

ECONOMIC NEGOTIATION THEORY AND PRACTICE

IR 550, Spring 2009
Office hours Wed 2-4 or by appointment
Home page www-rcf.usc.edu/~odell

Professor John Odell
Tel 740-4298, VKC 42c
Email odell@usc.edu

Frequent negotiations between governments, international organizations, companies, and other nongovernmental actors are central in determining what globalization and global governance mean for people. But what happens in these negotiations? What determines their outcomes? Could the negotiators do better? In this seminar you will study diverse theoretically-oriented research on the process of international negotiation over economic issues and will practice generating your own hypotheses and designing projects. First we concentrate on the face-to-face process and then we zoom out to take in the negotiators' contexts. Most analytical ideas studied and skills developed also apply to negotiations outside the economic realm. This is an arena in which to improve both theory and practice of politics and international relations.

This advanced seminar assumes prior study of undergraduate economics, the Politics and IR doctoral core curriculum, and IR 541. If you have not taken these prerequisites, please speak to the teacher. Most readings are on Blackboard or online elsewhere. Supplementary items are not required. The major assignment is to submit a research paper or advanced proposal at the end of the term. As you read, look for ideas you might use in your course project or later. In the final grade, small assignments will be weighted 15% and the final paper 85%. Papers will be accepted late for up to one week late but penalized one letter grade. A masters candidate may opt to submit a different type of final paper. A network of researchers writing about this subject, with some of the latest papers, can be found at www.usc.edu/enn.

SCHEDULE OF ASSIGNMENTS

I. INTRODUCTIONS

1. 1/15 **The negotiation analysis tradition**

Jönsson, C. 2002. Diplomacy, Bargaining, and Negotiation. In *Handbook of International Relations*, 212-34 (on Blackboard). A convenient summary and assessment of accumulating results of the negotiation analysis research program. Note how the negotiation process has been conceptualized. Read before class 1.

Supplements:

- Bayne, N. and S. Woolcock, eds. 2007. *The New Economic Diplomacy: Decision-Making and Negotiation in International Economic Relations*.
- D. Lax and J. Sebenius. 2006. *3-D Negotiation*
International Negotiation 9 (2004) and 10 (2005), 2 special issues on methods of negotiation research
- J. Lax and J. Sebenius. 1986 *The Manager as Negotiator* (worth ordering)
- H. Raiffa. 1982. *The Art and Science of Negotiation*
- Zartman, I.W. and M. Berman. 1982. *The Practical Negotiator*
- R. Walton & R. McKersie. 1965. *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations* (worth buying for your library)

2. 1/22 Ideas from game theory

A. Many IPE specialists have not read the negotiation analysis literature. Say “bargaining” to U.S. economists or political scientists and a majority will think “game theory.” This week samples from studies that rely on this method in some way to introduce the way of thinking about process associated with it. Most IR applications have been to security rather than economic bargaining, paradoxically. Schelling is foundational for all IR. Prepare to report orally on the main points of each required item, with your evaluation of its strengths and shortcomings. For greater depth, consult the supplements.

1. Schelling, T. [1960] 1980. *The Strategy of Conflict*, chaps. 1-4. These chapters are the same in all editions. (On paper reserve and worth ordering for yourself)
2. Wriggins, H. 1976. "Up for Auction: Malta Bargains with Great Britain," in *The 50% Solution*, ed. I. W. Zartman, pp. 208-234. Can you apply any of Schelling's ideas to interpret the negotiation process in this case?
3. Fearon, J. June 1994. Signaling versus the Balance of Power and Interests: an empirical test of a crisis bargaining model. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 38:236-69. Could any of Fearon's ideas be relevant for an economic negotiation?
4. Mansfield, E., H. Milner, B. P. Rosendorff 2000. "Free to Trade: Democracies, Autocracies, and International Trade." *Am.Pol.Science.Review* 94:305-22. In this article what contribution does game theory make? What is your evaluation of the article?

