Negotiation Planning and Preparation in Practice

Morten Lindholst

Department of International Business – Copenhagen Business School

Paper presented at IACM International Association for Conflict Management (27th annual conference). Leiden, NL, 4-7/7/2014

Short abstract (150 words): While scholars agree that planning and preparation is key to a negotiation's effectiveness, negotiation research has largely focused solely on what happens at the negotiation table and little is known about what occurs in preparation for a negotiation meeting. This paper aims to redress the balance by clarifying which preparation and planning activities are undertaken to conduct a complex business negotiation compared to the recommendations found in the literature. In contrast to the majority of negotiation research this study follows a qualitative research design multiple methods of inquiry and draws upon data grounded in a large global industrial company. The results suggest that a significant number of activities recommended in the literature concerning negotiation preparation and planning do not take place in the real-world. In addition, the study demonstrated the inherent weakness of relying on an open-ended survey as the sole data source through which to understand an internal-organizational phenomenon.

Abstract: While scholars agree that planning and preparation is key to a negotiation's effectiveness, negotiation research has largely focused solely on what happens at the negotiation table and little is known about what occurs in preparation for a negotiation meeting. This paper aims to redress the balance by clarifying which preparation and planning activities are undertaken to conduct a complex business negotiation compared to the recommendations found in the literature. In contrast to the majority of negotiation research this study follows a qualitative research design and draws upon data grounded in a large global industrial company. First, an open-ended survey with 68 purposefully selected respondents provides an understanding of the planning and preparation. Second, the survey is followed by a 13 month case study following a negotiation over a sale of a multi-million euro power generation plant what provides further understanding of the conducted activities, including activities performed unconsciously. The results suggest that a significant number of activities (two categories, nine sub-categories, and five activities) recommended in the literature concerning negotiation preparation and planning do not take place in the real-world. In addition, the study demonstrated the inherent weakness of relying on an open-ended survey as the sole data source through which to understand an internal-organizational phenomenon.

Keywords: qualitative research, case study, open-ended survey, multiple methods of inquiry, negotiation process, preparation, planning, business negotiation.

Introduction

The stakes involved in some negotiations are not high and, therefore, require less planning and preparation, but in others, like many business-to-business negotiations, stakes are often high (Mintu-Wimsatt & Calantone, 1991) and careful preparation and planning becomes an imperative (Ghauri & Usunier, 2003).

While preparation and planning are critical elements of negotiation (Ghauri, 1986; Mannix & Innami, 1993; Thompson, 2009) the activities associated with planning and preparing for the negotiations encounter are regarded, in the academic and practical literature at least, to be the most important activities a party in a negotiation can undertake (Watkins & Rosen, 1996). Still, the pre-negotiation planning and preparation has not been thoroughly studied by scholars (Peterson & Lucas, 2001; Peterson & Shepherd, 2010; Roloff & Jordan, 1991) and there is scant empirical evidence on the impact careful planning and preparation have upon the negotiation process (Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, 2010).

As a result of the limited, empirically grounded literature on negotiation preparation and planning, Lindholst (2013) conducted a review of the literature with the aim of developing a comprehensive literature Negotiation Preparation and Planning Activity model (hereafter NPPA model) relying on a series of research-based textbooks by some of the most prominent researchers within the field of business negotiation and negotiation in general: Lewicki et al. (2010), Raiffa (1982), Salacuse (2003), Hames (2012), and Thompson (2009). In addition, the review includes peer-reviewed articles by Peterson and Lucas (2001), Peterson and Shepherd (2010), Weiss (1993, 2004, 2006a, and 2006b), and Watkins (1996, 1999, 2000, 2002, and 2006). In total the work of eight different authors was included in the review.

The review shows that the NPPA model which currently exists to understand which negotiation preparation and planning activities are recommended according to conventional academic wisdom (Peterson & Lucas, 2001; Peterson & Shepherd, 2010), while consistent, is ultimately incomplete. More specifically, the findings show that the high-level conceptualization, which has four distinct themes according to the model provided by Peterson and Lucas, are consistent with the pattern that has emerged from the rest of the literature. These four themes are information gathering, formulation, strategy development, and preparation (see **Table 1**, under).

Table 1: Four-phase Pre-Negotiation framework as suggested by Peterson and Lucas (2001).

Intelligence Gathering	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.

However, the activity categories and subcategories of the model were found to be incomplete, frequently omitting activities addressed by every other author selected for the named literature review. Consequently, this paper will use the extended literature NPPA model developed by Lindholst (2013) as a framework to compare recommendations from the literature with the finding in the real life business context and, thereby, advance the understanding of how negotiation planning and preparation is being conducted, which is what is sought by researchers (e.g., Weiss 2006b; Peterson & Shepard, 2010).

Method

The bulk of research into negotiation uses data drawn from student populations in experimental design settings (Buelens, Van De Woestyne, Mestdagh, & Bouckenooghe, 2008), an approach which may raise questions about the applicability of the findings to a business context. In contrast, this study follows a qualitative research design, with multiple sources of inquiry, and draws upon data grounded in a large global industrial company and, thereby, contributes to the limited selection of negotiation research which is conducted outside of university laboratories (Buelens et al., 2008; Pruitt, 2011).

