

DISPUTE RESOLUTION RESEARCH CENTER ANNUAL REPORT

September 1, 2009 – August 31, 2010

Introduction.....	1
Highlights of Initiatives 2009-2010	1
Governance	6
Research Activities 2009-2010	9
Teaching Materials	13
Graduate Education.....	14
Continuing Education and Other Outreach Programs.....	18
Development	18

APPENDICES

Negotiation Teaching Workshop, Harvard Kennedy School, Boston	21
Negotiation & Dispute Resolution Colloquium.....	23
Negotiation Research & Teaching Certificate Program Schedule.....	24
Negotiation Research & Teaching Certificate Program Past Participants	25
IACM-DRRC Fellowship Awards	26
Advisory Committee	27
Current Faculty Research.....	29
Publications	36
Grants Program Recipients, Projects, and Grant Awards	40
Dinner Colloquia Members List	42
Speakers, Research and Work-In-Progress Seminar Series & Dinner Colloquia	44
Conferences.....	46
Working Papers	48
Group Assigner	54
Kellogg Negotiation Faculty Since 1981.....	55
Teaching Materials Development.....	58
Courses on Negotiation and Dispute Resolution	62

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the activities of the Dispute Resolution Research Center (DRRC) at the Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University from September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010.

DRRC's goals are: 1) to be a nationally recognized center for research on dispute resolution and negotiation; 2) to be a major site for graduate education in negotiation and dispute resolution; 3) to be a major provider of continuing education programs targeted at exposing the legal and management worlds to the latest developments in the field of dispute resolution and negotiation. In recognition of DRRC's evolution, we have added a fourth goal: 4) to be an internationally recognized provider of negotiation, competitive decision making, and dispute resolution teaching materials.

This report highlights the center's initiatives in research, and graduate and continuing education from September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010, and summarizes the accomplishments of the center's ongoing programs during that period.

HIGHLIGHTS OF INITIATIVES 2009-2010

AWARDS

J. Keith Murnighan, the Harold H. Hines, Jr. Professor of Risk Management, has received the 2009-2010 Clarence L. Ver Steeg Graduate Faculty Award from Northwestern University in recognition of his graduate student mentoring. Leigh Thompson, the J. Jay Gerber Professor of Dispute Resolution & Organizations, was a "highly commended" award winner at the 2010 Emerald Literati Network Awards for Excellence. The article, "When your heart isn't smart: How different types of regrets change decisions and profits," originally appeared in the *International Journal of Conflict Management*.

NEW DEAN

DRRC reports administratively to the Dean of the Kellogg School of Management. Northwestern University named Sally Blount as the new dean of Kellogg in the spring of 2010.

Dean Blount was a PhD student at Kellogg. Her area of research is negotiations, and DRRC supported her dissertation research. Dean Blount has been outspoken in her praise for DRRC since she has arrived on campus.

ON-LINE DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHING MATERIALS

DRRC is moving to on-line distribution of its teaching materials. DRRC has been publishing a new CD edition of its teaching materials in even numbered years. However, as technology has moved data storage away from discs to the web, DRRC's technology was growing obsolete. DRRC staff has really pulled together to make this happen, and we think we are as prepared as we can be for opening the site.

WORKSHOPS

We are hoping to lure teachers to this web-based delivery by having more than 15 new exercises available only via the web. We showcased some of these new exercises at a teaching workshop held jointly with the Program on Negotiation, June 24, 2010, held at the Kennedy School at Harvard University. The workshop, ably managed by DRRC's, Nancy McLaughlin, was fully subscribed by June 1, due to space limitations at the Kennedy School. There were 112 attendees. The workshop program is in appendices section. In an effort to introduce the workshop attendees to DRRC's move to on-line delivery of teaching materials, all DRRC workshop materials were posted on a secured web site, available only to attendees.

DRRC also sponsored two workshops for the Sudan Good Governance Fellowship Program. This program brought five leaders from the Sudanese Peoples Liberation Movement to Northwestern for a month in the spring of 2010. DRRC's political science executive committee member, Wes Skogan, helped arranged workshops on negotiation with Jeanne Brett and dispute resolution with Stephen Goldberg. The theme of both workshops was how to negotiate when there is no trust between the parties.

The DRRC community is looking forward to the special series of negotiation and dispute resolution research workshops to be held in the fall of 2010. These workshops have been organized by

executive committee members, Janice Nadler and Zev Eigen for the School of Law. See the appendix for the complete schedule of the Law School Colloquium.

TEACHING CERTIFICATE PROGRAM

The 2010 Negotiation Research and Teaching Certificate Program will begin September 17th with orientation at the Kellogg School and an afternoon seminar at the Law School. The participants in the 2010 program are Carlos Escobar, Vice President of Human Resources and Legal Affairs, Volkswagen-Mexico, and Prachi Bhatt, University College of Management Studies at the Mohan Lai Sukhadia University, Udaipur, India. We are looking forward to their arrival. The fall schedule of events is in appendices section. The program was designed to provide a structured opportunity for DRRC faculty to share their knowledge with professors and graduate students from around the world who would like to set up research programs and teach negotiations in professional schools of management, law, public policy or in undergraduate management, communications studies, or political science. Past program participants' comments are located in the appendix.

POST DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP

Our second year post doctoral fellow in 2009-2010, Taya Cohen from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, will be taking a position at Carnegie Mellon University. Taya has been an active participant in DRRC activities since her arrival. We will miss her. Taya's research focuses on understanding why groups engage in conflict and how intergroup conflict can be reduced or prevented.

Our first year post doc was Hal Ersner-Hershfield from Stanford University. Hal's research focuses on the role that time plays in decision-making and emotional experience. He studies decision-making as it unfolds over the lifetime, with a special focus on financial decisions and retirement planning. He investigates how a sense of continuity with one's future self can impact decisions that have long-term consequences and examines how endings in life can give rise to mixed emotional experiences. Specifically, he and his colleagues have studied how such mixed emotions affect cognition, health, and

decision-making. Hal is investigating how to apply his research interests to negotiating and dispute resolution.

Our new post doc is Garriy Shteynberg from the University of Maryland. In his research, Garriy seeks to understand the emergence of cultural norms and their role in regulating behavior within organizations and society. For instance, his research suggests that individuals are more likely to remember information when it is shared with their social group. Other research reveals that perceived norms are more powerful predictors of behavior than personal attitudes. Together these findings shed some light on the nature and function of cultural norms in human behavior. Garriy is currently studying how cultural norms influence preference shifts within negotiation and dispute contexts.

SUPPORT FOR AWARDS IN THE FIELD OF CONFLICT MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

In an initiative new in 2009, DRRC is sponsoring the Most Influential Article/Chapter Award given annually by the Conflict Management Division of the Academy of Management. This year's award winners were Catherine Tinsley, Kathleen O'Connor and Brandon Sullivan for their paper, "Tough guys finish last: the perils of a distributive reputation". The paper was published in *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 2002, 88, 621-642. Although DRRC had no input into the selection of the DRRC sponsored award, DRRC is happy to point out that Catherine Tinsley's dissertation research was supported by DRRC and that Kathleen O'Connor was a DRRC post doc. Sharing the 2010 award were Gerben Van Kleef, Carston DeDreu, and A. Manstead, for their paper "The Interpersonal Effects of Anger and Happiness in Negotiations." This paper was published in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2004, 86, 57-76. Gerben Van Kleef and Carston DeDreu have both been DRRC visiting scholars.

DRRC sponsored 10 student scholars to attend the annual conference of the International Association for Conflict Management. These scholars were chosen by the program committee according to criteria: a PhD student who had not previously presented a paper at IACM, and who was the first

author on the paper. These scholars' names and their paper titles are listed in appendix. Their picture along with that of DRRC executive committee member, Adam Galinsky is on the DRRC web page.

GOVERNANCE

The Dispute Resolution Research Center is located administratively within the Kellogg School of Management. An executive committee manages the center. The committee is responsible for determining policy and appointing project directors to administer programs. The executive committee is composed of a director and at least four people representing at least two schools and three departments at Northwestern University. Northwestern University faculty who regularly participate in the center's activities serve as committee members. The director is appointed by the Dean of the Kellogg School based on recommendations from the executive committee.

DRRC added three new executive committee members in 2009-2010. They are Zev Eigen, Assistant Professor of Law, Northwestern University School of Law, Dan Molden, Assistant Professor, Social Psychology, Psychology Department, Northwestern University, and Will Reno, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Political Science, Northwestern University. The members of the executive committee are listed below with their affiliations and leadership responsibilities.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

- Director - Jeanne Brett
- Law - Lynn Cohn, Janice Nadler, Stephen Goldberg, Zev Eigen
- Management and Organizations - Leigh Thompson, Keith Murnighan, Vicki Medvec, Adam Galinsky
- Managerial Economics and Decision Sciences - Bob Weber
- Communications - Mike Roloff
- Political Science - Wesley Skogan, Will Reno
- Psychology – Daniel Molden

PROJECT DIRECTORS

- Research - Keith Murnighan
- Dinner Colloquium - Jeanne Brett
- Research Seminars – Adam Galinsky
- Visiting Scholars – Adam Galinsky
- Working Papers - Mike Roloff
- Work-in-Progress Seminars – Nancy McLaughlin
- Teaching Workshop - Jeanne Brett (DRRC), Lynn Cohn (Law), Leigh Thompson (KTAG)
- Post Doctoral Program - Adam Galinsky, Janice Nadler
- Executive Education - Jeanne Brett, Leigh Thompson
- Teaching Materials - Jeanne Brett, Leigh Thompson

STAFF

- 2009-2010 – Doug Foster, Abby Gunia, Nancy McLaughlin

THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DRRC's Advisory Committee is comprised of lawyers and managers who are interested in issues of negotiation and dispute resolution. The Advisory Committee's purpose is to counsel the Executive Committee on executive education and on development activities. The Advisory Committee meets annually to review the center's activities. Advisory Committee members are kept informed about center activities throughout the year and many are able to attend seminars or programs that are of particular interest to them. The members of the Advisory Committee are listed in appendix.

MEMBERSHIP AND AFFILIATION WITH THE CENTER

All Northwestern University faculty and PhD students are eligible to participate in center activities as members. Information about the center is sent annually to Northwestern University deans and department heads, as well as faculty in selected departments, informing them about the activities

of the center, and asking them to inform others with interests in conflict resolution, dispute resolution, and negotiations.

Scholars and scholar-practitioners, whose area of research and practice is dispute resolution and who are associated with Chicago area universities other than Northwestern University, are invited to participate in the center's activities as associates. Associates are welcome to attend all center activities. They may apply for center research grants in association with a Northwestern University faculty member.

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES 2009-2010

DRRC's goal to be nationally recognized for research on dispute resolution, negotiation, and conflict is being realized through the scholarly activities of center members and associates. Their research continues to have a major impact in the field.

CURRENT RESEARCH

Kellogg faculty associated with the center provided the following descriptions of their current research below and additional information can be found in Appendices section.

Jeanne Brett

As the business environment and Kellogg's student body has become more global, I have been challenged to provide solutions to the problems of negotiating across global boundaries and taking those solutions into the classroom. This past year I have initiated new projects focusing on relational negotiation and trust. The relational negotiation project is currently contrasting Spanish and US negotiators, with a plan to extend the contrast to negotiators in the Middle East. The trust project is contrasting U.S. and Indian negotiators and follows up on empirical evidence collected in executive programs of the past few years.

Zev Eigen

I study the relationship among power, status, and interpretations of and experiences with law on the one hand, and negotiation processes and outcomes on the other. It is often assumed that parties negotiate, reach accord, and then memorialize their agreement with contract. That is, parties negotiate over terms in contracts before consenting to them. However, in most contemporary exchanges, particularly between organizations and individuals, very little, if any, negotiation occurs *before* parties consent to contractual terms. My recent research focuses on post-contractual negotiations, examining when individuals obey contracts they have signed, and what means of preventing defection are most effective. I created an online experiment to behaviorally measure the extent to which pre-contractual contexts influence the extent to which individuals obey contracts they have signed, as well as a way of testing what kind of prompt attempting to prevent contract signers from "breaching" works best.

Adam Galinsky

I study how psychological processes affect objective and subjective outcomes of bargaining, negotiations, and dispute resolution. For example, after investigating the differential role that starting prices and first offers have at the bargaining table and in the auction house, I created a comprehensive model that details the multifaceted effects and seemingly contradictory findings of anchors: *higher* first offers lead to higher final prices in dyadic negotiations, but *lower* starting prices lead to higher final prices in auctions. In addition, I have shown that

stereotypes reduce and power increases the likelihood that someone will make a first offer and achieve a better outcome in a negotiation. My research gives managers tools to succeed in negotiations, while at the same time detailing the underlying psychological processes that explain these findings.

Stephen Goldberg

I am currently working on a proposal aimed at reducing the risks to both baseball players and teams that are inherent in their current approach to long-term contracts.

Victoria Medvec

I am interested in how negotiators can maximize their own outcomes while simultaneously building relationships with the negotiators on the other side of the table. This is a critical question for executives since so many of today's business transactions take place within ongoing relationships.

Keith Murnighan

I study the causes of trust and cooperation in negotiations. Most people dislike conflict and many outright avoid it, but we know that conflict is inevitable. One particularly potent solution to the problems of conflict in organizations and society more generally is the development of trust and the institutionalization of cooperative cultures. My approach is to study individual, dyadic, and group dynamics that can promote trust or destroy its chances of developing. I believe that trust constitutes the positive fabric of society and it is my goal to fully understand how it develops, grows, and/or dies.

Janice Nadler

I study the role of rapport as a social lubricant in negotiation. Building rapport is becoming increasingly important as electronic negotiations become more common due to economic forces and globalization. I am also interested in how law can reduce conflict by providing a focal point for coordinating behavior. My colleagues and I have demonstrated that law can influence behavior outside of a deterrence framework, and we explore the circumstances that are best suited for resolving conflict through expressive law. Finally, I am interested in the interaction between law, psychology, and morality, and on the behavioral backlash resulting from mismatches between law and community attitudes.

Michael Roloff

I continue to be interested in conflict management in intimate relationships. This year, I have studied the impact of repeated arguments on stress and illness. One study relates stress and illness to reoccurring demand/withdrawal argument patterns. Another project demonstrates that both destructive argument patterns (e.g., mutual hostility) and constructive argument patterns (e.g., self-disclosure, solution generation) are positively related to stress and to physical illness. We are completing a study that examines the extent to which constant teasing by intimates may lead to stress and health issues.

Leigh Thompson

I am primarily concerned with identifying the best methods for teaching negotiation skills to executives and managers. Simply using didactic instruction is not particularly effective; nor is observational learning. I focus on the social and cognitive factors that are most conducive to learning key negotiation skills. Social factors include for example, the presence of a team member (teams outperform solos); cognitive factors include the use of analogical reasoning. For example, we have found that the best way of ensuring that a particular negotiation skill is understood is to present students with two examples, drawn from different domains and have them identify the common strategic element.