B. Review or read Odell, “Case Study Methods in IPE,” on my home page under “publications,” for ideas about possible research methods to use in your proposal exercises. Note in any research design using case studies, selecting one case and rejecting many other candidates is a decisive step that may determine or bias what you find.

C. Turn in a one or two page proposal (to be graded) for a new concrete empirical research project about the economic negotiation process. Either choose a hypothesis from this week's readings using game theory (not the paper on Malta), or make up your own hypothesis using game-theoretic reasoning illustrated in these readings. As for form, all proposals in this seminar should provide (a) a specific research question about negotiation, (b) some specific recognized method to answer it (from "Case Study Methods" or any other source), (c) some specific empirical domain (place, time, issue area) from which to gather information; and (d) a provisional hypothesis (a generalization) that you think might be confirmed. Assume a team of assistants and all the resources you need. An illustrative proposal will be distributed in class.

Supplements:

- Evolutionary Game Theory. Summer 2003. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. [//plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2003/entries/game-evolutionary/](http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2003/entries/game-evolutionary/)
- Raiffa, H., J. Richardson, D. Metcalfe. 2002. *Negotiation Analysis*. How negotiation analysis differs from game theory, according to a founder of both.
- Fearon, J. and A. Wendt. 2002. Rationalism v. Constructivism: A Skeptical View. In *Handbook of International Relations*, ed. W. Carlsnaes, 52-72
- Allan, Pierre, and Cédric Dupont. 1999. International Relations Theory and Game Theory: Baroque Modeling Choices and Empirical Robustness. *International Political Science Review* 20:23-47.
- Powell, R. 1998. Bargaining Theory and International Conflict. *Annual Review of Political Science* 5:1-30. (war as seen through game models)
- Aggarwal, V. 1996. *Debt Games*.
- Morrow, J. 1994. *Game Theory for Political Scientists*
- Martin, L. 1992. *Coercive Cooperation*
- Young, Oran, ed. 1975. *Bargaining*, pp. 21-37, 129-44, 145-163

3. 1/29 A synthetic framework for economic negotiation theory

A. Study J. Odell, *Negotiating the World Economy* (on paper reserve and available for purchase online). Discussion question: What are two (or more) ways in which this book could have been better or a subsequent one could be better? Tip: Ask how scholars from various schools of thought would react to it.

B. Turn in another research mini-proposal (graded) on the economic negotiation process that builds on one of the suggestions in chapter 9.

II. THE NEGOTIATORS' PROCESS

4. 2/5 Subjective barriers and processes: psychological and constructivist theories

A. Read or review:

1. Bazerman, M. and M. Neale, 1992, *Negotiating Rationally*, 1-66
2. Thompson, L. 1995. They Saw a Negotiation: Partisanship and non-partisan perspectives. *J. of Personality and Social Psychology* 68: 839-53.
3. Review Odell, *Negotiating the World Economy*, chaps 4 & 5.
4. Hurd, I. Summer 2005. The Strategic Use of Liberal Internationalism: Libya and the UN Sanctions, 1992-2003. *IO* 59:495-526
5. Niemann, A. 2006. Beyond Problem-Solving and Bargaining: Genuine Debate in EU External Trade Negotiations. *International Negotiation* 11:467-97.
6. Odell, J. 2002. Bounded Rationality and the World Political Economy. In *Governing the World's Money*, D. Andrews, R. Henning, and L. Pauly eds. On my home page. Could a single theory unify the rational, psychological and constructivist approaches?

B. Turn in a mini-proposal beginning from an idea in or stimulated by something you read for this week.

Supplements:

- Ulbert, C. and Risse. 2005. Deliberately Changing the Discourse: What Does Make Arguing Effective? *Acta Politica* 40:351-67.
- Risse, T. 2000. "Let's Argue!": Communicative Action in World Politics. *IO* 54:1-40.
- Johnston, A. I. 2001. Treating International Institutions as Social Environments *International Studies Quarterly* 45:487-516
- Thompson, L. L. 2001. *The Mind and Heart of the Negotiator*, 2d ed.
- Berejekian, J. 1997. The Gains Debate: Framing State Choice. *Am.Pol.Sci.Rev.* 91: 789-805.
- Babcock, L. and G. Loewenstein 1997. Explaining Bargaining Impasse: The Role of Self-Serving Biases. *J of Econ. Perspectives* 11:109-26.