In the context of the company investigated the negotiations can be defined as buyer-seller, business-to-business exchange transactions of made-to-order solutions with multiple negotiation issues and multiple negotiation rounds. The data is generated exclusively from the seller perspective.

An open-ended survey with 68 purposefully selected respondents provides an understanding of the planning and preparation activities they conduct as part of their ordinary customer negotiations. The self-reported survey answers will, however, not allow for full understanding, as they can only illuminate activities which negotiators are conscious about, but will not include possible activities they perform unconsciously. Consequently, the second part of the data collection is a 13 month interpretive single case study following a multinational and multilingual negotiation over a sale of a triple digit million euro power generation plant. The case study serves two purposes; on the one hand it provides an understanding of all of the activities, including what negotiators don't know they do, and on the other hand it allows for the validation of the self-reported activities from the survey.

The research design chosen was a qualitative sequential design that allowed me to collect a rich and strong array of evidence. From an interpretive perspective, and in the context of the company, the sequence of the study was firstly to execute and analyse the survey, and secondly to apply the literature NPPA model (Lindholst, 2013) as a framework to analyse the case study. In other words a nested arrangement with an explanatory embedded single-case study within a survey was employed (Yin, 2009). However, rather than relying on deductive coding using the NPPA model, the open-ended survey data was first coded inductively, before applying the NPPA model which allowed for the generation of categories of activities not recommended in the literature. The two models were consequently compared in order to generate a comprehensive model to employ for the deductive coding of the data from the case study.

Acknowledging that pre-existing theories and models drive the entire research project (Mason, 2002), together with my inclusive and comprehensive focus on interpreting what the data is telling me, rather than exclusively adapting to theoretical frameworks (Braun & Clarke, 2006), calls for a method that allows for both deductive and inductive coding. Consequently, thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006) was chosen as it presents a good fit to my data sources and to my research question through its capacity to generate salient themes and categories and permits for both deductive and inductive coding. Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis tool ATLAS.ti was used to support the coding and analysis which allowed for a more thorough, transparent, and reliable analysis, and thereby adding further rigour to the research design (Friese, 2012; Saldaña, 2009). The challenges of doing real-life research in a closed setting were considered with the purpose of getting the best possible access to the field and, thereby, to ensure an appropriate sample (Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olsen, & Spiers, 2002). Moreover, and to further ensure the appropriateness of the sample, purposive sampling was applied to the survey and strict selection criteria were developed for the case study (Creswell & Clark, 2007).

Survey findings – preparation and planning in practice

The data used to develop the survey NPPA model derive from the 68 purposive selected respondents' answers to survey questions Q1, Q2', Q3', Q9 & 10, and Q11 shown in the table below. The length of the respondents' answers to the 13 open-ended questions ranged from between 78 to 900 words, with an average of 370 and a standard deviation of 203. The 68 respondents who completed surveys were functionally distributed with 35 (51%) from sales, 15 (22%) from service, 12 (18%) from legal contracting, and six from other areas (9%). 50 of the respondents were working in the south region (the Mediterranean and South and Central America) and 18 in the north region (UK, Denmark, and Sweden). Ten (15%) of the respondents were female; 58 (85%) were male.

An activity will only count as being conducted if a minimum of 10% of the respondents (7 or more) have reported the activity as having been conducted.

Table 2: Survey NPPA model – quotations per question, total no. of respondents and citing authors in Lindholst (2013) review.

Survey NPPA Activity Category:	Q1: How and what do you typically Prepare and Plan for your negotiations? - Individually (working on your own)?	Q2': How and what do you typically Prepare and Plan for your negotiations? - With colleagues or external consultants (not necessarily part of the negotiation team)?	Q3': How and what do you typically Prepare and Plan for your negotiations? - With the entire negotiation team (2 or more persons)?	Q9&10: Which areas or parts of your pre-negotiation preparation and planning do you believe give you the best payback?	Q11: If you use any tools (worksheets, checklists, Company tools...) as part of you Pre-negotiation Planning and Preparation, why do you use them?	Total Quotations	Total respondents	Dataset respondents / All respondents	No. of citing authors
1. Information Gathering	38	23	15	24	24	120	45	66%	8
1.1. Environmental Context	0	4	2	1	0	6	4	6%	4
1.2. Nature of Interaction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	8
1.3. Negotiation Context	17	8	8	11	17	59	28	41%	8
1.4. The Other Party	27	14	8	14	7	68	38	56%	8
2. Formulation	60	35	40	59	28	211	59	87%	8
2.1. Issues, Interests, Positions and Priorities	33	22	20	25	3	96	50	74%	8
2.2 Options	7	8	10	21	3	45	28	41%	8
2.3 Reservation Points	21	7	11	10	16	64	37	54%	8
2.4. Goals	19	5	9	8	8	47	26	38%	8
3. Strategy Development	24	19	43	39	8	125	55	81%	8
3.1. Setting-the-Table	4	9	34	21	4	65	41	60%	8
3.2. At-the-Table: Integrative Tactics	15	9	9	14	2	46	27	40%	8
3.3. At-the-Table: Distributive Tactics	8	6	9	12	3	36	25	37%	8
4. Preparation	8	2	2	8	1	21	15	22%	8
4.1. Support Material	8	2	1	4	1	16	13	19%	3
4.2. Logistical Concerns	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	3%	7
4.3. Role-Plays	0	0	0	4	0	4	4	6%	5