PUBLICATIONS – BOOKS, CHAPTERS AND JOURNAL ARTICLES

The faculty, associates, and graduate students affiliated with DRRC continue to write numerous working papers each year. Many of these papers are subsequently published in a wide variety of scholarly journals in the disciplines of psychology, economics, and political science, as well as in the

interdisciplinary fields of organizational behavior, communications, negotiation theory and law. Faculty, associates, and graduate students regularly present their research at scholarly meetings both in the U.S. and abroad. An abbreviated list of books, chapters, and articles on negotiation and dispute resolution published recently appears in the appendix.

ONGOING RESEARCH SUPPORT PROGRAMS

DRRC's mission to support research is carried out through nine ongoing programs:

1) The grants program funds small research studies and provides seed money for major studies. 2) The dinner colloquium provides an opportunity for the exchange of research ideas and the sharing of practical problems. 3) The research seminar series enables faculty and students to keep abreast of ongoing research at Northwestern University and other universities. 4) The work-in-progress seminars are a forum for sharing ideas that are under development, and opportunities for researchers to receive advice about their research plans. 5) The post doctoral program provides an opportunity for new PhDs trained in the disciplines to become involved in research and teaching in the area of negotiation and dispute resolution. 6) Conferences and workshops provide opportunities to integrate a variety of perspectives on negotiation and dispute resolution. 7) The working paper series disseminates the research being funded by the center. 8) The visiting faculty program provides an opportunity for in-depth discussions and the development of new research collaborations between faculty from other institutions, and faculty and students associated with the center. 9) The Negotiation and Research Certificate Program provides the opportunity for DRRC Faculty to share their knowledge with professors and graduate students from around the world who would like to set up research programs and teach negotiation in professional schools of management, law, public policy or in undergraduate management, psychology, sociology, communications studies, or political science curricula.

Grants Program. Thirteen research projects, six conference paper presentations, faculty research, and two DRRC Post Docs were funded during the period September 1, 2009 – August 31, 2010. The appendix lists the researchers and their projects.

Dinner Colloquium. The dinner colloquium encourages connections between researchers and practitioners. It continues to be an important activity of the center -- a meeting place for faculty members, center associates, and advisory committee members. The membership list changes annually as new Northwestern University faculty and visitors become interested in center activities. See the appendix for the Members List.

Research Seminar Series. This series of seminars provides the major intellectual focus of the center. It is a forum for in-depth discussion of theoretical and empirical research by scholars investigating negotiation and dispute resolution topics. The series is closely linked to the visiting scholars program and, in even numbered years, the certificate program. A complete list of speakers is in the appendix.

Work-In-Progress Seminars. This seminar series, focusing on research-in-progress, was initiated in 1986 by graduate students interested in dispute resolution research. It has become an institution for researchers receiving grants from the center. The seminar which occurs on Fridays in May and early June is a forum for presenting research funded by DRRC prior to its presentation at summer conferences. A list of the speakers is in appendix.

Post Doctoral Fellows. The post doctoral fellows program is designed to facilitate a disciplinary scholar's transition into research and teaching in the area of dispute resolution. This program continues as a joint enterprise of the Kellogg Dean and DRRC. The Fellows teach the negotiation course at Kellogg and DRRC buys down a course and provides their research support. Post doctoral fellows in residence during 2009-2010 were Taya Cohen and Hal Eisner-Hershfield. There were fifty-four applicants the 2010 Post Doctoral Fellowship. Garriy Shteynberg from the University of Maryland was selected.

Conferences. DRRC held a teaching workshop in association with the IACM meeting in Boston in June of 2010. A cumulative list of conferences and workshops is in the appendix.

Working Papers. The center's working paper site contains 202 entries, and 18 of those were entered for the 2009-2010 academic year. As of June 2001, working papers became available electronically on DRRC's special working paper website in pdf format: http://www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/drrc/working_papers.htm. Working papers added to the site since September 2009 are listed in the appendix. Working papers are limited to manuscripts-in-progress. When a paper is published in a journal or a book, the publication citation is indicated on the website and the paper is no longer accessible through the DRRC website. The center maintains copies of all unpublished papers and all unpublished papers that predate the electronic website. Abstracts of both published and unpublished papers remain on the web site.

TEACHING MATERIALS

DRRC's teaching materials are used by over 3,000 instructors throughout the world. Instructors are responsible for paying a \$3.50 royalty fee per exercise per user to DRRC. DRRC actively seeks to protect the integrity of the exercises, by keeping them off the internet. DRRC also actively protects the intellectual property of the exercises, monitoring exercise use against royalty payments.

DRRC has licensing agreements with PON, CCI, NAB, CPR, and specific authors for distribution of exercises not developed at Northwestern University.

DRRC's foreign language translations are under the supervision of foreign language coordinators. DRRC teaching materials assistant Doug Foster continues to work with professors from around the world to maintain the integrity of translated exercises. These are Spanish: David Gleiser, SIT, Colombia; Japanese: Tetsushi Okumura, Nagoya City University, Japan; Traditional Chinese: Shu-cheng (Steve) Chi, National Taiwan University, Taiwan; Modern Chinese: Zhi-Xue Zhang, Peking University; Portuguese: Joao Matos, Catholic University of Portugal; German: Georg Berkel, Siemens, Germany; French: Stephen Goldberg, DRRC. DRRC also has limited exercises in Brazilian Portuguese, and Hebrew. DRRC began offering all of its foreign translations of exercises as a collection in 2009.

DRRC's new Group Assigner software can be found at www.groupassigner.com and more information is listed in the appendix. Group Assigner is now being used by over 100 faculty and 65 schools.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

DRRC's goal to be a major site for graduate education in the area of dispute resolution is being realized through the teaching activities of center members and associates. These activities include teaching others to teach negotiation and dispute resolution; teaching courses to students in law and management, and to undergraduate students in the School of Communication; the preparation and sharing of teaching materials for these courses; the teaching of PhD level seminars; and the supervision of doctoral dissertations and other research by PhD students.

The teaching expertise of center members has become a major resource to the Kellogg School and the Law School as well as other schools of law and management in the U.S. and abroad. Center faculty are increasingly working with foreign scholars, helping them to adapt center teaching materials to the political, social, and economic climate of their countries.

TEACHING OTHERS TO TEACH

Center faculty's expertise in teaching others to teach came about because of the demand for the Negotiations course at the Kellogg School and the necessity to train post doctoral and PhD students to teach the course. An internship program was developed in which those wishing to teach the course on negotiations first participate in a teaching workshop, and then are assigned to intern in a regular faculty member's class for a quarter. That faculty member then acts as a mentor while the intern is developing and teaching his or her own course. The list of Kellogg negotiations faculty dating from 1981 appears in the Appendices section.

We will have a thorough discussion of the first year of DRRC's on-line delivery of teaching materials in next year's annual report. DRRC's CD will be slowly pulled out of service, as users become

comfortable with our web-based delivery. With the new site, DRRC will be able to make new exercises available as they emerge from the development process.

DRRC's editorial team of Jeanne Brett, editor, Doug Foster, managing editor, and Abby Gunia, designer of spreadsheets worked with 13 authors to bring 15 new exercises to DRRC users in 2010. The appendix describes these new exercises.

INTERNATIONAL TEACHING ACTIVITIES

The Kellogg School has initiated a series of joint ventures with business schools in Germany, Israel, China, and Canada to provide executive level MBA training. (Executive MBAs typically have at least 10 years of work experience and work on their degrees without taking a leave of absence from work.) A stand-alone negotiations course was designed into the curriculum in each of these joint programs. However, in the fall of 1997, the Israeli program brought its participants to Evanston to join the Kellogg program's live-in week in which students were taking negotiations and marketing strategy. The inter-cultural learning experience was so well received that Dean Jacobs renegotiated the curriculum in each of the international programs, so that their students would come to Kellogg for their negotiations course. In the summer, Professors Leigh Thompson and Jeanne Brett teach approximately 320 executive students from the Middle East, Europe, Asia, and North and South America. Annually in January, Professors Vicki Medvec and Leigh Thompson teach approximately 180 students from North America, Latin America and South America.

COURSES

Negotiation Courses. Negotiation courses for students in law and management continue to be among the most popular elective courses offered at each school. Multiple sections are taught at both schools in order to meet student demand. Negotiation is also a popular undergraduate course in the School of Communications Studies. The appendix lists the courses being offered on a regular basis at Northwestern University.

Mediation Process and Advocacy. This course at the Law School provides students with both a theoretical background and hands-on experience in mediation and mediation advocacy. A portion of the course consists of mediation skills training conducted by the Chicago Center for Conflict Resolution. Those students who successfully complete the skills training portion of the course and meet all of CCR's certification requirements have the opportunity to become certified as mediators, and to conduct actual mediations on behalf of the Center for Conflict Resolution.

The Strategic Dynamics of Bargaining. This Kellogg course combines the approaches of game theory, organization behavior, and negotiations to improve students' abilities to formulate and implement strategy in a variety of bargaining games. The course provides experiences in competitive and cooperative negotiations and culminates with an extended, complex bargaining simulation. The course uses Professor Keith Murnighan's book, *The Dynamics of Bargaining Games* and exercises, all of which are included in the DRRC teaching materials.

Cross-Cultural Negotiation. The Kellogg course takes the basic negotiation course global. It utilizes a web survey and the database developed out of DRRC sponsored research to provide students with personalized feedback about their intuitive approach to negotiation so that they can benchmark against strategies used by negotiators from many different cultures. Professor Jeanne Brett's book, *Negotiating Globally* is the text. A set of negotiation and dispute resolution exercises and an instructor's manual with additional cases and teaching suggestions are included in the DRRC teaching materials collection. As of fall 2008, Kellogg students are required to take one course with an INTL designation. As the cross cultural negotiation course has that designation, the school is preparing to provide more cross cultural sections of negotiations. We are keeping a close eye on staffing this course and whether demand justifies hiring another post doc.

ADR Course. Advisory Committee member, Rod Heard, began offering a general ADR course at the Law School beginning in 2002. Since its inception, Susan Walker has shared this teaching assignment with Rod Heard. The purpose of this course is to provide students with an understanding of the relative

advantages and disadvantages of the various dispute resolution options from negotiation to trial. Each dispute resolution process is critically analyzed for theoretical and practical differences, strengths and weaknesses, and appropriate areas of use. A variety of teaching techniques are utilized, including exercises, simulations, demonstrations (live and videotaped), and presentations. The course's principal focus is preparing and participating in three extensive simulations: negotiation, mediation, and arbitration. Lawyers and managers from the private and public sector and professional mediators act as the neutrals.

CONTINUING EDUCATION AND OTHER OUTREACH PROGRAMS

DRRC's goal to be a major provider of continuing education that introduces the latest developments in the field of dispute resolution and negotiation is being realized through continuing education programs associated with the Kellogg School's James L. Allen Center, programs for corporate and legal clients, and speeches to professional associations and other groups. These activities are an important aspect of the center's commitment to transfer the insights from research to practitioners. In addition, DRRC provides over one hundred and ten negotiation conflict management and decision making exercises to teachers all over the world. The user fees for DRRC exercises is \$3.50 per student per exercise.

DEVELOPMENT

DRRC has had a variety of sources of funding over the years. Grants from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation sustained the core activities of the center for many years. However, the Hewlett Foundation has redirected its funding to projects no longer including negotiation and dispute resolution. DRRC no longer receives funding from the Hewlett Foundation.

Funds from the Alan and Mildred Peterson Charitable Foundation and the Allstate endowment support DRRC's research activities. This income has been a much appreciated, stable source of support for research over many years.

DRRC's user royalty fees for teaching materials support staff in this area, as well as the teaching workshops, the Group Assigner initiative, and the new on-line delivery system.

DRRC's continuing education program, Negotiation Strategies for Managers, is another source of funds that are being used to maintain the infrastructure.

NEGOTIATION TEACHING WORKSHOP

Negotiation Teaching Workshop

Harvard Kennedy School, Cambridge, Massachusetts - June 24, 2010

Time	Littauer Building - Room – Bolton 130	Littauer Building - Room - Gundle 230
8:00-9:00 AM	Optional Event: Building a Negotiation Course ♦ Adam Galinsky, Kellogg School of Management (Gundle 230) Adam Galinsky will discuss how to structure a negotiation course, covering issues of evaluation, timing, and content.	
9:00-9:20 AM	Welcome: Introduction to the Workshop Jeanne Brett, DRRC & Mike Wheeler, PON (Gundle 230)	
9:30-10:20 AM	International Business Deals, PON ♦ Jes Salacuse, Tufts Fletcher School Two PON simulations, MEDLEE and ENCO teach students to identify and overcome cultural, legal, and political obstacles in negotiating high stakes business deals. In a series of steps, ENCO reveals the challenges of instable legal contracts.	Mediating Value Disputes, PON ♦ Larry Susskind, MIT Urban Studies Three PON role-play simulations (i.e. Williams v. Northville; Ellis v. MacroB; and Springfield Outfest) present the challenges of mediating values-based and identity-based disputes. These were used as the backbone of a recent advanced mediation class at Harvard Law School. Participating students helped develop an extensive Teaching Note describing the lessons they learned and summarizing the relevant literature.
10:20-10:40 AM	Break: Forum/Cafeteria	
10:40-11:30 AM	Multiparty: Fastskin, DRRC ♦ Holly Schroth, University of California-Berkeley Fastskin is a top management team strategic decision making exercise that involves a "shadow negotiation" element (i.e., negotiations that occur away from the table prior to an "official" negotiation). Themes include intra-organizational bargaining, especially coalition formation and agency issues, in the first informal pre-negotiation phase of the exercise.	Ethics: Kidney, DRRC ♦ Adam Galinsky, Kellogg School of Management This is an 8-party multistep negotiation exercise designed to demonstrate advocacy, persuasion, and ethics in the context of the allocation of scarce resources to deserving recipients (in this case kidneys). The exercise works great on its own but can be paired with the ultimatum game to discuss the general problems of resource allocation in organizations.
11:40-12:30 PM	UpDown: Re-negotiating (Reneging?) Existing Agreements, PON ♦ Deepak Malhotra, Harvard Business School UpDown is based on a real negotiation involving three co-founders of a start-up venture; the parties originally signed a one-page equity-split agreement, but now one of them thinks he is doing most of the work and wants to re-negotiate. The class discussion (covering issues related to contracting, trust, re-negotiation, coalitions, non-economic objectives, etc.) allows the instructor to leverage the rich background case as well as the 3-party, multi-issue exercise students have conducted.	Moves & Turns in Organizational Roles, PON ♦ Deborah Kolb, Simmons School of Management Caitlain's Challenge is a package of materials that includes a case, a role play, and associated video. It illuminates how gender impacts negotiations over job definition, compensation, and leadership roles in a business setting. Specific "moves and turns" are identified that can counter imbalances of power and stylistic differences.

