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TEACHING THE CULTURAL ASPECTS OF NEGOTIATION: A RANGE OF EXPERIENTIAL TECHNIQUES

Stephen E. Weiss
York University

This article presents 5 main experiential techniques for teaching about negotiation and culture. They are symmetric acting (prescribing negotiating styles for a role-play), interacting with "real Romans", concentrating on implicit cultures in the class, multicultural negotiating, and culture in (complex) context. Interacting with Romans may involve featured guests, multiple cultural representatives, or negotiations in their language. The article illustrates and evaluates each technique, and closes with general pedagogical considerations such as participants' backgrounds, deroling/debriefing, and the capacity to effect behavioral change.

Keywords: negotiation teaching; culture; cross-cultural training; experiential learning

One of the most common cross-cultural negotiation role-plays in the United States since the early 1980s has been "Alpha-Beta," a sales and licensing negotiation in robotics involving two-person teams. In confidential material for its role, the Alpha, Inc., team is instructed to negotiate according to the Alphan style, whereas Beta, Inc., is to act Betan. Each style consists of six characteristics. For instance, Alphans are informal, direct, and impatient; Betans are formal, indirect, and patient. These styles clash as soon as the role-play begins. Students can learn a number of lessons from this exercise, and it
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works well in various circumstances. Still, it is only one option for instructors interested in experiential approaches.

The purpose of this article is to present for negotiation, management, and other instructors a range of experiential methods for teaching about cultural aspects of negotiation. They suit comparative and intercultural orientations to the subject. I begin the article by addressing teaching objectives, then concentrate on five experiential techniques—describing, illustrating, and evaluating each of them from my experiences. These techniques vary in purpose, materials, and required resources, so that every instructor should find at least one of them feasible for course use.

This article also is intended to stimulate reflection on larger issues related to teaching culture and negotiation. They are pragmatic, as well as cognitive and pedagogical. Consider the following account:

During a term-long MBA course on international negotiation, the instructor invited a number of Japanese businessmen to one class to negotiate with students. After this experience, one American student concluded that Japanese are patient and at ease with long periods of silence.

A few weeks later, he interviewed for a job in New York City with a recruiter who was Japanese. When their conversation hit a lull, the student recalled what he had learned from class and allowed the silence to linger. In mere seconds, the Japanese recruiter surprised him by saying, “What’s the matter? Don’t you have any more questions?”

Two issues here, namely, the transferability of in-class lessons to the workplace and the usefulness of knowing attributes of a group for an encounter with one member, are among several relevant issues. Raising such issues should contribute to instructors’ capacity to improve students’ understanding and skills for cross-cultural negotiations.

Teaching Objectives

The principal aim of most negotiation instructors is to teach students to be better, if not excellent, negotiators. As Lewicki (1986, p. 18; 1997, p. 258) has observed, instructors typically plan to familiarize students with certain basic topics such as conflict theory, competitive bargaining, cooperative negotiation, and resolution of deadlocks. Most instructors endeavor to improve students’ knowledge bases, analytical capabilities, and interpersonal skills. Beyond these general aims, however, instructors differ in their specific goals, as well as values and approaches.

My teaching of negotiation emphasizes general skills, relationship dynamics, and repertoires of styles. Students work on four skills: (negotia-
tion) preparing, communicating, problem solving, and process management. Over two decades of experience, it is these skills, rather than scintillating but limited-use gambits and tactics, that have impressed me as determinants of how often or consistently a negotiator negotiates well. Every negotiator pursues his or her interests and objectives in the context of dynamic evolving relationships; it is through the cooperation of other parties, after all, that one seeks to satisfy one’s interests. Thus, a second of my goals is to instill in students a keen attentiveness to relationships and their development and a honed ability to analyze and deal with the relationship effects of various behaviors and conditions. I also try to broaden students’ negotiating repertoires because “one size does not fit all.” Different counterparts and types of relationships call for different approaches and behavior. It behooves students who are good competitive negotiators to learn collaborative approaches and students who are compromisers to add assertive techniques.

As for the cultural aspects of negotiation, this expression deliberately applies to negotiations within a culture, as well as between cultures. It encompasses intracultural, comparative, and intercultural perspectives, whereas cross-cultural, strictly speaking, refers only to the latter two. Whatever the perspective, culture may be thought of as the set of shared and enduring meanings, values, and beliefs that characterizes a group and orients members’ behavior (Faure & Sjostedt, 1993, p. 3). It includes the plans and rules they employ “to interpret their world and to act purposefully within it” (Spradley & McCurdy, 1971, p. 2). Many types of groups have cultures, but to limit scope, the rest of this article focuses on national cultures.

When teaching cultural aspects of negotiation, I bear in mind the three negotiation emphases discussed previously and add three more. Cross-cultural contexts accentuate the value of the first three goals; in fact, they contributed to my original discernment of the goals. These contexts typically expand the ranges of variation apparent in negotiators’ behaviors, relationships, and influencing conditions (see Weiss, 1993). They even bring to light new variables in negotiation, for what is constant within a culture may vary beyond it (e.g., the official language).

Among the teaching objectives specific to culture and intercultural negotiation, my first objective is to direct students’ sights past stand-alone lists of dos and don’ts to the real richness and complexity of culture. I also aim to make the point that culture is significant—not negligible but not necessarily dominant—in negotiation. The second objective is to enable students, through interactive experiences, to see how negotiating styles may differ from their own and, more critically, to see (and feel) how these styles interact. Cultural differences can lead to, not just impede, good agreements, as can, conversely, similarities. My third objective, consistent with broadening stu-
dents’ repertoires, is to raise their willingness to deal with different negotia-
ting styles. This includes familiarizing students with negotiating practices of
particular cultures. Finally, there are objectives specific to the experiential
techniques to consider, and they are discussed with the techniques in subse-
quent sections.

**Five Experiential Techniques**

Negotiation instructors are certainly not the first to teach about culture. There is substantial literature on cross-cultural training, a field dedicated to
enhancing individuals’ effectiveness in communicating and establishing per-
sonal relationships beyond their own cultures. Various methods for this pur-
pose have been developed, classified, and evaluated over the years (e.g.,
Brislin, Landis, & Brandt, 1983, pp. 7-8; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983,
p. 126).