The findings derived from the open-ended survey revealed that a significant number of activities, promoted both by practitioners and academics alike, do not take place in the real-world (4 categories, 17 sub-categories, and 20 underlying activities, see Appendix 1). In comparison the negotiators do conduct many of the activities included in the literature NPPA model, namely: 10 of 14 categories, 22 of 39 subcategories, and 24 of 39 underlying activities.

The model comprises 368 quotations from 67 of the 68 respondents. Of the four themes, formulation is the largest in terms of both respondents (59) and quotations (211) followed by the strategy development theme with 55 respondents and 125 quotations. The third largest theme is information gathering with 45 respondents and 120 quotations and, finally, the small preparation theme with 15 respondents and 21 quotations (Table 2, over).

Case Study findings – preparation and planning in practice

The negotiation observed concerns a multinational and multilingual negotiation over the sale of a triple digit, multi-million euro power generation plant including transport, installation, start-up, and a full scope service agreement. The observations made over 13 months included both preparation and planning sessions prior to customer negotiations and debriefing sessions which occurred promptly after the negotiations. The typical preparation and planning session took place with the lead negotiator and one or more people who sat together physically in one location and other participants who connected via phone- or video conferencing. The participants in the sessions typically also took part in the interactions with the customer, but on occasions different company specialists and management also took part in preparatory and evaluation activities without participating in the customer negotiation. All observations were taped and transcribed, save for the initial sessions.

The unit of analysis (Yin, 2009; Yin, 2011) of the case study is the negotiation team, which is defined as the individuals participating in the planning and preparation sessions both prior to and after the customer negotiations. Consequently, the primary data source (Farquhar, 2012; Yin, 2011) is the synchronous group interactions during the planning and preparation sessions rather than individual activities and asynchronous activities such as e-mail correspondence (secondary data sources).

The primary data was collected during team meetings held prior to anyone entering the meeting with the customer, pre-meetings, and post-meetings held immediately or few working hours after the customer meeting. The collection period of primary data was from January 19th, 2012 to January 22nd, 2013 covering 20 customer meetings with a total of 39 recordings, 18 of pre-meetings, and 21 of post-meetings. Of the almost 12½ hours of recording, 53% related to the pre-meetings and 47 % to the post meetings (see **Table 3**, under).

Table 3: Primary data for the case study

Meeting type	No. of meetings	Total Duration [hh:mm:ss]	Participation: Lead Negotiator		Participation: Sales Management		Participation: Legal		Participation: : Service		Participation: Other	
Pre	18	06:33:00	06:21:30	97%	05:02:30	77%	03:14:00	49%	01:45:30	27%	01:27:00	22%
Post	21	05:50:00	05:50:00	100%	03:32:30	61%	03:57:30	68%	00:24:00	7%	00:07:00	2%
Total	39	12:23:00	12:11:30	98%	08:35:00	69%	07:11:30	58%	02:09:30	17%	01:34:00	13%

In addition to the primary data, secondary data was collected from various sources, namely conversations with the lead negotiator, which were recorded and transcribed (6 recordings of a total duration of 52 min), internal and external e-mails (194 e-mails from 12 different people) and written notes by the researcher from various conversations with team members, both individually and collectively. The secondary data was collected from January 17th, 2012 until July 24th, 2013.

Unlike the thematic survey analysis, *one* occurrence in the thematic analysis of the case study data is considered enough for an activity to be registered as part of the team negotiation planning and preparation in the actual negotiation, as the circumstances are clearly different from the generalized survey.

As expected, the addition of the case study, as a method of inquiry increased the number of the planning and preparation activities identified and performed by the negotiators (two categories and eight subcategories, see Appendix 2, second column "A"). Similarly, albeit to a lesser degree, the thematic analysis of the case study material furthermore revealed that some of the activities surfaced under the analysis of the survey data did not appear in the case study data (one subcategory). Still, 30 of the 39 subcategories showed equal results from the survey and case study analyses, which is a strong validation of the findings. 21 of these 30 subcategories confirmed activities being conducted and nine subcategories confirmed activities not being performed by the negotiators. Generally, the thematic analyses of the case study observations revealed that 12 of the 14 activity categories and 29 of the 39 subcategories are being conducted by the team, as we can see from Appendix 2, which shows the full literature NPPA model indicating the survey and case study findings. The second column in the appendix, comparison, classifies the activities in relation to the findings as follows: (A) what they don't know they do, (B) what they say they do, but don't do (C) what they do and say they do, and finally (D) what they don't know they don't do.