Negotiation Teaching Workshop - Continued
Harvard Kennedy School, Cambridge, Massachusetts - June 24, 2010

12:30-1:30 PM	Lunch, The Charles Hotel, Kennedy Room, 1 Bennett Street – Ground Floor	
1:30-2:20 PM	Employment: New Recruit & Outside Offer, DRRC ♦ William Maddux, INSEAD New Recruit is one of DRRC's most popular exercises. The Outside Offer acts as a second round of New Recruit, adding additional complexity and real-world relevance. Either round can involve the introduction of virtual (email, IM) formats. Themes includes building interpersonal capital, expectations, cooperation, trust repair, and spillover effects.	Dollar Auctions and Other Games, DRRC ♦ Keith Murnighan, Kellogg School of Management Dollar Auction is one of the most popular exercises to illustrate escalation of commitment. Keith will describe several variations of the exercise and some of the more extreme outcomes that he has witnessed. He will also summarize a recent HBR article ("When winning is everything"). Themes are competitive arousal and the many situations that can stimulate it - to the detriment of those involved - and ways to alleviate it.
2:30- 3:20 PM	Multi-stakeholder, Public-Private ♦ Carsten de Dreu & Alexander Rinnooy Kan, University of Amsterdam KLM-Air France / Fokker-Dasa: Based on in-depth interviews with key players from the companies, stakeholders, and government agencies, these two cases/exercises bring to the fore the complex maneuvering needed in multi-party multi-issue business (intergroup) negotiations. Students prepare and negotiate in sub-groups. Lots of background material will accompany the cases, facilitating the students to act out their roles as if they were the CEOs themselves.	Clinical Skills Training, PON ♦ Bob Bordone, Harvard Law School In 2006, Harvard Law School added a clinical component focusing on dispute systems design to its already-rich negotiation and dispute resolution curriculum. The new Negotiation & Mediation Clinic has proven to be a rich laboratory for learning about the negotiation field and about effective teaching pedagogies and approaches. In this session, we describe some of the learnings we've had and some of the tools we've used including case examples and simulations.
3:20-3:40 PM	Break: Forum/Cafeteria	
3:40-4:30 PM	Multiparty, Public-Private: Aussie Air, DRRC ♦ Jeanne Brett, Kellogg School of Management Aussie Air is a 5 party, quantified exercise based on the failed attempt by a private equity firm to take over Qantas. There are labor issues, management interests, government regulation issues, and breaking news handed out during the exercise.	Agents: Goliath Agency, DRRC ♦ Holly Schroth, University of California-Berkeley Goliath is a 2 party agency negotiation illustrating the disadvantages of using an agent as well as strategies and tactics that are effective when acting as or being represented by an agent. The incentives for the agents and the narrow bargaining zone make creating value challenging. There is the possibility of a contingent agreement.
4:30-5:00 PM	Closing: Mike Wheeler, PON & Jeanne Brett, Kellogg School of Management	

NEGOTIATION & DISPUTE RESOLUTION COLLOQUIUM

NEGOTIATION & DISPUTE RESOLUTION COLLOQUIUM - Fall 2010	
Levy Mayer 317 – 4pm-5:50pm (unless noted)	
Date	Presenter
September 17 *FRIDAY* 12 Noon – 1:50pm	CARRIE MENKEL-MEADOW (University of California, Irvine School of Law) “The Ethics of Compromise in Negotiation”
September 27	COLIN RULE (Paypal) "Online Dispute Resolution"
October 11	ASHLEY BROWN (MIT Sloan School of Management) “Parallel and Divergent Predictors of Objective and Subjective Value in Negotiation”
October 25	BERNADETTE ATUAHENE (Chicago-Kent College of Law) “Land Reform in South Africa”
November 15	ADAM GALINSKY (Northwestern University – Kellogg School of Management) “The Power of Social Hierarchy”
November 29	RUSSELL KOROBKIN (UCLA Law School) “The <i>Borat</i> Problem in the Law of Bargaining”

CERTIFICATE PROGRAM SCHEDULE

Calendar of Activities Fall 2010 DRRC Negotiation Research and Teaching Certificate Program			
<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Event</u>
<i>September 21, 2010</i>	9:00 AM - 12:00 PM	Office	<i>Orientation Office Move In</i>
<i>September 20 – December 3, 2010</i>	Weekly W 3:15 PM – 6:15 PM	TBD	<i>Kellogg negotiation classes - Thompson</i>
	Weekly W 3:15 PM – 6:15 PM	TBD	<i>Kellogg negotiation classes - Berger</i>
<i>September 20 – December 3, 2010</i>	Weekly F 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM	Seminar Room	<i>Negotiation Research Seminar - Thompson</i>
<i>September 20 – December 3, 2010</i>	Weekly Th 3:30 - 5	Seminar Room	<i>Negotiation Teaching Seminar - Brett</i>
<i>September 17 – December 3, 2010</i>	M 4-5:50	Law School	<i>Law School Colloquium</i>
<i>September 26, 2010 - September 29, 2010</i>	5:00 PM	Allen Center	<i>Negotiation Strategies Executive Education</i>
<i>October/November</i>	F 4:00 PM 6:30 PM	Law School	<i>Mediation Workshop - Goldberg</i>
<i>September 23, 2010</i>	6:00 PM – 9:00PM	Allen Center	<i>DRRC Dinner Series – Leonard Riskin</i>
<i>October 7, 2010</i>	12:00-1:30PM 3:30-5:00 PM	DRRC Seminar Room	<i>DRRC Speaker Series – Zev Eigen</i>
<i>November 5, 2010</i>	12:00-1:30 PM	DRRC	<i>DRRC Speaker Series – Dan Ames</i>
<i>Saturday December 4, 2010</i>			<i>Closing Event</i>

CERTIFICATE PROGRAM PAST PARTICIPANTS

"By attending the certificate program I have significantly broadened my knowledge of cutting-edge negotiations theory and research. Capitalizing on my new insights I developed a research agenda in cross-cultural negotiations. In the program I've also acquired valuable teaching skills that I later applied in the classroom both at INCAE and at Kellogg. I attended many research seminars and conferences at Northwestern University and I was exposed to the unique research culture of Kellogg and the Management & Organizations Department. My personal experience has been very positive I have made many long-lasting friendships and developed new research collaborations. My current research interests are intra- and inter-cultural negotiations and dispute resolution and the impact of organizational culture on stock prices."

Brosh Teucher, Certificate Program 2008
INCAE Business School, Cost Rica; Kellogg School of Management.



"The Certificate Program provided insights about the most up to date methods in teaching negotiation and cross-cultural perspective of negotiation. I had the opportunity to network with a world class negotiation faculty and the experience to study at a top university in the USA."

Joao Matos, Affiliated Senior Lecturer at Catholic University of Portugal

"The certificate program has been a new beginning in my early career as a researcher and as a teacher. The amount of knowledge I gained from the program is immense. The professors are role models for teaching and an example of academic quality. Being part of the Certificate Program was fundamental for the development of my current research interests and teaching skills. I have used the teaching materials and I can say that the quality crosses national boundaries. This excellent program should continue to offer this incredible learning opportunity. My memories from the program will always guide my practice towards the highest possible quality. I deeply appreciate the experience."

Jimena Ramirez, Universidad de Sevilla



IACM-DRRC SCHOLAR AWARD



DRRC Fellowship Winners at IACM 2010 (Michele Gelfand (IACM 2010 President), Julia Bear, Sreedhari Desai, Ryan Fehr, [Adam Galinsky](#) (DRRC Representative), Ashley Fulmer, Sebastian Lotz, Jolie Martin, Shira Mor, Sunita Sah, Ming-Hong Tsai)

Here are this year's IACM Graduate Student Scholarships! These scholarships support graduate students' attendance at the Boston conference and are funded by the Dispute Resolution Research Center at the Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University. There was a great deal of competition for this year's scholarships. They were only awarded to the applicants who submitted excellent, highly-rated papers and who had not previously received support for attendance at IACM. The winners and their first-authored conference papers are:

Julia Bear, Carnegie Mellon University, *"Passing the Buck": Incongruence between Gender Role and Topic Leads to Avoidance of Negotiation*

Sreedhari Desai, Harvard University, *Some Like it Hot: Why Some People Respond Negatively to Procedural Fairness and the Resulting Reduction in Perceived Uncertainty, and When Executives Rake in Millions: Meanness in Organizations*

Christian Downie, Australian National University, *A 'Prolonged' Look at the 'Two-Level Game': The Case of the International Climate Negotiations*

Ryan Fehr, University of Maryland, *The Road to Forgiveness: A Meta-Analytic Synthesis of its Situational and Dispositional Correlates*

Ashley Fulmer, University of Maryland, *Dynamic Trust Processes: Trust Dissolution, Recovery, and Stabilization*

Sebastian Lotz, University of Cologne and Yale University, *Justice Sensitivity, Moral Emotions, and Altruistic Punishment*

Jolie Martin, Carnegie Mellon University, *The Cultural Determinants of Strategic Bias in Conflict Resolution*

Shira Mor, Columbia University, *Resolving the Double-Bind: Gender-Profession Identity Integration & Women's Negotiation Outcomes*

Sunita Sah, Carnegie Mellon University, *Cheap Talk and Credibility, and The Burden of Disclosure*

Ming-Hong Tsai, University of California, Los Angeles, *The Effect of Group Attitude Diversity and Attitude Strength on Subsequent Cooperation*

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Bob Agdern
Attorney/Negotiations Consultant

Frederic Artwick
Partner
Sidley Austin ^{LLP}

Richard Wm. Austin
Judge
Circuit Court of Cook County

Jeanne Brett
Director
Dispute Resolution Research Center
Kellogg School of Management

Kathy Bryan
CPR International Institute for Conflict
Prevention & Resolution

R. Theodore Clark, Jr.
Partner
Seyfarth Shaw

Lynn Cohn
Clinical Associate Professor
School of Law
Northwestern University

Thomas A. Demetrio
Partner
Corboy & Demetrio

Morton Denlow
Magistrate Judge
Northern District of Illinois
United States District Court

Zev Eigen
Professor
School of Law
Northwestern University

Adam Galinsky
Professor
Management & Organizations
Kellogg School of Management

Stephen Goldberg
Professor
School of Law
Northwestern University

H. Roderic Heard
Partner
Barnes & Thornburg ^{LLP}

William Hobgood
Senior Labor Advisor
United Airlines

Donald Jacobs
Dean Emeritus
Kellogg School of Management
Northwestern University

Julie Knudson
Director
Alan & Mildred Peterson Foundation

Frederick J. Manning
President
Celtic Group, Inc.

Victoria Husted Medvec
Associate Professor
Management & Organizations
Kellogg School of Management

Daniel C. Molden
Professor Department of Psychology
Northwestern
University

John Moran
Partner
KPMG Peat Marwick

John H. Morrison
Arbitrator and Mediator

J. Keith Murnighan
Professor
Management & Organizations
Kellogg School of Management

Janice Nadler
Professor of Law
School of Law
Northwestern University

Glenn Newman
Associate General Counsel for Labor & Employment
Commonwealth Edison

Marilyn Pearson
Partner
DLA Piper Rudnick
Gray Cary

Alan Peterson
Chairman
Tucker Alan Inc.

Will Reno
Professor
Department of Political Science
Northwestern University

Michael E. Roloff
Professor
Speech/Communication Studies
Northwestern University

Wesley Skogan
Professor of Political Science
Institute for Policy Research
Northwestern University

Leigh Thompson
Professor
Management & Organizations
Kellogg School of Management

David Van Zandt
Dean and Professor of Law
Law School
Northwestern University

Robert Weber
Professor
Managerial Economics & Decision Sciences
Kellogg School of Management

Richard Weise
President
International Council of
Education & Software

CURRENT FACULTY RESEARCH

Jeanne M. Brett - Management and Organizations, Kellogg School of Management

Culture and Negotiation

I am engaged in a series of studies investigating topics in negotiations and cross cultural negotiations. For example, a recent *Harvard Business Review* article reported on our study identifying the challenges faced by negotiating teams and the advice of negotiators who have significant experience managing negotiating teams through these challenges. I am also studying the intersection of high and low status and cooperative versus competitive relationships in negotiations and comparing these results in the US and in China.

However, the emphasis of my current work is on the links working backwards, from joint gains, to insight, to negotiators' strategies, to trust and holistic versus linear mindset, to culture. In a series of cross-cultural negotiation studies beginning in the mid 1990s, colleagues and I identified two different strategic approaches to generating the insight needed to create joint gains. Japanese negotiators were using offers and substantiation (argument) from the earliest stage of the negotiation, gaining insight and reaching high joint gains. U.S. negotiators were also gaining insight and reaching similarly high joint gains, but their strategic approach was quite different. The U.S. negotiators were engaged in a series of questions and answers early in the negotiation and they then put the information together into multiple issues offers later in the negotiations. A 2005 *Organizational Science* paper showed that these findings generalized to negotiators from other low context communication cultures like U.S. (Germany, Israel, Sweden) and to negotiators from other high context communication cultures like Japan (Thailand, Russia, Hong Kong Chinese).

More recently, we have been studying Indian negotiators, finding consistently, that they negotiate on average lower joint gains than the managers in our prior studies. We have also determined that they fail to develop insight into each other's priorities, they rely heavily on the offer and substantiation strategy, compared to U.S. negotiators and they report less trust before and after the negotiation than U.S. negotiators. We are on a quest to document what we are quite sure is distinguishing negotiators from these different cultural sectors. In particular, we want to distinguish the Japanese negotiators whom we think have low trust, use substantiation and offers, but gain insight and high joint gains from the Indian negotiators, whom we know have low trust, use substantiation and offers and low joint gains. We believe this difference is due to linear thinking on the part of the Indian negotiators and holistic thinking on the part of the Japanese.

Zev Eigen

I study the relationship among power, status, and interpretations of and experiences with law on the one hand, and negotiation processes and outcomes on the other. It is often assumed that parties negotiate, reach accord, and then memorialize their agreement with contract. That is, parties negotiate over terms in contracts before consenting to them. However, in most contemporary exchanges, particularly between organizations and individuals, very little, if any, negotiation occurs *before* parties consent to contractual terms. My recent research focuses on post-contractual negotiations, examining when individuals obey contracts they have signed, and what means of preventing defection are most effective. I created an online experiment to behaviorally measure the extent to which pre-contractual contexts influence the extent to which individuals obey contracts they have signed, as well as a way of testing what kind of prompt attempting to prevent contract signers from "breaching" works best.

