



Pop Quiz: Do You Use This Evaluation Method?

*Noam Ebner & Yael Efron**

Editors' Note: Some things should never go out of style. In the midst of an impressive array of new tools, Ebner and Efron argue that there is still a role for a surprisingly basic tool which has been underused in our field. The quiz is a device to which most students have been subjected many times before they take a course in negotiation. Few other tools are so well adapted to the basic educational need to find out quickly if the student "knows" something that has been presented as fact. Surprisingly, however, Ebner and Efron find few teachers of negotiation using this tool. They examine why this might be, and suggest strategies suited to our field.

Introduction

Looking back on our early education, it seems as if a lot of our time was spent taking tests. Tests monitored our progress, decided large portions of our final grades, kept us on our toes, provided us with a chance to shine, and at the same time, induced no small degree of performance-anxiety.

However, this changed noticeably as our educational paths took us through law school and the social sciences, first as students and then as teachers. The predominance of tests rapidly gave way to various forms of written papers, whether they were the specific case/problem-solving papers so common to legal education or more general research papers. While it seems we were always preparing for mid-term or final exams, these were, in fact, exercises in producing the same types of written papers, only under time constraints and with little or no material to support our memories. Rarely, if ever, were we required to sit down and take a *quiz*, as we will define it for the purposes of this chapter.

* **Noam Ebner** is an assistant professor at the Werner Institute at Creighton University's School of Law, where he chairs the online master's program in Negotiation and Dispute Resolution. His email address is noamebner@creighton.edu. **Yael Efron** is the Head of Academic Administration and a law teacher at the Zefat College School of Law in Zefat, Israel. Her email address is yaele.law@gmail.com.

By “quiz” or “test,” we are referring to an assessment tool with the following characteristics:

- Specific questions are asked, specific answers are required;
- The correct answers are predetermined, not affected by students’ opinionating or reasoning;
- The exercise is conducted in a controlled, monitored framework (a classroom or an online quiz area), usually involving a short time-limit.

A quiz, as we regard it, is therefore a written examination of students’ knowledge and understanding, with specific and objective grading criteria. We do not consider the *style* of questions used in it as having an effect on this definition. A quiz might include multiple choice, yes/no, true/false, or short-answer questions. However these are framed, the quiz aims at specific answers – and not general pontificating. Students need to take a stance and give what they consider to be the most precise answer to the question (as opposed to “demonstrating the ability to see both sides,” is generally encouraged in legal education). The answers – whether given in a word or in a couple of sentences – reflect the student’s *understanding* of, and ability to *recall*, specific pieces of knowledge. Alternatively, they demonstrate a student’s ability to *apply*, on the spot, a concept learned in class.

The wider field of education has devoted much discussion to quizzes, examining their contribution to assessment, considering design issues, ensuring reliability and validity, comparing different types of formats (such as multiple choice and true/false) and recommending best practices (see, for example, Frisbie 1973; Oosterhof and Glasnapp 1974; Richardson 1992; Downing 1992; Burton 2005).

However, the literature on negotiation pedagogy does not devote attention to this method, reflecting what seemed to us to be the state of the art in teaching: quizzes are rarely part of the assessment “package” employed by negotiation teachers. In this paper, we will ground this assumption by reviewing a wide range of negotiation courses and teachers, and then discuss some of the reasons which we think underlie this state of affairs. We will then rethink the use of quizzes for assessment, pointing out some of the benefits associated with them, and make some suggestions for how they might be designed and employed.

Surveying the Field: Use of Quizzes for Assessment

In an attempt to uncover whether quizzes are commonly used as an assessment model, we explored several primary sources. The first was Gerald Williams and Joseph Geis’ (2000) survey of negotiation course syllabi, covering twenty negotiation courses in law schools across the United States. While six of those courses listed exams

as an assessment method used in the course, we got the sense that these all referred to “traditional,” essay-answer ADR law exams – e.g., pontificate on a theory, analyze a conflict, reflect on a certain type of performance, or discuss a policy problem – and that none of them incorporated the type of quiz we are discussing in this chapter.

Widening the sample by surveying databanks containing more recent negotiation course syllabi, in legal as well as in non-legal frameworks,¹ we reviewed seventeen additional syllabi. Again, while several syllabi included exams, only one noted use of a *quiz* for assessment.²

These findings held true in a survey we conducted at the third conference of the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching project, in Beijing in 2011. Seeking to update the previous two surveys and present a portrayal of the current state of the art, we asked negotiation teachers to answer a brief questionnaire (see Appendix A), in which they detailed whether they used quizzes for student evaluation in negotiation courses, *when* they administered those quizzes, and what relative weight they granted these in the overall course grade.