Management researchers Black and Mendenhall (1989) have proposed a
two-dimensional framework for selecting among these training methods. The first dimension rests on social learning theory and, specifically, on two
processes of behavioral modeling: symbolic modeling and participative
modeling. In the former, the trainee hears the behavior modeled, or both hears
and sees it; in the latter, the trainee observes and participates verbally or both
verbally and physically. The second dimension, “rigor,” is defined as the
degree of cognitive involvement required of a trainee. Lecturing on how Jap-
anese people negotiate, for example, would be a “factual” method (symbolic
modeling, low rigor) in the framework, whereas a negotiation simulation
would be classified as an “experiential method” (participative modeling,
high rigor). Black and Mendenhall identify a dozen training methods and rec-
ommend that selection of any one of them be based on contingencies such as
culture novelty (the degree of difference between the trainee’s own and the
target culture) and the degree of expected interaction between the trainee and
members of the host culture. The greater the magnitude of such variables,
they assert, the greater the rigor needed in the training method.3

Experiential teaching methods are preferred by many instructors and
trainers (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1983, p. 126; Lewicki, 1986). Black and
Mendenhall (1989, p. 523) themselves have written that “[there is] evidence
to strongly suggest that the more rigorous the training, the more effectively
the trainee will be able to actually and appropriately execute the learned
behaviors.” But the contingencies the authors point out, an instructor’s own
teaching objectives and differences in students’ learning styles (Hayes &
Allinson, 1988; Kolb, Osland, & Rubin, 1995, pp. 55-56), argue for the more
circumspect view that experiential methods are not always better than others.4

That said, there is a rich variety of ways in which to use experiential meth-
ods to teach cross-cultural negotiation. Five main ways or techniques are
listed in Table 1, roughly in order of difficulty (including rigor) for students
and teachers. These techniques all entail face-to-face interaction (i.e., in per-
son, in the same room), although other modes of communication available
today—from asynchronous fax and e-mail exchanges to live chats, tele-
conferencing, and video-conferencing—also could be considered experien-
tial. The following paragraphs discuss in detail each of the five techniques. I
have used them primarily with MBA and corporate students in North Amer-
ica and as a “non-Roman” teaching about “Roman” practices, but the tech-
niques have wide applicability.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Experiential Techniques for Cross-Cultural Negotiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Symmetric acting (prescribing scripts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interacting with “real Romans”:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) featured guests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) multiple cultural representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) negotiations in their language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Concentrating on implicit cultures in the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Negotiating across many cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Culture in (complex) context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SYMMETRIC ACTING (PRESCRIBING SCRIPTS)**

In symmetric acting, participants are instructed confidentially to negotiate
according to a style, or script, that differs significantly from their own. The
script may represent a real culture, disguised or exaggerated, or an entirely
fictitious one. Typically the negotiating styles conflict.

This technique enables an instructor to expose students directly to the
emotional and behavioral effects of interacting with counterparts who have
unfamiliar or very different negotiating styles. Participants experience cul-
ture shock and procedural impasse. An equally important purpose is to pro-
vide students with an opportunity to run with a style different than their own
and discover firsthand some of its strengths, possibly incorporate a few ele-
ments into their own repertoires, and still learn how difficult it is, as a non-
Roman, to sustain a Roman approach. During a debriefing, the instructor also
can broach biases against “foreigners.”
The Alpha-Beta role-play previously mentioned was created expressly for symmetric acting. The substantive agenda is fairly simple. Alpha, Inc., and Beta, Inc., are industrial companies, from the countries of Alpha and Beta, poised to finalize a two-phase, sales and licensing deal in robotics. Four issues remain (e.g., the number of robots). The original version of the role instructions consists of an internal memo, public information on markets and companies, and a negotiating style sheet (Lewicki, Litterer, Saunders, & Minton, 1993, pp. 626-628). (The upgraded version adds a fifth issue, and cost and price data.)

Each style sheet describes six attributes. Betans, for example, are collectivistic, formal, patient, indirect, unemotional, and passive. Behaving indirectly, to take one trait, is conveyed as follows:

Ask many questions, while offering little information. Betans are tentative, vague, and play hard to read. Do not look members of the Alpha team in the eye when you talk to them (you think that would be aggressive and individualistic); instead look down. Say “yes” when you mean “I hear you talking” or “I’m trying to understand.” “No” is hardly ever used in Beta because answers in the complete negative lead to embarrassment and loss of face. Instead of “no,” say “That would be very difficult.”

The Alphan style is diametrically opposed, a fact not revealed to the participants in advance, although they sometimes suspect it. To minimize leaks about these styles, the instructor can send Alphans and Betans to separate rooms to prepare for the role-plays.

The negotiations themselves may be conducted in either of two formats. In the short format, participants are stopped after 6 to 8 minutes of negotiation. In my experience, that is all it takes for North American MBA students to reach a high frustration point with the lack of substantive progress. Thereafter, yearning to resolve the issues, they tend to slip out of character. The long format consists of two phases: the first for symmetric acting; the second, which follows a quick mini-debriefing of the first, allows participants to try to finalize an agreement without using styles.

For part of the debriefing (whenever it takes place), the instructor might direct all Alphans to sit on one side of the classroom and Betans to sit on the other. He or she can ask one side, then the other, to express their feelings. Common responses include surprised, uncomfortable, confused, and frustrated. Some students feel betrayed and distrustful. Next, the instructor can ask for descriptions of counterparts’ negotiating styles. Alphans often describe Betans as uncooperative and evasive (a few will say reserved), whereas Betans label Alphans aggressive, slick, and, more objectively,
straightforward. These replies may be used to show how easy it is to be judgmental and to launch a broad discussion of cultural aspects of negotiation.

Symmetric acting is not restricted in use to a particular negotiation scenario, although it is best suited to relatively simple agendas so students can concentrate on negotiation styles. It is feasible with culturally homogeneous classes, offers a liberating “level playing field” for all participants to fully act out their roles, and illuminates aspects of negotiation that they might otherwise ignore. For instance, Americans who act Betan are often amazed by the power of silence. Thus, as a teaching technique, symmetric acting can efficiently meet several purposes in a short or introductory class. Among its drawbacks, however, students face counterpart behavior that is contrived (a non-Roman is pretending to be Roman), and more constrained and rigid than likely in a real intercultural negotiation. They also do not learn facts about a real culture and may emerge overly impressed with the role of behavior as compared with values and assumptions in cultures (cf. Sanyal & Neves, 1998).

