೫ 6 ೫

Using Video Recordings:
A Mirror and a Window on Student Negotiation

*Melissa Manwaring & Kimberlee K. Kovach**

Editors' Note: Technological progress may have made Sergei Eisenstein's and Richard Nixon's methods of recording obsolete, but it is still easy for a teacher to imagine that recording students at work will either become a Herculean endeavor, or somehow intrusive, if not both. This is not necessary. The cost and labor of using videorecordings has declined dramatically in recent years; in many countries, students not only bring the necessary equipment to class with them routinely, but have free access to the necessary software to process the raw recordings. Meanwhile, the nervousness that recording has classically inspired may be declining, as a result of the sheer volume of student-inspired YouTube and other videos made every day. Yet the utility of the recordings has not been diminished by this familiarity. Indeed, it has been enhanced, as well as made more transparent. The authors review a significant variety of the recent research, and place videorecording squarely at the heart of efforts to make assessment more meaningful, more reliable, and more responsive to students' needs.

> "The whole purpose of education is to turn mirrors into windows."
> (Sydney J. Harris)

---

* **Melissa Manwaring** is a lecturer in negotiation and the director of learning assessment at Babson College. Her email address is mmanwaring@babson.edu. **Kimberlee K. Kovach** is the director of the Frank Evans Center for Dispute Resolution and a distinguished lecturer in dispute resolution at South Texas College of Law. Her email is k2kovach@yahoo.com.

Introduction

Experiential learning requires more than just experience. Review and reflection are critical to evaluating our experiences and developing prescriptions for improvement (Kolb and Fry 1975; Brookfield 1990). Yet when performance reviews are simply based on recollections of what happened, data may have been missed or ignored, and memories may be incomplete, inaccurate, biased, and subject to the limitations of first-person perspective (see Bazerman and Chugh 2006). Videorecordings allow a more concrete – and powerful – form of review, or "re-seeing."

Instructors have long used videorecording to help assess student performance in skills-oriented courses, including negotiation and mediation courses (see, e.g., Steinmetz 1983, quoted in Moffitt 2004); Kovach 1996; Bordone 2000; Menkel-Meadow 2000; Peppet 2002; Ferber 2002; Mack et al. 2002; Moffitt 2004; Williams, Farmer, and Manwaring 2008; Patton 2009; Matz and Ebner 2010; Ebner and Kovach, 2010; Fukkink, Trienekens, and Kramer 2011). Video-based assessment offers a number of advantages over the assessment of live performances.[1] An audiovisual record of a negotiation offers participating students, their peers, and their instructor concrete data on which to base their evaluations, as opposed to secondhand descriptions and generalizations (Peppet 2002; Williams, Framer, and Manwaring 2008; Kovach and Ebner 2010; Fukkink, Trienkens, and Kramer 2011). Because the action can be paused or re-played during review, video facilitates careful reflection on the daa (Fukkink, Trienekens, and Kramer 2011). Video also frees students from the burden of trying to "notice" their own negotiation behavior for purposes of later evaluation, and captures dynamics that they may have missed during the actual simulation: for instance, their own body language and expressions, the other party's physical reactions, or (when multiple cameras are used in multiparty negotiations) caucuses in which they did not take part (see Susskind 2007).

When shared with multiple students, a videorecording provides opportunities to elicit differing perceptions and interpretations of the same negotiating behavior (Peppet 2002). It may even shift self-perception for students who see themselves enacting behaviors of which they might not have believed themselves capable (Bordone 2000).

From a logistical standpoint, video-based assessment addresses many of the difficulties involved in assessing live student performances. While an instructor cannot observe multiple simultaneous live simulations, she can observe multiple videorecordings of the same simulations (Kovach 1996). This allows teachers to assign out-of-class assignments in classroom-based courses, saving valuable class time while providing a vehicle for assessment (Ebner and Kovach 2010).

It also facilitates the incorporation of simulation-based assessment in online or distance-based courses (Matz and Ebner 2010; for another approach to overcoming this challenge, see Nelken, *Evaluating Email Negotiation*, in this volume). Moreover, instructors can manage the time commitment involved in observation-based assessment by asking students to preview their videorecordings and direct the instructor's attention to the most relevant or interesting segments.

Along with these benefits, traditional video assessment methods posed significant logistical challenges. In the early days of video assessment, an instructor would typically set up one or more video cameras, often with the assistance of technical professionals (see Kovach 1996; Ebner and Kovach 2010). Many institutions did not (and still may not) have sufficient videocameras to record all students simultaneously, so recording often took place over several sessions. This could be expensive, and required substantial time commitment and organization from the instructor – particularly if the instructor subsequently met with students in person to review and discuss their videorecordings (Kovach 1996).

