

NEGOTIATION PREPARATION DIFFERENCES IN SELLING SITUATIONS: COLLABORATIVE VERSUS COMPETITIVE EXPECTATIONS

ROBERT M. PETERSON, Northern Illinois University

C. DAVID SHEPHERD, Georgia Southern University

Pre-negotiation planning is critical to a successful negotiation encounter, yet while vital, few studies have made it a focal point. In this exploratory study, scenario analysis was used to discern potential differences in the pre-negotiation process in highly collaborative and highly competitive selling situations. Results indicate a disparity in the planning processes between the groups; not only in terms of the amount of planning, but also in the behaviors that comprise the planning process. Five major planning differences between pre-negotiation for an anticipated collaborative encounter versus a competitive encounter were identified: 1) obtain information on alternatives the client may be pursuing, 2) understand the other side's decision making unit, 3) obtain information on the client's anticipated preparation activities, 4) contrive your best alternative to a negotiated agreement (BATNA), and 5) devise competitive attacking strategies. The findings are the first to empirically illustrate that the current theory of firm-to-firm negotiation should begin to incorporate an important element, that of preparation.

INTRODUCTION

Marketing theorist Wroe Alderson once described negotiation as the “crowning process of business effort” (1957, p. 11). Certainly, the ability to effectively negotiate gives the individual or organization a competitive advantage in the marketplace (Miller and Cardinal 1994). Over the past three decades, a significant stream of research has focused on the negotiation process. As a result, much is now known about the characteristics of the negotiators (for example, see Rubin and Brown 1975; Graham 1983), the negotiation process itself (Ganesan 1993; Graham 1984a), as well as potential negotiation outcomes (Ganesan 1993).

Others, however, have suggested that the manner and degree to which a negotiator prepares for the negotiation encounter may have a significant impact on the negotiation outcome. For example, Smith (2007) suggested that entering the negotiation encounter

unprepared diminishes the negotiator's credibility while providing the other side a negotiating edge. Rognes (1995) and Lewicki, Saunders, and Minton (1997) have identified planning as an important pre-negotiation process and suggested that effective negotiators spend time planning for the upcoming negotiation session(s), thus enhancing their chances for success in the negotiating process.

Unfortunately, little research has focused on understanding what negotiators do to prepare for the negotiation encounter (Evans and Beltramini 1987), especially as it relates to the selling process. Pitz (1977) stated that if a theorist is truly interested in the processes used by an individual in arriving at decisions, it is essential to explore the predecisional behavior of the vested parties. Since planning is the process that links cognition with action (Sacerdoti 1977; Wilensky 1983), it is imperative to better understand what drives the behaviors performed at the negotiation table. Hence, exploratory studies can make contributions to theory development and practical use by investigating this “pre-negotiation” phase. Without a more robust comprehension of the factors and behaviors of

the pre-negotiation phase, the consequence of ignorance most likely includes failed negotiations, extended and more costly negotiations than required, and the continuation with the fascination of “table exchanges” without understanding why they may have occurred.

While there are several conceptual models of negotiation involving commerce (Graham 1987; Brooks and Rose 2004), several years ago a framework that did not concentrate on individual personalities or other pure demographic information, but offered a pre-negotiation focal point. Peterson and Lucas (2001) proposed a broadened conceptualization of the pre-negotiation process in the sales arena that focused on the information gathering, planning, and rehearsal that a negotiator may conduct prior to a negotiation interaction. Recently, Peterson and Shepherd (2010) identified an inventory of 34 specific pre-negotiation activities that negotiators utilize as they prepare for a business-to-business negotiation situation. Exploratory studies can contribute to theory development and practical use by investigating this “pre-negotiation” phase. As a next step in this research process, this study begins to investigate the use of pre-negotiation activities in differing negotiation situations using empirical evidence. In short, the research intent is to better understand what people do when preparing for certain types of negotiation situations (competitive-collaborative), in broad terms, but also in the precise activities they would undertake to ready themselves.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Negotiation

Negotiation has been defined as “the process whereby people attempt to settle what each shall give and take or perform and receive in a transaction between them” (Rubin and Brown 1975, p. 2). The negotiation process ranges from a cooperative situation that may potentially lead to a positive outcome for both parties, often termed a win/win negotiation

(Rapoport 1970), to a competitive “haggling” session in which one party gains at the other party’s expense, often termed a win/loss negotiation (Druckman 1977). Either way, industrial purchases are best viewed as “negotiated settlements” (Bonoma and Johnston 1978, p. 218). Interorganizational negotiations are typically characterized as having professional individuals involved who are empowered to make buying and selling decisions. Interactions are most often performed face-to-face (Graham 1987), where the parties are expected to be prepared to ask and answer relevant questions that can reduce the potentially conflicting needs and demands that each holds. These actions are generally performed in groups while representing particular organizations (Lambert, Boughton, and Banville 1986; Zaltman and Bonoma 1977).