Adam D. Galinsky- Management and Organizations, Kellogg School of Management

My research explores the problem of how an individual's thoughts are linked to the greater social environment and the conditions that promote and prevent the infiltration of bias into thought and deed. In addition, I am intrigued by the paradoxes that emerge when people seek control over psychological or organizational processes.

Stereotyping and Prejudice

In a series of studies we have explored the different conditions that lead stereotypes to be more or less accessible in our minds. In this research we have pitted two different intuitively appealing strategies, suppression and perspective taking, for trying to prevent stereotypic thinking and prejudicial behavior. We have found that

perspective-taking is a more effective strategy for navigating a multicultural world: Suppression ironically increases the accessibility and influence of stereotypes, whereas perspective taking increases sympathy for and understanding of the situations of out-groups (with Gillian Ku and Gordon Moskowitz).

Stereotype Threat

Members of stigmatized groups often suffer from diminished expectations for their performance in stereotype-relevant domains and these expectations can reduce performance on such tasks. We have shown that when stereotypes are made relevant in a negotiation, performance for the group with diminished expectations will suffer. In particular, telling men and women that a negotiation is diagnostic of their underlying ability will lead men to outperform women at the bargaining table. However, this gender gap can be reversed when stereotypically feminine traits are implicitly linked to negotiator effectiveness (with Laura Kray and Leigh Thompson).

Power

We have explored the effect that power has on individuals. We have shown that the possession of power over others leads one to take more action in any given situation, whether it is at the blackjack table, the bargaining table, simply moving an annoying table fan off of a table, or even helping in an emergency. In addition, we have found that power tends to lead to objectification of others. Those with power are less likely to take the perspective of others and are more likely to see others only in terms of currently held goals. The increased level of action by those with power occurs regardless of whether that action has prosocial or antisocial implications. Thus, power does not always corrupt but can lead others to feelings of responsibility (with Deborah Gruenfeld and Joe Magee).

Counterfactual thinking

Counterfactual thinking refers to thoughts such as “if-only” or “what might have been”, thoughts that lead people to consider how events might have turned out otherwise. In a series of experiments I have shown that thinking counterfactual thoughts in one context can have a debiasing effect on later decision making processes by leading people to consider more alternatives and possibilities. Simply engaging in counterfactual thinking in one context can allow people to avoid the error of only searching for confirming evidence for hypotheses. This debiasing effect occurs regardless of whether decisions are made by individuals or groups (with Gordon Moskowitz and Laura Kray).

In another series of experiments, we have found that counterfactual thoughts can lead people to feel dissatisfied with their negotiated outcomes, even when those outcomes are objectively superior. In addition, behaviors that can improve performance in negotiations (focusing on one’s ideal price) can lead people to get better outcomes but feel dissatisfied with those outcomes. Thus counterfactual thinking can lead people to do better but feel worse (with Victoria Husted Medvec and Thomas Mussweiler).

Stephen Goldberg – School of Law

I recently published – together with Margaret Shaw (an experienced mediator) – two articles based on interviews with 30 of the “founders” of U.S. mediation. The first article, published in *Negotiation Journal*, focused on the views of the mediators concerning the past, present, and future of mediation in the U.S. The second article, published in *Dispute Resolution Magazine*, contained the mediators’ advice to people seeking to become successful mediators. I am currently working on a proposal aimed at reducing the risks to both baseball players and teams that are inherent in their current approach to long-term contracts.

Keith Murnighan – Management and Organizations, Kellogg School of Management.

We recently published ***Social Psychology and Economics***, a volume of 17 original chapters by researchers in the two fields: The book presents current research findings that have the potential for exciting people in the other field. Thus, the authors span an impressive array of productive researchers in behavioral economics, experimental economics, and social psychology (Co-edited with David DeCremer and Marcel Zeelenberg).

In March of 2009, David DeCremer, Rolf van Dick, and I, with the support of the DRRC, sponsored a conference at Kellogg on Social Psychology and Organizations. The conference volume will include 16 original chapters by outstanding scholars; it will be published in 2010.

Speaking the Same Language: The Cooperative Effects of Labeling in the Prisoners' Dilemma

The long history of research on the prisoners' dilemma has preserved its mixed-motive nature by using a singular, non-descriptive methodology to avoid providing cues to participants to cooperate or compete. In contrast, however, researchers have interpreted participants' choices as cooperative or competitive. This research investigated whether experimental participants would be more cooperative if the game, their choices, and their outcomes were presented with the same labels that the research community has long used to interpret their behavior. In a large-scale experiment, we labeled the game, participants' choices, and their outcomes using the most common labels in previous research, such as cooperate/defect for choices, and winner/saint/traitor/punishment for outcomes. Participants played six 12-trial games with labels varying across games; a control group played six unlabeled games. The results indicate that labels led to significantly more cooperation than not labeling the game, the choices, and the outcomes; labels such as trust and cooperate/defect augmented cooperation even more. A second experiment found that many but not all evaluations of the labels led to perceptions that were generally but not always consistent with individuals' choices in the larger, first experiment. These results suggest that we might need to rethink the import of many of our previous findings and their applicability to everyday interactions (with Jeffrey Loewenstein, Chen-Bo Zhong).

Culture, Norms, and Values in Decision Making Groups

This study investigates cultural values and normative beliefs as predictors of behavior in a competitive group decision-making task in three countries, Israel, Japan, and the United States. Its purpose is to test hypotheses about how cultural values and norms influence the display and use of power in groups. The "power" players in Israel claimed significantly more of the resources than either the power players in Japan or the U.S. And the power players in the U.S. claimed more than those in Japan (with Mary Kern, Gillian Ku).

Compensatory ethics

Models of ethical decision-making (e.g., Jones, 1991; Murnighan, Canteloni, & Elyashiv, 2001) have argued that ethical awareness is a key antecedent to ethical decision-making. However, given the time constraints that individuals constantly face in their personal and professional lives, they may not be aware of their ethical values and the ethical implications of their decisions. Hence, the current paper examines time-pressured ethical decision-making and reports a surprising finding that respondents demonstrated less ethical behavior over time. We predicted that extended contemplation would increase awareness hence which would then increase ethical decisions. Our results indicated just the opposite: greater contemplation led to less ethical decisions. Post-hoc analyses and a follow-up experiment suggested that decision-makers act as if their previous choices have created or lost moral credentials: after an (un)ethical first choice, people acted significantly less (un)ethically in their subsequent choice. These findings provide the basis for a model of compensatory ethics, which suggests that self-interest and the desire to portray a moral self-image conflict within individuals (with Chen-Bo Zhong, Gillian Ku, Robert B. Lount).

Getting off on the wrong foot: restoring trust and the timing of a breach.

This research investigates the restoration of trust after an immediate or a later breach (i.e., after several cooperative interactions). During an initial interaction, people may be more forgiving of another person who pursues self interest because neither person knows how long their interaction might continue, and thus, the desire for one's own outcomes might dominate the desire to appear trustworthy. In contrast, after initial acts of cooperation, they move into an early stage of their interaction in which a trust violation might be especially damaging. In a large scale, prisoners' dilemma experiment, we encouraged people to start out by cooperating. When they experienced a defection, they obviously reacted by immediately cooperating less. Over time, however, people who suffered an immediate defection returned to cooperating at the same rate as people who did not suffer any defections. This basic pattern is also true for people who suffer later defections but, as predicted, these people never completely returned to the same high level of cooperation as people who did not suffer any defections (with Robert B. Lount, Jr., Chen-Bo Zhong, Niro Sivanathan).

Towards a competitive arousal model of decision-making: a study of auction fever in live and internet auctions.

In 1999, Chicago sponsored a public art exhibit of over 300 life-sized fiberglass cows that culminated in 140 Internet and live, in-person auctions. Collectively, the cows sold for almost 7 times their initial estimates. These unexpectedly high final prices provided the impetus for a model of decision-making, “competitive arousal,” which focuses on how diverse factors such as rivalry, social facilitation, time pressure, and/or the uniqueness of being first can fuel arousal, which then impairs decision-making. In Study 1, live and Internet bidding and survey data from 21 auctions throughout North America tested the model’s predictions, as well as hypotheses derived from rational choice and escalation of commitment models. Analyses provided considerable support for the competitive arousal and escalation models, and no support for rational choice predictions. Study 2 was a laboratory experiment that investigated the similarities and differences between escalation and competitive arousal, finding again that both can result in overbidding. The discussion focuses on the implications of these findings and on the broader issue of competitive arousal and escalation and their impact on decision-making (with Ku, G., Malhotra, D.).

Starting low but ending high: A reversal of the anchoring effect in auctions.

This paper presents five studies that use a diverse set of methodologies (laboratory, archival, and field) to test three models of decision-making in the context of Internet auctions. We demonstrate for the first time a behavioral reversal of the classic anchoring effect, finding that lower starting prices in auctions can produce higher final sale prices. We show that this effect occurs because lower starting prices reduce barriers to entry into the auction, thereby increasing traffic, and, in the end, generating higher final prices. In addition, low starting prices increase early bidder’s sunk costs and lead to subsequent escalation of commitment. We also show how starting price interacts with a number of different variables – puffery and quality – in affecting arousal, cognition, traffic, and final prices. In doing so, we find support for Mandler’s (1975, 1982) congruity model and a new model of competitive arousal (Ku, Malhotra, & Murnighan, 2004). The discussion focuses on extending our understanding of the effects of anchors from intrapersonal and dyadic to group domains, contextualizing anchors in social processes, and the simultaneous influence of escalation, competitive arousal, and congruity on decision-making (with Ku, G., Galinsky, A.).

Suckers or saviors? Consistent contributors in social dilemmas.

One of the most basic problems in groups and organizations is the task of encouraging cooperation when individuals have incentives to shirk. What we call “the cooperation problem” has been the focus of attention for economics models of transaction costs (Williamson, 19) and industrial organization (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992), the multidisciplinary literature on social dilemmas and public goods (Dawes, 1980; Ostrom, et al., 2002; Weber, et al., 2004), as well as many other fields. The research that we present here investigates a potential solution to the cooperation problem. Specifically, we formulate and test a model which suggests that consistent contributors (CCs) can act as catalysts for cooperation by altering the perceptions and actions of their fellow group members. In particular, a consistent cooperator can implicitly signal that cooperation constitutes appropriate behavior, thereby influencing the frequency and size of cooperative action in groups and increasing their efficiency (with Weber, J. M.).

Power gained, power lost

Changes in power typically lead to changes in behavior. This paper presents three experiments to test hypotheses that make either symmetric or asymmetric predictions about the effects of increases and decreases in power in two-person interactions that augmented or decreased one party’s strong position and the other party’s weak position by investigating the effects of moves from ultimatum to dictatorship games, or vice versa, on offerers’ allocations, respondents’ demands, and their evaluations of their power. Although the results supported parts of several models’ predictions, they were most comprehensively explained by egocentrism: increases in power led to larger behavioral effects than decreases in power. The discussion explores the effects of changes in power (with Niro Sivanathan and Madan Pillutla).

Causal Forces in Risky Decisions: Identity and Task Competence Trump Rational Choice.

When facing demand declines, some firms “go for broke” by entering new markets while others “stick to their knitting” by remaining focused on current business. Models of strategic choice and decision-making similarly focus on increased risk-taking versus risk avoidance. The current research uses appropriateness rather than consequential, rational choice logic to suggest that decision makers’ internal evaluations of their identity and competence are essential determinants of their strategic decisions. Two experiments model key features of the go-for-broke versus stick-to-your-knitting decision and find that risky, endeavor-switching decisions depend on identity and competence with the new task (with Mark Kennedy).

Janice Nadler – School of Law, Northwestern University

Law, Psychology & Morality

This research explores the mechanisms by which law and morality influence each other. These mechanisms include informational and group influence of law on attitudes, as well as the effects of salience, coordination, and social meaning on behavior, and the behavioral backlash that can result from a mismatch between law and community attitudes. The backlash effects we examine more closely are: 1) Moral Spillovers, which can occur when institutional violations of moral standards leads to deviant behavior; and 2) Public Opinion Backlashes, such as when cultural values are threatened by unpopular court decisions. We are also examining the role of moral character on judgments of responsibility and blame. Collaborators: Kenworthy Bilz, Northwestern University; Shari Diamond, Northwestern University; Mary-Hunter Morris, Kellogg; Elizabeth Mullen, Stanford University.

Expressive Law and Focal Points

I am testing the theory that law influences behavior in coordination games by providing a “focal point” around which the parties can coordinate. Most economic analysis views law as a means of solving cooperation problems. But law can also provide a means of solving coordination problems, by providing a focal point that enables individuals to settle upon a particular equilibrium. A simple example is the choice between driving on the left or right side of the road. More complex examples include public smoking, property disputes, and sexual harassment. By examining the behavior of participants in bargaining games in an experimental setting, we test the proposition that law, as a form of third-party cheap talk, can solve coordination problems by providing a focal point around which individuals coordinate. Collaborator: Richard McAdams, University of Chicago.

Electronically Mediated Negotiation

This research examines the dynamics of negotiation behavior conducted via electronic mail. In a series of studies, we investigate three major issues: 1) What are the major behavioral and performance differences of e-mail versus face-to-face negotiation? 2) What are the key social factors that can affect the nature and quality of negotiating via e-mail? and, 3) What steps can be taken by people who must negotiate via e-mail, so that they can enhance the social as well as economic outcomes of negotiation? Key findings are that non-task related, relationship-focused communication (i.e., “schmoozing”) sets the stage for cooperation and trust that facilitates mutually beneficial agreements. In addition, e-negotiators who share social ties with their counterparts, whether through shared group membership or explicit rapport-building rituals are more successful both economically (e.g., reaching mutually beneficial agreements) and socially (e.g., building valuable future working relationships) than their counterparts without such social ties. Collaborators: Leigh Thompson, Northwestern University; Michael Morris, Columbia University; Terri Kurtzberg, Rutgers University.

Michael Rolloff – School of Communications

Characteristics of intractable conflicts in intimate relationships

Scholars have been increasingly interested in the features of conflict that make them intractable. Much of this research has focused on international disputes. In conjunction with a graduate student, I have conducted a study which examines intractable conflict within intimate relationships and compares them to conflicts that intimates have successfully resolved or that are ongoing but that partners feel are being resolved. Collaborator: Courtney Waite Miller.

The effects of counterfactual thinking on relational lessons

The vast majority of dating relationships will end prior to marriage and many marriages will end in divorce. Given this reality, some scholars have wondered what if any lessons individuals learn from their prior relationships that might improve future ones. We hypothesized that counterfactual thinking plays a role in how people feel about their past relationships and the lessons they bring into their current ones. We found that counterfactual thinking does influence feelings but that lessons learned are not translated into behavior in future relationships. Collaborator: Rachel Ruan.