Twenty teachers responded to the survey, providing us with the following data:³

- Fourteen teachers (seventy percent of respondents) replied that they never use quizzes at all.
- Of the six teachers (or thirty percent) who reported using quizzes, only one responded that s/he “always” uses quizzes, three “usually” use quizzes and two “sometimes” use quizzes.

We asked teachers whether they employed quizzes as a mid-course method, or as a course-end assessment method. One interesting fact that stood out is that five out of the six quiz-using teachers reported that they used quizzes as a mid-course assessment tool (a couple of these teachers noted that they also used them sometimes as an end-of-course assessment tool). This preference for administering quizzes mid-course might indicate that teachers perceive the quiz as a learning tool, as a formative form of assessment, and as an opportunity to provide students with a “wake-up call” (see Ebner, Efron, and Kovach, *Evaluating Our Evaluation*, in this volume).⁴

Regarding the weight of the overall grade granted to quizzes, the data shows wide variation. Five out of the six teachers awarded between ten to fifty percent of the final grade to quizzes, and one teacher based the *entire* course grade on the quiz.⁵

These findings strengthen the findings we described above, namely, that the large majority of negotiation teachers do not use quizzes. In addition, these findings display how the few teachers who do use quizzes grant them different levels of significance in relation to the overall grade. With three surveys pointing

to these conclusions, we would do well to explore the question of *why* teachers tend to avoid using quizzes for assessment.

Quizzes: Suitable for Evaluating Negotiation Students?

The most clearly articulated objection to using quizzes for evaluation in negotiation courses was voiced by Bruce Patton:

...as an evaluation mechanism for negotiation training, it is vulnerable to the charge that it cannot test anything of central importance to the course. A student's ability to talk about the process of negotiation does not necessarily bear any resemblance to their skills as a negotiator, except to the extent that the test can be designed as negotiation with the grader (Patton 2000: 45).

Patton's opposition to use of the method gives rise to several comments:

First, Patton might be absolutely correct in the context of skills-oriented, outcome-focused negotiation training. However, in the context of a negotiation course in an academic framework, his suggestion ties in to a much wider debate (which in our opinion, ought to be granted more prominence; see Ebner, Efron, and Kovach, *Evaluating our Evaluation*, in this volume) regarding what the goal of a negotiation course should be in the first place. Is it about negotiation practice skills improvement? Theoretical understanding? Personal development? All of the above (as many negotiation teachers would probably answer)? And if the latter, in what ratio?

Second, tests can (and should) be carefully tailored to focus on the course's primary objectives. If a course's objectives include student familiarity with the basic bibliography of the field, a test is an excellent tool for determining students' understanding and retention of the reading material. If they include the ability to recognize and discuss key elements in negotiation, a test can measure this ability quite precisely. If, however, a course's objectives are framed in outcome-terms (e.g., "Students will be able to capitalize on opportunities for joint gain"), tests are not a good measure for evaluation.

Third, Patton's critique of exams would seem to hold equally true for many other methods of evaluation. For example, journal writing, a popular evaluation method (see McAdoo, *Reflective Journal Assignments*, in this volume; Ebner, Efron, and Kovach, *Evaluating our Evaluation*, in this volume), also invites students to discuss negotiation in the abstract, by encouraging students' theoretical introspection, or at best (in a practical sense) – their planning for self improvement.

However, Patton's critique certainly provides us with one clear caveat: If course objectives include improving skills and abilities, and not

only enhanced knowledge and understanding, a test cannot be, on its own, a sufficient assessment tool. It would need to fit in to a more comprehensive array of evaluation methods, tailored to course objectives.

In addition to the challenge of matching quizzes with course objectives, we will suggest three very real considerations which we think affect teachers' choices regarding quizzes.

Quizzes Seem to be at Odds with Course Content

In some perhaps intangible way, there is something about the pinpointed nature of a quiz which does not intuitively match the flowing, perspective taking, polythetic, integrative and inclusive nature of a negotiation course. We teach our students that there is no single recipe, and that there are no magic sentences which will always work. Many teachers shy away from teaching a sequential or chronological model of negotiation, preferring to discuss more generally the elements that are at play (see Ebner and Kamp 2010: 400 at note 12) and to stress the interrelationships between these elements that lead to each negotiation being unique (see Druckman and Ebner 2008; Druckman and Ebner 2010). In this manner, we convey the message that there is no one right way to negotiate, and no do-this/do-that checklist that will always apply. A quiz, by its very nature, is at odds with this approach.