As noted earlier, considerable research attention has focused on the characteristics of the negotiators, the negotiation process itself, and potential negotiation outcomes. Conversely, little research has focused on what the negotiator does in preparation for the encounter. The Peterson and Lucas (2001) study was one of the first to address this pre-negotiation process. According to their conceptualization, the pre-negotiation process consists of the four components or phases in a sales environment, as shown in Table 1. Two of these four phases, formulation and strategy development, are directly related to planning activities, with the former focusing on the development of goals and objectives, and the latter focusing on strategies developed to help achieve these goals and objectives. The other two phases focus on collecting information to facilitate the planning process (the intelligence gathering phase) and practicing or rehearsing the application of the plan in anticipation of the negotiation encounter (the preparation phase). For simplicity, the four phases of this model will be referred to collectively as the “pre-negotiation process” throughout the remainder of this manuscript.

TABLE 1 :
Four-Phase Conceptualization of the Pre-Negotiation Process
Peterson and Lucas (2001)

Phase	Domain
Intelligence Gathering	The act of collecting, processing, analyzing, and evaluating available data concerning the other party and relevant environmental factors.
Formulation	Entails developing goals, specific objectives, and setting the parameters for each issue to be negotiated.
Strategy Development	Strategy is a plan that integrates a person's goals and action sequences into a cohesive whole.
Preparation	Involves rehearsing verbal communication, arranging/creating support materials, and attending to logistical concerns.

Peterson and Lucas (2001) did not attempt to develop a list of mental processes or behaviors that would typically be found in each phase of the pre-negotiation process. However, recently, Peterson and Shepherd (2010) developed and empirically tested an inventory of 34 pre-negotiation mental processes and behaviors. One logical outcome of that research is to identify variation in the pre-negotiation process across negotiation situations. In particular, they recommended contrasting the pre-negotiation process in a highly cooperative negotiation situation with the pre-negotiation process in a highly competitive situation.

Sales Planning

Foster (1993) has noted that business planning is generally done for two reasons: to reduce future uncertainty and to diminish the risk of failure. Numerous definitions of planning exist (Berger 1988; Hobbs and Evans 1980; Troub 1981). However, in general, most negotiation researchers agree that plans are:

Cognitive structures that outline actions to be taken which help to achieve one or more stated goals (Berger and Bell 1988; Berger and diBattista 1993).

Planning in the business arena usually involves written objectives, strategies, and policies. Kotter (1982) noted planning often occurs in informal or implicit ways and therefore,

managers develop loosely connected goals and plans. Normally included in planning processes are data collection, formulating, developing strategies, and preparation for planning. Phenomena such as the actual execution of the tactics at the negotiation table or verbal interaction would fall outside the domain of planning.

Planning is considered the process of devising a formula that aids in offering a course of action based on the contextual environment (Alterman 1988; Carbonell 1981). After a plan is devised, it is executed in hopes of attaining the desired outcome(s) (Hjelmquist 1990). Communication research notes that belief in the efficacy of planning (Kreitler and Kreitler 1987), goal setting, and goal specificity (Huber and Power 1985) promotes more planning in general, and the generating of more elaborate plans.

Given a much larger body of accumulated research briefly mentioned above that supports the value and efficacy of well-developed planning activities, one might believe that planning at several levels in the sales process would be an important factor leading to the success in the selling process. However, there is little evidence to support either the nature of planning or its linkage to sales success at either the level of the individual account or territory by the individual salesperson. Most planning discussions regarding the sales process concern

themselves with managers and their planning activities (Lidstone 1990).

THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to identify variations that may arise in the inter-organizational pre-negotiation process that is dependent on the nature of the negotiation situation. Specifically, the research focuses on identifying variation in the pre-negotiation process when a highly collaborative negotiation process situation is compared with a highly competitive negotiation situation; however, the authors acknowledge there are certainly negotiations that are of mixed nature (Harwood 2002).