INTERACTING WITH “REAL ROMANS”: THREE FORMS

If symmetric acting is considered “acting Roman,” the next technique and its variants involve student interaction with real Romans. These representatives of a real target culture are guests to the class, not class members or students’ acquaintances. The instructor’s role is to organize, facilitate, and debrief the interactions. Three forms of interaction are presented below, in order of increasing rigor for students.

Featured Guests

This technique involves inviting a team of two to three guests to negotiate in front of the class with a team of students. The guests are requested “just to come and negotiate [the case] as realistically as possible.” Unlike the cultural informant employed in anthropological research, these guests do not talk about how they negotiate; they actually do negotiate. The student team should be chosen from a single cultural group in order to limit cultural noise. The negotiations are conducted in the students’ native language.

The major purpose of this technique is to provide an example of a real intercultural negotiation that students can experience or observe for differences and similarities with their own practices. It is a way to demonstrate or reveal some negotiating practices of a culture of particular class interest, although this goal should be pursued cautiously (see ahead to pros and cons). By inviting at least two guests, the instructor can expose students to intra-
cultural differences, as well as similarities. Furthermore, to maximize the
guests’ educational impact, one might select invitees who are seasoned pro-
fessionals and are newcomers to the students’ country.

Various role-play materials may be used with the featured guests tech-
nique. Generally, the less the case explicitly incorporates social and cultural
factors, the better, because the students and guests bring those elements to the
negotiation. Examples include the Alpha-Beta role-play minus style instruc-
tions and “Bolter Turbines,” a bilateral sales negotiation over a natural gas
compressor involving three-person teams (Graham, 1984).

With regard to format, I run this kind of role-play twice during a single
class or workshop. The first time, all students except one team negotiate with
each other in various locations for, say, 20 to 25 minutes. One of these pairs
negotiates alone in the classroom and is videotaped. When they conclude,
everyone reenters the classroom, and the guests arrive. Students then watch
the same case negotiated anew by the guests and remaining student team. The
first run gives the student observers a basis for comparison; it also familiar-
izes them with the substance of the case, allowing them, as observers, to pay
more attention to fine points of the second negotiation.

When this negotiation ends, a 20- to 30-minute debriefing takes place. To
put participants at ease, I lead observers in applause then sit with the partici-
pants at the front of the classroom. Focusing on communication, I ask a stu-
dent participant, “What one statement or action by a counterpart stands out in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debriefing Questions for Intercultural Negotiation Role-Plays and Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Party A, what one thing that B said or did during the negotiation really stands out in your mind? What do you think B meant or intended to accomplish?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“B, do you remember saying/doing that? Why did you say/do it? (What were you trying to accomplish?)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Party B, what one thing that A said or did...?” [see above]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A, do you remember saying/doing that...?” [see above]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Observer X (1, 2, 3...n), do you remember that statement (action)? What did you make of it?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Guest Y, how would this negotiation have differed if it had taken place outside the classroom?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Party B, what general recommendations would you offer to A’s who negotiate in your culture?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
your mind? What do you think he (she) meant or intended to accomplish?”

After the student’s response, I turn to that counterpart and ask, “Do you
remember that? What was your intention?” The same sequence is followed
with the other student and the guests (see Table 2). (To some extent, I am tac-
itly modeling behavior for dialogue that furthers mutual understanding.)
Audience members contribute questions and comments. Finally, before their
departure, I request additional recommendations guests may have for stu-
dents when they negotiate in the real world with the guests’ compatriots.

When the class reconvenes after a break (when guests depart), I encourage
students to probe more deeply the vicissitudes of communication and intrica-
cies of relationships. We compare students’ observations and compare these
observations to videotape excerpts from both negotiations. There is always at
least one behavior or statement for which observers have three or four differ-
ent interpretations.

My experience with this technique spans MBA classes and numerous cor-
porate workshops in the United States and Canada. For many workshops, I
have invited (and compensated) mature graduate students from countries as
diverse as Argentina, China, France, Japan, Kuwait, Mexico, and Saudi Ara-
bia. What emerges in these unchoreographed negotiations is always instruc-
tive and usually fascinating.

Consider, for example, the following three excerpts from Alpha-Beta
negotiations (sans style) with Japanese, Mexican, and French guests playing
the Beta roles. In each case, participants have been told the Alphans are trav-
eling to Beta.

The first negotiation involves two Americans (disguised here as “John”
and “Jane”) and two Japanese men (“Tanaka” and “Goto”). The following
occurs in just the first 2 minutes:

John says “Good morning” in English and in Japanese. He introduces himself
to Goto, extends a hand and bows slightly, then introduces Jane as his manager
[a fact that later goes unheeded]. The four individuals exchange business cards,
but Jane hesitates after offering her card to Goto. [She does not have one left for
Tanaka.] They take their seats, and Goto asks, “How was your trip?” John says, “Very
good, thank you . . . From our last meeting, if I may, I’d like to give you some
minutes.” Goto replies, “I see.” After distributing copies to both Goto and
Tanaka, John says, “These minutes sum up . . . agreements we reached at our
last meeting and some . . . outstanding issues.” Goto says, “Yes . . . I’d like to
[read them].” With heads down, Goto and Tanaka each read the document with
apparent care while John watches and becomes visibly more anxious to pro-
ceed. Goto finishes reading before Tanaka, waits quietly until Tanaka finishes,
then looks over to him. Tanaka nods, Goto nods, and they both then redirect
their attention to John.
Even in this brief segment, there is much about negotiator behavior to notice and discuss.

The second negotiation, between two Americans and a Mexican, illustrates the contests that may occur over procedure. Watch for “Manuel’s” response to “Jim’s” initiative.

After some socializing, Manuel says, “OK, we are supposed to talk about the business our colleagues make [sic] the last few months. I was wondering what are your targets? What do you want from us?” Jim replies, “Before I discuss our wants, I’d like you to explain your understanding of past discussions.” Manuel obliges, describing the concept of a two-phase tie-up then noting, “We have to discuss quantities, models, price and royalty.” [He omits the fifth issue.]

Jim says, “That’s exactly right. Now going back to preliminary discussions . . . there’ve been some changes.” Manuel’s posture tightens as he says, “Hmmm.” Jim flips back and forth through his papers, mumbling. Manuel asks, “Was it in models? Spraying and welding only?” Jim replies, “No . . . hmmm . . . there’s just one other thing [he nonverbally consults his teammate, fruitlessly]. OK, why don’t we proceed? . . . First issue we wanted to discuss—models. (Manuel says, “Yeah.”) And we thought we’d take four models.” Now Manuel responds, “I’d like to know a global view. What’s all the package?” (Jim checks, “The complete package?”) “The complete package, and then we’ll discuss.”