5. 2/12 **The distributive strategy and process.** What is this strategy and which what environmental conditions condition the choice and payoff of it? Have any falsifiable hypotheses been proposed?

A. Review Schelling, Malta, and *NWE*, chap. 6 (Brazil, EC and US).

B. Study the following:

1. Lax, D. and J. Sebenius. 1986. *The Manager as Negotiator*, chap.2 & 6
2. Bayard, T., and K. Elliott. 1994. *Reciprocity and Retaliation in US Trade Policy*, pp. 1-22, 51-97
3. Schoppa, Leonard J. 1999. The Social Context in Coercive International Bargaining. *IO* 53: 307-42.
4. Either (a) J. Odell and S. Sell. Reframing the Issue: The Coalition on Intellectual Property and Public Health in the WTO, 2001. Or (b) A. Narlikar and J. Odell. The Strict Distributive Strategy for a Bargaining Coalition: The Like Minded-Group in the World Trade Organization, 1998-2001. Both in *Negotiating Trade: Developing Countries in the WTO and NAFTA*, ed J. Odell, 2006.
5. Odell, J. 2009. Negotiating from Weakness in International Relations. On Blackboard.

C. Turn in a one-to-two page comparative research project outline beginning from an idea in something you read for this week.

Supplements:

- Hufbauer, G., J. Schott, and K. Elliott. 2007. *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered: History and Current Policy*.
- Kirshner, J. 1995. *Currency and Coercion: The Political Economy of International Monetary Power*
- Shoppa, L. 1993. Two-level games and bargaining outcomes: why *gaiatsu* succeeds in Japan in some cases but not others. *IO* 47: 353-86
- Ryan, M. P. 1991. Strategy and Compliance with Bilateral Trade Dispute Settlement Agreements: USTR's Section 301 Experience in the Pacific Basin. *Michigan Journal of International Law* 12, no. 4: 799-827.
- Odell, J.S. 1985. The outcomes of international trade conflicts. *ISQ*.
- Yoffie, D. 1983. *Power and Protectionism*
- Odell, J. S. 1980. Latin American trade negotiations with the United States. *IO* 34: 207-228.
- Liebert, et al. 1968. The Effects of Information and Magnitude of Initial Offer in Interpersonal Negotiation," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 4: 431-41.
- Walton, R., and R. McKersie. 1965. *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations*, chaps. II and III.

6. 2/19 The mixed-integrative strategy and process, including mediation. Which tactics and conditions are most favorable for gains from a mixed-integrative strategy?

A. Review and read:

1. Review the Jönsson 2002 essay and *NWE*, chap 7
2. Walton and McKersie 1965. *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations*, chs. IV & V (what do they mean by integrative bargaining, what is the process, what are the dilemmas?)
3. Lax, D. and J. Sebenius. 1986. *The Manager as Negotiator*, chap. 5.
4. Sebenius, J. 1992. Formal Individual Mediation and the Negotiators' Dilemma: Tommy Koh at the Law of the Sea Conference. In *Mediation in International Relations*, ed. J. Bercovitch & J. Rubin.
5. Elms, D. 2006. How Bargaining Alters Outcomes: Bilateral Trade Negotiations and Bargaining Strategies. *International Negotiation* 11(3):399-429.
6. Odell, J. Forthcoming 2009. Breaking Impasses in International Regimes: The WTO, Seattle and Doha. *ISQ*

B. Do psychological or constructivist findings suggest any moves or process that could reduce conflict and expand joint gains?

C. Turn in a one to two-page comparative research proposal beginning from an idea in something you read for this week.

Supplementary:

Wagner, L. 2008. *Problem-Solving and Bargaining in International Negotiations*

Murphy Ives, P. 2003. Negotiating Global Change: Progressive Multilateralism in Trade in Telecommunication Talks. *International Negotiation* 8:43-78.

Raiffa, Richardson and Metcalfe. 2002. *Negotiation Analysis*, parts III and IV

Friedheim, R. L. 1999. Explaining Japan's Failure in the International Whaling Negotiations. In *International Negotiation*, eds. Berton, Kimura & Zartman, 151-190

Sebenius, J. 1995. Dealing with Blocking Coalitions and Related Barriers to Agreement: Lessons from Negotiations on the Oceans, the Ozone, and the Climate. In *Barriers to Conflict Resolution*, ed. K. Arrow et al.

Hampson, F. & M. Hart. 1994. *Multilateral Negotiations: Lessons from Arms Control, Trade and the Environment*

Fisher, R. and W. Ury. 1981. *Getting to Yes*, chaps 1-5.

- Zartman, I.W.ed. 1974. *International Multilateral Negotiation: Approaches to the Management of Complexity*
- Rhodes, C. 1989. Reciprocity in trade: the utility of a bargaining strategy. *IO*
- Zartman, I.W. and M. Berman 1982. *The Practical Negotiator*

III. THE NEGOTIATOR'S EXOGENOUS CONTEXT

7. 2/26 Markets and the official negotiation process

One family of hypotheses implies that in international economic negotiations, exogenous market conditions of several types will drive states' domestic politics, their policies, and in turn their external demands, reactions to others' positions, and negotiated outcomes.

- A. Review *Negotiating the World Economy*, chap. 3. Recall writings on changes and differences in world markets, including globalization and sectoral differences, from IR 541 and other courses.
- B. To go deeper, choose two of the three sections below. In those two sections read each title marked with an asterisk. Also read either one required article from the third section or a supplementary article from any section. The supplementary article will be selected in class. Bring notes summarizing the findings and your evaluation of the 3 articles for your classmates (not graded).
- C. Turn in a proposal (graded) for a new research project investigating a link between market conditions of some type and an aspect of either an international negotiation process or an outcome. This week, select from this literature a hypothesis that uses an economics idea, or invent a hypothesis using another economics idea. Make this a comparative project that uses either qualitative evidence or quantitative evidence and statistical methods. If you are not sure whether needed data on the process or outcomes exist, spell out briefly what data you would like someone to create for this project.

I. Macroeconomic & monetary issues

*Odell, J. 1988. From London to Bretton Woods: Sources of Change in Bargaining Strategies and Outcomes. *J. Public Policy*. 8:287-316.

*Frieden, J. 1991. Invested Interests: the politics of national economic policies in a world of global finance. *International Organization* 45: 425-52. If he is right, what external negotiating positions should we expect different governments to take?

Supplementary:

- Klimenko, M. Oct 2002. Trade interdependence, the international financial institutions, and the recent evolution of sovereign-debt renegotiations. *Journal of International Economics* 58:177-210.
- Katada, S. 2001. *Banking on Stability*
- Mesjasz, C. 2000. Reorganization of Commercial Debt: Negotiations between Poland and the London club (1981-1994). In *International Economic Negotiation: Models versus Reality*, ed. V. Kremenyuk and G. Sjöstedt, eds.
- G. Garrett. 1996. Capital Mobility, Trade, and the Domestic Politics of Economic Policy. In *Internationalization and Domestic Politics*, ed. Keohane and Milner.
- R Chang. 1995. Bargaining a Monetary Union. *J. Econ. Theory*. J. Keohane & J. Nye 1977. *Power and Interdependence*.

II. Investment regulation issues: the MNC and the state

*Kobrin, S. 1987. Testing the Bargaining Hypothesis in the Manufacturing Sector in Developing Countries. *IO* 41: 609-38

*Ramamurti, R. 2001. The Obsolescing 'Bargaining Model'? MNC-Host Developing Country Relations Revisited. *J. International Business Studies* 32:

Supplementary:

- Weiss, S. 2006. International Business Negotiation in a Globalizing World: Reflections on the Contributions and Future of a (Sub) Field. *International Negotiation* 11:287-316 (only part I for market conditions)
- Sawyer, A. 2000. Renegotiation of the VALCO Agreement: Contribution to a theoretical interpretation. In V. Kremenyuk and G. Sjöstedt, eds. *International Economic Negotiation*, 99-116
- Encarnation, D. & M. Mason 1990. Neither MITI nor America: the Political Economy of Capital Liberalization in Japan. *IO* 44: 25-54.
- Fagre, N. and L. Wells. Autumn 1982. Bargaining power of multinationals and host governments. *J. of International Business Studies* 13: 9-23.

III. Trade policy issues:

*Zeng, Ka. 2002. Trade structure and the effectiveness of America's 'Aggressively Unilateral' Trade policies. *International Studies Quarterly* 46:93-115.

*Chase, Kerry. 2003. Economic interests and regional trading arrangements: the case of NAFTA. *International Organization* 57: 137-74.

Supplementary:

J. Goodman, D. Spar and D. Yoffie. 1996. Foreign Direct Investment and the Demand for Protection in the United States. *IO*

Lazer, D. July 1999. The Free Trade Epidemic of the 1860s and Other Outbreaks of Economic Discrimination. *World Politics* 51: 447-483.

Milner, H. and D. Yoffie. 1989. Between free trade and protectionism: strategic trade policy and a theory of corporate trade demands. *IO* 239-72. What external negotiating positions and responses does this model predict?

Frieden, J. 1988. Sectoral conflict and US foreign economic policy 1914-1940. *IO* 59-90.

I. Destler and J. Odell. 1987. *Anti-Protection: Changing American Trade Politics*

J. Odell. 1985. The Outcomes of International Trade Conflicts: The U.S. and South Korea, 1960-1981. *ISQ* 29: 263-86

8. 3/5 Domestic political institutions, processes, and tactics

Recall relevant background material from your earlier courses.

A. Read or review:

1. Putnam, R. 1988. Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: the logic of two-level games. *IO* 42: 427-460.

2. *Negotiating the World Economy*, chaps. 6, 7 and 8, and Mansfield, Milner, Rosendorff (2000) from week 3 (game theory)

3. Walton, R. and R. McKersie. 1965. *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations*, chap 9.

3. Two articles from part I and two articles from part II below, to be selected in class. Outline one of these articles and bring one copy of the outline for each classmate.

B. Turn in a one or two page proposal for a new *comparative* research project on domestic institutions or domestic politics, in the same format as week 2. Choose a hypothesis from your readings or invent one. Think especially about ideas linking DI or DP and elements of the international *process* (e.g., strategies used by the parties, likely

reactions to a distributive strategy, coalitions most likely to be formed, persuasion attempts most likely to be effective)--rather than links directly between DI/DP and the outcome ignoring the process. Use either qualitative or quantitative methods.

I. DOMESTIC INSTITUTIONS affect external negotiating positions, responses, and outcomes

- Mansfield, Milner and Rosendorff. Summer 2002. Why Democracies Cooperate More: Electoral Control and International Trade Agreements. *IO* 56:577-513.
- Jupille, J. 1999. The European Union and International Outcomes. *IO* 53:409-25.
- Winham, G. 1998. Explanations of Developing Country Behaviour in the GATT Uruguay Round Negotiation. *World Competition Law and Economics Review*. 21:109-34
- Bailey, M., J. Goldstein and B. Weingast 1997. The Institutional Roots of American Trade Policy: Politics, Coalitions, and International Trade. *World Politics* 49:309-38.
- Milner, H. 1997. *Interests, Institutions, and Information*
- Cowhey, P. Spring 1993. Domestic institutions and the credibility of international commitments: Japan and the United States. *IO* 47:299-326.
- Encarnation, D. and L. Wells. Winter 1985. Sovereignty en garde: negotiating with foreign investors. *IO* 39: 47-78.

II. DOMESTIC POLITICAL PROCESSES (group pressures, bureaucratic politics, the media and public opinion, elections) and negotiators' DOMESTIC TACTICS affect the external negotiation process, while institutions are constant.

- Zahrnt, V. April 2008. Domestic constituents and the formulation of WTO negotiating positions: what the delegates say. *World Trade Review* 7: 393-421
- Zahariadis, N. July 2003. Domestic Strategy and International Choice in Negotiations Between Non-Allies. *Polity*. 35:573-94.
- Stubbs, R. 2000. Signing on to liberalization: AFTA and the politics of regional economic cooperation. *Pacific Review* 13: 297-318.
- Wang Yong. 1999. Why China Went for WTO. *China Business Review*
- Schoppa, L. Summer 1993. Two-level games and bargaining outcomes: why *gaiatsu* succeeds in Japan in some cases but not others. *IO* 47: 353-386.
- Friman, H. R. Summer 1993. Side-payments versus security cards: domestic bargaining tactics in international economic negotiations. *IO* 47: 387-410.
- Evans, P, H. Jacobson, and R. Putnam, eds. 1993. *Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Eichengreen and Uzan, or Milner, or Kahler.

Winham, G. 1980. Robert Strauss, the MTN, and the Control of Faction. *Journal of World Trade Law*

9. 3/12 Negotiations inside international institutions and talks to form them

A. Re-read *Negotiating the World Economy*, pp. 186-194 and 197-201.

B. Review other ideas you have read about the process of forming or changing a regime (including the influences of market conditions, state strategies, mediation) and ideas about a regime as a context for negotiators (liberal norms and Libya sanctions, EU internal bargaining, the social context of Japan-US trade bargaining) and other relevant works.

C. Read:

Young, O. 1994. *International Governance*, ch. 4, Institutional Bargaining: Creating International Governance Systems.

Martin, L. 1992. *Coercive Cooperation*, chap. 1 for her main arguments plus chap. 6 on UK sanctions against Argentina.

Jönsson, C., and J. Tallberg. 1998. Compliance and Post-Agreement Bargaining. *European Journal of International Relations* 4: 371-408

Either (a) C. Davis. 2006. Do WTO Rules Create a Level Playing Field for Developing Countries?" or (b) J. Smith. 2006. "Compliance Bargaining in the WTO: Ecuador and the Bananas Case." In *Negotiating Trade: Developing Countries in the WTO and NAFTA*, ed J.Odell. On www.usc.edu/enn, under What's New.

Spector, B. 2003. Deconstructing the Negotiations of Regime Dynamics, and P. Chasek. 2003. The Ozone Depletion Regime. Both in B. Spector and I. W. Zartman, eds. *Getting It Done: Post-Agreement Negotiation and International Regimes*

Ulbert, C. and T. Risse. 2005. Deliberately Changing the Discourse: What Does Make Arguing Effective? *Acta Politica* 40:351-67; pp-351-57 only are required.

C. Turn in a 500 word proposal for a project comparing the negotiation process in the context of two international organizations, or inside one compared with similar states bargaining over similar issues outside it. The focus could be either the process of forming or changing a regime, or how established regime features affect subsequent negotiations among members. If possible, also integrate the study of one hypothesis from earlier in the syllabus (game theory, psychology, constructivism, distributive or integrative strategies, markets, domestic institutions or politics).

Supplements:

- Zhang, X. 2007. Settling Trade Disputes under the Shadow of WTO Adjudication. Dissertation, USC, chap. IV on precedents inducing early settlements
- Tallberg, J. 2006. *Leadership and Negotiation in the European Union: The Power of the Presidency*.
- Momani, B. 2004. American politicization of the International Monetary Fund. *Review of IPE* 11:880-904.
- Raustiala, K. and D. Victor. 2004. The Regime Complex for Plant Genetic Resources. *IO* 58: 277-309
- Mansfield, E. and E. Reinhardt. 2003. Multilateral Determinants of Regionalism: The Effects of GATT/WTO on the Formation of Preferential Trading Arrangements. *IO* 57:829-62.
- Steinberg, R. 2002. In the Shadow of Law or Power? Consensus-Based Bargaining and Outcomes in the GATT/WTO. *IO* 56:339-74.
- Busch, M., and E. Reinhardt. 2002. Testing International Trade Law: Empirical Studies of GATT/WTO Dispute Settlement. In *The Political Economy of International Trade Law*, ed. D. Kennedy and J. Southwick;
- Eising, R. 2002. Policy Learning in Embedded Negotiations: Explaining EU Electricity Liberalization. *IO* 56:85-120.
- Moravcsik, A. 1999. A New Statecraft? Supranational Entrepreneurs and International Cooperation. *IO* 53: 267-306.
- Noland, M. 1997. Chasing Phantoms: The Political Economy of USTR. *IO* 51: 365-388 [international norms shape bilateral trade outcomes]
- Bartilow, Horace. 1997. *The Debt Dilemma: IMF Negotiations in Jamaica, Grenada, Guyana*. [The IMF as a bargainer]
- Susskind, L. 1995. Barriers to Effective Environmental Treaty-Making." *Barriers to Conflict Resolution*, eds. K. Arrow et al.
- Hampson, F. O. 1994. *Multilateral Negotiations*
- Zartman, ed. 1994. *International Multilateral Negotiation*
- Zartman, I. W. 1987. ed. *Positive-Sum: Improving North-South Negotiations*

RECESS.

10. 3/26 Individual meetings. Bring a 1 or 2 page memo proposing your own research project, using the same format as earlier proposals. If you plan case studies, it should say which cases you have selected and why not others. Take a preliminary look at possible sources of evidence before our meeting, since I will ask you whether you think you can get enough evidence to make the project feasible.

11. 4/2 The cultural context of the negotiator

Study the following:

- Mingst, K. and C. Warkentin. 1996. What Difference Does Culture Make in Multilateral Negotiations? *Global Governance* 2: 169-88.
- Weiss, S. 2006. 2006. International Business Negotiation in a Globalizing World: Reflections on the Contributions and Future of a (Sub) Field. *International Negotiation* 11:287-316.
- Brett, J. et al. 1998. Culture and Joint Gains in Negotiation. *Negotiation J* 14: 61-86.
- Adair, W., et al. 2004. Culture and negotiation strategy. *NJ* 20:87-111.
- Lin, X. and S. Miller. 2003. Negotiation approaches: the direct and indirect effect of national culture. *International Marketing Review* 20: 286-303
- Lewis, 2005. The Janus Face of Brussels: Socialization and Everyday Decision Making in the European Union. *International Organization* 59:937-71. Is there a diplomatic culture, at least in Europe?
- Supplements:
- Kumar, R. and V. Worm. 2004. Institutional Dynamics and the Negotiation Process: Comparing India and China. *International J of Conflict Management* 15:304-34.
- Smyser, W. R. 2003. *How Germans Negotiate: Logical Goals, Practical Solutions.*
- Solomon, R. 1999. *Chinese Negotiating Behavior*
- Albin, C. 1999. Justice, Fairness, and Negotiation: Theory and Reality. In *International Negotiation*, ed. Berton, Kimura and Zartman, 257-90
- Cohen, R. 1997. *Negotiating Across Cultures*, rev. ed.
- Zartman, I. W. 1997. Conflict and Order--Justice in Negotiation. *International Political Science Review*. 18: 121-38.
- Faure, G. & J. Rubin, eds. 1993. *Culture and negotiation*
- Graham, J. April 1993. The Japanese Negotiation Style: Characteristics of a Distinct Approach. *NJ*. 9: 123-40;
- Ogura, Kazuo. 1979. How the 'Inscrutable' Negotiate with the 'Inscrutable': Chinese Negotiating Tactics Vis-a-vis the Japanese. *The China Quarterly*

PART IV. STUDENT PAPERS

12. 4/9 **Individual meetings; report your research accomplishments and raise questions.** Circulate 2 papers.
13. 4/16 **Circulate and discuss student papers**

Please read your colleagues' papers and write a page or two of reactions and suggestions on one of them. Give copies to the author and the professor (graded). You are exempt from this writing requirement the day your paper is discussed.

14. 4/23 Circulate and discuss student papers

15. 4/30 Discuss student papers