki-Richter. Oldenburg, Germany: BIS-Verlag, Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg. Available at: <http://www.mde.uni-oldenburg.de/download/asfvolume11eBook.pdf> (last accessed May 19, 2010).
- Jones, G. T. 2009. Designing heuristics: Hybrid computational models for teaching the negotiation of complex contracts. In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Kersten, G. E., S. T. Koszegi, and R. Vetschera. 2002. The effects of culture in computer-mediated negotiations. *Working Paper*: School of Business, Economics, and Computer Science, University of Vienna. Available at http://zsu-schmelz.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/orga/working_papers/OP2002-08.pdf (last accessed May 19, 2010).

- Koeszegi, S. T. and G. E. Kersten. 2003. On-line/off-line: Joint negotiation teaching in Montreal and Vienna. *Group Decision and Negotiation* 12(4): 337-345.
- Koeszegi, S. T., K. J. Srnka, and E. M. Pesendorfer. 2006. Electronic negotiations: A comparison of different support systems. *The Business* 66(4): 441-463.
- McKersie, R. B. and N. O. Fonstad. 1997. Teaching negotiation theory and skills over the internet. *Negotiation Journal* 13(4): 363-368.
- Miglino, O., A. Di Ferdinando, A. Rega, and B. Benincasa. 2007. SISINE: Teaching negotiation through a multiplayer online role playing game. In *Proceedings of the 6th European Conference on e-Learning*. Reading, UK: Academic Conferences Limited.
- Peppet, S. 2002. Teaching negotiation using web-based streaming video. *Negotiation Journal* 18(3): 271-283.
- Ponte, L. and T. Cavenagh. 2005. *Cyberjustice: Online dispute resolution (ODR) for e-commerce*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Raiffa, H. 1982. *The art and science of negotiation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rule, C. 2002. *Online dispute resolution for business: B2B, e-commerce, consumer, employment, insurance, and other commercial conflicts*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tannen, D. 1986. *That's not what I meant: How conversational style makes or breaks relationships*. New York: Random House.
- Williams, G. R., L. C. Farmer, and M. Manwaring. 2008. New technology meets an old teaching challenge: Using digital video recordings, annotation software, and deliberate practice techniques to improve student negotiation skills. *Negotiation Journal* 24(1): 71-87.