Manuel and Jim’s procedural preferences differ, and Manuel, who concedes the first time and grows suspicious with subsequent events, counters when Jim asks him the second time to proceed his way.

The third and last excerpt demonstrates the effectiveness of being responsive and nimble in an intercultural negotiation. Here, an American team led by “Joe” is negotiating with two French men (“Pierre” and “Jean-Louis”). Notice how Joe deals with the hurdles he encounters.

After some preliminaries, Pierre states, “I guess we’re going to see if we can reach an agreement here. Our first point was to see how many models you wanted... (Because we may also enter your market and want to offer different models,) I thought it would make more sense for you to take three.” Joe says, “Well, based on our prior negotiations, maybe we want to go over the agreement . . . brief review . . . then we can go into the topics that are outstanding.” Getting the Betans’ consent, Joe summarizes the tentative agreement and identifies the five remaining issues. The Betans concur.

Then Joe says, “Getting into the models is one thing. I would like to see what your consideration is on unit price based on your wholesale export business in today’s environment.” After verbally consulting his teammate, Jean-Louis replies, “Well, in fact, I think price will depend of [sic] how many units you’re going to take. . . . [W]e should focus first on number of models you want and how many units. . . . It makes more sense to see the price according to the
number you’re willing to buy.” Joe follows with “Based on your proposal, do you have a unit quantity that you’re considering?” Jean-Louis lays out a careful rationale then states, “So we were thinking at the beginning to introduce you one or two models at a quantity of about 175-200 units per year.” Joe asks, “Based on that quantity and number of models, what would you be offering for a wholesale price?” Now Jean-Louis says, “We’ll offer you a price of basically $71,000.”

As Joe demonstrates, there is often more than one way to reach a destination.

In evaluating the featured guests technique, one could highlight its feasibility for most instructors, the opportunity to select a particular culture of focus, and the naturalistic as opposed to scripted behavior of the counterpart. In fact, when guests inquire in advance as to whether they should “act typically Mexican” if they are Mexican, I emphatically say, “No, just be yourself.” This technique corresponds well with the objective of furthering students’ skills in communication and relationship building with diverse counterparts.

On the negative side, an instructor may find students reluctant to negotiate with guest experts in “fishbowl” style. When that happens, I try to coax volunteers by pointing out that they will learn the most from this special opportunity and will be contributing value to the whole class. When pressed, I also agree to erase the videotape immediately after class. Debriefing, too, can be a delicate undertaking. Students’ comments are sometimes undiplomatic, which makes for awkward class moments and a potentially shorter future guest list. Some guests limit themselves to making only “rosy” comments (Mendenhall, 1989, p. 31), and there is some risk that students will develop cultural stereotypes. Finally, for all but two students in the class, this technique does not entail participative modeling or high rigor, in Black and Mendenhall’s (1989) sense of the term.

**Multiple Cultural Representatives**

By bringing into class as many guests from a focal culture as there are students, an instructor can provide every student with a comparable firsthand intercultural negotiation experience. This multiple cultural representatives technique has two other purposes. The first purpose is to delve into the negotiating practices of one culture, partly by identifying similarities in guests’ ideas and behavior. The second purpose is to illustrate the variations possible within a cultural group.

Procedurally, an instructor may divide a 3-hour class into a brief orientation; 30-minute preparation period (built in primarily for the guests’ benefit); 60-minute period for concurrent, student-guest negotiations (divisible into
negotiation sessions and caucuses as participants see fit); 30-minute plenary debriefing; and an informal reception. All participants should receive the role materials in advance.9 (Role-play materials similar to those in the featured guests technique are suitable here.) The instructor may assign all guests the same side (role) or different sides, as one might do to explore role behavior (e.g., Japanese buyers versus sellers). The negotiations are conducted in separate rooms and in the students’ usual (in-class) language, although guests may well conduct some caucuses and at-table sidebars in their mother tongue. During the negotiations, the instructor may want to circulate and briefly observe each of them as a show of appreciation and moral support for both sides and as a means of gathering themes for the debriefing.

Starting the plenary debriefing promptly is both a logistical challenge, given the number of role-plays, and a judgment call. Students have much to gain not only from the role-play but also from subsequent conversation with guest counterparts as they return to the main classroom. That should not be cut off too quickly. Once the debriefing starts, I ask all student teams to report their negotiation outcomes, which typically vary; then I ask two or three students to describe their proceedings. Guests will volunteer comments, and I invite students to direct questions to guests. In my view, the instructor’s role is to maximize student-guest discussion that furthers improved student understanding of the guests’ culture and ways to negotiate effectively in it. Before concluding the class, I ask guests for general recommendations about negotiation for the students. The optional reception, like the postnegotiation conversations, allows individual students to draw additional insights from their counterparts and from other guests.

Discussing this exercise exclusively with the students in a subsequent class usually adds value to the experience. In this forum, the instructor and students can appropriately address potentially sensitive observations about guests that they withheld. Perhaps more important, the class can collect information across the independent negotiation experiences and openly compare guests’ ideas and behaviors.

Use of the multiple cultural representatives technique, like any other, has its pros and cons. The pros include students’ more sophisticated appreciation of the target culture and its internal diversity, the culture-negotiation connection, and the individual feedback that students obtain from guests. This kind of program also generates tremendous student interest and enthusiasm, which spill over to the rest of a course. Among the cons, this technique requires major resources and access to a large, nearby cultural group.10 Other cons include too many negotiations for the instructor to observe, the brevity of the plenary debriefing, and most guests’ limited disclosures during it.
Negotiations in Their Language

Of the three forms of interacting with real Romans, the most rigorous for students is to negotiate with guests in the guests’ mother tongue(s). Independent concurrent negotiations may all be conducted in one language or in different languages.

Why attempt this technique? It pushes the limits of most students’ communication, process management, and relationship-building skills (see Weiss, 1994). It is, in many ways, the ultimate, cross-cultural negotiation role-play. More than any of the previous techniques, negotiation in their language focuses on student behavior (rather than guests’ behavior) and on fine-tuning their skills in a particular intercultural situation. This technique also serves to deepen their knowledge of another culture and its communication patterns, and to open up discussion of cultural beliefs, values, and assumptions.