Quizzes are not an Equal-Opportunity Evaluation Method

Some people thrive on quizzes. Others do not; indeed, some students are adversely affected by quizzes to an extreme extent. Test-anxiety is a well-documented condition, discussed at length in the educational literature. Students suffering test-anxiety show lower motivation in class and achieve lower grades on quizzes than other students. This would indicate that using tests for evaluation might have a negative effect on students' classroom experiences as well as on their final grades (see, for example, Hembree 1988; Hancock 2001). In addition, the very nature of a rigidly scheduled, time-constrained exercise (as opposed to a take-home paper or a journal) might not present equal opportunity for success to a student suffering from a headache at the wrong moment.

Quizzes Threaten the Teacher-Student Relationship

Quite simply, many students dislike quizzes. This leads to confrontations with students who view course requirements as negotiable. In turn, this can also diminish a teacher's popularity and affect the evaluation reports submitted by students. Quizzes sometimes foster students' distrust of their teacher, with the former assuming the latter is out to get them, such as by using trick questions.

These are very real issues, all worthy of consideration as teachers deliberate using quizzes. In the following section, we will describe some of the benefits that quizzes offer. This honest scrutiny of quizzes will allow teachers a more comprehensive “rethinking” of the use of this tool – perhaps triggering ideas on how to gain the unique assessment benefits it offers, while avoiding some of the negative issues discussed above.

Assessment Benefits of Quizzes

The first benefit of quizzes is that they can provide an objective measure of a student’s ability to retain and recall knowledge, or apply concepts to concrete examples. While the occasional challenge to the preciseness of one answer, or the acceptability of another, is to be expected (particularly during the first few uses of a particular quiz or question), these are exceptions to a general rule. Students seem to respect the objectivity of the quiz, and even disgruntled students often accept that they were wrong when faced with the correct answer. This benefit suggests that quizzes might serve as a counterbalance in an assessment system containing subjective elements, such as journals or reflective papers.

This same objective nature of the tool also connotes fairness. Nobody feels they are being judged by a measure different than that of any other student. Of course, saying the measure itself is objective and fair does not mean that it eliminates students’ subjective aptitude with the measure. While we have noted the disadvantage this creates for some, such as students suffering from test anxiety, it undeniably gives other students a chance to shine. Students are able to demonstrate their knowledge of a subject, unhampered, for example, by difficulties posed to them by a paper assignment: language issues, poor writing skills, paper-anxiety, word limitations, etc. Once more, the value of incorporating quizzes into an array of methods is obvious.

Anticipation of verification is a powerful motivator for compliance. This fact, well known to negotiators, should also guide teachers regarding how to affect what they cannot control in their courses. The primary example for this relates to students reading the material they are assigned. Quite simply (although we do not have the numbers to back this up), some students do not prepare the reading material, and due to the teacher’s teaching style or their own ability to “wing it,” they escape unsanctioned. This may serve to reinforce this behavior, and to set an example for others. Assigning a quiz on the reading material every so often will ensure that students actually read the material and come prepared for class – resulting in an overall improvement of the in-class learning experience.

Quizzes are also a powerful motivator for review of previously learned material. Students who might write a paper off the top of their heads will stay up late at night studying for a quiz. Whether the motivation is positive (desire to excel) or negative (fear of failure), quizzes do tend to “light a fire” under students.

Assigning a quiz incorporates setting students up for multiple learning opportunities:

- 1) The study or review period, in anticipation of a quiz, is a student-structured, socially-supported learning framework. Students get to apply their own preferences in learning habits and patterns, and can come up with creative study tools. In one recent course, a student invited all of his classmates to take responsibility for one or two topics from a list the teacher prepared, and set up a shared online document which all students could access so as to share their summaries of these topics – and finally, to download a full summary of all topics. Another student set key concepts to music. Quizzes seem to trigger individually effective ways of learning.
- 2) The actual quiz itself can be structured as a learning exercise, including not only questions evoking retain-and-recall skills but also opportunities to *practice application* of particular models or concepts. For example, a quiz could ask: “identify which type of conflict, as categorized by Thompson (2001) – real, false, latent or none – is depicted in the Ugli Orange scenario.” However, even if quizzes are solely focused on knowledge *retrieval*, the quiz itself becomes a study mechanism through which the knowledge which the quiz demands becomes more solidly cemented in students’ minds, as tested through follow-on retention experiments (see Karpicke and Blunt 2011).
- 3) Post-quiz, students not only enhance their knowledge through learning the correct answers to any questions they missed, they can also elicit information regarding areas requiring improvement or study habits to be reconsidered. Quizzes contain elements of formative assessment, particularly if conducted mid-course. The fundamental message (e.g., “Your knowledge level is at seventy-five percent”) is a simple and self-explanatory message. If a student answered all of the questions on one topic correctly, or missed out on a couple of questions regarding another, they can easily map out – in relatively high definition – their areas of strengths and weaknesses. In a more general sense, quizzes can help students identify changes they need to make in their study habits; for example, students sometimes realize that they need to pay more atten-