"I am sick of all of this arguing": The impact of arguing on health

Research indicates that interpersonal conflict is linked to reduced psychological and relational well-being. There is some research that implies that it may also impact physical health. I am currently working on a chapter that examines the possible links of arguing on health and I am designing a research project on that subject. Collaborator: Rachel Reznick.

Organizational change and framing: How change agents frame proposals differently from change targets -

Proposals for changing an organization are often resisted, but researchers have not fully addressed the reasons for opposition. One possibility is that change agents view their proposals from a gain frame while those who are the targets of change view the same proposal from a loss frame. If so, targets more so than agents should be prone to risk taking behavior. Although this may include preferences for proposals in which the odds of success are low, it also may mean that they become more creative as they attempt to find alternative solutions that minimize their losses. We conducted an experiment which provides evidence of both processes. Collaborator: Meghann Drury

The development and maintenance of maladaptive behaviors

Individuals sometimes engage in conflict communication that appear to be maladaptive in that they are ineffective and sometimes counterproductive responses to disagreement. However, some research suggests that maladaptive behaviors often are functional in the immediate context. Hence, individuals who avoid confronting their partners about undesirable behavior may allow the behavior to continue but avoid the negative outcomes that often arise from argument escalation. I have been conducting research focused on the factors that produce maladaptive behavior. Collaborator: Courtney Wright.

Wesley Skogan – Political Science

Violence Prevention

This study is an evaluation of CeaseFire, one of the nation's largest crime prevention programs. Headquartered in Chicago, it currently is running in 22 sites. The program deploys violence interrupters to intervene in gang violence and brokers services for young at-risk youth. The process and outcome evaluation involves monitoring program implementation, including how it varies across the many sites, tracking success in dealing with clients' problems, and a statistical analysis of crime trends. This project is funded by the National Institute of Justice. Prof. Skogan currently is preparing a book on CeaseFire, to be published by Oxford University Press.

Community Policing in Chicago

This project is a process and impact evaluation of Chicago's community policing program. It involves monitoring program implementation in the field, surveying city residents, neighborhood activists, and police officers, and tracking trends in crime and related neighborhood conditions. The study has lead to three books; the latest -- *Police and Community in Chicago* -- was recently released by Oxford University Press. The project has been funded by the National Institute of Justice, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, the MacArthur Foundation, and the Chicago Community Trust.

Leigh Thompson - Management and Organizations, Kellogg School of Management

Emotion: Rationality, Rapport, or Intimidation

There is conflicting advice in the negotiations literature concerning the optimal role of emotions at the bargaining table. Some literature prescribes that negotiations should be rational not emotional and regards emotion to be a weakness. A quite different perspective in the social psychological literature urges negotiators to feel and express their positive emotions at the table, because of the link between a positive atmosphere and mutual rapport and

information sharing that leads to integrative agreement. Yet, other advice suggests negotiators should be aggressive at the negotiating table – with the purpose of convincing the other party that they are just crazy enough to carry out some irrational course of action. In a series of studies we are testing which of these perspectives is most effective. So far results indicate that the positive and rational approaches are better than the aggressive approach that seems to backfire. Collaborators: Vicki Medvec, Janice Nadler, Vanessa Seiden, Peter Kim, Shirli Kopelman.

Learning: Applying principles from the classroom to managerial contexts

The assumption that managers can use what they know underlies much of our intuition about how managers solve problems and make decisions. However, studies of knowledge transfer reveal that people often do not access their relevant knowledge when it would be appropriate. In a series of studies with managers, executives, and consultants complemented by a set of laboratory investigations with students we have found that managers' ability to access their knowledge depends on how they learned what they know. In particular, analogical reasoning dramatically improves the performance of managers in organizational tasks such as negotiation. In further research we are investigating why this is so. We are relying on structure mapping theory that suggests people learn more when they 1) highlight commonalities; (2) abstract a common structure; and (3) recognize the schema in new situations when two or more analogies are presented. Collaborators: Deidre Gentner, Jeff Loewenstein.

Stereotyping: How do stereotypes affect organizational performance?

We have consistently found that when seated across from one another at the bargaining table men outperform women, even when controlling for possible potential countervailing factors such as experience and skill. Our research is investigating why the table seems to be tipped in favor of the men and what can be done to improve women's performance at the bargaining table. Our theoretical explanation is drawn from Steele's stereotyping threat theory that makes three assertions: (1) The stereotype of the effective negotiator maps onto the classic stereotype of the typical male, and the stereotype of the ineffective negotiator maps onto the stereotype of the traditional female. (2) Most female negotiators probably neither embody nor buy into the traditional female stereotype; however, we believe that the mere knowledge of this stereotype threatens the ability of women to effectively negotiate. (3) The negotiation setting of a male versus female contest activates the stereotype for both men and women and generates a self-fulfilling prophecy. Collaborators: Laura Kray, Adam Galinsky.

PUBLICATIONS

Jeanne M. Brett

Teucher, B. Brett, J. M., & Gunia (in press). Culture and negotiation: Three models. In K. P. Sycara, M. Gelfand, A. Abbe. Modeling Intercultural Collaboration and Negotiation Springer Publishers.

Goldberg, S.B. Shaw, M. L., & Brett, J. M. (2009). What Difference Does a Robe Make? Comparing Mediators with and without Prior Judicial Experience. *Negotiation Journal* July 2009 277-305.

Brett, J. M., Behfar, K. & Friedman, R. (2009). How to Manage Your Negotiating Team. *Harvard Business Review* September 2009, 105-109.

Zev Eigen

Estreicher, Samuel, Eigen, Zev. (2010) *The Forum of Adjudication of Employment Disputes*. Wachter, Michael, Estlund, Cynthia (eds) Research Handbook on the Economics of Labor and Employment Law. Edward Elgar Publishing, Ltd.

Eigen, Zev, Listokin, Yair. (2010) Do Lawyers Really Believe Their Own Hype and Should They?: A Natural Experiment. *Yale Law & Economics Research Paper No. 412*.

Adam Galinsky

Kray, L. J., George, I. G., Liljenquist, K. A., Galinsky, A. D., Tetlock, P. E. & Roese, N. J. (2010). From what *might* have been to what *must* have been: Counterfactual thinking creates meaning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 106-118.

Liljenquist, K. A., Zhong, C., Galinsky, A. D. (2010). The smell of virtue: Clean scents promote reciprocity and charity. *Psychological Science*, 21, 381-383.

Wade-Benzoni, K., Sondak, H., & Galinsky, A. D. (2010). Leaving a legacy: Intergenerational allocations of benefits and burdens. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20, 7-34.

Ashton-James, C., Maddux, W. W., Galinsky, A. D., & Chartrand, T. L. (2009). Who I am depends on how I feel: The role of affect in the expression of culture. *Psychological Science*, 20, 340-346.

Lammers, J. & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). The conceptualization of power and the nature of interdependency: The role of legitimacy and culture. In D. Tjosvold & B. van Knippenberg (Eds.), *Power and interdependence in organizations* (pp. 67-82). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ashton-James, C., Maddux, W. W., Galinsky, A. D., & Chartrand, T. L. (2009). Who I am depends on how I feel: The role of affect in the expression of culture. *Psychological Science*, 20, 340-346.

Fast, N. J., Gruenfeld, D. H., Sivanathan, N., & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). Illusory Control: A generative force behind power's far-reaching effects. *Psychological Science*, 20, 502-508.

Galinsky, A. D. (2009). Introduction: Negotiations and achieving the social cognition dream. *Social Cognition*, 27, 339-341.

Galinsky, A. D., Ku, G., Mussweiler, T. (2009). To start low or to start high? The case of auctions vs. negotiations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18, 357-361

Gunia, B. C., Sivanathan, N., & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). Vicarious entrapment: Your sunk costs, my escalation of commitment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 1238-1244.
Featured in *Science*. <http://sciencenow.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/2009/1110/2>

Kay, A. C., Whitson, J. A., Gaucher, D., & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). Compensatory control: Achieving order through the mind, our institutions, and the heavens. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18, 264-268

Kray, L. J., Galinsky, A. D. & Markman, K. D., (2009). Counterfactual structure and learning from experience in negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 979-982.

Maddux, W. W., & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). Cultural borders and mental barriers: The relationship between living abroad and creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 1047-1061.

Maddux, W. W., Leung, K. Y., Chiu, C. Y., & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). Toward a more complete understanding of the link between multicultural experience and creativity. *American Psychologist*, 64, 156-158.

Ordóñez, L. D., Schweitzer, M. E., Galinsky, A. D., & Bazerman, M. H. (2009). Goals gone wild: The systematic side effects of over-prescribing goal setting. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 23, 6-16.

Ordóñez, L. D., Schweitzer, M. E., Galinsky, A. D., & Bazerman, M. H. (2009). On good scholarship, goal setting, and scholars gone wild. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 23, 82-87.

Roose, N. J., Epstude, K., Fessel, F., Morrison, M., Smallman, R., Summerville, A., Galinsky, A. D., & Segerstrom, S. (2009). Repetitive regret, depression, and anxiety: Findings from a nationally representative survey. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 28, 671-688.

Rucker, D. D., & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). Conspicuous consumption versus utilitarian ideals: How different levels of power shape consumption. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 549-555.

Wang, C. S., Galinsky, A. D., & Murnighan, J. K. (2009). Bad drives psychological reactions but good propels behavior: Responses to honesty and deception. *Psychological Science*, 20, 634-644

Stephen B. Goldberg

Goldberg, Stephen, Shaw, Margaret. (2010) *The Past, Present, and Future of Mediation as Seen Through the Eyes of Some of Its Founders*. *Negotiation Journal*, (26), 241.

Goldberg, Stephen, Shaw, Margaret. (2010) *Who Wants To Be a Mediator?* *Dispute Resolution Magazine*, (25)

Goldberg, S.B. Shaw, M. L., & Brett, J. M. (2009). What Difference Does a Robe Make? Comparing Mediators with and without Prior Judicial Experience. *Negotiation Journal* July 2009 277-305.

Vicki Medvec

Swaab, R.I., Diermeier, D., Kern, M., & Medvec, V.H. (2009) Who says what to whom? The impact of communication on social exclusion. *Social Cognition*, 27(3), 385-401.

Tenbrunsel, A., Wade-Benzoni, K., Tost, L., Medvec, V.H., Thompson, L., & Bazerman, M. (2009) The reality and myth of sacred issues in ideologically-based negotiations. *Negotiations and Conflict Management Research*, 2(3), 263-284.

Daniel Molden

Molden, D. C. (2009). Finding meaning in others' intentions: The process of judging intentional behaviors and intentionality itself. *Psychological Inquiry*, 20, 37-43

Molden, D. C., ^SLucas, G. M., Finkel, E. J., Kumashiro, M., & Rusbult, C. E. (2009). Perceived support for promotion-focused and prevention-focused goals: Associations with well-being in unmarried and married couples. *Psychological Science*, 20, 787-793.

Molden, D. C., ^SLucas, G. M., Gardner, W. L., ^SDean, K., & ^SKnowles, M. (2009). Motivations for prevention or promotion following social exclusion. Being rejected versus being ignored. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 415-431.

Finkel, E. J., Molden, D. C., ^SJohnson, S. E., & ^SEastwick, P. E. (2009). Regulatory focus and romantic alternatives. In J. P. Forgas, R. F. Baumeister, and D. M. Tice (Eds.), *Self-regulation: Cognitive, affective, and motivational processes*. New York: Psychology Press.

J. Keith Murnighan

Huang, L. & Murnighan, J. K. (2010). What's in a Name? Subliminally Activating Trusting Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 111, 62–70.

Zhong, C., Ku, G., Lount, R. B., & Murnighan, J.K. (2009). Compensatory ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 92: 323-339.

Gibson, K.W. & Murnighan, J. K. (2009). From theory to practice: Messick and morality. In Kramer, R., Tenbrunsel, A., and Bazerman, M. (Eds.), *Social Decision Making: Social Dilemmas, Social Values, and Ethics*. Psychology Press, in press.

Cohen, T., Gunia, B., Kim, S. Y., & Murnighan, J. K. (2009). Do groups lie more than individuals? Honesty and deception as a function of strategic self-interest. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 1321-1324.

Wang, C. S., Galinsky, A. D., & Murnighan, J. K. (2009). Bad drives psychological evaluations but good propels behavior: responses to honesty and deception. *Psychological Science*, 20, 634-644.

Weber, J. M. and Murnighan, J. K. (2009). Suckers or saviors? Consistent contributors in social dilemmas. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, in press.

Kern, M., Ku, G., and Murnighan, J. K. (2009). Culture, Norms, and Values in Decision Making Groups. Sivanathan, N., Pillutla, M. M. and Murnighan, J. K. (2008). Power gained, power lost. (Lead article). Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 105, 135-146.

Lau, D. C. and Murnighan, J. K. (2009). Faultlines. In Levine, J. and Hogg, M. (Eds.), Encyclopedia of Group Processes and Intergroup Relations. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA., in press.

Gibson, K.W., and Murnighan, J. K. (2009). Expanding utilitarianism: Messick and morality. In Kramer, R., Bazerman, M., and Tenbrunsel, A. (Eds.), A Volume Commemorating David Messick. Psychology Press, in press.

Lount, R. B., Zhong, C., Sivanathan, N., and Murnighan, J.K. (2009). Getting off on the wrong foot: restoring trust and the timing of a breach. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, in press.

Janice Nadler

Bilz, K. & Nadler, J. (2009) *Law, Psychology & Morality*, in D. Medin, L. Skitka, C. W. Bauman, & D. Bartels (eds.) Moral Cognition and Decision Making: The Psychology of Learning and Motivation, Vol. 50 (Academic Press).

Michael Roloff

Drury, M., & Roloff, M. E. (2009). The effect of authority and option frames on resource allocation decisions: Using prospect theory to predict choices, expressed justifications, and advocating creative solutions. Communication Quarterly.

Roloff, M.E., & Li, S. (2009). Bargaining and Negotiation. In C.R. Berger, M.E. Roloff, D. Roskos-Ewoldsen (Eds.), *The Handbook of Communication Science* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Wright, C., & Roloff, M. E. (2009). Relational Commitment and the Silent Treatment. Communication Research Reports.

Wesley Skogan

Skogan, Wesley. 2009. "Policing Immigrant Communities in United States" In William F. McDonald (ed.), *Immigration, Crime and Justice*. Emerald Publishing.

Leigh Thompson

Thompson, L. (2009). *The mind and heart of the negotiator*. 4th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Tenbrunsel, A.E., Wade-Benzoni, K.A., Medvec, V., Thompson, L. and Bazerman, M.H. (2009). The reality and myth of sacred issues in ideologically-based negotiations. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*.

Kern, M., Berger, G., Rua, T., and Thompson, L. (2009). Taking care of business: Aligning group focus with individual self-construal. Working paper.