Alpha-Beta (without style sheets) and Bolter Turbines (with minor modifications) work well as role-plays for these negotiations. Ideally, however, role-play instructions would be “in-language.” For example, “Cartoon,” which involves a film producer’s sale of syndication rights to a TV station general manager, is available in English, Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, and Spanish (through the Kellogg School at Northwestern University). These versions include appropriate modifications of other aspects of the instructions (e.g., the nationality of the individual negotiators, names and ownership or domicile of the companies, location of the negotiations).

A class schedule similar to that for multiple cultural representatives may be used for negotiations in their language. The debriefing should be conducted in the class’s usual language when the student-guest negotiations have been in multiple languages, although a bilingual instructor could debrief in “Roman” if only that language were used in the negotiations. In the case of multiple languages, the instructor can augment the impact of the debriefing by requiring each student to submit a follow-up memo that describes their preparations and the negotiations, assesses their team’s performance, and identifies areas for personal improvement.

In my experience, these negotiations unfold in various ways. In a recent Cartoon negotiation in French, the guest, in the role of the TV general manager, probed students’ product and market knowledge, asking why the French market would want American cartoons, whether other American cartoons had succeeded, and what lessons Euro Disney offered. He controlled the entire process, albeit diplomatically. On another occasion, an Alpha-Beta role-play in Japanese began with discussion of the weather, travel destinations, and Japanese food, but once the Japanese team turned the conversation
to business, they pressed students hard for concessions. In sum, many guests treat students even-handedly, a few guests intentionally test them, and some guests even coach students during the negotiations (although I would prefer they do so afterward).

What students take from these experiences relates to cultural similarities and differences, negotiators’ use of language, and other negotiation skills. One student participant in a stand-alone program of this kind who had previously taken a term-long negotiation course commented to me, “This negotiation, more than any other I have participated in . . . was an exercise of thinking on your feet.” It is mentally and physically demanding. Students also realize how intricate a role language—one aspect of culture—plays in negotiation, and they come to appreciate that negotiating effectively across cultures involves perceiving nuances, finding le mot juste for a reply, and arguing persuasively. Last, students learn more about guest cultures’ general norms and negotiating norms, through both confirmation of their expectations and through counterexample.

To be sure, there are drawbacks and advantages to this technique. It requires high language proficiency levels for students and the instructor (alternatively, one could employ bilingual assistants or team teach), major logistical arrangements and access to qualified guests, and too quick a coverage of multiple targets during the debriefing. Yet, it accomplishes the purposes for which it is designed. It helps students, in a low-cost environment, to refine their skills for negotiations with a particular cultural group. The fine-grained attention to language often sparks discussion of underlying core elements of culture (e.g., French values and bases for persuasion). This is perfect for students in dedicated international MBA programs that require region and language specializations. Many students in regular MBA programs also have second language capabilities. Finally, students tend to remember lessons from this experience long after the course or workshop.

Two variations in format. An instructor might well consider two other formats for negotiations in their language. In the first, each guest (typically, a seasoned professional) negotiates with—rather than against—a student team of two to three members and serves as their lead negotiator or advisor. Students benefit from the guidance in their preparations, the real-time feedback and coaching during caucuses, and their observation, when guests lead, of expert negotiation modeled in front of them.

The second variation, which could be called “sociolinguistic immersion,” is an option for instructors from a culture other than their students’. (The instructor is essentially a guest.) A trainer in the Netherlands with a Franco-Dutch background employs this technique: He teaches Dutch professionals,
in French, how to negotiate with the French. In his workshop, role-plays with French guests begin with the entire class and guests going to a French restaurant for a business lunch. The group then returns to the classroom and begins—rather, continues—guest-student negotiations. The trainer video-tapes the exercises, debriefs them with guest input, and later reviews the tapes in detail.

CONCENTRATING ON IMPLICIT CULTURES IN THE CLASS

Anthropologist Edward Hall (1973, p. 30) has observed that cross-cultural interaction often teaches a person more about himself or herself than it does about others. Each of the foregoing techniques puts students in situations that can cause them to reflect, but an instructor may also direct their attention to their cultural norms and values by explicitly encouraging introspection, expression of beliefs and values, and discussion. Although class discussion is not role-play, it may be instigated by one, and to the extent that students address their relationships with each other, their dialogue is experiential.12

A major purpose of this technique is to enhance students’ self-awareness, largely as a means to greater cross-cultural effectiveness. It has the potential to help students improve their work relationships with each other. This technique redirects views of culture as something “out there” to its immediacy in daily behavior and relationships. Indeed, it becomes clear that neither the classroom nor the instructor, whether one teaches at home or abroad, is context-free (or culture-free).

How does an instructor bring implicit cultures to light? One analytical method (Black & Mendenhall, 1989) is to administer a cultural questionnaire (e.g., Hofstede, 1984) and discuss students’ results. Some cross-cultural trainers begin workshops by asking participants, in small groups, to select one identity or aspect of their cultural background and tell others about it (see also Sanyal & Neves, 1998). Other instructors have same-culture participants brainstorm to identify key traits and values of their culture. But tangibly juxtaposing one’s own culture with another seems most effective in increasing self-awareness (Lee, 1966), which is, again, where experiential methods—and specifically role-plays—come to the fore.

Relatively simple role-plays, substantively speaking, are sufficient for the implicit cultures technique. “New Recruit” (a job interview) and “Bestbooks-Paige Turner” (a book contract) represent two possibilities.13 Both are scorable, eight-issue negotiations with a built-in set of possible solutions for each issue. More important than the particular role-play or material, however, are the role assignments. The instructor pairs against each other, students
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who would generally be expected to behave very differently from each other or from the rest of the class. The negotiation itself may be set up as a fishbowl exercise or for all students to undertake.

To debrief a fishbowl negotiation, an instructor poses questions similar to those used with featured guests (recall Table 2), with the goal here of increasing students’ self-awareness more than other-culture knowledge. Participants discuss their experience, and observers from cultures other than the participants’ add comments from a comparative point of view. When debriefing multiple role-plays, an instructor might start with outcomes, asking “Which is the best outcome? Who obtained the best result?” By drawing out and endorsing multiple answers, the instructor enables students to see their predispositions, underlying values, and legitimate alternative standards. Aspects of proceedings may then be discussed. Cultural factors emerge in different ways, but they always surface.