tion to details and examples in the reading material and not try to get by with just getting the general gist of a chapter.

While quizzes certainly need to be carefully designed, just like any other assessment tool, their grading requires relatively little investment of teachers' time. This compares well with other tools for assessment such as journals, simulation design, reflective papers etc., in which teachers can look forward to many hours of labor once students have submitted their work. A no-discretion multiple choice or true/false quiz can be graded by a computer system, or by a teaching assistant, if these are available; if they are not, and even if the quiz contains some short-answer questions, each quiz can be graded in a couple of minutes – perhaps one-tenth (or less!) of the time it would take to grade a four to five page paper. As opposed to some assignments in which a teacher must consider the number of points to award, or to detract, for individual points a student made or omitted, the gap between “marking” and “grading” of quizzes is bridged in just a few seconds by simple calculation.

Quizzes not only provide students with a clear picture of their standing vis-à-vis the material, the speed at which they can be administered and checked provides teachers with an on-the-spot indication of how things stand with the class. For example, a quiz on the week's assigned reading material gives a very clear and current picture of students' compliance with preparation policies. A quiz towards the end of an important section of the course can indicate to the teacher whether she should move on, or spend another couple of hours of course time on that section's material.

Based on the above, we make the following suggestions:

Mix Your Methods

As we have noted elsewhere (Ebner, Efron, and Kovach, *Evaluating Our Evaluation*, in this volume), assessment should be seen as a series or a system of exercises, and not be dependent on one task. Those exercises should mix objective and subjective methods, formative and summative elements, and be carefully matched to course objectives.

Consider Quizzes

Adding an objective element into student evaluation systems has multiple benefits. Quizzes are the most time-efficient and self-explanatory way to achieve these, and offer other benefits, discussed above, which are unique to this tool.

Be Aware of the Downsides, and Try to Take Advantage of Them

While you do not need to be apologetic, there are advantages to dedicating a few minutes of class time, or a post in a forum, to explaining why you are using a quiz and what you expect. Explain that this allows you to help students pin down specific knowledge and concepts rather than general familiarity, and to focus them on important points in the material. Share that you feel it is only fair to utilize multiple methods of assessment, so that no one feels unfairly disadvantaged by a system that favors a particular type of learner. Pre-empt the issue of test anxiety, saying that this is a familiar condition which many people have to some extent, and try to alleviate it by clarifying that the quiz is a straightforward checkup on their knowledge, or a diagnostic tool for locating improvement areas – not an attempt to trip them up, embarrass them or threaten their grade average. One good way to alleviate the degree of vagueness associated with quizzes, particularly those covering a lot of material, is by providing students with a list of points to concentrate on in their preparation (even if these points are really, in essence, a categorization of the points you covered in the course). This helps students focus on what you consider to be of importance, and reminds them that you really do have their best interests in mind and are not looking to harm them.⁶

Consider Giving More Than One Quiz

This allows for each quiz to be an element in an ongoing formative assessment, and allows the quiz system to provide for accurate assessment by eliminating external factors which sometimes affect quiz preparation and performance. For example, in an introductory course one of us teaches in negotiation and dispute resolution, a final quiz accounts for a quarter of the final grade. To help students prepare themselves for this significant assessment task, two other quizzes (each worth about five percent of the final grade) are given during the course, dispelling any uncertainty or vagueness regarding the nature of a quiz, clarifying the teacher's intent (and trustworthiness), and setting the bar for the level of detail and specificity the teacher expects students to be able to deliver.

What Makes a Good Quiz?

In our experience, and based on discussions with quiz-administering colleagues and with many quiz-taking students, these would seem to be the hallmarks of an effective quiz:

- The quiz mixes recall of knowledge with application of concepts.
- The quiz adheres to the level of detail and precision which teachers expect from students – and have clearly articulated to them.