Choi, H.S., Anderson, C. and Thompson, L. (2009). The emotional composition of groups: Effects on group performance and decision making. Working Paper.

Dumas, T., Kern, M.C. and Thompson, L. (2009). Women, career choice, and performance. Working Paper.

Thompson, L., and Loewenstein, J. (2009). Surface-similarity inhibits learning: Making the case for learning in different domains. Working Paper

GRANTS PROGRAM RECIPIENTS, PROJECTS AND GRANT AWARDS

Fall 2009

<u>Name</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Award</u>
<u>Project Name</u>		
Del Mercado, Salvador Vazquez	Political Science	\$2,200
Research <i>"An Investigation on the Features and Effects of Accusations of Electoral Fraud"</i>		
Egan, Louisa	MORS	\$4,975
Research <i>"Origins of Zero-Sum Thought: A Cross-Cultural, Developmental Investigation"</i>		
Ersner-Hersfield, Hal	MORS	\$3,600
Research <i>"Thinking About What Will Be Versus What Could Have Been"</i>		
Gellman, Mneesha	Political Science	\$1,940
Research <i>"Memory, Violence, and Democratization: A Study of Citizenship Expression of Former Women Insurgents in El Salvador"</i>		
Kim-Jun, Sun Young	MORS	\$4,850
Research <i>"Gender Differences in Individual and Group Bargaining"</i>		
Molden, Daniel & Hui, Chin	Psychology	\$1,850
Research <i>"Communication, Regulatory Focus, and Strong Reciprocity in Social Exchange"</i>		
Monroe, Kristin	Anthropology	\$5,960
Research <i>"Civic Cartographies: Space, Conflict, and Public Culture in Beirut"</i>		

Spring 2010

<u>Name</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Award</u>
<u>Project Name</u>		
Gosztonyi, Miklos	Political Science	\$2,000
Travel <i>"All-weather Insurgents: Conflict Mediation and Resolution Mechanisms"</i>		
Gunia, Brian	MORS	\$1,200
Travel <i>"Did I do that? Group positioning and asymmetry in attributional bias"</i>		
Halevy, Nir & Chou, Eileen	MORS	\$1,800
Travel <i>"Stanford: Games Groups Play: Mental Models in Intergroup Conflict and Negotiation"</i>		
Hay, Richard	Political Science	\$3,000
Research <i>"Antagonism, Accommodation, and Abridgment."</i>		
Huang, Li	MORS	\$1,200
Travel <i>"When the Mind and Body Collide: Mind-Body Dissonance Generates Creative Sparks"</i>		
Kim-Jun, Sun-Young	MORS	\$1,200
Travel <i>"Reactions to Disagreement from an In-group Member: The Impact of Outgroup Member Status"</i>		
Kim-Jun, Sun-Young, Bean, Meghan,	MORS	\$4,600
Richardson, Jennifer, Galinsky, Adam		
Research <i>"Trust and Conflict in Interracial Interactions"</i>		
Pornpattananangkul, Narun	Psychology	\$5,000
Research <i>"Winning the Unfair by Turning Down Arousal."</i>		
Shim, So-Hyeon	MORS	\$1,200
Travel <i>"Who Pays More Attention to Whom? Gender Differences in the Effects of Third-Party's Eye Contact"</i>		
Wang, Jiunwen	MORS	\$1,200
Travel <i>"Effects of relationship and status on negotiations in China"</i>		
Will Reno, Miklos Gosztonyi, and Chris Day	Political Science	\$9,699
Research <i>"All-weather Insurgents: Conflict Mediation and Resolution Mechanisms."</i>		
Zellman, Ariel	MORS	\$4,900
Research <i>"Exclusive Histories, Disputed Lands: Ethnonationalism in Territorial Conflict."</i>		

DINNER COLLOQUIA MEMBERS LIST

Bob Agdern
Attorney/Negotiations Consultant

Frederic Artwick
Partner
Sidley, Austin, Brown & Wood

Richard Wm. Austin
Judge
Circuit Court of Cook County

Miles Berman
Alzheimer & Gray

Henry Bienen
President
Northwestern University

Jeanne Brett
Director
Dispute Resolution Research Center
Kellogg School of Management

Kathy Bryan
CPR International Institute for Conflict Prevention &
Resolution

Michelle Buck
Professor
Management & Organizations
Kellogg School of Management

R. Theodore Clark, Jr.
Partner
Seyfarth Shaw

Lynn Cohn
Clinical Associate Professor
Law School
Northwestern University

Jack Cooley
Arbitrator and Mediator

Thomas A. Demetrio
Partner
Corboy & Demetrio

Morton Denlow
Magistrate Judge
Northern District of Illinois
United States District Court

Daniel Diermeier
Professor
Managerial Economic and Decision Sciences
Kellogg School of Management

Katheryn Dutenhaver
Professor
DePaul University College of Law

Adam Galinsky
Professor
Management & Organizations
Kellogg School of Management

Stephen Goldberg
Professor
School of Law
Northwestern University

William Hartgering
Mediator

H. Roderic Heard
Partner
Barnes & Thornburg ^{LLP}

William Hobgood
Senior Labor Advisor
United Airlines

Donald Jacobs
Dean Emeritus
Kellogg School of Management
Northwestern University

Dipak Jain
Dean
Kellogg School of Management
Northwestern University

Kenneth Kaye
Kaye & Associates

Julie Knudson
Director
Alan & Mildred Peterson Foundation

Frederick J. Manning
President
Celtic Group, Inc.

Victoria Husted Medvec
Professor
Management & Organizations
Kellogg School of Management

John Moran
Partner
KPMG Peat Marwick

John H. Morrison
Arbitrator and Mediator

J. Keith Murnighan
Professor
Management & Organizations
Kellogg School of Management

Janice Nadler
Professor of Law
Law School
Northwestern University

Glenn Newman
Associate General Counsel for Labor & Employment
Commonwealth Edison

Greg Northcraft
Department of Business Administration
University of Illinois

Marilyn Pearson
Partner
DLA Piper Rudnick
Gray Cary

Alan Peterson
Chairman
Tucker Alan, Inc.

Katherine Williams Phillips
Associate Professor
Management & Organizations
Kellogg School of Management

Michael E. Roloff
Professor
School of Communication
Northwestern University

Donna Rosemeyer
Legal Director
Allstate Insurance Company

Richard Salem
Mediator

Wesley Skogan
Professor of Political Science
Institute for Policy Research
Northwestern University

Ann Tenbrunsel
Professor
Management Department
University of Notre Dame

Leigh Thompson
Professor
Management & Organizations
Kellogg School of Management

David Van Zandt
Dean and Professor of Law
Law School
Northwestern University

Lyn Van Swol
Professor
School of Communication
Northwestern University

Rakesh Vohra
Professor
Managerial and Economic Decision Sciences
Kellogg School of Management

Robert Weber
Professor
Managerial Economics & Decision Sciences
Kellogg School of Management

Richard Weise
President
International Council of
Education & Software

SPEAKERS, RESEARCH AND WORK-IN-PROGRESS SEMINAR SERIES & DINNER COLLOQUIA

RESEARCH SEMINAR SERIES 09-10

- | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| October 14, 2009 | Hannah Riley Bowles | Harvard University |
| <i>"Gender and Persistence in Negotiation: A Dyadic Perspective"</i> | | |
| October 14, 2009 | Hannah Riley Bowles | Harvard University |
| <i>"Three Things Women Should Know About Gender in Job Negotiations"</i> | | |
| December 2, 2009 | Joe Magee | New York University |
| <i>"Developing and Testing the Social Distance Theory of Power in Real World Crises: Hurricane Katrina and September 11, 2001"</i> | | |
| December 2, 2009 | Joe Magee | New York University |
| <i>"My Brief Journey Using Mixed (and Some Mixed Up) Methods"</i> | | |
| March 3, 2010 | Selin Kesebir | University of Virginia |
| <i>"How to Build Cooperative Alliances: Lessons from Bee Hives"</i> | | |
| March 8, 2010 | Garriy Shteynberg | University of Maryland |
| <i>"The Psychology of Culture"</i> | | |
| April 28, 2010 | Aaron Kay | University of Waterloo |
| <i>"Psychological Power of the Status Quo: Implications for Inequality, Discrimination, and Social Change"</i> | | |
| May 19, 2010 | Jennifer Overbeck | USC Marshall School of Business |
| <i>"When jerks come out on top: Arrogance, status prototypes, and the active construction of hierarchy"</i> | | |

WORK-IN-PROGRESS SEMINARS 09-10

May 4

- | | | |
|---|------|------------------------------|
| Nir Halevy | MORS | Kellogg School of Management |
| <i>"Games groups play: Mental Models in Conflict and Negotiations"</i> | | |
| Jiunwen Wang | MORS | Kellogg School of Management |
| <i>"Asymmetric Trust Transference: A friend's friend may not be a friend, but an enemy's friend is definitely an enemy"</i> | | |

May 11

- | | | |
|--|-------------------|------------------------------|
| Daniel Molden | Psychology | Northwestern University |
| <i>"Motivating the Development and Reestablishment of Trust"</i> | | |
| Mneesha Gellman | Political Science | Northwestern University |
| <i>"The Role of Memory and Identity in Post-Violence Citizenship Participation in El Salvador"</i> | | |
| Long Wang | MORS | Kellogg School of Management |
| <i>"The Calculativeness of Greed"</i> | | |

May 18

Li Huang

MORS

Kellogg School of Management

"The Creative Consequences When Facial Expressions Contradict Mental Emotional States"

Eileen Chou

MORS

Kellogg School of Management

"The hidden cost of contracts: Adverse effects on relationships and performance"

Brian Gunia

MORS

Kellogg School of Management

"To take or not to take" Intra-organizational reactions to blame-taking

ANNUAL ADVISORY MEETING 09-10

May 3, 2010

Taya Cohen

Kellogg School of Management

"Do Groups Lie More Than Individuals?: Honesty & Deception as a Function of Strategic Self-Interest"

CONFERENCES

September 15-17, 2000

Auctions and Negotiations

The DRRC organized a conference on electronic exchange, bringing together preeminent thinkers on human interaction from psychology, economics, and organizational behavior with more than a dozen leaders of the digital economy to discuss bargaining and negotiation in an electronic world. Panels focused on four key areas of electronic exchange: markets, dispute resolution, auctions, and negotiations. Among the questions that were explored:

- Do people behave differently when bargaining and negotiating on-line than they do face to face?
- How does the Web build markets for goods and services? What characteristics of virtual markets, besides electronic exchange, are different from those of tangible markets?

October 27-28, 2001

Culture and Negotiation Conference

The Culture and Negotiation Conference addressed an important void in mainstream negotiation theory and research: an understanding of the cultural context of negotiations. The purpose of this conference was to cross-fertilize ideas, insight, and theory from negotiation and cultural research. Topics covered included basic psychological processes, social processes in negotiation, and social context in negotiation.

November 2, 2002

Negotiation Teaching Workshop

The Teaching Workshop, the DRRC's first open enrollment event, featured seven current Northwestern University faculty and one former faculty member. They presented teaching materials which focused on deal making and integrative negotiations, bargaining games, using video in the classroom, dispute resolution, international negotiations, email negotiations, and social dilemmas and the environment. The purpose of the workshop was to share a number of new teaching exercises and techniques with teaching faculty from other schools

October 22-23, 2003

Frontiers of Negotiation

The conference titled, *Frontiers of Social Psychology: Negotiations*, is a new book of the same title to be published in the Psychology Press series.

May 22-23, 2004

Frontiers of Social Psychology: Negotiations

The conference is titled, **Frontiers of Social Psychology: Negotiations**, is the new book of the same title to be published in the Psychology Press series.

October 23, 2004

Negotiation & Teamwork Teaching Workshop

2nd Biennial Teaching Workshop featuring faculty from Kellogg and Northwestern University's Law School. Sessions focused on negotiation: deal making, dispute resolution, culture, ethics, multi-parties, and decision making: trust, teamwork decision making, and team dynamics. Instructors stress how to maximize the learning experience for your students. The purpose of the workshop is to share teaching exercises and techniques with faculty from other schools.

November 4, 2006

Negotiation & Teamwork Teaching Workshop

3rd Biennial Teaching Workshop featuring faculty from Kellogg and Northwestern University's Law School. Sessions focused on negotiation: deal making, dispute resolution, culture, ethics, multi-parties, and decision making: trust, teamwork decision making, and team dynamics. Instructors stress how to maximize the learning experience for your students. The purpose of the workshop is to share teaching exercises and techniques with faculty from other schools.

July 3-6, 2008

International Association for Conflict Management

Annual Conference - The International Association for Conflict Management (IACM) was founded to encourage scholars and practitioners to develop and disseminate theory, research, and experience that is useful for understanding and improving conflict management in family, organizational, societal, and international settings.

November 1, 2008

Negotiation & Teamwork Teaching Workshop

4th Biennial Teaching Workshop featuring faculty from Kellogg and Northwestern University's Law School. Sessions focused on negotiation: deal making, dispute resolution, culture, ethics, multi-parties, and decision making: trust, teamwork decision making, and team dynamics. Instructors stress how to maximize the learning experience for your students. The purpose of the workshop is to share teaching exercises and techniques with faculty from other schools.

June 15, 2009

Negotiation Teaching Workshop, Kyoto, Japan

Negotiation Teaching Workshop featuring faculty from the Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University's Law School, the Tepper School of Business, and the Haas School of Business. Sessions focused on negotiation: deal making, dispute resolution, and multi-parties. Instructors stress how to maximize the learning experience for your students. The purpose of the workshop is to share teaching exercises and techniques with faculty from other schools.