The study was conducted using a scenario format. Scenario methodology is widely accepted in negotiation research as it allows standardization of stimulus across respondents while, at the same time, providing an extremely realistic decision-making situation (Alexander and Becker 1978). The negotiation scenario used prescribed the general role the respondents were to play leading up to the intended negotiation. The scenario employed was a modified version of Graham's Bolter Simulation (1984b). The Bolter Simulation entails the buying or selling of capital equipment for the purposes of extracting natural gas (See Appendix A). Negotiators need to prepare to discuss a wide range of issues including purchase price, delivery terms, payments terms, and a service agreement—a very typical selling encounter. Other researchers have used the Bolter simulation and found it robust and complex enough to connote a real world experience (Alexander 1988; Alexander, Schul, and Babukus 1991; Westbrook 1997).

Data Collection

Business professionals seeking their MBA at a large southeastern U.S. university were chosen as the sample frame. MBA student populations are often used in exploratory negotiation research as they have been found to have adequate business experience and skill to

effectively represent a more general business population without skewing results (Luthy 1995; Min, LaTour, and Jones 1995). In fact, Petty and Cacioppo (1996) note that student subjects are appropriate and even desirable when research objectives include theory development, as the current research does. Thus, each respondent was randomly assigned one of two negotiation scenarios, competitive or collaborative. Respondents saw only their version of the scenario, ensuring no cross-group contamination. Each person received an identical response questionnaire, coded to indicate which scenario he/she was given. Post-survey completion discussions with a sample of the respondents indicated they had responded to the manipulation.

The respondents were asked to decide how they would split their time between each of three negotiation categories: 1) pre-preparation, 2) active negotiation and 3) follow-up - prior to completing the remainder of the questionnaire to ensure they were not aware of the research question. The respondents were given a constant sum of 500 points to spread across the three categories. Pre-negotiation activities had a mean of 207 units with a standard deviation of 73 units. Negotiation had a mean of 177 units with a standard deviation of 72 units. Post-negotiation activities had a mean of 115 units with a standard deviation of 55 units. Next, the respondents were asked, based upon the units of time they had allocated for pre-negotiation activities, to allocate that time over the 34 pre-negotiation activities. In addition, demographics were collected to help understand the nature of the respondents.

RESULTS

The final instrument was distributed to 178 MBA students, resulting in 173 usable responses. The respondents were predominantly male 110/63, mostly under 34 years old 140/33, and had an average of 5-6 years of professional experience. Of those useable responses, 86 responded to the collaborative scenario and 87 to the competitive scenario.

Validity and Reliability of the Measures

In their measurement development process Peterson and Shepherd (2010) established the face validity of their measure. As a first step in building upon that foundation, respondents were given the option of adding additional activities in each category. Only three respondents added a total of four activities, which the authors deduced were not different than the existing choices. This suggests that among the sample, the list appears to be thorough. Additionally, the measures of behaviors are formative versus reflective measures (Jarvis, Mackenzie, and Podsakoff 2003). Hence, techniques such as confirmatory factor analysis or the alpha reliability coefficient are not suitable in this situation.

Behavior Usage

Table 2 provides the responses to the behaviors. Remember that respondents were asked to apportion time units to the various pre-negotiation activities they might undertake. Also recall, in an initial question, they had allocated, on average, 207 time units to the pre-negotiation behaviors. This represents nearly 60 percent of the possible 350 units they could have allocated to pre-negotiation behaviors. The range of values respondents earmarked was from 50 units (14 percent of the total possible) to 350 units (or 100 percent of the total pre-negotiation units possible). Thus, a wide range of time units were allocated to pre-negotiation behaviors. Intelligence gathering had the largest average time allocation with 69.13 units, out of 110 possible, followed by formulation 49.34 units of 90, strategy 48.35 units of 85, and preparation 36.39 units of 65 possible. While formulation had slightly higher total units of time allocated, strategy had a slightly higher percentage of the total possible units.