- The quiz avoids trick questions. There is a world of difference between a question requiring extreme precision, and a question intended at tripping students up.
- The questions are worded with great care, to avoid misunderstanding or seemingly trick questions. Remember to read each question through a *student's* eyes, keeping in mind their experience with jargon, the limited material they have read, and the relative novelty of the subject to them – at least when compared to the understanding and experience of the quiz-writer.

Ask yourself: Is this what you can reasonably expect a student, who has read the material and attended lectures, to understand?

Types of Quizzes

There are many ways to approach formulating exercises that require short answers in a quick-response style. Two differentiations might be kept in mind:

The first differentiation relates to the type of knowledge-demonstration required. Questions can aim at *recalling* specific knowledge, or they can ask students to *recognize* or to *apply* specific concepts.

Another differentiation relates to the answer-providing mode. One simple method is to leave a blank line or three for the student to fill in an answer in their own words. This allows a teacher to measure their students' ability in an unprompted, undistracted way (as opposed to the other methods listed below). However, this also leaves room for ambiguity, and thereby discretion, in determining whether a student's answer is correct or not. In addition, the evaluating process for such an answer takes more time than verifying that a student has ticked the right box. Alternative modes of answer-provision seek to avoid these downsides: true/false, multiple choice, yes/no, etc.

Of course, any issue might be addressed by any type of question, and there is a great deal of personal preference involved in which types of questions teachers use. A quiz can incorporate questions seeking different types of knowledge-demonstration, as well as mix different type of answer-providing modes.⁷ When mixing types of questions, it is important to keep the questionnaire very clear, using bolded text or italics to stress exactly which type of answer the teacher wants, so as to avoid student confusion. Teachers can also provide sample questions and answers for question-types which they feel might potentially confuse students.

Styles of Quizzes

Here are several commonly-encountered forms of quizzes:

- 1) Direct informational questions: These tap into a student's knowledge without setting the question in any context or

against any background. For example: “What does BATNA stand for?”

- 2) Vignettes: The teacher provides a brief snippet of a negotiation scenario, in a sentence or a paragraph, and poses one or more questions asking the students to identify or to apply a concept embedded in the story.
- 3) Simulation-based questions: An expansion of sorts on the vignette style, this style asks questions related to simulations which students have played out in class. The questions do not relate to the way students chose to play their roles, but to the information of the case itself or its structure. This adds in an element of familiarity, and also adds in some assessment of students’ analysis of the simulation as they were preparing for it and conducting it, as well as their attentiveness during debrief.⁸

Each of these styles can be used to evaluate just about anything taught in a negotiation course, from students’ understanding of the reading material to their ability to explain key concepts learned in class.⁹ For a demonstration of how students knowledge of the same basic negotiation concepts can be assessed using each of these styles of quizzes, see Appendix B.

Conclusion:

Quizzes have been a common method of student evaluation for as long as we can recall. Yet in negotiation pedagogy, they seem to have been underutilized. This chapter has suggested several possible reasons for this phenomenon, which have led us to believe that the potential value of this assessment method, for both evaluation and student learning, might not be fully appreciated. We suggest teachers rethink their assumptions regarding quizzes: they are highly beneficial for student assessment, contribute to formative assessment, and add an objective element into the array of assessment methods used in courses. In addition, they are very effective in guiding and encouraging students’ learning.

In order to make best use of quizzes – not only as a means to evaluate students, but as a learning method as well – we have provided several tools for teachers to consider, each a product of our own personal teaching experience. We suggest viewing them as an invitation to create and experiment with different types of quizzes, as teachers explore tailoring this assessment method to their own style. After all, there are many good ways to teach and many ways to learn – but all teaching, and all learning, starts with good questions.

Notes

¹ We identified two data banks, one maintained by the Alternative Dispute Resolution Section of the Association of American Law Schools (available at http://www.law.missouri.edu/aalsadr/DR_syllabi.htm, last accessed March 1, 2012) and another by Harvard's Program on Negotiation Clearinghouse described at http://www.pon.org/catalog/product_info.php?products_id=333, which was maintained until the end of 2011. Due to site renovation, the collection is presently inaccessible, but the Clearinghouse administrators anticipate it will be available again sometime in the future.

² Professor Alvin Goldman, in his Fall 2003 Negotiation Process course at the University of Kentucky College of Law, allotted ten percent of the final grade to a quiz designed to assess the students' comprehension and retention of the course's reading assignments.