June 24, 2010

Negotiation Teaching Workshop, Harvard Kennedy School, Boston

Held jointly with the Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School. The purpose of the workshop was to share materials and techniques with experienced negotiation teachers. Adam Galinsky from the Kellogg School of Management opened the program with an optional session on negotiation course design for new teachers. Subsequent sessions were designed for new and advanced teachers. These sessions highlight exciting new exercises from DRRC and PON

WORKING PAPERS

- 415 Memories of Violence: Women's Quest for Claim-Making in El Salvador – October 2010
Mneesha Gellman
- 414 "Kosovo is Serbia": Nation and Homeland in Contentious Territorial Politics - October 2010
Ariel Zellman
- 413 Building Accountability: The Politics of Anticorruption - October 2010
Maria Florencia Guertzovich
- 412 Motivating Trust: A Regulatory Focus Perspective – October 2010
Daniel Molden, Gale Lucas
- 411 The Sound of Power: Conveying and Detecting Power Through Voice – October 2010
Sei Jin Ko, Melody Sadler
- 410 Short horizons and shady situations: When lack of continuity to our future selves leads to unethical behavior – October 2010
Hal Ersner-Hershfield, Taya Cohen, Leigh Thompson
- 409 Paying a Price: Culture, Trust, and Negotiation Consequences – October 2010
Brian Gunia, Jeanne Brett, D Kamdar, Amit Nandkeolyar
- 408 The Role of Individual Regulatory Focus in Motivationally Mixed Groups – October 2010
Abigail Hazlett, Daniel Molden
- 407 Motivating Cooperation and Fairness: Promotion- or Prevention-Focused Choices in Mixed-Motive Conflicts – October 2010
Daniel Molden, Gale Lucas, Samantha Topper, J. Keith Murnighan
- 406 Honesty Pays: On the Benefits of Having and Disclosing Information in Coalition Bargaining – October 2010
Ilja van Beest, Wolfgang Steinel, J. Keith Murnighan
- 405 Contemplation and Conversation: Subtle Influences on Moral Decision Making – October 2010
Brian Gunia, Long Wang, Li Huang, Jiunwen Wang, J. Keith Murnighan
- 404 Differentiating their Way to the Top: Hierarchy, Cooperation and Team Performance – October 2010
J. Keith Murnighan

- 403 The Generalist Bias – October 2010
Long Wang, J. Keith Murnighan
- 402 Awards and the Agency Problem in the NBA – October 2010
Long Wang, J. Keith Murnighan
- 401 Boosting Creativity in Negotiation: The Effects of Accountability, Mood and Time – October 2010
Nir Halevy, Jiyin Cao, Jiunwen Wang, J. Keith Murnighan
- 400 On the pendulum of moral action: The effects of own and others' past moral actions on future moral behavior – October 2010
Jennifer Jordan, Elizabeth Mullen, J. Keith Murnighan
- 399 Economics Education and Greed – October 2010
Long Wang, Deepak Malhotra, J. Keith Murnighan
- 398 How Team Challenges Can Act as Catalysts and Suppressors of Effective Team Process – October 2010
Jeanne Brett, Kristin Behfar, Ray Friedman

Dispute Resolution Research Center's GROUP ASSIGNER

This **easy-to-use** web-based tool assigns students to groups of different sizes according to your specifications. Group Assigner is a **huge time-saver** for faculty teaching negotiations and other courses that use a series of experiential exercises. It works on an algorithm to **minimize the number of times students work with the same person** across a series of negotiation or group exercises, and virtually **eliminates students' complaints**, "but I've negotiated with him/her before."

- Upload your Excel class list.
- Specify the number of groups you would like for an exercise.
- Click "Create".
- Group Assigner does the rest!*

Faculty at Kellogg have benefited from the time saving features of Group Assigner for the past 5 years. Kellogg has recently made the software available to the DRRC to upgrade and share with its users. We are making Group Assigner publicly available under license to individual faculty members (5 classes per year for \$75) or to institutions (15 faculty members, 5 classes each for \$750).

Questions? Call DRRC at 847-491-8068.



The screenshot shows the 'Kellogg Group Assigner' web application. At the top, there is a header with the Kellogg logo and the text 'Dispute Resolution Research Center'. Below the header, there is a navigation bar with links: 'Home', 'About Us', 'Research', 'Contact', and 'Help'. The main content area is divided into two columns. The left column has a purple sidebar with links: 'My Courses', 'Edit Registration', 'Help', and 'Log Out'. The right column has a title 'Kellogg Group Assigner' and a subtitle 'For WFLA Group 2008'. Below this, there is a table with two columns: 'Assign Group' and 'Assign Course'. The table lists several groups and their corresponding courses, with 'Assign Course' links for each group. At the bottom, there are buttons for 'Print' and 'Help'.

Assign Group	Assign Course
Group 1	Assign Course
Group 2	Assign Course
Group 3	Assign Course
Group 4	Assign Course
Group 5	Assign Course
Group 6	Assign Course
Group 7	Assign Course
Group 8	Assign Course
Group 9	Assign Course
Group 10	Assign Course
Group 11	Assign Course
Group 12	Assign Course
Group 13	Assign Course
Group 14	Assign Course
Group 15	Assign Course
Group 16	Assign Course
Group 17	Assign Course
Group 18	Assign Course
Group 19	Assign Course
Group 20	Assign Course
Group 21	Assign Course
Group 22	Assign Course
Group 23	Assign Course
Group 24	Assign Course
Group 25	Assign Course
Group 26	Assign Course
Group 27	Assign Course
Group 28	Assign Course
Group 29	Assign Course
Group 30	Assign Course
Group 31	Assign Course
Group 32	Assign Course
Group 33	Assign Course
Group 34	Assign Course
Group 35	Assign Course
Group 36	Assign Course
Group 37	Assign Course
Group 38	Assign Course
Group 39	Assign Course
Group 40	Assign Course
Group 41	Assign Course
Group 42	Assign Course
Group 43	Assign Course
Group 44	Assign Course
Group 45	Assign Course
Group 46	Assign Course
Group 47	Assign Course
Group 48	Assign Course
Group 49	Assign Course
Group 50	Assign Course
Group 51	Assign Course
Group 52	Assign Course
Group 53	Assign Course
Group 54	Assign Course
Group 55	Assign Course
Group 56	Assign Course
Group 57	Assign Course
Group 58	Assign Course
Group 59	Assign Course
Group 60	Assign Course
Group 61	Assign Course
Group 62	Assign Course
Group 63	Assign Course
Group 64	Assign Course
Group 65	Assign Course
Group 66	Assign Course
Group 67	Assign Course
Group 68	Assign Course
Group 69	Assign Course
Group 70	Assign Course
Group 71	Assign Course
Group 72	Assign Course
Group 73	Assign Course
Group 74	Assign Course
Group 75	Assign Course
Group 76	Assign Course
Group 77	Assign Course
Group 78	Assign Course
Group 79	Assign Course
Group 80	Assign Course
Group 81	Assign Course
Group 82	Assign Course
Group 83	Assign Course
Group 84	Assign Course
Group 85	Assign Course
Group 86	Assign Course
Group 87	Assign Course
Group 88	Assign Course
Group 89	Assign Course
Group 90	Assign Course
Group 91	Assign Course
Group 92	Assign Course
Group 93	Assign Course
Group 94	Assign Course
Group 95	Assign Course
Group 96	Assign Course
Group 97	Assign Course
Group 98	Assign Course
Group 99	Assign Course
Group 100	Assign Course

Home New Groups History Monitor Account Groups Help

Groups Assignment

Kellogg Group Assignment

My Courses

Full Session Options

Help

Log Out

Create New Grouping

Name: Kellogg Group Assignment

Group Size: 10

Create

Relationship

Name: Kellogg

View Update Delete

Current Groupings

Options View Update Delete


Dispute Resolution Research Center

[Home](#)
[About Us](#)
[Research](#)
[Publications](#)
[Contact Us](#)

Course Assigner

[My Courses](#)
[Add New Course](#)
[Help](#)
[Log Out](#)

Kellogg Group Assigner

Assigning Details
Teach2U After Spring 2008 - Module
 To download the Assigned Module for Programming, right click the
 icon below and choose "Save Target As..."

Download

Group 1	Download
Group 2	Download
Group 3	Download
Group 4	Download
Group 5	Download
Group 6	Download
Group 7	Download
Group 8	Download
Group 9	Download
Group 10	Download
Group 11	Download
Group 12	Download
Group 13	Download
Group 14	Download
Group 15	Download
Group 16	Download
Group 17	Download
Group 18	Download
Group 19	Download
Group 20	Download
Group 21	Download
Group 22	Download
Group 23	Download
Group 24	Download
Group 25	Download
Group 26	Download
Group 27	Download
Group 28	Download
Group 29	Download
Group 30	Download
Group 31	Download
Group 32	Download
Group 33	Download
Group 34	Download
Group 35	Download
Group 36	Download
Group 37	Download
Group 38	Download
Group 39	Download
Group 40	Download
Group 41	Download
Group 42	Download
Group 43	Download
Group 44	Download
Group 45	Download
Group 46	Download
Group 47	Download
Group 48	Download
Group 49	Download
Group 50	Download
Group 51	Download
Group 52	Download
Group 53	Download
Group 54	Download
Group 55	Download
Group 56	Download
Group 57	Download
Group 58	Download
Group 59	Download
Group 60	Download
Group 61	Download
Group 62	Download
Group 63	Download
Group 64	Download
Group 65	Download
Group 66	Download
Group 67	Download
Group 68	Download
Group 69	Download
Group 70	Download
Group 71	Download
Group 72	Download
Group 73	Download
Group 74	Download
Group 75	Download
Group 76	Download
Group 77	Download
Group 78	Download
Group 79	Download
Group 80	Download
Group 81	Download
Group 82	Download
Group 83	Download
Group 84	Download
Group 85	Download
Group 86	Download
Group 87	Download
Group 88	Download
Group 89	Download
Group 90	Download
Group 91	Download
Group 92	Download
Group 93	Download
Group 94	Download
Group 95	Download
Group 96	Download
Group 97	Download
Group 98	Download
Group 99	Download
Group 100	Download

The Group Assigner does the rest!

KELLOGG NEGOTIATION FACULTY SINCE 1981

First Name	Last Name	University Organization
Wendi	Adair	University of Waterloo
Lisa	Amoroso	Roosevelt University
Cameron	Anderson	University of California - Berkeley
Ron	Anton	Loyola College in Maryland
Karl	Aquino	University of Georgia
Zoe	Barsness	University of Washington - Tacoma
Chris	Bauman	Northwestern University
Max	Bazerman	Harvard University
Rebecca	Bennett	Louisiana Tech University
Gail	Berger	Northwestern University
Sekou	Bermiss	Northwestern University
Sally	Blount	Kellogg School of Management
Terry	Boles	University of Iowa
Jeanne	Brett	Northwestern University
Michelle	Buck	Northwestern University
Karen	Cates	Monmouth College
Susan	Crotty	Northwestern University
Aletha	Claussen-Schulz	Northwestern University
Taya	Cohen	Northwestern University
Joe	Daly	Appalachian State University
Dania	Dialdin	Sawyer School of Management
Tina	Diekmann	University of Utah
Nicole	Dubbs	Columbia University
Tracy	Dumas	George Washington University
Louisa	Egan	Northwestern University
Craig	Fox	UCLA
Adam	Galinsky	Northwestern University
Tiffany	Galvin	University of Utah
James	Gillispie	University of Illinois, Chicago
Brian	Gunia	Northwestern University
Larry	Heuer	Columbia University
David	Houston	University of Memphis
Li	Huang	Northwestern University
Karen	Jehn	Leiden University
Michael	Jensen	University of Michigan
Jennifer	Jordan	Northwestern University
John	Joseph	Northwestern University
Rekha	Karambayya	York University
Mark	Kennedy	University of Southern California
Mary	Kern	Baruch College
Peter	Kim	University of Southern California
Sei Jin	Ko	Northwestern University
Shirli	Kopelman	University of Michigan

First Name	Last Name	University Organization
Rita	Kosnik	Trinity University – San Antonio
Laura	Kray	University of California Berkeley
Gillian	Ku	London Business School
Terri	Kurtzberg	Rutgers University
Rodney	Lacey	University of California – Irvine
Claus	Langfred	Washington University
Rick	Larrick	Duke University
Geoffrey	Leonardelli	University of Toronto
Daniel	Levin	Rutgers University
Katherine	Liljenquist	Brigham Young University
Paul	Lippert	University of Cincinnati
Jeff	Loewenstein	University of Texas
Michael	Lounsbury	University of Alberta
Robert	Lount	Ohio State University
Denise	Loyd	MIT
Anne	Lytle	Australian Graduate School of Management
Deepak	Malhotra	Harvard University
William	Maddux	INSEAD
Beta	Mannix	Cornell University
Paul	Martorana	University of Texas, Austin
Kathleen	McGinn	Harvard University
Vicki	Medvec	Northwestern University
Don	Moore	Carnegie-Mellon University
Elizabeth	Morrison	New York University
Elizabeth	Mullen	Stanford University
Keith	Murnighan	Northwestern University
Janice	Nadler	Northwestern University
Charles	Naquin	Notre Dame University
Margaret	Neale	Stanford University
Amit	Nigam	Emory University
Kathleen	O'Conner	Cornell University
John	Oesch	University of Toronto
Jim	Oldroyd	Massachusetts Institute Of Technology
Cy	Olson	Michigan State University
Sherry	Peck	Capital University
Robin	Pinkley	Southern Methodist University
Jeffrey	Polzer	Harvard University
Jo-Ellen	Pozner	University of California - Berkeley
Jared	Preston	Consultant
W. Trexler	Proffitt	University of California - Riverside
Sandra	Robinson	University of British Columbia
Ashleigh	Rosette	Duke University
Michael	Sacks	Emory University
Holly	Schroth	University of California, Berkeley

First Name	Last Name	University Organization
Vanessa	Seiden	Consultant
Pri	Shah	University of Minnesota
Debra	Shapiro	University of Maryland
Donna	Shestowsky	University of California, Davis
Marc	Siegell	California State University, Chico
Tony	Simons	Cornell University
Niro	Sivanathan	Northwestern University
Harris	Sondak	University of Utah
Paul	Straub	InterAccess Co.
Roderick	Swaab	Northwestern University
Laurie	Taylor	Christopher Newport University
Ann	Tenbrunsel	University of Notre Dame
Brosh	Teucher	Northwestern University
Melissa	Thomas-Hunt	Cornell University
Leigh	Thompson	Northwestern University
Tracy	Thompson	University of Washington-Tacoma
Cathy	Tinsley	Georgetown University
Tom	Tripp	Washington State University
Kim	Wade-Benzoni	Duke University
James	Walsh	University of Michigan
Cindy	Wang	National University of Singapore
Jiunwen	Wang	Northwestern University
Marvin	Washington	Texas Tech University
Laurie	Weingart	Carnegie-Mellon University
Jennifer	Whitson	University of Texas - Austin
Chen-Bo	Zhong	University of Toronto

NEW TEACHING MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT

Analogical Reasoning

Author Leigh Thompson

Source KTAG

Analogical Reasoning introduces students to learning by analogy (comparison based on structural versus superficial similarity) with the goal of improving their ability to apply concepts learned in the classroom to real world (business) situations. The unit consists of 5 exercises or “demos” - the Tumor and Fortress Demo, the Contingent Contract Demo; the Logrolling Demo, the Sunk Cost Demo and the Proverb Demo. These “demos” can be used singly or in combination to help students and improve their ability to learn, store, and access structural knowledge.

Time: Allow 20-45 minutes for each demo.

Aussie Air

Authors: Brooks Holtom, Adam Bellotti, & Catherine Tinsley

Source: DRRC

Aussie Air is a quantifiable, 5-party multi-issue, quantified with points, negotiation exercise modeled on the Macquarie Bank-led consortium’s takeover attempt of Qantas Airlines. The purpose of the exercise is to demonstrate how negotiations are influenced by social context: new information, changing interests, and shifting coalitions. In order to simulate these social context effects the exercise is divided into three general meetings of all the parties broken up by 2 private or small group conferences.