The advent of digital video and the proliferation of webcams address many of these logistical problems. Videorecording technologies are now much less expensive and more widely accessible than even a decade ago (see Ebner and Kovach 2010). Students – increasingly comfortable with digital and audiovisual technology (Pew Research Center 2010) – can record their own simulations without professional assistance, often using webcams built into their own laptops, smart phones, or tablet computers (Shrosbee 2008; Ebner and Kovach 2010.) The ability to share videos online eliminates the need for manual transfer of videotapes, as well as the need for students and/or instructors to review the videos in person (see Peppet 2002; Williams, Farmer, and Manwaring 2008).

Of course, virtually any technological development creates new challenges even it addresses old ones. The increasing use of student-produced digital video raises issues such as variations in technical comfort and ability, compatibility of the video files with editing and viewing software, and challenges in uploading or transferring video files electronically. In addition, the sheer range of options for capturing and sharing videos may feel overwhelming for some instructors (Shrosbee 2008). Overall, though, digital video makes the logistics of video-based assessment more efficient than in the early days of videotape (see Peppet 2002; Moffitt 2004; Ebner and Kovach 2010).

Beyond the reduced expense and greater efficiency, new technologies and pedagogical techniques offer an increasingly broad array of options for video-based learning and assessment. Video annotation

software, for instance, allows for sophisticated analysis and evaluation of the recorded performance. Numerous video annotation programs allow users to insert written comments directly into a digital video, associating them with particular time codes or segments.[2] Some programs also include the ability to "tag" specific portions of a video by inserting a labeled or coded marker (Williams, Farmer, and Manwaring 2008; Shrosbee 2008). Such technologies are not merely bells and whistles. Beyond encouraging fine-grain, data-driven analysis, the graphic array of tags and comments can help illustrate patterns across the whole negotiation. Depending on how the annotations are labeled, coded, or arranged, for instance, they might highlight frequencies of certain behaviors (e.g., value-claiming moves or active listening), shifts in focus over time (e.g., an initial focus on the relationship followed by a focus on interests and options, or a focus on the substance of the dispute followed by increasingly frequent personal attacks), narrative patterns (e.g., the relative use of inclusive pronouns like "we" and "us" versus "me" and "you"), or relational dynamics (e.g., the degree to which negotiators appear to enact stereotypical gender roles or mirror each other's body language). Such patterns may be harder to notice in a more traditional, linear video review.

The increasing ease with which videos can be manipulated also offers new opportunities for insights regarding the negotiation. Time-lapse techniques – speeding up a video so that an hour of negotiation is compressed into a single minute, for instance – can illustrate macro-dynamics such as group interaction revealed through body language (Rosenberg and Petersen 2008). At the opposite end of the spectrum, dramatically slowing a particular moment – for instance, stretching one second into five, or capturing a series of still shots – might reveal micro-expressions that are too fleeting in real time to be noticeable, but that provide clues to a negotiator's emotional state (see Ekman 2007). A highly focused video review can also reveal changes in vocal tone or language that suggest stress – an indication that a negotiator *might* be lying.[3]

Given the various benefits video review offers, the range of pedagogical applications, and the numerous technological advances in recent years, how might a negotiation instructor think about using student videorecordings as a basis for assessment?

Approaches to Video-based Assessment

Assessment is often characterized as either formative (designed to help the student improve going forward) or summative (to evaluate the student's overall achievement) (Palomba and Banta 1999). As has been suggested in this volume (see Ebner, Efron,

and Kovach, *Evaluating Our Evaluation*), teachers would do well to incorporate both types of assessment in their courses, and videorecorded negotiation performances provide a basis for both.

For formative assessment in particular, the effectiveness of any given assessment approach depends on the purpose. If the pedagogical goal is to improve particular behavioral skills – for instance, a student's ability to respond to difficult tactics – then a reflective journal is not well-aligned for assessing this competency, although the journal may be an excellent basis for assessing the student's analytical skills (see Cohn et al. 2009; Foster and Farquharson 2011). Similarly, while a quiz might assess knowledge retention, it is a less suitable method for assessing the competency of deep analysis (Ebner and Efron, *Pop Quiz*, in this volume). Following are examples of possible purposes for video-based assessment, along with suggestions for assessment approaches that align with these purposes.

Assessing to Develop Self-awareness

One potential purpose for assessing videorecorded student negotiations is to help students develop fuller awareness of their own negotiation behaviors. Due to factors such as inattentional blindness and psychological biases that contribute to bounded awareness, people are unable to consciously notice *all* relevant data in a negotiation – even concrete data about their own behavior (Bazerman and Chugh 2006). Videorecordings can help mitigate these "blind spots." Often, students will notice behaviors of their own in videorecorded negotiations that they had not noticed during the actual negotiation. These might include, for instance, body language (e.g., a rapidly tapping foot, a scowl); behavioral patterns (e.g., hesitation before answering pointed questions, a tendency to mirror the counterpart's posture); or language patterns (e.g., frequent expressions of positive or negative emotions, a preponderance of visual metaphors). As mentioned above, accelerating, slowing, or pausing playback might also reveal dynamics that would have been difficult for anyone to notice in real time.