³ We should note that this group included a wide and diverse group of participants, teaching negotiation in many different countries, contexts and academic departments (see Ebner, Coben, and Honeyman, *Assessment as Mirror*, in this volume). We checked the data for geographical differences, which might indicate cultural and institutional differences. Ten of the respondents teach in North America, and the other ten from all around the globe. There were no notable correlations between geographical location and use of quizzes; the spread for all responses was proportional.

⁴ Based on our own experience, we suggest that quizzes are a tool which can be employed with relatively little effort by the teacher – this method is particularly suited for mid-course assessment, given the multitude of other tasks the teacher is engaged in at this point in time.

⁵ Interestingly, this teacher, who was the only teacher to report that s/he “usually” uses quizzes as a *final* assessment only, gives students the choice between a final quiz and writing a final paper – and the tool chosen by the student counts for 100 percent of the course's grade.

⁶ Another way to alleviate quiz-anxiety while preserving the opportunity for constant formative assessment, is to use several quizzes throughout the course, but to announce that the lowest quiz score will be dropped and not calculated towards the final grade.

⁷ Indeed, even individual questions can incorporate these different types/elements, such as “True/False + Explain” questions, in which the student must tick a box indicating whether a statement is true or false and in addition add on a sentence or two substantiating their answer; the two parts of the answer are graded separately.

⁸ Of course, there are many other styles in which to conduct quizzes. Other types of content or background might include asking questions on one background case the teacher provides (in the form of a newspaper article, or of role information for a simulation students have not performed in class). Teachers might ask questions relating to videoclips – shown in class in the past, or screened during the quiz (see Manwaring and Kovach, *Using Video Recordings*, in this volume). Other style differentiations have to do with quiz mode or forum: while most teachers prefer the pencil-on-paper mode, quizzes can be conducted on an online platform, in a one-on-one teacher interview, or in a public arena – by asking students to demonstrate their knowledge in front of the class.

⁹ Note that each of these styles can be used with any answer-providing mode the teacher prefers. However, they differ with relation to the type of knowledge demonstrated. While the first is better suited for ask-

ing students to recall knowledge, the second and third are better methods for assessing their ability to apply or identify specific concepts.

References

- Burton, R. 2005. Multiple choice and true/false tests: Myths and misapprehensions. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 30(1): 65-72.
- Cohn, L., R. Howell, K. K. Kovach, A. Lee and H. de Backer 2009. We came, we trained, but did it matter? In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Downing, S. 1992. True-false, alternative-choice, and multiple-choice items. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 11(3): 27-30.
- Druckman, D. and N. Ebner. 2008. Onstage, or behind the scenes? Relative learning benefits of simulation role-play and design. *Simulation & Gaming* 39(4): 465-497.
- Druckman, D. and N. Ebner. 2010. Enhancing concept learning: The simulation design experience. In *Venturing beyond the classroom: Volume 2 in the rethinking negotiation teaching series*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Ebner, N. and Y. Efron. 2009. Moving up: Positional bargaining revisited. In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Ebner, N. and A. Kamp. 2010. Relationship 2.0. In *Venturing beyond the classroom: Volume 2 in the rethinking negotiation teaching series*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Frisbie, D. A. 1973. Multiple choice versus true-false: A comparison of reliabilities and concurrent validities. *Journal of Educational Measurement* 10(4): 297-304.
- Hancock, D. R. 2001. Effects of test anxiety and evaluative threat on students' achievement and motivation. *The Journal of Educational Research* 94(5): 284-290.
- Hembree, R. 1988. Correlates, causes, effects, and treatment of test anxiety. *Review of Educational Research* 58(1): 47-77.
- Karpicke, J. D. and J. R. Blunt. 2011. Retrieval practice produces more learning than elaborative studying with concept mapping. *Science* 331: 772-775.
- Oosterhof, A. C. and D. R. Glasnapp. 1974. Comparative reliabilities and difficulties of the multiple-choice and true-false formats. *The Journal of Experimental Education* 42(34): 62-64.
- Patton, B. M. 2000. On teaching negotiation. In *Teaching negotiation: Ideas and innovations*, edited by M. Wheeler. Cambridge, MA: PON books
- Richardson, R. 1992. The multiple choice true/false question: What does it measure and what could it measure? *Medical Teacher* 14(2-3): 201-204.
- Thompson, L. 2001. *The mind and heart of the negotiator*, 2nd edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Williams, G. and J. Geis, J. 2000. Negotiation skills training in the law school curriculum. In *Teaching negotiation: Ideas and innovations*, edited by Wheeler. Cambridge, MA: PON books.