In one fishbowl negotiation over a used car purchase, two of my Chinese-Canadian students, “Frank” and “James,” played the buyer and the seller. Consider the following:

Their conversation is even-paced (though slow by North American standards) for the first 12 minutes. During this time, Frank raises the faults he sees with James’s car but offers to buy it for $3,700. James desires $5,000. Both men repeat their respective arguments several times as they move to $4,000 and $4,700, respectively. Then, at the 12½-minute mark, Frank says, “Unless you’re willing to fix all the problem [sic] for free, then you have to drop the price.” For the next 20 seconds, James is completely silent. Over the next 2½ minutes, there are five more pauses lasting up to 12 seconds each. Finally, Frank, wanting to move along, says, “My bottom line is . . . $4,100 . . . take it or leave it,” a 17-second silence ensues, and James states, “I don’t think I can make a deal for you in this case, so thanks for your time, Frank.”

Subsequent class discussion was led off by an English-Canadian observer who found the negotiations so agonizingly slow that she was “ready to jump in.” Observers’ expectations drive them to notice what does not happen as well as what does. Several observers noted that Frank and James did not negotiate similarly (their ostensibly common backgrounds notwithstanding). Other observers picked up on second language issues, possible role (buyer-seller) differences, and James’s minimal relationship-building effort. Class discussion was lively and productive.

Role-play materials have brought out cultural factors in my classes in unforeseen as well as predictable ways. For example, seeing the word *rind* in the Ugli Orange case caused a student in Argentina to call out, before the role-play began and in front of the entire class, “What is rind?” whereas a Dutch
student in one of my classes in Canada, who spoke English fluently, did not know the word and chose to ignore it during his role-play. Chinese and Japanese students have commented that instructions in U.S.-developed role-plays to “maximize your individual points” and “not share your role information [with a teammate]” are “unnatural.” Many of the students circumvent these rules in their role-plays.

The pros of this technique include the ready applicability of its lessons to students’ daily interactions. Necessary resources are built into the class. If the class is not internationally heterogeneous, other cultural differences may be pursued this way. Among cons, implicit cultures may provide less “culture novelty” (Black & Mendenhall, 1989), and cultures of most interest to the class may not be represented in it. Highlighting students’ own cultures also risks putting on the spot those who are not in the majority. In general, this technique offers the instructor less predictability, especially in a one-time class or workshop; one must remain alert and flexible enough to pursue relevant comments and behavior when they occur—but that has an “up” side as well.

NEGOTIATING ACROSS MANY CULTURES

The discussion of techniques thus far has been based on bilateral, two-culture negotiations, yet an increasing number of negotiations involve three or more cultures. They include multilateral talks between culturally homogeneous teams and the internal bargaining of heterogeneous teams. These negotiations represent another focal point for an instructor. More of a topic than a pedagogical technique, “negotiating across many cultures” may be combined with any foregoing technique except negotiations in their language.

Multicultural negotiation presents the most complicated mix of cultural effects to understand and manage. It is not a matter of one side simply adjusting to the other—the “host” culture. The instructor emphasizes the interaction of cultural factors and explores multiple parties’ diverse options. These include coalitions and “linked bilaterals.” The instructor may even introduce roles for cultural go-betweens or translators (which also could be done with other techniques above). Materials for both multilateral and team role-plays are available through Harvard’s Program on Negotiation and through the Kellogg School.

My experience with multicultural negotiations has been largely indirect—a secondary theme—when using techniques such as implicit cultures and culture in context (see next section). For instance, in a large-scale simulation in my MBA negotiation course last winter, one four-person team consisted of a French Canadian man, an English Canadian man, a Thai woman exchange
student, and a Canadian woman with a South Asian background. During their extensive preparations and afterward, three of the students consulted me individually about group dynamics. In this situation—and perhaps generally in multicultural more than bicultural situations—the students looked to me as a possible intermediary, mediator, and even referee.

The sheer complexity of interaction in these role-plays offers plenty for students and instructors alike to explore, analyze, and manage, but that very complexity also complicates efforts to extract pragmatic, cultural take-aways from these experiences.

**CULTURE IN (COMPLEX) CONTEXT**

During an Alpha-Beta role-play in New York City, a Brazilian student offers the following assessment to his teammate: “He’s [the counterpart’s] playing a Japanese-American game. This is no more a Japanese-American game. It’s an Alpha [Inc.]-Beta [Inc.] game.”

This final technique treats culture as part of a larger picture of negotiation and places students in international simulations—the experiential method with the highest rigor in Black and Mendenhall’s (1989) framework. In contrast to limited-range or abstract role-plays designed to illustrate a few points, negotiation simulations are intended to replicate real situations. Simulations involve richer role and background information, more participants (including teams), more complicated agendas, and longer negotiation periods. The instructor decides exactly how to treat culture in this context: whether as one element among many or as a qualitatively different factor embedded in or defining the context itself (see Janosik, 1987; Wilson, Cai, Campbell, Donohue, & Drake, 1995, p. 230).

The main purpose of culture in context, with respect to teaching about cultural aspects, is to enable students to see how culture affects various aspects of negotiation process and outcome, and to consider its impact relative to other influences. Each of the four previous techniques, by comparison, singles out culture for attention. With this technique, an instructor also can accomplish several other teaching objectives mentioned earlier, for students use a variety of skills to try to handle the many aspects of an international negotiation simulation.

Materials for simulations may be obtained from several sources. They include the Program on Negotiation, Kellogg, Duke University’s CIBER center, and individual faculty (e.g., Moxon, 2001). An instructor may set up simulations in ways ranging from face-to-face in-class exercises to teleconferencing. In the late 1980s, for instance, the ICONS Project at the University of Maryland ran simulations in which participants spent several hours during
each of 3 days negotiating online with counterparts at world trade centers overseas (a version of featured guests).

In my MBA courses, I use simulations for 12 participants, divided into four to five teams, over a 3-week period. This includes team preparation, weekend-long face-to-face negotiations, and extensive debriefings (see Weiss, 2001). The primary purpose, again, is for students to concentrate on developing their international negotiating skills, which include cross-cultural skills (not vice versa).