The results offer several interesting insights. In terms of pure numbers, each category has some activities that were chosen more than others. For intelligence gathering, collecting primary and secondary data information were among the most chosen items. For formulation, trying to

incorporate the action plans of the other and defining your role were most often mentioned, but establishing the BATNA (best alternative to a negotiated agreement-at what point to you agree to disagree and pursue your next best alternative) and defining your own interests were also frequently selected. For strategy, developing third party strategies and attack strategies were the most frequently selected. The third party strategy decision seems particularly interesting. For preparation, script opening, role-plays, and dealing with logistics were the most frequently chosen. Another notable trend was the fact that pre-negotiation activities had the highest allocation of points across the three elements (pre-negotiation, active bargaining, and implementation), suggesting that the respondents recognized the importance of planning in negotiation activities.

Differences Across Negotiation Expectations

In order to test for differences across negotiation expectations, one-way analysis of variance was utilized. The test was utilized across total pre-negotiation behaviors, intelligence gathering, formulation, strategy, and preparation behaviors. SPSS version 17.0 for Windows was utilized for the data analysis. Table 3 provides the results of that analysis.

The data indicates that both intelligence gathering and formulation activities were significantly greater for competitive situations as opposed to collaborative situations. However, this does not indicate which of the actual behaviors drives the differences. Chi-square analysis of the 34 behaviors was conducted to ascertain which behaviors were significantly more utilized by either the competitive or collaborative negotiation planners. The assumption was that each would be requested equally across the two situations. Table 4 provides that analysis for the five items that were significant at the .05 level or better in a two-tailed test, which is significantly more items than we would expect by chance. The results suggest that a small number of activities, five, drive the differences shown in Table 4.

TABLE 2:
Response Frequencies of Pre-Negotiation and Planning Activities

<u>Negotiation Activity</u>	<u>Time/Value</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Intelligence Gathering</u>			
Collect primary data	15	146/173	84.4%
Obtain client preparation info	5	122/173	70.5%
Collect secondary data	15	108/173	62.4%
Review previous strategies	5	93/173	53.8%
Review history of the relationship	10	78/173	45.1%
Understand other side decision making unit	20	70/173	40.5%
Obtain client's competitive alternatives	15	65/173	37.6%
Gather data on market conditions	15	52/173	30.1%
Understand other party (personality, etc.)	10	51/173	29.5%
<u>Formulation</u>			
Incorporate action plans of other	5	113/173	65.3%
Outline your personal role	5	107/173	61.8%
Contrive BATNA	20	94/173	54.3%
Define your interests	5	94/173	54.3%
Define the bargaining mix	5	82/173	47.4%
Consult with others on the plan	5	78/173	45.1%
Define issues to be deliberated	5	74/173	42.8%
Set limit levels on the issue	15	69/173	39.9%
Create agenda for negotiation	15	61/173	35.3%
Create negotiating team	5	52/173	30.1%
Set negotiation objectives	5	41/173	23.7%
<u>Strategy</u>			
Develop 3 rd party influence strategies	15	140/173	80.9%
Devise competitive attack strategies	15	111/173	64.2%
Devise competitive defend strategies	15	88/173	50.9%
Devise concession strategies	10	80/173	46.2%
Develop trade-off strategy	10	67/173	38.7%
Devise collaborative strategies	10	54/173	31.2%
Develop team strategy	10	36/173	20.5%
<u>Preparation</u>			
Script opening ceremonies	5	118/173	68.2%
Perform role plays	20	112/173	64.7%
Address logistical concerns	5	102/173	59.3%
Prepare mutual interest topic	5	96/173	55.5%
Prepare visual and other aids	10	47/173	27.2%
Prepare questions for client	10	41/173	23.7%
Prepare for questions from client	10	25/173	14.5%

TABLE 3:
ANOVA Behaviors by Type of Expectation of the Negotiation

Behavior	Mean Compet (Std Dev)	Mean Collab (Std Dev)	F	Sig
Total	216.70 (71.89)	192.30 (63.91)	4.698	.032
Intelligence	73.55 (29.73)	64.77 (25.39)	4.364	.038
Formulation	50.81 (23.26)	44.94 (20.64)	5.211	.024
Strategy	51.34 (24.12)	45.40 (21.62)	3.086	.081
Preparation	37.38 (15.45)	35.35 (14.36)	.808	.370

DISCUSSION AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

One of the contributions of this research is finding significant variation in the pre-negotiation process across negotiation situations. Specifically, on several items, the pre-negotiation process for a selling situation that is expected to be highly collaborative varied significantly from the pre-negotiation process for a selling encounter that was expected to be highly competitive. As noted in Table 4, the following five specific activities were found to statistically differ between the competitive and collaboration negotiation situations:

- 1) Obtain information on alternatives the client may be pursuing
- 2) Understand the other side's decision making unit (process and structure)
- 3) Obtain information on the client's anticipated preparation activities
- 4) Conceive your BATNA (detail what you will do if this deal does not close)
- 5) Devise competitive attacking strategies (options to put other party in a bind)

Theoretically, and pragmatically, collaborative negotiation approaches require more resources during the pre-negotiation phase. The salesperson must expend capital to understand the client's needs, as well as motivations, in order to formulate solutions that work to both

parties' advantage. Further, it often takes considerable time and forethought to build the foundation of trust and respect generally required for a collaborative relationship. Thus, it may be speculated that collaborative negotiation approaches require more preparation than other negotiation approaches. However, at the same time arguing against this notion, one can suggest that perhaps those who expected a collaborative negotiation and hence less conflict, felt less of a need to prepare. Yet again, to be competitive, perhaps all the preparation you need is to practice saying "no" to all the other party's requests; which does not really require much preparation or forethought. Thus, finding significant differences between the groups, and the direction of the difference, is an important piece of information for negotiation theory development and practitioner use. By understanding the proclivities of negotiators who anticipate a competitive or collaborative encounter, one can make the necessary adjustments to planning and strategy development.

Intelligence Gathering, the collection, processing, and evaluation of information prior to the negotiation, was of significantly more importance to the competitive group, as compared to the collaborative group. Accumulating accurate data on market conditions, future trends, personnel, and previous behaviors performed by each party is undertaken with more vigor from the

TABLE 4:
Chi-Square Analysis of Individual Indicators

Variable	Competitive Count/Total	Collaborative Count/Total	Exact Sig. 2-sided
Obtain Alternatives	63/86	45/87	.005
Obtain Client Prep Information	32/86	19/87	.031
Understand other Sides' Decision Unit	62/86	41/87	.001
Contrive BATNA	46/86	33/87	.048
Devise Competitive Attack Strategies	39/86	23/87	.011

competitive group. The connection between preparation level and perceived risk of loss is quite evident. The desire to “not lose” seems to spark a need to gather any and all relevant information and outweighed a typical collaborative notion that you must know yourself, but also the client just as intimately.

Defining objectives, creating a negotiating team, and setting limit levels are important parts of the Formulation phase. To a negotiator anticipating a competitive encounter, this type of preparation is more important, as compared to those who believe a collaborative meeting will be convened. The psychological “room for error” is believed to have a narrow tolerance in a highly competitive engagement. Either the negotiator is fully equipped and prepared, or the other person/team will have a potential advantage in the negotiation encounter. For this latter reason, it seems that the competitive group is highly concerned with the Formulation stage.

Within the Intelligence Gathering phase, a gap exists between competitive and collaborative scenario respondents in their desire to “obtain information of the competitive alternatives the client may be pursuing.” The lower frequency of the collaborative scenario respondents

appears to signal a belief that they can work together, whatever differences they may have at the table, and do not see client alternatives as a true threat to completion of the agreement. Another disparity is found in an individual’s desire to “understand the other side’s decision making unit.” Apparently, knowing precisely how the client’s team will make its decision—who has what authority, who is involved in the process—is much more important to the competitive scenario negotiators. This is surprising since in a collaborative model the sale representative would strive for a win-win, which by definition he/she needs to comprehend how the client makes decisions. The last difference in the Intelligence Gathering phase was geared to “obtain(ing) information on the client’s anticipated preparation activities.” Again, the collaborative scenario respondents felt it a less important activity, as measured by the frequency of choice, possibly because the belief of working together to reach agreement does not require such knowledge.

Creating a BATNA in the Formulation phase seems to make sense no matter what the encounter might entail, so it is difficult to explain the statistical difference here. Even collaborative people cannot make all deals flow smoothly, so one should explore what they

might do if a permanent impasse should arise. Within the Strategy phase, a contrast in the desire to “develop competitive attacking strategies” comes as no surprise between the groups. One would expect such a finding if the competitive-collaborative treatment effect was genuine. The competitive scenario respondents should gravitate to this activity, whereas within the collaborative approach, this would appear to be counter-productive.