Appendix A

Survey: Use of Quizzes in Evaluating Student Performance in Negotiation Courses

Noam Ebner & Yael Efron

Could we ask you for 60 seconds (or less!) of your time? Thanks!

- 1) Do you teach **negotiation** courses in **academic settings** (in other words, courses that are fully or primarily negotiation focused, as opposed to more general courses on “Mediation,” “ADR,” etc.)
 - a) Yes
 - b) No

- 2) In these courses, do you use quizzes (including multiple choice, yes/no, true/false, or short-answer, etc. -type exams) as part of your students’ course performance assessment?
 - a) Always
 - b) Usually
 - c) Sometimes
 - d) Never

- 3) Are these quizzes given:
 - a) Mid-course
 - b) At the end of the course
 - c) Both

- 4) What percent of the student’s overall grade do these quizzes account for?

Appendix B

Three Sample Quizzes

In this appendix, we demonstrate how the same negotiation knowledge can be assessed through different quiz styles. For the simulation-based questions, given that this piece is written for an audience of teachers who might each use their own individual material, we will use well-known simulations – *Ugli Orange* and a generic Prisoner’s Dilemma simulation – as well as a simulation introduced in an earlier book in the series, *Moving Up* (Ebner and Efron, 2009).

	Concept	Direct Informational (taps into a student's knowledge without setting the question in any context or against any background)	Vignette (poses one or more questions asking the students to identify or to apply a concept embedded in a story)	Simulation-based (asks questions related to simulations which students have played out in class)
			<i>In question 1-5, assume that you are trying to sell your car. The questions ask you to identify negotiation elements at play in the interactions between you and a potential buyer, your negotiation opposite.</i>	
1	Attribution	In your own words define the Fundamental Attribution Error. Include a short example.	When your opposite called, s/he sounded brusque and kept the call short. At first you were worried that s/he might be a tough, contentious character. On second thought, you realize this might just be _____ at play. a) BATNA b) Attribution c) Options d) Values	In <i>Ugli Orange</i> , both parties assumed that Mr. Cardoza, the South American orange supplier, is a heartless business person who is only in it for the money; he will not be swayed by entreaties to save lives. On second thought, they realize, this might just be _____ at play. a) BATNA b) Attribution c) Options d) Values

<p>2</p>	<p>Positional Bargaining</p>	<p>List three significant differences between positional bargaining and integrative negotiation.</p>	<p>You told the buyer you would sell him the car for \$8,000, and the buyer offered you \$7,000. You told him you would not accept less than \$7,700. This is an example of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Interest-based negotiation b) Positional bargaining c) Integrative problem-solving d) Conflict Avoidance 	<p>After showing him the house, the seller in <i>Moving Up</i> informed the buyer that she would sell it to him for \$215,000. The buyer offered \$160,000. The seller responded that she would not accept less than \$200,000. This is an example of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Interest-based negotiation b) Positional bargaining c) Integrative problem-solving d) Conflict Avoidance
<p>3</p>	<p>ZOPA</p>	<p>What is ZOPA? Is there one in every negotiation?</p>	<p>If the buyer cannot possibly stretch his budget beyond \$9,000, and you have a friend who has assured you that if you want to sell the car for \$7,000, she would definitely take it, the range between \$7-9,000 is called:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Zone of possible agreement b) Dispute resolution spectrum c) Range of alternatives d) Area of value creation 	<p>In <i>Moving Up</i>, the sellers did their math and figured out that there was no way they could sell the house for \$168,000; however, anything above that would be profitable. They estimated that the buyers were able to go up as high as \$178,000. Based on that, the sellers can conclude:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The house will definitely sell b) They should hold out for different sellers

				<p>c) There is a zone of possible agreement</p> <p>d) The buyers are going to play hardball</p>
4	BATNA	Define BATNA, and explain why one party would be interested in learning the other party's BATNA.	<p>When you demanded \$8,000 for the car, the buyer offered \$7,000. You told him you would not accept less than \$7,700. The buyer said he had seen other good cars for sale, the cheapest of which was selling for \$7,000. The buyer is making sure you know that he has a:</p> <p>a) Right to a fair deal</p> <p>b) BATNA</p> <p>c) Zone of possible agreement</p> <p>d) Superior status position</p>	Give an example of each of the parties' BATNA in the <i>Ugli Orange</i> simulation.
5	Trust	List Lewicki's 3 types of trust, and give an example of each.	The potential buyer told you he'd be back with the money the next day. You were wary of this setup, not wanting to turn away other potential clients in the meanwhile, only to find that the buyer had changed his mind. He gave you a \$500 cash advance on the	List the three types of trust we've learned, and demonstrate each using examples from our Prisoner's Dilemma exercise.