Students learn about cultural aspects from two sources: their roles and coparticipants, who bring their own backgrounds into the simulation (recall “Concentrating on Implicit Cultures”). An American student assigned to a role in a Japanese company, for example, receives information on, among other things, Japanese business practices and culture. In simulations, as compared with role-plays, I am more interested in students understanding how Japanese might think and act in the situation than I am in their adopting Japanese behaviors, as they might do in symmetric acting. My emphasis falls on cognitive more than on behavioral dimensions of the role. If the student asks whether to act Japanese, as students often do before their first simulation, I say, “Concentrate instead on the role’s [person’s] interests and point of view. Study the role materials, absorb and front-load as much as you can about him and his cultural norms and values, then run with it.”

The numerous variables at play are challenging for students. Consider this excerpt from a GM-Toyota negotiation simulation involving the multi-culturally composed MBA team described above (as Toyota), along with GM, a union (UAW), and the U.S. Federal Trade Commission.

During the first evening, Toyota greets their counterparts formally, using some Japanese customs, and the team chairman (“Claude,” the French-Canadian man) speaks on their behalf. He states that the team would like to meet the UAW without GM. GM’s chairman (“Jack”) suggests that he and Claude go to the FTC while the rest of Toyota meets with the UAW. Claude replies that he will go to the UAW with his team. Later, in a four-on-one meeting with Toyota, Jack asks for a comprehensive proposal to take back to his team for consideration. Toyota avoids responding and inquires about the FTC. In a Toyota caucus, one member voices concern about the process thus far, but Claude asserts that the team should address issues with other teams before reconnecting with GM. Toward the end of the evening, when Jack again asks for a package, Claude says, “We’ll inform you of any progress.” In GM caucuses throughout the evening, Jack has angrily vented his frustration over Toyota. Now, after 3 hours of sessions, GM-Toyota relations are extremely tense.

The GM team, keying on Claude’s formality, domineering team leadership, and terse statements, believed Toyota was “acting Japanese.” They also
deemed Toyota intransigent. In a postsimulation debriefing, Toyota admitted having adopted some Japanese behavior but stressed that their position not to compromise on process was based on an agreement Jack and Claude had reached days before. Toyota felt Jack was violating it. Thus, whereas some observers and participants attributed the interteam tension to one team’s acting Japanese, there was a complicated mix of factors at work: motives, strategies, personalities, simulation behavior, cultures, and more.

With this technique, lessons about culture can be fuzzier, and culture risks being under-attended. Large-scale simulation also requires a huge investment of time and energy by the instructor and students not only up front but also in the deroling and debriefing necessary afterward. On balance, the intensity of the experience makes it highly memorable. The lessons it offers are multifaceted. It engages students emotionally, cognitively, and behaviorally.

**General Pedagogical Considerations**

Each of the foregoing sections has touched on or hinted at general pedagogical issues. Lewicki (1986) already has identified problems for negotiation instructors, such as the volatility and unpredictability of classroom dynamics and multiple instructor roles (e.g., classroom manager, counselor). A complete list for cross-cultural negotiation instructors lies beyond our scope, but four general considerations in the use of experiential techniques are worth underscoring.

**TYPES OF PARTICIPANTS: EXPECTATIONS, BACKGROUNDS**

Beyond wanting to negotiate more effectively across cultures, which neatly aligns with most instructors’ principal teaching objectives, students usually have specific ideas about what and how they want to learn. They often are taken with the dos and don’ts of a culture. They tend to seek predictability in the behavior of foreign counterparts. Although a negotiation instructor should be open to negotiating some expectations and objectives, I resist or downplay expectations of this kind. In my view, an alternative focus on attitudes and underlying values improves students’ understanding of their counterparts and gives them some guidance in situations for which they do not have a specific do or don’t. Furthermore, students bent on predictability may “take their eyes off the ball” in negotiation and not proactively or creatively shape the process.

Other student expectations should give an instructor real pause. For instance, some non-U.S. businessmen take negotiation courses in the United
States, not to learn techniques for their own use but to learn how Americans use them and think about negotiation. One Japanese student took my negotiation course in the United States to polish the fine points of his English, not just to enhance his negotiating skills. So an instructor going overseas to teach negotiation ought to think hard about what to teach, what may be expected, and what is likely to be learned.

Some groups resist experiential methods per se. When Abu-Nimer (1998) held workshops in the Middle East, his participants thought role-playing lacked credibility; they valued and expected formal lectures. Abu-Nimer adjusted his workshop design by making role-plays voluntary and allowing participants to sit out. The transferability of U.S.-developed teaching methods—not to mention concepts—merits consideration.

Differences among students in a course or workshop present a different kind of challenge for the instructor. Participants’ levels of international negotiating experience and future negotiating responsibilities may vary. For that, Meerts (1991, p. 401) has suggested separate workshops for each level. In the same vein, some students may be interested in one target culture, whereas others prefer another, just as one group may desire more role-plays, whereas another desires fewer. Or students may be culturally heterogeneous. All of the experiential techniques may be modified for such groups (as shown with in-language negotiations); in fact, techniques such as implicit cultures and multicultural negotiating are actually better suited for heterogeneous than for homogeneous groups. The instructor should consider these participant attributes when selecting a technique.

APPROPRIATE MATERIALS AND SETUPS

Role-play materials and instructions also should be judiciously evaluated. Both are potential sources of bias or confusion when used outside the culture for which they were developed, as noted at several previous points in this article. The Used Car case refers to upholstery (an unusual word for nonfluent speakers) and a Blue Book value (Canadians have a Red Book for current market values). In Bolter Turbines, the sales representative’s role description states that the year-end bonus hinges on this deal. Japanese guests in my classes have said in Japan that would never be the case. Role-players from certain cultures take exception to instructions to withhold information from teammates or to maximize individual gains. In addition, the short time periods for role preparation and for negotiation, with virtually no warm-up or relationship building, stand contrary to practice in many non-U.S. cultures.

An instructor may attempt to sanitize materials and instructions by minimizing cultural biases or modifying them to fit target or local cultures.
Another effective option is to assign roles “as is,” knowing the biases, in order to provoke discussion among participants about cultural aspects of negotiation. Finally, and probably least effectively, an instructor could use unmodified material serendipitously, open to whatever occurs in the classroom.

DEROLING AND DEBRIEFING

With experiential methods, the learning comes not only in the doing but also in the analysis that follows. It should address participants’ affect, cognitions, and behavior, and when possible, draw on multiple sources of feedback. These include the expert observer, negotiating counterpart(s), videotape, and personal review. The longer the role-play or simulation, the more an instructor should invest in deroling and debriefing.