Thus, finding significant differences between the groups, and the direction of the difference, is an important piece of information for negotiation theory development and practitioner use. By understanding the proclivities of negotiators who anticipate a competitive or collaborative sales encounter, one can make the necessary adjustments to their own planning and strategy development. From a selling and planning perspective, thirty years ago Rackham and Carlisle (1978) concluded that “...planning was the foundation for any successful negotiation” (p.2), after conducting 153 extensive sessions of observing and conversing with negotiators. Based on the current study, we now have some of the first empirical data explaining what the salespeople might explicitly be thinking/doing during this negotiation planning phase. This is valuable for future theory development that moves beyond comparing demographic data by looking at actual preparation behaviors based on contextual circumstances, which may override personal attributes or individual orientations.

LIMITATIONS & FUTURE RESEARCH

This research has limitations, as any exploratory research does. The sample might be difficult to generalize to other populations. While simulations are good research tools, they are not the same as putting the respondent into an actual situation or perhaps having them recall specific situations. However, the advantage to this method is the elimination of the recall issue problem. Asking people to think back upon a negotiation and then attempt to articulate their planning behaviors is not overly practical. Being one of the first investigations in

this domain, numerous future studies should test and re-test the findings gathered from this exploration, and further develop the understanding of the activities undertaken prior to a face-to-face negotiation meeting.

This research suggests a number of important future research directions. Given this pre-negotiation behavioral inventory, future research needs to link the quality of these behaviors, as well as their use or absence, to the nature and quality of negotiation behaviors, and then to outcomes such as the success of the negotiation. Within the context of buying and selling, a next step may be to establish the usage and perceived importance of these behaviors in negotiation situations similar to the buyer-seller interaction described in this study. Once this is ascertained and measures further developed, laboratory research could be done in buyer-seller negotiations to link pre-negotiation behaviors to negotiation patterns and, ultimately, output.

One other finding in the activities chosen by the respondents warrants attention, but it is not a difference between the groups. Surprisingly the bottom ranking for both “incorporating the anticipated actions of the other party” (number 31 out of 34), and “obtaining information on the client’s anticipated preparation activities” (number 33). These results are evidence of the ethnocentric fixation that many negotiators have with regard to their opponents, even if they expect them to be highly collaborative. They tend to solely focus on themselves and their planning. Most people were concerned about their level of preparation as if they existed in a vacuum. While they would prepare for questions from the client, they certainly did not feel at peril due to the preparation of the other person/team. Noting what negotiators do not do might be just as informative as what they do.

Understanding which of these pre-negotiation behaviors leads to a better negotiation process and thus, to better outcomes, will provide significant information for training and evaluation of salespeople and other boundary

spanners in the firm engaged in buyer-seller negotiations. Tying inputs to outcomes will eventually be required to empirically discern which items negotiators should spend their limited time when preparing for negotiation encounters.