Self-awareness is not an unqualified virtue. Particularly for students with relatively low self-confidence, highlighting undesirable, previously unconscious behaviors through video feedback can generate self-consciousness and further decrease their confidence (see Karl and Kopf 1993; Hinton and Kramer 1998). At the same time, greater awareness of certain unintentional behaviors may allow students to try to consciously control them, or at least account for them as they try to interpret their counterparts' reactions. Carefully crafted, data-driven feedback may mitigate negative reactions to constructive criticism (Moffitt 2004).

Bearing all this in mind, one approach to assessing videorecorded student negotiations for the purpose of developing self-awareness is self-observation with subsequent instructor feedback. With advance guidance from the instructor on what to look for, students could privately review their own videorecordings, record their observations (for instance, in an informal journal/wiki/blog entry, a more formal written report, or an annotated video), and then submit the video and observations to the instructor for feedback. If the intended purpose is to develop greater self-awareness, then the student observations and instructor feedback should focus on comparing the video data with the student's pre-existing self-image: confirming or disconfirming assumptions, noticing surprises, calibrating impressions, and so forth.

Depending on the point in the course and the learning objective, this assignment might be very open-ended ("What do you notice that surprises you?") or more focused ("To what extent does your body language [posture, gestures, facial expressions, etc.] appear to reinforce or contradict what you say?"). A structured observation form can further focus the review, directing students to attend to certain dynamics such as the types and frequency of questions they ask, or their use of, and response to, silence.

In an alternative approach to guided self-observation, the instructor and student view the video simultaneously, with the instructor offering guidance and feedback during the viewing. This has the benefit of focusing the instructor and student on the same data at the same time, and offering an interactive assessment opportunity. It can also be quite time-consuming, though the time commitment can be managed in part if the student previews the video and selects particular excerpts on which to focus during a simultaneous viewing.

Students could also review the videorecording with their negotiation counterpart(s), in addition to or in lieu of an individual review. Even though video offers the students a quasi-external perspective on their negotiation, it does not eliminate biases such as egocentrism, culturally-based assumptions, or other filters to which the students may have been subject during the negotiation. Accordingly, input from one student regarding his perceptions of his counterpart's actions can offer a fuller picture of what happened. A student reviewing her videorecorded negotiation might comment that she perceives herself as making a particularly assertive offer, yet her counterpart might point out that he did not experience the offer as assertive at all, and that he actually found it more modest than expected. Another student might critique his opening by observing that he moved too abruptly to the substance of the negotiation, without engaging in rapport-building discussion; yet he might rethink this critique after learning that his counterpart appreciated "getting down to business" relatively quickly.

As with the self-review, video review with a counterpart can provide the basis for any number of concrete deliverables. The counterpart review, however, offers students the opportunity to reflect on what surprised them about their counterparts' input – miscommunications, assumptions, discrepancies between intent and impact, and so forth – in addition to what surprised them about their own review of the video.

Perspectives from classmates who did not participate in a particular negotiation can also help develop a negotiator's self-awareness by offering insight into how the negotiator appears to others. Third-party peer feedback may be quite intimate – for instance, via a third-party student "coach" who observes a negotiation exercise and offers extensive individualized feedback (see Bordone 2000). It might also be incorporated at a much larger scale. A number of instructors have shared videos of student negotiations with the entire class, either by playing the videos during a class session or by making them available online (see, e.g., Peppet 2002).

Whether third-party feedback on a negotiator's behavior reinforces, contradicts, or simply expands on the counterpart's feedback, it offers the negotiator additional data on which to base his self-understanding. Moreover, viewing and discussing a recorded negotiation between peers can help develop the *viewers'* self-awareness offering the viewers the opportunity to compare their own behaviors and interpretations with alternatives, and possibly reassuring them that others share their challenges (Peppet 2002).

Regardless of the specific video-based approach to developing negotiator self-awareness, some sort of focus and structure is essential. Merely watching a videorecorded negotiation – whether of oneself or of one's peers – appears to be of limited benefit (see e.g., Hinton and Kramer 1998, finding that self-directed observation of videorecorded speeches had little impact on future performance). Several researchers have concluded that structured self-observation – that is, observation based on some sort of model, or set of guidelines – is much more effective than unstructured self-observation (see, e.g., Karl and Kopf 1993; Fukkink, Trienekens, and Kramer 2011). A structured observation form may be used for self- or peer- assessment, for instance (see McEnrue 2002; Mack et al. 2002). Others have highlighted the role of a trained guide – such as a classroom instructor, a teaching assistant, or a professional consultant – in providing focus and structure to a video review. Carrie Menkel-Meadow (2000), for instance, discusses how a skilled instructor can elicit observations regarding gender in a classroom debriefing of a student negotiation video; and Robert Bordone (2000) emphasizes the importance of using professional consultants and trained teaching assistants in a video-based

skills development exercise, as this training helps them get to the heart of student challenges both rigorously and compassionately.