Preparation 60 minutes; negotiations and private meetings 3 hours

Celtic Luck

Author: Joao Neves

Source: DRRC

Celtic Luck is a simple, yet puzzling, exercise based on Prof. Howard Raiffa’s example of offering one ticket to a basketball game to each of his two best students only to find out that they had already made previous arrangements with their respective significant others. The exercise is designed to introduce fundamental negotiation concepts, especially the creation of alternatives. Two uncommon and challenging features are the fact that the exercise involves simultaneous buy and sell propositions and that the tickets seem to be worth either a lot or nothing. Celtic Luck can be used in large settings (as in an auditorium) or in small classes. Extensive ideas for debriefing are provided.

Preparation: 5-10 minutes

Negotiation: 10-15 minutes

Debriefing: 20-40 minutes

Dollar Auction

Author: J. Keith Murnighan

Source: DRRC

This is a classroom exercise that was originally created by Martin Shubik in 1971. It creates a context in which escalation of commitment almost always results. It shows how public commitments often lead to additional investments, often to the investor’s ultimate detriment. It also shows how emotions and the desire ‘to get a deal’ can be tremendously costly. The teaching notes for this exercise document several extreme cases, where the bidding really got out of hand.

Preparation: 5 minutes

Exercise plus discussion: 10-25 minutes

Fastskin**Author: Holly Schroth****Sources: DRRC**

Fastskin is a multi-person (7-9), multi-issue (3) negotiation with both integrative and distributive elements. It is based on a real situation associated with the introduction of Speedo's Fastskin technology that was associated with many new world swimming records in 2008. It illustrates power, politics, coalition building, and agency issues in the context of an intra-organizational negotiation. It provides for "shadow" negotiations (that occur away from the table prior to an "official" negotiation), for understanding how parties not directly involved at the table can influence negotiations, a discussion of ethics and dispute resolution strategy, and potentially how phone or email may affect negotiations.

Preparation 60 minutes; negotiation: Part 1 – informal negotiations outside of class via phone or chat; Part 2 - Press Party in class 25 minutes; Part 3 - Crisis Meeting 30 minutes

Give and Choose**Author: Cabin Kim****Source: DRRC**

Give and Choose is a 2-party exercise that demonstrates that emotions and perceptions of fairness can lead to non-rational actions in negotiation, decision making and game theory. The exercise is designed to become a part of the students' final grade in the course. To demonstrate a full spectrum of non-rational effects and biases in negotiations or decision-making, this exercise can be paired with the "Guess the Number" exercise, which demonstrates the effect of anchoring and first offers.

Preparation: 2-3 minutes; negotiation: 10 minutes

Goliath**Author: Holly Schroth****Source DRRC**

Goliath provides the opportunity to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of using an agent, the strategies and tactics that are effective for a person acting as an agent, and those that are effective for a person being represented by an agent in negotiations. There is an integrative outcome, but the incentives for the agent and the narrow bargaining zone make creating value challenging. The exercise can also be used to introduce contingency agreements.

Preparation: 2 hours one hour alone outside of class; one hour with a same role partner (can be done in class); time with client – 5-20 minutes; negotiation: 40 minutes with client as observer

H&G Household Goods**Authors: Tanya Menon, Leigh Thompson and Evelyn Williams****Source KTAG**

Household Goods is a conversation between a superior and a subordinate concerning the role the subordinate will take in a team to develop marketing for a new product. The idea for the new product and access to the product's technology came from the subordinate. However, the superior is uncertain about whether to turn leadership of the team over to the subordinate. This exercise can be debriefed and discussed in 5 different ways:

- conflict management;
- negotiating interpersonal relationships;
- creative problem-solving;
- power and relationships; and
- influence.

Preparation: 20-30 minutes; negotiation 30 minutes

Internship**Author Don Moore****Source DRRRC**

Internship is a two-party, multi-issue, quantified in dollars exercise with integrative potential set in the context of negotiating an employment package. Use Internship to introduce the concepts of bargaining zones, BATNAs, and reservation prices, as well as priorities and interests and integrative outcomes. This exercise is a good alternative to DRRC's popular New Recruit. If your school has used New Recruit heavily and you are concerned that the point structure may have been compromised, use Internship.

Preparation: 60 minutes; negotiation 30 minutes

Kidney Case**Authors: David Austen-Smith, Timothy Feddersen, Adam Galinsky & Katie Liljenquist****Source DRRRC**

The Kidney Case is multi-person exercise that involves the allocation of a single kidney. Students read profiles of eight candidates for the kidney and make a first allocation decision. Each candidate was designed to be high on some allocation principles but low or unknown on others (e.g., best, match, time in cue, age, personal responsibility for disease, future benefits to society, etc.). Then, students are put into groups and assigned to advocate for one of the candidates. Each group will prepare and give a 3-minute presentation on why their candidate should receive the kidney. Finally, students make a second allocation decision. Topics for class discussion include value-based principles of resource allocation, persuasion and influence, procedural versus distributive justice, the advocacy effect, and the utility of and ethical considerations for the use of markets. This exercise can be used in Leadership, Negotiation, Power/Politics, and Ethics courses.

Part 1: 10-15 minutes. Working individually, students read the case and rank order the kidney candidates.

Part 2: 15-20 minutes. Divide the class into eight groups and assign each group a kidney candidate. Tell each group to prepare a 3 minute presentation advocating for their candidate to receive the kidney. (Groups do not have to be equal size).

Part 3: 20-25 minutes. Students make their presentations (eight presentations in total).

Part 4: 5 minutes. Working individually, students re-rank the candidates.

Part 5: 30-90 minutes. Discussion

Life Story**Author Leigh Thompson****Source: KTAG**

Life Story's purpose is to provide a venue to explore issues of personal development and self-understanding. The exercise can be used in general management and OB (organizational behavior) courses, leadership courses, power and politics courses, and teamwork and group courses. It is based on research. The exercise requires each student to write a life story using specific guidelines provided by the exercise. Students share life stories with a small group of classmates and then the class debriefs as a whole touching on these of identity, the power of narrative, and happiness and well-being.

Preparation: 60-120 minutes to write the life story; debrief: 60 minutes small groups; 30-60 minutes class as a whole

MP3 Player**Author Leigh Thompson****Source: KTAG**

MP3 Player is a classic team on team prisoner's dilemma exercise. There are 10 rounds with two face to face meetings, one before round 4 and the other before round 9.

Preparation: 20-25 minutes to read and plan strategy with the team; negotiation: 30-45 minutes

Nonprofit Conflict**Author Cabin Kim****Source DRRC**

Non-Profit Conflict is a 2- party exercise with integrative potential if the parties share information about their interests rather than sticking to their positions. It is similar to the Ugly Orange exercise (REF). Two parties are vying over a piece of property. Non-Profit Conflict can be used to teach the difference between fixed and variable pie negotiations, between positions and interests. It illustrates what information to share and under what circumstances to achieve an integrative agreement.

Preparation 15 minutes; negotiation 10 minutes

Omni Chart**Author: Leigh Thompson****Source KTAG**

Omni Chart is a two party –eight issue deal making negotiation exercise. It can be used to introduce concepts of bargaining zones, BATNAs, and integrative bargaining. It is quantified with points, similar to DRRC's New Recruit exercise. However, unlike New Recruit, in Omni Chart the buyer and seller roles are designed to have equal power, unless the instructor wishes to manipulate BATNAs. This exercise can be run one on one or team on team.

Preparation 20-30 minutes for team; negotiation: 30-50 minutes for team.

Shared Activity**Author Leigh Thompson****Source KTAG**

The purpose of Shared Activity is to create cohesion and trust in a group. The exercise is ideally suited for a small group (less than six persons) and it requires approximately three hours of out of class time to complete. There are three parts to the exercise: The first part involves planning a shared activity. The team should set aside 30 minutes to do this. The second part involves engaging in the activity that will last between two hours and one half a day. The third part is a structured question and answer exchange among team members. Team members should plan to spend at least 30 minutes on Part 3. There are guidelines for each part of the exercise.

Exercise: 3 hours of out of class time

COURSES ON NEGOTIATION AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION

A. Kellogg School of Management

1. Cross-Cultural Negotiation

The objective of this course is to improve students' skills in all phases of negotiation including managing intragroup relations, integrative and distributive approaches; making choices in response to ethical and human problems; and negotiating in a variety of contexts, including multilateral negotiations and negotiating with the assistance of a third party.

2. Power and Politics in Organizations

This course examines personal and organizational factors that contribute to a person's political effectiveness in organizations. There will be an emphasis on developing awareness of different political strategies and tactics. The analysis of power will include an examination of ethical considerations as well as different strategies to protect yourself when you are the target of an influence attempt.

3. Strategic Decision Making

A decision maker faces two types of uncertainty: uncertainty about the state of nature (How much oil is on a tract of land?) and uncertainty about the strategic behavior of other decision makers (What pricing strategy will a competitor follow?). This course focuses on a strategic uncertainty and the uses of a decision maker can make of the concepts of game theory to guide his decisions. Topics include bargaining and arbitration, collusion and competition, joint cost allocation, market entry and product differentiation, and competitive bidding. Role-playing exercises and case analysis are used.

4. Conflict, Authority and Rules

A seminar examining the ways that authorities and rule structures cause or prevent conflict and manager conflict when it occurs. The class is interdisciplinary in focus, examining the writing of psychologists, political scientists, sociologists, anthropologists, organization theorists, and law and social science researchers.

5. Individual and Competitive Decision Making

The purpose of this course is to understand and improve how we make decisions. This course is designed to complement the technical skills learned in other courses at Kellogg. A basic premise of the course is that a manager needs analytical skills to discover optimal solutions to problems. However, the intuition that lies at the core of these decisions may be faulty. This course will allow participants the opportunity to develop better decision making skills experientially. The course is designed to be relevant to a broad spectrum of decisions that are faced by the manager and professional.

6. The Theory of Games

Game Theory is concerned with the problems of conflict and cooperation between rational decision makers. It explores concepts basic to economic, political, and social theory. This course provides a rigorous introduction to the fundamental ideas of game theory.

7. Principles of Game Theory for Managerial Decisions

To formulate an effective strategy in a competitive situation, a manager needs to understand and anticipate the strategic behavior of his opponents. To do so, he must try to look at the situation from their point of view, as well as his own. Game theory provides a general framework for analyzing competitive situations and formulating optimal strategies that take into account the information and incentives of other decision makers. This course will develop the fundamental ideas of game theory as they apply to the analysis of managerial decision making.

8. Games and Decisions

A decision maker generally faces two kinds of uncertainty: uncertainty about nature, and uncertainty about other decision makers. This course develops the basic concepts for determining optimal decisions in economic problems involving both kinds of uncertainty.

9. Negotiation Strategies for Managers

Taught at the James L. Allen Center for the Executive Masters Program, this seminar uses the latest advances in the field of negotiations to help managers plan and implement more effective negotiation strategies. The emphasis is on creating opportunities for mutual gain in negotiations.

10. Team-Building

Taught at the Allen Center features Leigh, Keith, Dave, Brian and Deb doing communication, interdependence and some conflict management.

B. Northwestern University Department of Communications Studies

1. Theories of Persuasion

This course is designed to make the student aware of major theoretical perspectives of persuasion. The student is expected to exhibit understanding and retention of key concepts and theories. As such, the primary course content comes from social scientific theory and research. We will explore general perspectives of persuasion as well as those focused on particular contexts (e.g., advertising, bargaining, and negotiation).

2. Interpersonal Conflict

This course is focused on processes observed in interpersonal disputes. Causes of conflict and methods of resolution will be discussed. Sources of information include research and theory drawn from communication, social psychology, and sociology. The course includes general models of conflict as well as material related to disagreements in specific contexts such as friendship, dating, and marriage. The primary method of teaching is lectures and students are encouraged to ask questions and offer examples.

3. Theories of Bargaining and Negotiation

A variety of theories and research projects that explain and predict behavior within negotiation contexts are the focus of this course. These theories are drawn from a variety of disciplines including organizational behavior, industrial relations, political science, social psychology, and communication. Much of the class material is drawn from social scientific theory and research and negotiation within a variety of contexts including collective bargaining, family interactions, sales, and international diplomacy. The primary method of teaching is lectures and students are encouraged to ask questions and offer examples.

4. Seminar in Persuasion

An overview of theoretical and research traditions in the scientific study of persuasion. This course was developed to meet two needs that have been expressed by the faculty and former doctoral students in the department. First, the study of persuasion is central to many of the areas of communication inquiry; hence, our doctoral students need grounding in classic and contemporary theories of persuasion in order to develop important research questions. Second, after completing the doctorate, many of our students will be expected to teach a course in persuasion. Therefore, they need to be sufficiently familiar with the material so as to perform well in the classroom.

5. Persuasion

The goal of this course is to translate the product of the Seminar in Persuasion into practical applications to persuasion situations of interest to individual students. As such, the professor provides information about the theoretical frameworks that drive inquiry and the results of scholarship with a specific aim of showing its relevancy for everyday persuasion.

C. Northwestern University School of Law

1. Dispute Resolution

Of the disputes that come into a lawyer's office, only a small proportion are resolved by court adjudication. Yet legal education is almost exclusively concerned with this form of dispute resolution. The goal of this course is to provide students with an understanding of the full range of dispute resolution processes -- negotiation, mediation, adjudication, and arbitration, as well as hybrid forms of these processes, such as Med-Arb, the Mini-Trial, and Rent-A-Judge.

2. Negotiation Workshop

For most lawyers, negotiation is a major part of their professional duties. Of those matters that come into a lawyer's office, the vast majority are resolved by negotiation. Negotiation -- communication for the purpose of persuasion--is also a major element of everyday life. This course is designed to give students experience in negotiation as well as a grounding in negotiation theory.

The emphasis of the course is on experiential learning. Students will spend most of their time participating in negotiation simulations, as well as discussing negotiation problems. Students will frequently be observed in their negotiations and will receive immediate feedback. Some negotiations will be videotaped for later viewing and feedback.

The negotiation simulations cover a wide range of situations. In past years, students have negotiated the settlement of lawsuits, neighborhood disputes, campus disputes, personal services contracts, contracts for the sale and purchase of commercial and residential property, intra-family disputes, corporate take-overs, international disputes and labor disputes.

3. Mediation Advocacy

Steve Goldberg and Lynn Cohn presented their new course on mediation advocacy at Northwestern University Law School in the spring semester, 2000. This course provides students both with a theoretical background and hands-on experience in mediation and with a special emphasis on mediation advocacy. A portion of the course is mediation skills training conducted by the Chicago Center for Conflict Resolution.