Discussion

This study contributes several significant findings to academia by supporting and expanding upon the extant research on negotiation preparation and planning. The findings are expected to have important implications not only for the company from which the data were collected but also more generally for companies involved in complex buyer-seller negotiators which have several negotiation rounds.

NPPA according to the real-world of the company

The findings derived from the open-ended survey revealed that a significant number of activities, promoted both by practitioners and academics, were not included in the survey model due to a lack of reports on the matter by the respondents. The case study, as an additional method of inquiry, increased the number of planning and preparation activities identified which were performed by the negotiators and, accordingly, completed the model, as was expected.

Still, the model demonstrates that a significant number of activities (two categories, nine sub-categories, and five activities) recommended in the literature concerning negotiation preparation and planning do not take place in the real-world (**Table 4**, under).

Table 4: Literature NPPA model activities not conducted by the negotiators

NPPA Model Activity Category:	Activities not conducted by the negotiators	Percentage of authors citing the activity in the literature NPPA model (Lindholst, 2013)
1. Information Gathering		100%
1.1. Environmental Context	ø	50%
1.1.1. Economic	ø	50%
1.1.2. Political	ø	38%
1.1.3. Institutional-legal	ø	38%
1.1.4. Cultural	ø	38%
1.2. Nature of Interaction	ø	100%
1.2.1. Negotiation nature	ø	100%
1.2.2. Industry conventions and norms	ø	75%
3. Strategy Development		100%
3.2. At-the-Table: Integrative Tactics		100%
3.2.2.2. Share information about I & P	ø	75%
3.2.2.3. Unbundle issues	ø	75%
3.2.3.1. Brainstorming	ø	38%
3.2.4. Evaluate solutions	ø	88%
3.3. At-the-Table: Distributive Tactics		100%
3.3.1.2. Influence the other party's impression of own RPs and targets	ø	50%
3.3.1.3. Manipulate the other party's perception of his or her own RPs and targets	ø	50%
3.3.4. Closing tactics	ø	38%
4. Preparation		100%
4.2. Logistical Concerns		88%
4.2.2. Physical arrangements	ø	50%

The two categories and six of the nine subcategories not performed by the negotiators fall under the information gathering theme. The category Nature of Interaction, with the subcategories Negotiation Nature and Industry Conventions was not expected to be found because these activities only address information which remains constant for the industry over time and across geographies (e.g., negotiation in teams and official contracts with ratification of both parties). More surprisingly, even though this category was only mentioned by 50% of the authors, no activities within the Environmental Context category are performed by the negotiators. One explanation may be that many of the factors of the Environmental Context operate at a macro-level, which does not concern the negotiators in a given buyer-seller negotiation (e.g., macroeconomic factors such as interest rate and inflation level, or political framework such as governmental subsidy schemes).

Unbundling entails separating a single issue into more issues (Lax & Sebenius, 1986; Pruitt, 1981). Research suggests that better agreements are achieved as the number of issues being negotiated increases (Lewicki et al., 2010; Naquin, 2003) which corroborates the advice given by Lax and Sebenius (1986) “where different interests are bundled into a negotiating issue, a good strategy can be to unbundle and seek creative ways to dovetail them” (p. 94). Through the unbundling process the smaller issues can be reprioritized and can form the basis for logrolling or bridging (Carnevale, 2006). Comparing to the recommendations in the literature is may seem surprisingly that the negotiators do not perform the activity of unbundling according to the findings. This, however, was to be expected in the context of the company where negotiators have conducted many deals and, consequently, should know most of the latent issues and underlying issues that may surface during the negotiation.

The sub-category Evaluate Solutions was not observed during the case study and did not yield enough respondents to count as being performed by the negotiators, which is surprising given it was found to be cited by seven of the eight authors in the review conducted by Lindholst (2013). Evaluate Solutions is an integrative negotiation tactic which is concerned with the identification of objective criteria. Objective criteria are independent of the will of the negotiators on either side and enable the negotiators to choose solutions based on the principle of fairness or merit (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 1991). Below the only quotation in the data corpus to mention objective criteria:

> In one of the cases, the customer was very much insistent on equal distribution of the losses in case of Force Majeure. I have worked on it and searched for internal sources. There was no alternative available. Then I referred to FIDIC practice. I have a book on FIDIC implications showing the practice in more than 20 countries. I saw that in all countries'

> chapters, it was concluded that the risk belongs to the owner. I brought that book and told the customer that we would be fair and go for FIDIC solutions but even in there it was concluded as an Owner risk. I showed them the relevant passages therein. We ended up dropping that issue from the matrix as the customer did not have a chance to complain about our approach. (Survey participant 36, Questions 4)

The quotation above does, however, demonstrate how objective criteria can be used effectively in negotiation as prescribed in the literature reviewed, indicating that there is a gap between what is being done and what could be done as negotiation preparation and preparation.