Assessing to Develop Analytical Ability

In addition to helping students develop deeper self-awareness regarding their negotiation behaviors and the impressions these behaviors might create, videorecorded negotiations also provide a basis for developing and assessing students' analytical ability. A student's analysis of his (or his classmates') negotiation video might not only demonstrate the student's understanding of particular concepts such as anchoring, value creation, active listening, or coalition-building, but also his ability to recognize how those concepts manifest themselves dynamically in a particular negotiation context. This distinguishes video analysis from other, more traditional analytical assessment methods such as essays and written exams. Beyond simply identifying concepts and dynamics, students might also be asked to diagnose particular challenges, detect apparent gaps between intent and impact, evaluate the merits of particular strategies or tactics, or develop recommendations for what they or others might have done differently (see Moffitt 2004). For multi-party negotiations, video even offers students the opportunity to review and analyze caucuses in which they did not take part (see Susskind 2007), giving them a more comprehensive understanding of multi-party dynamics.

Video-based analytical work products can take any number of forms. An informal oral analysis might simply be incorporated into the video review – for instance, during private instructor-student meetings, small group work, or full class discussions (Kovach 1996; Menkel-Meadow 2000; Peppet 2002).

Alternatively, students could submit a more formal written product, such as a reflective journal or critique (Kovach 1996), an observation form (McEnrue 2002), an analytical report (Mack et al. 2002), or a final exam (Moffitt 2004). If the written analysis is submitted in conjunction with the video (or selected clips), the concrete video data allows the instructor to assess the quality of the student's analysis far better than with a written analysis alone. Video annotation tools allow students to tie analyses even more closely to the concrete data: rather than submitting a traditional written analysis, a student could submit an annotated video as an assessable work product, inserting his analysis and evaluation directly into the video itself (see Williams, Farmer, and Manwaring 2008). These approaches not only encourage data-driven analysis but also facilitate specific, data-driven feedback, which is helpful for both formative and summative assessment (see Ferber 2002; Moffitt 2004.)

All of the above suggestions involve post hoc analysis, which does not necessarily improve students' analytical ability in the heat of a negotiation. It might, however, provide a foundation for developing in-the-moment analytical skills, as well as developing students' ability to review and assess their own negotiations in the future – an essential skill for continued improvement (McAdoo and Manwaring 2009).

Assessing to Develop Behavioral Skills

As discussed above, videorecorded negotiations can provide a rich set of data for cultivating and subsequently assessing students' self-awareness and/or analytical ability. In such cases, while the students may assess their own and their peers' recorded negotiations, the instructor's assessment – whether formative or summative – will likely focus on the students' review and reflection of those negotiations. When the learning goal is behavioral skill-building, however, the assessment will focus on the negotiation performances themselves.

Ultimately, most negotiation students are primarily interested in becoming better negotiators. While greater self-awareness and improved analytical ability likely contribute to more effective negotiation, observable improvement in behavioral skills is no doubt even higher on the typical student's agenda. Video is particularly well-suited for assessing behavioral skills and measuring improvement.

Of course, some negotiation behaviors lend themselves more readily to video-based assessment than others. Negotiation encompasses a complex and wide-ranging set of skills, from fine-grain tactics to comprehensive strategy, from substance-oriented deal design to relational dialogue, from advance preparation and setup moves to improvisational responses, from persuading and influencing to listening and learning. While videorecordings can capture visual and audible behaviors such as questions, remarks, facial expressions, and body language, internal dynamics such as thoughts, emotions, mental strategies, and so forth are undetectable if they have no physical manifestation.

Moreover, it is more logistically feasible to capture interpersonal tactics at the negotiating table – what Lax and Sebenius have termed "first-dimension" tactics – than to capture the broad array of advance or behind-the-scenes "setup" or "third-dimension" moves, such as coalition-building, BATNA (best alternative to a negotiated agreement) development, and the like (2006).[4]

In addition, video-based assessment may be more effective in developing certain types of negotiation behavior than others. In a comprehensive analysis of thirty-three experimental studies, Fukkink, Trienekens, and Kramer (2011) found that video-based feedback: 1) influenced verbal skills slightly more strongly than non-verbal and paralingual skills such as body language and tone; 2) influenced

receptive and productive skills (e.g., active listening and explaining) slightly more strongly than relational skills (e.g., displaying empathy); and 3) influenced efforts to increase positive behaviors slightly more strongly than efforts to reduce or eliminate negative behaviors. While more research is needed to explain these intriguing results, it may be that explicit, data-based feedback more easily influences behaviors that tend to be conscious and purposeful, such as word choice, than potentially more subconscious behaviors such as body language or relational skills. This suggests that, to most effectively improve a broad array of negotiation skills, video-based assessment of student negotiation performance should be supplemented with other techniques, such as observational learning.[5]

As an example of video-based behavioral assessment, students could use a laptop-embedded video camera and microphone to record themselves negotiating, and upload the video to a designated online location. If the video is long, students might be asked to designate particular segments for the instructor to review. This can be accomplished through video annotation software that allows "tagging" of event on a time counter (see note 2), or simply through a memo specifying the relevant time codes. The instructor would then provide feedback on the students' performance, which – depending on the learning goals for that exercise – could focus on anything from strategy and tactics to tone, expressions, and body language (see Kovach 1996; Foote 2013, forthcoming). The student would attempt to incorporate this feedback into another negotiation (which, if time allows, could be videorecorded as well).

A variation on the act-review-repeat approach incorporates the principle of deliberate practice. Under conditions of deliberate practice, subjects attempt: 1) *a well-defined task* that is 2) *challenging but achievable*; 3) the subjects receive *immediate feedback* on their performances and outcomes; 4) they *correct their errors*; and 5) they *repeat the tasks until performance becomes routine* (Williams, Farmer, and Manwaring 2008: 71). In a negotiation course, the well-defined task might consist of an observable, discrete negotiation skill such as "reframing demands as options" or "demonstrating active listening" (Williams, Farmer, and Manwaring 2008: 77). This skill would be identified up-front, and students would then attempt to apply the skill in the context of a video-recorded negotiation exercise. The "exercise" need not be a full-blown simulation; it might be a very brief exchange in which the student focuses solely on "reframing demands as options," "demonstrating active listening," or whatever the predefined skill may be. The instructor or coach would then provide individual feedback on what the student did well and how she might improve, and the student would repeat the performance – reviewing

the video each time – until she was able to perform the skill well. Professors Gerald Williams and Larry Farmer applied this approach to the teaching of negotiation and client interviewing and counseling, finding that it resulted in measurable improvements in students' skills and performances (Williams, Farmer, and Manwaring 2008). While deliberate practice can be time-consuming, it has been found to be effective in a number of skills-based disciplines such as sports and musical performance (Williams, Farmer, and Manwaring 2008).[6]

Yet another approach to developing discrete negotiation skills draws on techniques from psychotherapy and psychodrama. Described thoroughly by Robert Bordone (2000), the Interpersonal Skills Exercise (IPS) developed at Harvard Law School shares some similarities with deliberate practice techniques, as it calls on students to repeatedly practice discrete interpersonal negotiation skills using video-based feedback. Unlike deliberate practice techniques, however, which are designed to hone and refine behavioral skills, the Interpersonal Skills Exercise is designed to help participants *broaden* their repertoire of approaches to a particular skill, and in some cases to address participants' limiting assumptions about what they can or should do. Following a critical "en-role-ing" session, a role reversal exercise, and a baseline simulation to demonstrate what typically happens, a student in the Interpersonal Skills Exercise conducts an iterative series of videorecorded "takes" focused on her chosen skill (e.g., "saying 'no' to a friend"). Based on instructor and peer feedback, the participating student may try dozens of alternative approaches to this skill, such as channeling someone whom she views as good at the skill, enacting an "over-the-top" performance of the skill, or simply repeating a suggested script, in order to expand her mental repertoire. In this approach, the power of the videorecording lies not only in providing concrete data for feedback, but also in demonstrating to the student what she is able to do, and how she looks and sounds doing it. A student may feel terribly rude when she firmly says "no," but upon reviewing the videorecording may find that she does not look or sound nearly as rude as she felt. This third-person perspective offered by the videorecording can be very powerful in overcoming limiting assumptions (see Bordone 2000).

Caveats and Challenges

Time Commitment
A major potential drawback to video-based assessment is the time and effort required from the instructor (see Kovach 1996; Bordone 2000; Peppet 2002; Moffitt 2004). At the outset, merely arranging the technological logistics (or explaining them to students) can be

time-consuming. Moreover, while students can videorecord dozens of negotiations simultaneously, an instructor must review them sequentially. Providing feedback tied to the video data requires more time still, as does troubleshooting any technical issues that may arise with file uploading, transfer, annotation, and the like.

While video-based assessment is unlikely ever to be quick and easy, the judicious use of technological and pedagogical techniques can reduce the time burden on the instructor. These approaches include:

- Shifting responsibility for videorecording to students. Today's students tend to be far more capable and comfortable with video technology than students in past generations. Indeed, many have their own video cameras embedded in their laptops, tablets, or other mobile devices, and may prefer these over instructor-provided equipment. (Note, however, that the instructor may wish to specify parameters for the final videorecording, such as file formats and file size limits, to facilitate video sharing and viewing.)

- Asking students to pre-select clips for instructor review. Regardless of how the instructor plans to review video-recorded negotiations (jointly with the students, independently, etc.), she can ask students to select particular episodes on which to focus her review. Asking students to identify up to three critical episodes, for instance, or up to ten minutes' worth of key interactions, will help reduce the instructor time required to review each video.

- Distributing feedback responsibility. Rather than providing individualized video-based feedback to each student, an instructor can distribute this responsibility among students. In pairs or small groups, students might offer feedback to their negotiation counterparts or to classmates with whom they did not negotiate, possibly using a structured feedback form or similar tool to guide their observations. Formative assessment responsibility may be distributed still further: instructors could videorecord one or two negotiations per class and use selected clips as a basis for full-class discussion (Peppet 2002). An instructor might also share feedback responsibilities with trained teaching assistants or outside coaches, if he has access to such resources.

- Recording multiple students at once. Recordings of multi-party or team negotiations can increase the efficiency of the review. For a two-on-two negotiation, for instance, the instructor may be able to assess all four students based on a single videorecording.

The time required for video-based assessment can also be a concern for participants, particularly in short courses (e.g., a two-day executive workshop). While it may not be practical to devote in-class time to recording and/or reviewing videos, one option may be to conduct these activities outside of class.

Cost and Resource Requirements

Creating, sharing, and assessing videos is easier and more affordable than in the past. Small portable digital "webcams" have become relatively inexpensive (see Williams, Farmer, and Manwaring 2008), and as mentioned above, many students have video cameras embedded in mobile devices. Completed videorecordings no longer need to be copied or transferred by hand; digital videos can be uploaded at no charge to any number of file-sharing sites or to online academic platforms (Peppet 2002). Even video annotation software is more widely accessible than in the past, with some programs available online at no charge.

Despite these developments, resource limitations undoubtedly remain an issue in some educational communities. Access to a single videorecording and playback device, however, is sufficient to record student negotiations sequentially and to use the recordings as the basis for instructor or peer assessment.

Student Sensitivity/Apprehension

Another potential issue is that some students may react negatively to viewing themselves on video, becoming acutely embarrassed or hypercritical. The likelihood and degree of this effect will depend in large part on the nature of the video review and of the participants themselves. Some research suggests that unstructured and self-directed viewing exacerbates self-consciousness more than instructor-directed and structured reviews (Karl and Kopf 1993).[7] Moreover, self-directed video review can have a negative impact on people with low self-esteem and/or moderate levels of self-consciousness: without guidance, they may focus excessively on any errors, challenges, or other behaviors that confirm their negative self-image (Karl and Kopf 1993; Hinton and Kramer 1998).[8]

For apprehensive viewers, multiple video feedback sessions may both reduce anxiety and improve negotiation effectiveness (Karl and Kopf 1993; Peppet 2002). Some instructors recommend keeping video reviews private (between students and the instructor) in order to minimize self-consciousness (Hinton and Kramer 1998); others highlight the benefits of public reviews, including the potentially reassuring effect of seeing peers struggling with similar challenges (Peppet 2002). While feedback should not be relentlessly

positive when there is clearly room for improvement, framing feedback to be *constructive*, structured, and data-driven may also help facilitate students' receptiveness (Karl and Kopf 1993; Moffitt 2004).

Grading Incentives and Fairness

The use of videorecorded negotiations as a basis for summative assessment (and grades) raises additional concerns regarding fairness and behavioral incentives. For instance, the effectiveness of a student's negotiation performance depends in part upon his counterpart's behavior. In a highly competitive academic environment, one student may intentionally make the negotiation quite difficult for the other. On the other hand, a student may be confronted with a counterpart who is unprepared or does not take the exercise seriously, making it difficult to complete the negotiation in any meaningful way.

The grading criteria can also create counterproductive incentives, as many commentators have observed. For instance, outcome-focused assessment may discourage experimentation with new behaviors, and may encourage students to focus on short-term, substantive issues at the expense of longer-term considerations such as reputation and relationship (see Moffitt 2004; Welsh 2012, Welsh, *Making Reputation Salient*, in this volume; see also Coben, *Empowerment and Recognition*, in this volume). On the other hand, performance-based assessment requires instructors to define "good performance" – a difficult task, given that any given behavior may be more or less effective depending on the context and purpose.[9] Any fixed criteria for assessing negotiation performance may encourage students to focus on meeting the performance criteria, regardless of whether this approach makes sense in light of their purposes in that situation (Moffitt 2004). This risks triggering a "chilling effect" – students might avoid contextual or situational experimentation in favor of play-acting in order to make the grade (see Coben, *Empowerment and Recognition*, in this volume; Falcão, *Competition Without Winners or Losers*, in this volume, discussing this issue in the context of negotiation competitions).

This incentive problem may be partially addressed through use of meta-criteria that define general qualities of good performance (e.g., "the negotiator's tactics were consistent with her purposes" or "the negotiator was influential in shaping an outcome that met her primary interests") rather than specific behaviors (e.g., "the negotiator asked multiple open-ended questions") – though the more general the criteria, the less easily it can be applied to the specific data in the videorecording. It might also be addressed by applying more than one assessment method to the same videorecorded exercise, e.g., combining relational and substantive outcomes (see Coben, *Empowerment and*

Recognition, in this volume) or substantive and reputational outcomes (see Welsh 2012; Welsh, *Making Reputation Salient*, in this volume). Another approach might be to give the students latitude in setting their own criteria for simulation assessment (see Lee, *Negotiating the Assessment Criteria*, in this volume; Coben, *Empowerment and Recognition*, in this volume; also see, more generally, Nelken, McAdoo, and Manwaring 2008, on involving students in learning design).

Conclusion

Advances in videorecording technology – including widespread access to digital videorecording capability and the availability of simple file-sharing and video editing tools, combined with greater student familiarity in creating and manipulating their own videos, reduce many logistical hurdles instructors once faced in using video to assess negotiation performance. Beyond making video assessment easier and cheaper, technological advances now offer new ways of learning through video: video annotation software allows for sophisticated analysis and/or evaluation, for instance, and video manipulation techniques such as time-lapse and stop-action replay can help highlight macro- or micro-level dynamics.

Video offers multiple options for formative and summative assessment using any combination of self, peer, and/or instructor review. Much of the value of video-based assessment lies in the opportunity to literally "re-see" a negotiation. Ideally, through video-based assessment, a student will not simply "re-see" the negotiation, but "re-see" herself as a negotiator – perhaps gaining new insights into how she negotiates, how others might view her, and how she might negotiate even more effectively. In that case, the video is not necessarily just a mirror reflecting the negotiator she is, but also, potentially, a window offering a view of the negotiator she might become.

Notes

[1] The terms "negotiations" and "negotiation performances" in this chapter refer to both simulations and actual negotiations. While most videorecorded student negotiations are likely based on simulations, authentic (non-simulated) negotiations might be recorded in certain situations. For instance, an instructor might assign student groups to a task that requires negotiation, but is not labeled as such – such as taking photographs that best represent certain concepts or designing a simulation (see Manwaring, McAdoo, and Cheldelin 2010; Druckman and Ebner 2011) – and videorecord the groups' interactions (with their knowledge and permission, of course) for later review.

[2] Examples of commercially available video annotation software include Microsoft MovieMaker (bundled free with Windows XP and Vista), Apple iMovie, Viddler (www.viddler.com), Landro Play Analyzer (www.landro.com) and MediaNotes (www.cali.org/medianotes). The popular video-sharing website YouTube (www.youtube.com) also allows users to insert pop-up comments. Multiple free, open-source video annotation programs (many from individuals and educational institutions) are available online. For a detailed technical discussion of options for capturing, uploading, annotating and distributing digital videos, see Shrosbee (2008).

[3] Clark Freshman, a professor at Hastings School of Law and expert in the study of lie detection, has used videorecordings of student negotiation simulations for this purpose (Personal communication with Clark Freshman, April 21, 2012).

[4] As videorecording capabilities become increasingly ubiquitous through webcams on mobile devices, students may be able to capture even advance and away-from-the-table setup moves (bearing in mind, of course, the need for all participants' informed consent). Videorecorded data of such moves, such as agenda-setting, coalition building, or BATNA (best alternative to a negotiated agreement) development, may be highly valuable to an analysis and evaluation of the first-dimension negotiation at the table.

[5] A study conducted by Janice Nadler and her colleagues (2003) showed that while observation of expert negotiation videos resulted in greater performance improvement than analogical learning, didactic learning, or information revelation, it conversely resulted in students having the least ability to *articulate* the relevant learning principles. This suggests that observation may be better suited to the development of the "tacit" or subconscious understanding associated with certain behavioral skills than to developing the explicit understanding associated with analytical ability.

[6] But see Fukkink, Trienekens, and Kramer (2011), finding in a meta-analysis of video feedback studies that the experimental effects of video feedback were systematically smaller for discrete, quantifiable micro-skills (e.g. making eye contact) than for broader molar skills (e.g., exhibiting empathy).

[7] Numerous commentators have examined the dilemmas inherent in assessing student negotiation *performance* (as opposed to theoretical understanding, for instance). These dilemmas include how to define negotiation performance (e.g., the substantive outcome; behavior during the negotiation process), what criteria to use in evaluating the performance, and the extent to which incorporating performance assessments into a course grade is fair, appropriate, or desirable. Michael Moffitt (2004) offers a particularly thorough discussion of the benefits and limitations of outcome- and performance-based assessments (see also Kovach 1996; Patton 2009; Welsh 2012; Lee, *Negotiating the Assessment Criteria*, in this volume; and Coben, *Empowerment and Recognition*, in this volume).

[8] A recurring theme in the literature on video-based assessment is that unstructured, self-directed video reviews are simply not as helpful compared with structured, peer- or instructor-led review, even when they do not trigger self-consciousness (see Karl and Kopf 1993; Hinton and Kramer 1998; Peppet 2002, Mack et al. 2002). The third-party perspective that video offers may be insufficient by itself to facilitate negotiation skill development.

[9] For more on the dilemmas of interpreting such observations, see David Matz's "Some advice for mediator evaluators and trainers," pp. 36-38 in Honeyman et al 1995.

References

Bazerman, M. and D. Chugh. 2006. Bounded awareness: Focusing failures in negotiation. In *Negotiation theory and research*, edited by L. Thompson. New York: Psychology Press.

Bordone, R. 2000. Teaching interpersonal skills for negotiation and for life. *Negotiation Journal* 16(4): 377-385.

Brookfield, S. 1990. *The skillful teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohn, L., R. Howell, K. Kovach, A. Lee, and H. de Backer. 2009. We came, we trained, but did it matter? In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Implications for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.