REFERENCES

- Alderson, Wroe (1957), *Marketing Behavior and Executive Action: A Fundamental Approach to Marketing Theory*, Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Alexander, Joe F. (1988), "Interorganizational Negotiation in Marketing: An Assessment Of A General Buyer-Seller Model Utilizing Competitive and Cooperative Orientation", Doctoral Dissertation, Memphis State University.
- Alexander, Cheryl S. and Henry J. Becker (1978), "The Use of Vignettes in Survey Research", *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 42 (Spring), 93-104.
- Alexander, Joe F., Patrick L. Schul and Emin Babukus (1991), "Analyzing Interpersonal Communications in Industrial Marketing Negotiations", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 19 (2), 129-139.
- Alterman, R. (1988), "Adaptive Planning", *Cognitive Science*, Vol. 12, 393-421.
- Berger, Charles R. (1988), "Planning, Affect, and Social Action Generation", in L. Donohew, H. E. Sypher, and E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Communication, Social Cognition, and Affect* (p. 93-116). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berger, Charles R. and R. A. Bell (1988), "Plans and the Initiation of Social Relationships", *Human Communication Research*, Vol 15, 217-235.
- Berger, Charles R. and Patrick diBattista (1992), "Information Seeking and Plan Elaboration: What Do You Need To Know To Know What To Do?", *Communication Monographs*, v59 (December): 368-387.
- Bonoma, Thomas V. and Wesley J. Johnston (1978), "The Social Psychology of Industrial Buying and Selling", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 7, 213-224.
- Brooks, Bradley W. and Randall L. Rose (2004), "A Contextual Model of Negotiation Orientation", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 33 (2), 125-133.
- Carbonell, J. G. (1981), "Counterplanning: A Strategy-Based Model of Adversary Planning in Real-World Situations", *Artificial Intelligence*, Vol 16, 295-329.
- Cox, William E. (1979), *Industrial Marketing Research*, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Druckman, D. (1977), "Social-Psychological Approaches to the Study on Negotiation", in *Negotiations*, (Ed. D. Druckman), Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Evans, Kenneth R. and Richard F. Beltramini (1987), "A Theoretical Model of Consumer Negotiated Pricing: An Orientation Perspective", *Journal of Marketing*. 51 (April): 58-73.
- Foster, M. John (1993), "Scenario Planning for Small Businesses", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 26 (1), 123-129.
- Ganesan, Shankar (1993), "Negotiation Strategies and the Nature of Channel Relationships", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 30 (May), 183-203.
- Graham J. L. (1983), "Brazilian, Japanese and American Business Negotiations", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 14 (Spring/Summer), 47-61.
- Graham J. L. (1984a), "A Comparison of Japanese and American Business Negotiations", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 1 (1), 51-68.
- Graham J. L. (1984b), "Bolter Turbines Inc., Negotiation Simulation", *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 6, 28-36.
- Graham J. L. (1987), "A theory of Interorganizational Negotiations", *Research in Marketing*, Vol. 9, 163-183.
- Harwood, Tracy (2002), "Business Negotiations in the Context of Strategic Relationship Development", *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, Vol. 20 (6), 336-348.
- Hjelmquist, E. (1990), "Planning and Execution of Discourse in Conversation", *Communication & Cognition*, Vol. 23 (4), 277-294.

- Hobbs J. R. and D. A. Evans (1980), "Conversation as Planned Behavior", *Cognitive Science*, Vol. 4, 349-377.
- Huber, George P. and Daniel J. Power (1985), "Research Notes and Communications Retrospective Reports of Strategic-Level Managers: Guidelines for Increasing Their Accuracy", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 6, 171-180.
- Jarvis, Cheryl Burke, Scott B. McKenzie and Philip W. Podsakoff (2003), "A Critical Review of Construct Indicators and Measurement Model Misspecification in Marketing and Consumer Research", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 30 (2), 199-218.
- Kotter, J. P. (1982), *The General Managers*, New York: Free Press.
- Kreitler, S. and H. Kreitler (1987), "Plans and Planning: Their Motivational and Cognitive Antecedents," In S. L. Friedman, E.K. Sholnick and R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Blueprints for Thinking: The Role of Planning in Cognitive Development*, p.110-178, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambert, David R., Paul D. Boughton and Guy R. Banville (1986), "Conflict Resolution in Organizational Buying Centers", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 14 (Spring), 57-62.
- Luthy, Michael R. (1995), "Pre-Negotiation Strategy Development in Asymmetric Bargaining Situations: An Investigation of New Buys in The Business-To-Business Marketing Arena", Doctoral Dissertation, University Of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign.
- Lewicki, Roy J., David M. Saunders and John W. Minton (1997), *Essentials of Negotiation*, Chicago: Irwin.
- Miller, C. Chet and Laura B. Cardinal (1994), "Strategic Planning and Firm Performance: A Synthesis of More Than Two Decades of Research", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37 (6), 1649-1665.
- Min, Hokey, Michael S. LaTour and Michael A. Jones (1995), "Negotiation Outcomes: The Impact of the Initial Offer, Time, Gender, and Team Size", *International Journal of Purchasing and Materials Management*, (Fall): 19-24.
- Peterson, Robert M. and George H. Lucas (2001), "Expanding The Antecedent Component of the Traditional Business Negotiation Model: Re-Negotiation Literature Review and Planning-Preparation Propositions," *Journal of Marketing Theory & Practice*, Vol. 4 (Fall), 37-49.
- Peterson, Robert M. and C. David Shepherd (2010), "Preparing to Negotiate: An Exploratory Analysis of the Activities Comprising the Pre-Negotiation Process in a Buyer-Seller Interaction," *Marketing Management Journal*, Vol. 20 (1): 66-75.
- Petty, Richard E. and John T. Cacioppo (1996), "Addressing Disturbing and Disturbed Consumer Behavior: Is It Necessary to Change the Way We Conduct Social Science?" *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33 (1), 1-8.
- Pitz, G. F. (1977), "Decision Making and Cognition", in Jungermann, H. and G. de Zeeuw (Eds.) *Decision Making and Change in Human Affairs*, p. 403-424, Dordrecht-Holland: Springer.
- Rackham, Neil and John Carlisle (1978b), "The Effective Negotiator-Part 2: Planning for Negotiations", *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 2, p. 2-5.
- Rapoport, Anatol (1970), "Experiments in Dyadic Conflict and Cooperation", in (Ed. P. Swingle), *The Structure of Conflict*, New York: Academic Press.
- Rognes, Jorn (1995), "Negotiating Cooperative Supplier Relationships: a Planning Framework", *International Journal of Purchasing and Materials Management*, Vol. 31(October), 12-18.
- Rubin, Jeffrey Z. and Bert R. Brown (1975), *The Social Psychology of Bargaining and Negotiation*, New York: Academic Press.
- Sacerdoti, E. D. (1977), *A Structure for Plans and Behavior*, Amsterdam: Elsevier North-Holland.
- Smith, Teresa L. (2007), "Let's Make a Deal: A Guide to Successful Workplace Negotiations", *Business and Economic Review*, (October/December), 11-14.