The inductive coding conducted as part of the thematic analysis of the survey data and the case study data did not uncover any new groups of negotiation preparation and planning activities, which suggests that the literature NPPA model developed during the literature review is both comprehensive and inclusive. In addition, of the 30 subcategories conducted by the negotiators of the company, only 20 were identified in the framework developed by Peterson & Shepherd (2010), emphasizing the need for the new expanded NPPA model developed by Lindholst (2013).

These mentioned findings are significant as they, on the one hand, confirm the validity of the expanded NPPA model as an overall NPPA framework and on the other hand demonstrate that real world negotiators in real negotiations do perform activities other than those included in the Peterson and Shepherd model. Furthermore, the results are useful in identifying gaps that may improve the effectiveness of negotiation preparation and planning for the company.

Full understanding of an internal-organizational phenomenon

The study has demonstrated that open-ended surveys, despite their many advantages and strengths, cannot give the fullest answer to understanding which preparation and planning activities are conducted by negotiators. Respondents may, for whatever reason, not wish to accurately respond to what was asked of them and they often cannot report what they don't know they do, even if they have the desire to do so. In other words, to rely on an open-ended survey solely presupposes that participants must be both capable and willing to report which activities they conduct to prepare and plan for a negotiation. Participant observation, undertaken while at the company, confirmed that negotiators undertook activities which were not reported in the survey. Had this study relied solely on data from open-ended surveys then the model of the negotiation preparation and planning activities which were derived would not have included two categories and eight sub-categories only found as a result of the case study (Appendix 2, second colomn "A"), some of which were reported as being important according to every single one of the authors reviewed by Lindholst (2013). Similarly, one subcategory (Deal goals) and two activities (Negotiate multiple issues simultaneously and Opening offer) which emerged from the survey did not appear in the case study's data (Appendix 2, second colomn "B").

Self-reported answers to surveys and interviews have been found to be influenced by social desirability (DeMaio, 1984; Nederhof, 1985; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff , 2003) and thereby exaggerate the behaviour which is desired by the research project and can underestimate undesirable behaviour in the answers. Furthermore, research on socially desirable responses suggests that the motivation to be normatively appropriate produces the desire to perform impression management (e.g., Lalwani, Shavitt, & Johnson 2006; Paulhus, 1998). Thus, impression management in responding to surveys refers to favourable self-presentations which are designed to maintain a positive and normative image (Paulhus, 1998; Schlenker & Britt, 1999). Assuming that the negotiators have an interest in showing that they do many activities as part of their negotiation preparation and planning, the argument above would not explain why the survey failed to capture key activities.

The gap between results from the survey and the case study is more likely to exist because negotiators are simply unaware of some of the activities they perform when conducting NPP. Furthermore, they may be both cognitively limited in remembering all of what they do and limited in the time that they allocate in answering the survey. Consequently, respondents may be affected by anchoring effects (Eisenhower, Mathiowetz, & Morganstein, 1991), availability heuristics (Tversky & Kahneman, 1975), and other heuristics when responding to the survey and, thereby, might generate answers that only partly answer the research question(s) sought.

Given that the aim of the research is to fully understand an internal-organizational phenomenon, relying on open-ended survey as the method of inquiry has been shown to generate incomplete answers, making this finding important to researchers considering open-ended surveys as their primary method of inquiry.

Limitations and directions for future research

The findings in this study are subject to a number of limitations, which emphasises the need for future research. Firstly, the investigation was conducted in a single company setting, which restricted the sample to both industry and negotiation contexts (Patton, 2001) which may, possibly, have limited the generalizability of the findings to similar organizational contexts exclusively (Piercy, Cravens, Lane, & Vorhies, 2006). It is therefore not possible to be assured of the degree to which the findings are influenced by elements which are unique to the company under study (e.g. corporate culture). Although a single company research design provides the possibility to control for contextual effects, such as negotiation context and industry, the limitation above emphasises the need for future research, possibly by applying a multiple-company research design.

Second, the research design uses a single case study which increases the vulnerability of the findings compared to a multiple case design (Yin, 2009). Furthermore, the study failed to follow the negotiation until the final contract was signed, due to the entry of a third party into the negotiation and the consequent change of negotiation team. This may have prevented observation of some negotiation activities which would have been expected to take place such as the development of an opening offer. Moreover, the data coding and the identification of categories was conducted by only one person and the analysis was discussed with the supervisor. While this process allowed for consistency, it failed to provide inter-rater reliability and, thereby, rigour as claimed by some qualitative researchers (Armstrong, Gosling, Weinman, & Marteau, 1997; Morse, 1997).

Third, it is probable that negotiators make an extra effort in their NPP as result of the management's focus and the participation of the researcher, which is consistent with impression management (Leary & Kowalski, 1990) and self-monitoring theory (Snyder, 1974), and with quotations from the participants and, thereby, might possibly inflate the findings in terms of activities. Moreover, the dual-role of acting as a researcher and advisor (Morton, 1999), although mitigated by limiting researcher interference with the field to when questions are asked directly to the researcher and at the end of the sessions where possible, may cause the negotiators who participated in the longitudinal case study to develop additional preparation and planning skills over time, compared to the negotiators who did not participate in the research study.

