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**Course Description**

This course covers theoretical and practical aspects of international negotiation. Students will study historical negotiation processes, cross-cultural issues of negotiation, the differences in worldview, and the ethical dimensions of negotiation. Active simulations where dialogue and deliberation can be practiced will be the hands-on part of the class work.

**Learning Outcomes**

Students will:

* Be able to describe the different negotiation techniques and their role in reaching agreements.
* Be able to analyze cultural differences and their impact in international negotiations.
* Be able to use their knowledge of international negotiation in a practical problem-solving way to address issues of immediate international concern.
* Think critically about the United States’ role in various negotiating instances.
* Be able to work in small groups in a way that demonstrates respect for their colleagues and efficiency in working collaboratively towards projects and goals.

**Required Textbooks**

1. Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, *Negotiation* (6th or 7th ed.), 2010 or 2014

2. Cohen, *Negotiating Across Cultures* (revised ed.), 1997

3. Solomon & Quinney, eds., *American Negotiating Behavior*, 2010

4. Fisher, Ury and Patton. *Getting to Yes*. New York, NY: Penguin, 2011.

Additional readings will be posted in Canvas.

Recommended Readings:

1. Hare, Making Diplomacy Work, Sage, 2016

2. Mnookin, Bargaining with the Devil, Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2010.

3. Jeong, International Negotiation, Cambridge University Press, 2016.

**Course Requirements**

1. Class participation – 5% of course grade

Students will be expected to attend all classes, complete all assigned readings, and participate in classroom discussions. on the subjects addressed in the readings and lectures. Most importantly, students need to take part in all in-class simulations organized throughout the course. Lectures during the course may not cover the readings and will often present new ideas and information. You are responsible for the information contained in the reading, whether it is covered or not in lectures, as well as for the information in the lectures.

Participation grade is based on active and constructive contribution to class discussions and group work (5%), as well as on attendance. (5%)

1. Reflection papers – 10% of course grade

Several in-class simulations will be followed by a reflection-essay assignment. This will require students to discuss the simulation process and their particular negotiating role through theoretical concepts covered by the text.

1. Simulation Research Paper – 10% of the course grade

This is a group assignment in preparation of the Fifth Annual International Diplomacy Simulation that will be organized at Georgia Tech on Saturday, February 23rd, 2019, between 10 am and 3 pm. Each group (2-3 students) will represent a party (country or organization) that will be assigned to them. Your group will be expected to:

1. Write a 7-8-page paper examining the position on issues of nuclear nonproliferation and arms control of your party (country/organization). Your party’s position needs to be researched in relation to its historical stand on nuclear arms and any domestic and international constraints on that country/organization.
2. Furthermore, you are expected to decide on your party’s negotiation goals, analyze the barriers to your party’s treaty aims, and explain the terms you are willing to accept, intend to use, and would deem unacceptable.
3. The Simulation Research Paper is due **February 21st.** **Participation in the February 23rd Simulation (10 am-3pm) is mandatory**.
4. Negotiation advisory memo - 25% of course grade

In a paper of 2,000-2,400 words (*indicate word count*), develop an advisory memo from the position of a trusted adviser to a negotiator. Please select an international negotiation that has received sufficient coverage to allow you to examine the parties’ strategies, tactics, and other behaviors. The memo will consist of two distinct sections:

 a. Overview/context (no more than 400 words): identify the parties and their relationship, their respective goals, the issues and broader context of the negotiation, other relevant information.

 b. Analysis and recommendations (1,600-2,000 words): employ four or five course concepts to analyze the negotiation and to ground your recommendations. Be sure to present the concepts and their application in language accessible to non-academic readers. For each recommendation (or discussion of past actions), assess the likely (or realized) effectiveness.

1. Negotiation research paper and presentation - 50% of course grade

In a paper of 3,600-4,000 words (*indicate word count*), deliver one of the following—students must confer with the faculty member to ensure focus and fit are appropriate:

 a. Comprehensive analysis of a specific negotiation

 b. Historical/comparative analysis of a specific negotiation strategy/tactic

 c. A topic of your interest

In a lively 30-minute presentation, highlight the most compelling conclusions, issues, and insights from your research; seek feedback from colleagues.

**Grading and Assessment**

A = 89.5-100; B = 79.5-89.4; C = 69.5-79.4; D = 59.5-69.5; F = below 59.5

* Participation 5%
* Reflection Papers 10%
* Simulation Paper 10%
* Advisory Memo 25%
* Research Paper and Presentation 50%

**Late Paper Policy**

Late papers will receive 5 points deduction for each calendar day (this includes weekends) they are late.

**Other Class Policies**

* Laptop computers can be used in class ONLY when the instructor allows.
* Cell phone should be put on silent. Disruptions from such devices will adversely affect your participation grade.
* For assignments that will be submitted through T-square, students need to ensure that assignments can be opened and are readable. To ensure this, students should attach all written assignments in either .doc or .pdf formats.
* The instructor will make any effort to return your graded assignments in a timely manner (usually within two weeks).
* The instructor will respond to all emails (sent M-F) within 48 hours. If you do not receive a response in 48 hours, I probably did not receive your message and you should resend it.

**Additional Information and Services**

1. The Office of Disability Services – adaptsinfo@gatech.edu (404-894-0285)

2. Academic Honor Code

The Georgia Tech Academic Honor Code states: “Students are expected to act according to the highest ethical standards. The immediate objective of an Academic Honor Code is to prevent any Students from gaining an unfair advantage over other Students through academic misconduct. Academic misconduct is any act that does or could improperly distort Student grades or other Student academic records.” Such acts include, for instance, plagiarism.

Plagiarism means using an author’s exact or paraphrased words without citation or acknowledging the source of information. Whether intentional or not, plagiarism is considered cheating and will not be tolerated. If you are unsure whether something should be cited, please ask.

**Course Outline and Reading Assignments**

Note: The schedule is subject to revisions. I will provide ample notice.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Topics and Readings** | **Simulations**  | **Assignments** |
| 1.8 | Course introduction  |  |  |
| **Part I Negotiation Fundamentals** |  |
| 1.10 | **Questionnaire 1: Personal Bargaining Inventory** |  | **Complete Questionnaire 1 before class** |
| 1.15 | **The nature of negotiation*** Lewicki, Barry, & Sanders, Ch. 1
 |  |  |
| 1.17 |  | **“Pasta Wars” Simulation** |  |
| 1.22 | **Strategy and tactics of distributive bargaining*** Lewicki, Barry, & Sanders, Ch. 2
* Hopmann, “Bargaining and Problem Solving: Two Perspectives on International Negotiation,” *Turbulent Peace*, 2001, Ch. 27, pp. 445-468
 |  | **“Pasta Wars” Reflection Paper due** |
| 1.24 |  | **Used Car Simulation** |  |
| 1.29 |  | **“Island Cruise” Simulation** |  |
| 1.31 | **Strategy and tactics of integrative negotiation*** Lewicki, Barry, & Sanders, Ch. 3
 |  | **“Island Cruise” and Used Car Reflection Paper due** |
| 2.5 | **Integrative and distributive negotiations in comparison** |  |  |
| 2.7, 12 | **Negotiation: Strategy and planning** **Ethics in negotiation*** Lewicki, Barry, & Sanders, Ch 4, 5
* Laue, “Ethical Considerations in Choosing Intervention Roles.”
 | **SINS II Scale** |  |
| **Part II Negotiation Subprocesses** |  |
| 2.14 | **Finding and using negotiation power*** Lewicki, Barry, & Sanders, Ch 8
 |  |  |
| 2.19 |  | **“Toyonda” Simulation** |  |
| 2.21 | **Preparation for simulation** |  | **Simulation Paper due** |
| **2.23** | **Simulation** |  |  |
| 2.26 | **Perception, Cognition, and Emotion****Communication*** Lewicki, Barry, & Sanders, Chs. 6, 7
* Ury & Smoke, “Anatomy of a Crisis,” *Negotiation Journal* 1, 1985, pp. 93-100
 | **Communication Scale** | **“Toyonda” Reflection paper due (Feb 17)** |
| 2.28 | **Influence** * Lewicki, Barry, & Sanders, “Influence,” Negotiation, pp. 285-318
 |  |  |
| **Part III Negotiation Contexts** |
| 3.5 | **Relationships in negotiation*** Lewicki, Barry, & Sanders, Ch. 9
 | **Trust Scale** |  |
| 3.7  | **Multiple parties, groups, and teams in negotiation****Coalitions*** Watkins & Rosegrant, “Assembling the Persian Gulf Coalition”
 | **Case Study:****Persian Gulf Coalition** |  |
| 3.12 | **Multiple parties, groups, and teams in negotiation****Coalitions*** Lewicki, Barry, & Sanders, Ch. 10
* Lewicki, Barry, & Sanders, “Coalitions” (T-square)
* Singh, “Coalitions, Developing Countries, and International Trade: Research Findings and Prospects,” *International Negotiation* 11:499-514, 2006
 | **“Coalition” Simulation** |  |
| 3.14 | **Agents, Constituencies, Audiences*** Lewicki, Barry, & Sanders, “Agents, Constituencies, and Audiences” (T-square)
 |  |  |
| 3.18-22 | **Spring Break** |  |  |
| **Part IV Cross-cultural negotiation** |  |
| **3.26**  | **International cross-cultural negotiation*** Lewicki, Barry, & Sanders, Ch. 11
* Cohen, Ch. 1
 | **“Mouse” Simulation** | **Advisory Memo due** |
| 3.28 | **Negotiation: The cultural roots****Intercultural dissonance: A theoretical framework**Cohen, Chs. 2, 3 |  |  |
| 4.2 | **What is negotiable?****Setting out the pieces: Prenegotiation** **Let the contest commence: Opening moves*** Cohen, Chs. 4, 5, 6
 |  |  |
| 4.4 | **On tactics and players: Middle game I****Sounds, Signals, Silence: Middle game II*** Cohen, Chs. 7, 8
* Rivers & Lytle, “Lying, Cheating Foreigners!! Negotiation Ethics across Cultures,” International Negotiation 12: 1-28, 2007
 | **Case Study: Oslo Accords** |  |
| 4.9 | **Under pressure: End game I****Face and form: End game II*** Cohen, Chs. 9, 10
* Colson, “The Ambassador between Light and Shade: the Emergence of Secrecy as the Norm for International Negotiation,” *International Negotiation*, 13:179-195, 2008
 |  |  |
| 4.11 | **When is a deal a deal?****In Search of harmony** **Best practices in negotiation*** Cohen, Chs. 11, 12
* Lewicki, Barry, & Sanders, Ch. 12
 |  |  |
| 4.16 | **Mediation*** Zartman, Internatinal Mediation in Post-Cold War Era,” Turbulent Peace, pp. 427-444
* Mnookin, “Giant Software Wars: IBM vs. Fujitsu”
 |  |  |
| 4.18 | **Diplomacy and Public Diplomacy*** Hare, Making Diplomacy Work
 |  |  |
| **4.23** | **Research Project Presentations** |  | **Research Paper due** |