- Troub, Roger (1981), "A General Theory of Planning: The Evolution of Planning and the Planning Evolution", *Journal of Economic Issues*, v16 (June): 381-390.
- Westbrook, Kevin W. (1997), "An Assessment of the Reciprocal Action Model During Interorganizational Negotiations", Doctoral Dissertation, University of Memphis.
- Wilensky, R. (1983), *Planning and Understanding*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Zaltman, Gerald and Thomas V. Bonoma (1977), "Organizational Buying Behavior: Hypotheses and Directions", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 6 (1), 53-60.

APPENDIX A

The Bolter Scenario

You are the lead sales representative in a contract negotiation between two firms over the sale of a complex compressor system used in the offshore production of natural gas. Stated simply, the compressor forces the natural gas from the seabed into a system that allows for its capture. The two involved firms are: 1) Bolter Turbines Inc.—a manufacturer of natural gas production equipment (with whom you are a salesperson), and 2) Maverick Natural Gas Inc.—a producer of natural gas with production operations concentrated in the Gulf of Mexico. This contract negotiation is based on the potential purchase by Maverick of one compressor system, but there is always a desire of selling additional units.

Maverick has been a customer for several years and knows you and your company through previous work you have performed for them. This compressor system would represent a lucrative increase in business from your client, and would be one of the first sales for a new and improved compressor system. The sales process has proceeded relatively smoothly, a few bumps here and there, but now the big decisions must be made during the negotiation.

Over the past few months, you (the Bolter sales representative) have been actively involved in preliminary sales negotiations with the Maverick purchasing agent and other Maverick staff members over the purchase of the system. This product is a specialized compressor system recently developed by your firm, and is rated as the best in the market at

extracting natural gas. You have offered Maverick a general price range for the system (\$2-3 million), but have not talked any specifics yet.

Your role in the negotiation will be to negotiate with the other party to reach a decision on a contract for the system, including finalizing the price on the compressor, the price of the service contract, and the delivery date. Again, your task is to complete the negotiations and get a signed agreement for the 1) compressor system, 2) service contract, and 3) delivery date of the equipment.

Those receiving the **Competitive** stimuli were given additional information (emphasis original).

Additional Information:

It is your professional feeling, and other sources have confirmed it, that the Maverick negotiators are only concerned with making as much money from this deal as possible. They are not out to hurt you necessarily, but they do not feel the need to help you either. You anticipate Maverick being highly competitive with you. In fact, they will be as competitive as it takes so they can reach their objectives on every issue. You must take care of yourself if you intend to reach your goals and corporate objectives.

Those receiving the **Collaborative** stimuli were given additional information (emphasis original).

Important Information:

It is your professional feeling, and other sources have confirmed it, that the Maverick negotiators will tend to be highly collaborative with you. They have a reputation for working well together with those who cooperate with them. They think your system can be a good business arrangement for both parties. Maverick still wants to win as much as they can, but they also want you to win as well. While you might not agree on everything, you have reason to believe that everyone has the best intentions and will work together to find an agreeable solution.