Deroling addresses the affective dimension of the experience. Addressing it explicitly reminds students that affect is one of the effects they create and experience as negotiators (George, Jones, & Gonzalez, 1998). Moreover, when a role-play generates negative emotions, they may, if unprocessed, block or distort student learning about other aspects of the experience.

In my teaching, deroling has been especially important after intensive simulations. It helps pull students out of their roles. Students sit in a circle so they can all see each other, then I ask a student “X, what are you feeling right now? [We’ll get to strategy and other factors later].” I work around the circle, commenting occasionally. Whenever a student refers to another student, however, I invite the second student to respond. Deroling is eye-opening, although in some venues, it may be considered a peculiarly Western activity (see Abu-Nimer, 1998).

Debriefings of role-play outcomes and proceedings have been discussed throughout this article. In addition to facilitating plenary sessions with participants, an instructor may wish to schedule individual feedback sessions and encourage participants to discuss the experience directly with each other. For the instructor, the touchstones in these sessions are the parties who were directly involved. When a student asks me to interpret or evaluate one of her role-play actions, or to explain why a counterpart said or did X, I say, “Let’s ask your counterpart.” Then I reply, prefacing my response with “If I had been your counterpart . . .”

EFFECTING CHANGE

Grammar and pronunciation aren’t as important as expressing yourself in a way that matches the way Westerners think, which is very different from our thought process. You have to switch off your Japanese way of seeing things, or they will never understand what you are saying. . . . So when you’re in America
you must be clear, and when you return to Japan you must be vague. [Is it hard
to switch back and forth?] It’s more difficult than you can imagine. (Akio

In a review of negotiation teaching, Lewicki (1997, p. 264) has asked
point-blank, “Does training really work?” Indeed, what types of changes can
instructors effect in students? How much can we legitimately offer or prom-
ise our students? Lewicki provocatively replies, “We have no idea.”

Reviewers of research on cross-cultural training are more sanguine (Black &
Mendenhall, 1990; Earley, 1987). They also concur on several points, such as
targeting communication skills (Barkai, 1996; Beneke, 1983). At the same
time, few would disagree that behavioral change—let alone the cognitive
change to which Morita refers above—is unlikely to come in one-shot work-
shops (Black & Mendenhall, 1989, pp. 522-523); it probably requires repeti-
tion over time and a developmental process that involves activities with
increasing degrees of difficulty. (Note that none of the techniques described
here are restricted to one-time use per culture, except perhaps symmetric
acting.)

Concluding Thoughts

To teach cultural aspects of negotiation experientially, an instructor may
select from a range of techniques. Five major possibilities have been pre-
sented in this article: symmetric acting, interacting with Romans, implicit
cultures, multicultural negotiating, and culture in context. Each of them can
meet certain teaching objectives and student expectations. They involve dif-
ferent levels of rigor and potential change for students and trainees, so an
instructor could well use all of them.

Ultimately, the lessons students learn from these techniques depend criti-
cally on how the instructor uses them. It is up to the instructor to shape and
reinforce the cross-cultural lessons possible from experiences between stu-
dents, students and guests, and students and the instructor. This article has
provided illustrations and guidelines from one instructor’s experiences in the
hope that others who teach cross-cultural negotiation will build on them.

Notes

1. These definitions do not include behavior as an element of culture, although some experts
and probably most laypeople would include it. One could debate this issue, but it seems more im-
portant to communicate to students that either way, behavior is not the essence of a culture.
2. The nature and magnitude of culture’s effects on international negotiation continue to be studied and argued (Weiss, 1999). I think we will learn that these effects are not uniform but vary with the individuals and particular cultures involved. Meanwhile, students seek assistance in order to negotiate more effectively across cultures. Instructors can provide some assistance responsibly even before all the research results are in. (See also the section “Pedagogical Considerations.”)

3. Alternatively, Bhawuk (1990)—who has classified cross-cultural orientation methods according to the degree of trainer involvement, degree of trainee involvement, and cultural content (general, or specific to a particular culture)—recommends that a training program target moderate levels in each of these categories. He reasons that operating always at “high, high, general” risks trainee burnout.

4. The experiential learning model implicit in many negotiation course designs actually incorporates aspects of all three methods from Black and Mendenhall’s (1989) framework: factual, analytical, and experiential (see Lewicki, 1986, p. 17). For a write-up of resources for factual and analytical methods of teaching cross-cultural negotiation, contact the author.

5. A longer period can work, however. Executive participants at some U.S. and Canadian schools have stayed in role for 30 to 60 minutes.

6. For example, I also have used it with the classic Ugli Orange role-play (see Barkai, 1996).

7. The featured guests technique also may be compared to the renowned “contrast American” simulation in cross-cultural training (DeMello, 1995; Stewart, 1995), which centers on a trained guest acting out an unspecified unknowable (synthetic) culture. This might be labeled asymmetric acting.

8. See also attribution training (Brislin, Landis, & Brandt, 1983, p. 11ff), which emphasizes understanding the reasons for an individual’s behavior from his or her culture’s point of view.

9. Among other ways to build student commitment to this class and make negotiations as realistic as possible, the instructor may recommend that students wear appropriate business attire.

10. Exchange students at an instructor’s institution (but not in the negotiation course) are a possibility. In my experience, however, they have not worked out as well as outside guests. Negotiations between students have been more game-like and complicated sometimes by preexisting friendships between student guests and students in the course. An MBA culture effect also may overwhelm other cultural factors.

11. As one reviewer pointed out, negotiation courses conducted in cosmopolitan cities may have special opportunities. In New York City, for example, an instructor might be able to make use of United Nations sessions that are simultaneously translated.


13. These are available from the Kellogg School and from Lewicki et al. (1993, pp. 597-598).

14. Opposing role assignments may be based on student nationalities, regional or professional backgrounds, or even, if short on those attributes, gender or personality. These last two factors often lead to role-play interactions that raise some of the communication, relationship, and process management issues present in cross-cultural situations.

15. One also might consider two other debriefing models used by cross-cultural trainers: DATA, which sequentially addresses description, analysis, transition (parallels between the role-play experience and life experiences), and application (applying insights to one’s own work or life); and affective, cognitive, and “what if?” (going beyond the simplified situation that was simulated by changing certain parameters) (Berney, Blohm, & Swenson, 2000).
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