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 K. Kovach. 2010. Simulation 2.0: The Resurrection. 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.

Ekman, P. 2007. *Emotions revealed: Recognizing faces and feelings to improve communication and emotional life*, 2nd edn. New York: Owl Books.

Ferber, P. 2002. Adult learning theory and simulations: Designing simulations to educate lawyers. *Clinical Law Review* 9: 417-461.

Foote, L. 2013 forthcoming. Honing crisis communication skills: Using interactive media and student-centered learning to develop agile leaders. *Journal for Management Education* 37(1).

Foster, T. and E. Farquharson. 2011. Assessment procedures for skills-based MBA courses adapted from the US Army Reserve Officer Training Corps leadership development program. *Negotiation Journal* 27(3): 367-386.

Fukkink, R. G., N. Trienekens, and L. J. C. Kramer. 2011. Video feedback in education and training: Putting learning in the picture. *Educational Psychology Rev*iew 23:45-63.

Hinton, J. S. and M. W. Kramer. 1998. The impact of self-directed videotape feedback on students' self-reported levels of communication competence and apprehension. *Communication Education* 47:151-161.

Honeyman, C. et al. (Test Design Project). 1995. Performance-based assessment: A methodology for use in selecting, training and evaluating mediators. Washington, DC: National Institute for Dispute Resolution. Available electronically at www.convenor.com/madison/performa.htm (last accessed July 30, 2012).

Karl, K. A. and J. M. Kopf. 1993. Guidelines for using videotaped feedback effectively. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 4(3): 303-310.

Kolb, D. A. and R. Fry. 1975. Toward an applied theory of experiential learning. In *Theories of group process*, edited by C. Cooper. London: John Wiley.

Kovach, K.1996. Virtual reality testing: The use of video for evaluation in legal education. *Journal of Legal Education* 46(2): 233-251.

Lax, D. and J. Sebenius. 2006. *3-D negotiation: Powerful tools to change the game in your most important deals.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

McAdoo, B. and M. Manwaring. 2009. Teaching for implementation: Designing negotiation curricula to maximize long-term learning. *Negotiation Journal* 25(2): 195-215.

Mack, K., G. Mullins, J. Sidford, and D. Bamford. 2002. Developing student self-reflection skills through interviewing and negotiation exercises in legal education. *Legal Education Review* 13:221.

Manwaring, M., B. McAdoo, and S. Cheldelin. 2010. Orientation and disorientation: Two approaches to designing "authentic" negotiation learning activities. 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.

Matz, D. and N. Ebner. 2010. Using role-play in online negotiation teaching. 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.

McEnrue, M. P. 2002. Managerial skills teaching: Ten questions and twelve answers. *Journal of Management Education* 26: 648-670.

Menkel-Meadow, C. 2000. Teaching about gender and negotiation: Sex, truths, and videotape. *Negotiation Journal* 16(4): 357-375.

Moffitt, M. 2004. Lights, camera, begin final exam: Testing what we teach in negotiation courses. *Journal of Legal Education* 54: 91-114.

Nadler, J., L. Thompson, and L. Van Boven. 2003. Learning negotiation skills: Four models of knowledge creation and transfer. *Management Science* 49(4): 529-540.

Nelken, M., B. McAdoo, and M. Manwaring. 2008. Negotiating learning environments. In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. DePalo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.

Palomba, C. and T. Banta. 1999. *Assessment essentials: Planning, implementing, and improving assessment in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, B. 2009. The deceptive simplicity of teaching negotiation: Reflections on thirty years of the negotiation workshop. *Negotiation Journal* 25(4): 481-498.

Peppet, S. 2002. Teaching negotiation using web-based streaming video. *Negotiation Journal* 18(3): 271-283.

Pew Research Center. 2010. Millennials: A portrait of generation next. Available at http://pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/10/millennials-confident-connected-open-to-change.pdf (last accessed July 26, 2012).

Rosenberg, L. and G. Petersen. 2008. Time-lapse video as a self-reflection tool for collaborative learning projects. *Journal of Research for Educational Leaders* 4(2): 4-16.

Shrosbree, M. 2008. Digital video in the language classroom. *JALT (Japanese Association for Language Teaching) CALL (Computer-Assisted Language Learning) Journal* 4(1): 75-84.

Steinmetz, C. 1983. The effect of videotape feedback on the development of presentation skills. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* 11: 343-357.

Susskind, L. 2007. *Rebuilding the world trade center site*. DVD. Cambridge, MA: PON Clearinghouse. Available at http://www.pon.harvard.edu/shop/re-building-the-world-trade-center-site/ (last accessed July 27, 2012).

Welsh, N. 2012. The reputation advantages of demonstrating trustworthiness: Using the reputation index with law students. *Negotiation Journal* 28(1): 117 – 145.

Williams, G., L. Farmer, and M. Manwaring. 2008. New technology meets an old teaching challenge: Using digital videorecordings, annotation software, and deliberate practice techniques to improve student negotiation skills. *Negotiation Journal* 24(1): 71-87.