			<p>agreed sale price, which he would forfeit if he didn't show up the next day. You agreed to hold the car for him This is an example of:</p> <p>a) Calculus-based trust b) You using your BATNA c) An objective criteria d) Positional bargaining</p>	
			<p><i>In questions 6-9, assume that two countries, Elad and Shkorit, having disputed the territory of Liti for decades, are at the negotiation table in hopes of achieving a peace treaty.</i></p>	
6	Typology of needs	<p>Explain, and give an example of identity-based needs</p>	<p>The lead negotiator for Elad declared "The Eladian flag must fly over Liti forever! My nation is not complete without it!" On the continuum of human needs, this would fall under the category of:</p> <p>a) Identity-based needs b) A need for autonomy c) Survival-related needs</p>	<p>In <i>Ugli Orange</i>, Dr. Jones explained to Dr Roland that she needed to get the oranges as her boss had boasted in front of the entire company board that "Jones has never failed us!" On the continuum of human needs, this would fall under the category of:</p> <p>a) Identity-based needs</p>

			d) Procedural interests	b) A need for autonomy c) Survival-related needs d) Procedural interests
7	Integrative negotiation	Which of these is <i>not</i> a mechanism for expanding the pie in integrative negotiation? a) Logrolling b) Saving costs c) Disclosing Your BATNA d) Exploring differential valuation	The two countries considered a resolution in which Elad would retain sovereignty over the province of Liti, and Shkorit would retain security control in the area so as to cut off weapons being smuggled though Liti to separatists in Shkorit. This is an example of: a) Interdependence-based trust b) Positional bargaining c) A distributive negotiation d) Integrative or interest-based negotiation	The example of two parties negotiating over how to divide up a supply of oranges and reaching a resolution of one party getting to use the peels of all the oranges (to make marmalade) and the other party getting to use the juice of all the oranges (to make orange juice), illustrates: a) Calculus-based trust b) Positional bargaining c) A distributive approach d) Integrative or interest-based approach
8	Options and Alternatives	What is the difference between an option and an alternative?	The lead negotiator for Shkorit announced: "If you do not agree to our demands, we will occupy Liti by force by this time tomorrow!" The negotiator is voicing: a) An alternative b) An option	In the Prisoner's Dilemma game, once communication was allowed, one party suggested to the others: "Why don't we all agree to cooperate for the rest of the game, and we can split the profits?" The party is suggesting:

			c) An objective criterion d) All of the above	a) An alternative b) An option c) An objective criterion d) All of the above
9	Communication skills	Name the five important elements of reflecting/paraphrasing, as discussed in class. _____ _____ _____ _____	The Eladian negotiator responded to the statement above (in question #8) by saying, "We understand that if we do not comply with your requests, you view taking Liti by force as a possible course of action." The Eladian negotiator is: a) Bargaining b) Logrolling c) Reflecting d) Yielding	Dr. Roland listened to Dr. Jones' words, and responded: "So you're telling me that you're facing an outbreak of Rudosen, which infects pregnant women and afflicts their unborn children. You also say that if you don't get the oranges immediately, you are facing thousands of sick or still-born babies." Dr. Roland is: a) Bargaining b) Logrolling c) Reflecting d) Yielding
10	Dual Concern model	In the Dual Concern Model, competition constitutes: a) A low concern with achieving goals and a low concern for the relationship b) A low concern with achieving goals and a high concern	When you agree to forgo a debt owed you by one of your regular clients (without requesting anything in return), which of the strategies in the dual concern model are you exercising? Explain	In the Prisoner's Dilemma game we played, most of the rounds saw most participants defecting. With regards to the Dual Concern Model, this would indicate that participants usually tended to choose a strategy of _____; due to their having _____.

		<p>c) A high concern with achieving goals and a low concern for the relationship</p> <p>d) A high concern with achieving goals and a high concern for the relationship</p>		<p>a) Yielding; a low concern with achieving goals and a low concern for the relationship</p> <p>b) Cooperation; a low concern with achieving goals and a high concern for the relationship</p> <p>c) Competition; a high concern with achieving goals and a low concern for the relationship</p> <p>d) Competition; a high concern with achieving goals and a high concern for the relationship.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