Conclusion

This study demonstrated a gap between activities conducted by real negotiators and the activities recommended in the literature (two categories, nine sub-categories, and five activities), and has found evidence to validate the literature NPPA model as both comprehensive and inclusive.

In addition, the study demonstrated the inherent weakness of relying on an open-ended survey as the sole data source through which to understand an internal-organizational phenomenon. I hope the findings in this study will contribute to an increase in the awareness of negotiation planning and preparation.

Appendix 1: Survey NPPA model – categories, subcategories, and activities not performed according to self-reports by company negotiators.

Survey NPPA Activity Category:	Total Quotations	Total respondents	Dataset respondents / All respondents	Percentage of authors citing the activity in the literature NPPA model (Lindholst, 2013)
1. Information Gathering	120	45	66%	100%
1.1. Environmental Context	6	4	6%	50%
1.1.1. Economic	1	1	1%	50%
1.1.2. Political	2	2	3%	38%
1.1.3. Institutional-legal	3	3	4%	38%
1.1.4. Cultural	2	1	1%	38%
1.2. Nature of Interaction	0	0	0%	100%
1.2.1. Negotiation nature	0	0	0%	100%
1.2.2. Industry conventions and norms	0	0	0%	75%
1.3.2. Future relationship	3	2	3%	50%
1.3.5. Resources and constraints	3	3	4%	50%
2. Formulation	211	59	87%	100%
2.1.3.1. Customer Priorities	2	2	3%	100%
2.2.1.1. Customer Options Issues	5	4	6%	88%
3. Strategy Development	125	55	81%	100%
3.1.1. How to negotiate	1	1	1%	88%
3.1.1.1 Communication medium	0	0	0%	50%
3.1.1.2. Participants	0	0	0%	38%
3.1.1.3. Procedural and ground rules	0	0	0%	63%
3.1.1.4. Do's and Don'ts	1	1	1%	38%
3.2.1.1. Emotions	4	3	4%	38%
3.2.1.3. Communication	3	3	4%	75%
3.2.2. Understand the underlying interests and needs	5	5	7%	100%
3.2.2.1. Ask questions about I & P	3	3	4%	100%
3.2.2.2. Share information about I & P	2	2	3%	75%
3.2.2.3. Unbundle issues	0	0	0%	75%
3.2.3.1. Brainstorming	0	0	0%	38%
3.2.4. Evaluate solutions	1	1	1%	88%
3.2.5.2 Using Differences to create integrative agreement	5	5	7%	63%
3.3.1. Reservation point and targets	3	3	4%	75%
3.3.1.1. Validate of the other party´s RPs and targets	0	0	0%	63%
3.3.1.2. Influence the other party´s impression of own RPs and targets	3	3	4%	50%
3.3.1.3. Manipulate the other party´s perception of his or her own RPs and targets	0	0	0%	50%
3.3.2.2. Concession plan	3	3	4%	75%
3.3.3. Hardball tactics	5	4	6%	63%
3.3.3.1. Understand and detect	0	0	0%	50%
3.3.3.2. If and how to apply	5	4	6%	50%
3.3.3.3. Defence	0	0	0%	50%
3.3.4. Closing tactics	0	0	0%	38%
4. Preparation	21	15	22%	100%
4.2. Logistical Concerns	2	2	3%	88%
4.2.1. Where to negotiate	1	1	1%	75%
4.2.2. Physical arrangements	0	0	0%	50%
4.2.3. Timing of the negotiation	0	0	0%	50%
4.3. Role-Plays	4	4	6%	63%

Appendix 2, 1 of 2: NPPA model - comparison of activities which emerged from the survey and case study – Information gathering and Formulation themes.

NPPA Model Activity Category:	Comparison	Case Study	Survey
1. Information Gathering			
1.1. Environmental Context	D		
1.1.1. Economic	D		
1.1.2. Political	D		
1.1.3. Institutional-legal	D		
1.1.4. Cultural	D		
1.2. Nature of Interaction	D		
1.2.1. Negotiation nature	D		
1.2.2. Industry conventions and norms	D		
1.3. Negotiation Context	C	√	√
1.3.1. Scope of the negotiation	C	√	√
1.3.2. Future relationship	A	√	
1.3.3. Linkage and precedence	C	√	√
1.3.4. Competitive alternatives	C	√	√
1.3.5. Resources and constraints	A	√	
1.3.6. Own constituents	C	√	√
1.4. The Other Party	C	√	√
1.4.1. Understand the customer organization	C	√	√
1.4.2. Understand the negotiation team	C	√	√
1.4.3. Understand the individual negotiators	C	√	√
2. Formulation			
2.1. Issues, Interests, Positions and Priorities	C	√	√
2.1.1. Issues and interests	C	√	√
2.1.1.1 . Customer	C	√	√
2.1.1.1. Seller	C	√	√
2.1.2. Positions	C	√	√
2.1.2.1. Customer	C	√	√
2.1.2.2. Seller	C	√	√
2.1.3. Priorities	C	√	√
2.1.3.1. Customer Priorities	A	√	
2.1.3.2. Seller	C	√	√
2.2 Options	C	√	√
2.2.1. Options - Issues	C	√	√
2.2.1.1. Customer Options Issues	A	√	
2.2.1.2. Seller	C	√	√
2.2.2. Options - Deal	C	√	√
2.2.2.1. Customer	C	√	√
2.2.2.2. Seller	C	√	√
2.3 Reservation Points	C	√	√
2.3.1. RP - Issues	C	√	√
2.3.1.1. Customer	C	√	√
2.3.1.2. Seller	C	√	√
2.3.2. RP - Deal	C	√	√
2.3.2.1. Customer	C	√	√
2.3.2.2. Seller	C	√	√
2.4. Goals	C	√	√
2.4.1. Goals - Issues	C	√	√
2.4.1.1. Customer	C	√	√
2.4.1.2. Seller	C	√	√
2.4.2. Goals - Deal	B		√
2.4.2.1. Customer	B		√
2.4.2.2. Seller	B		√

Appendix 2, 2 of 2: NPPA model - comparison of activities which emerged from the survey and case study – Strategy development and Preparation themes.

NPPA Model Activity Category:	Comparison	Case Study	Survey
3. Strategy Development			
3.1. Setting-the-Table	C	√	√
3.1.1. How to negotiate	A	√	
3.1.1.1 Communication medium	A	√	
3.1.1.2. Participants	A	√	
3.1.1.3. Procedural and ground rules	A	√	
3.1.1.4. Do's and Don'ts	A	√	
3.1.2. How to organize the team	C	√	√
3.1.2.1. Size and composition of the team	C	√	√
3.1.2.2. Roles and responsibilities of the team members	C	√	√
3.1.2.3. Alignment of the team	C	√	√
3.1.3. What to Negotiate - Agenda	C	√	√
3.2. At-the-Table: Integrative Tactics	C	√	√
3.2.1. Separate the people from the problem	C	√	√
3.2.1.1. Emotions	A	√	
3.2.1.2. Perspective taking	C	√	√
3.2.1.3. Communication	A	√	
3.2.2. Understand the underlying interests and needs	A	√	
3.2.2.1. Ask questions about I & P	A	√	
3.2.2.2. Share information about I & P	D		
3.2.2.3. Unbundle issues	D		
3.2.3. Generate integrative options	C	√	√
3.2.3.1. Brainstorming	D		
3.2.3.2. Methods for achieving integrative agreements	C	√	√
3.2.4. Evaluate solutions	D		
3.2.5. Select solutions	C	√	√
3.2.5.1. Negotiate multiple issues simultaneously	B		√
3.2.5.2 Using Differences to create integrative agreement	A	√	
3.3. At-the-Table: Distributive Tactics	C	√	√
3.3.1. Reservation point and targets	A	√	
3.3.1.1. Validate of the other party´s RPs and targets	A	√	
3.3.1.2. Influence the other party´s impression of own RPs and targets	D		
3.3.1.3. Manipulate the other party´s perception of his or her own RPs and targets	D		
3.3.2. Positions and concessions	C	√	√
3.3.2.1. Opening offer and responses to other party's opening offer	B		√
3.3.2.2. Concession plan	A	√	
3.3.2.3. Develop arguments and counterarguments	C	√	√
3.3.3. Hardball tactics	A	√	
3.3.3.1. Understand and detect	A	√	
3.3.3.2. If and how to apply	A	√	
3.3.3.3. Defence	A	√	
3.3.4. Closing tactics	D		
4. Preparation			
4.1. Support Material	C	√	√
4.2. Logistical Concerns	A	√	
4.2.1. Where to negotiate	A	√	
4.2.2. Physical arrangements	D		
4.2.3. Timing of the negotiation	A	√	
4.3. Role-Plays	A	√	

References

Armstrong, D., Gosling, A., Weinman, J., & Marteau, T. (1997). The place of inter-rater reliability in qualitative research: An empirical study. *Sociology, 31*(3), 597-606.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development* Sage Publications, Incorporated.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Buelens, M., Van De Woestyne, M., Mestdagh, S., & Bouckenooghe, D. (2008). Methodological issues in negotiation research: A state-of-the-art-review. *Group Decision and Negotiation, 17*(4), 321-345.

Carnevale, P. J. (2006). Creativity in the outcomes of conflict. (pp. 414-35) Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* Wiley Online Library.

DeMaio, T. J. (1984). Social desirability and survey measurement: A review. *Surveying Subjective Phenomena, 2*, 257-281.

Eisenhower, D., Mathiowetz, N. A., & Morganstein, D. (1991). Recall error: Sources and bias reduction techniques. *Measurement Errors in Surveys,* , 125-144.

Farquhar, J. D. (2012). *Case study research for business* Sage.

Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (1991). *Getting to yes: Negotiating an agreement without giving in* (2. ed.). London: Random House.

Friese, S. (2012). *Qualitative data analysis with ATLAS. ti* Sage Publications Limited.

Ghauri, P. N., & Usunier, J. C. (2003). *International business negotiations* Emerald Group Publishing.

Ghauri, P. N. (1986). Guidelines for international business negotiations. *International Marketing Review, 3*(3), 72-82.

Hames, D. S. (2012). Negotiation: Closing deals, settling disputes, and making team decisions SAGE.

Lalwani, A. K., Shavitt, S., & Johnson, T. (2006). What is the relation between cultural orientation and socially desirable responding? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(1), 165.

Lax, D. A., & Sebenius, J. K. (1986). *The manager as negotiator: Bargaining for cooperation and competitive gain*. New York: The Free Press.

Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*(1), 34.

Lewicki, R. J., Barry, B., & Saunders, D. M. (2010). *Negotiation* (6. ed. ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Lindholst, M. (2013). *Complex business negotiation: Understanding preparation and planning.* (PhD manuscript submitted for publication). Copenhagen Business School, Mannix, E. A., & Innami, I. (1993). The effects of argument preparation and timing of first offer on negotiators' cognitions and performance. *Group Decision and Negotiation, 2*(4), 347-362.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching* Sage Publications Limited.

Mintu-Wimsatt, A., & Calantone, R. J. (1996). Exploring factors that affect negotiators’ problem-solving orientation. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 11*(6), 61-73.

Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 1*(2), 13-22.

Morse, J. M. (1997). " Perfectly healthy, but dead": The myth of inter-rater reliability. *Qualitative Health Research, 7*(4), 445-447.

Morton, A. (1999). Ethics in action research. *Systemic Practice and Action Research, 12*(2), 219-222.

Naquin, C. E. (2003). The agony of opportunity in negotiation: Number of negotiable issues, counterfactual thinking, and feelings of satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 91*(1), 97-107.

Nederhof, A. J. (1985). Methods of coping with social desirability bias: A review. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 15*(3), 263-280.

Patton, M. Q. (2001). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* Sage Publications, Incorporated.

Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Interpersonal and intrapsychic adaptiveness of trait self-enhancement: A mixed blessing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(5), 1197.

Peterson, R. M., & Lucas, G. H. (2001). Expanding the antecedent component of the traditional business negotiation model: Pre-negotiation literature review and planning-preparation propositions. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice,* , 37-49.

Peterson, R. M., & Shepherd, C. D. (2010). Preparing to negotiate: An exploratory analysis of the activities comprising the pre-negotiation process in a buyer-seller interaction. *Marketing Management Journal, 20*(1), 66-75.

Piercy, N. F., Cravens, D. W., Lane, N., & Vorhies, D. W. (2006). Driving organizational citizenship behaviors and salesperson in-role behavior performance: The role of management control and perceived organizational support. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 34*(2), 244-262.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879.

Pruitt, D. (2011). A critique of experimental research on negotiation. *SSRN Electronic Journal,* doi:10.2139/ssrn.1872144

Pruitt, D. G. (1981). Negotiation behavior. *Negotiation Behavior,*

Raiffa, H. (1982). *Art and science of negotiation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Roloff, M. E., & Jordan, J. M. (1991). The influence of effort, experience, and persistence on the elements of bargaining plans. *Communication Research, 18*(3), 306-332. doi:10.1177/009365091018003002

Salacuse, J. W. (2003). *The global negotiator: Making, managing and mending deals around the world in the twenty-first century*. London/Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles:

Schlenker, B. R., & Britt, T. W. (1999). Beneficial impression management: Strategically controlling information to help friends. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*(4), 559.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*(4), 526.

Thompson, L. L. (2009). *The mind and heart of the negotiator*. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson Education.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1975). *Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases* Springer.

Watkins, M. (2000). Dynamic negotiation: Seven propositions about complex negotiations.

Watkins, M. (2002). *Breakthrough business negotiation: A toolbox for managers* John Wiley & Sons.

Watkins, M., & Rosen, S. (1996). *Rethinking" preparation" in negotiation* Research Programs, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Watkins, M. (1999). Negotiating in a complex world. *Negotiation Journal, 15*(3), 229.

Watkins, M. (2006). *Shaping the game: The new leader's guide to effective negotiating*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press.

Weiss, S. E. (1993). Analysis of complex negotiations in international business: The RBC perspective. *Organization Science, 4*(2), 269-300.

Weiss, S. E. (2004). Revisiting" bricks, mortar, and prospects. *Handbook for International Management Research,* , 415.

Weiss, S. E. (2006). International business negotiation in a globalizing world: Reflections on the contributions and future of a (sub) field. *International Negotiation, 11*(2), 287-316.

Weiss, S. E. (2006). Planning for international negotiations: A systematic approach with asia-north america illustrations.

Yin, R. K. (2011). *Applications of case study research* Sage Publications, Incorporated.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research, design and methods*. Los Angeles: