

7-3-2017

"I Need That Week Off!": An Experiential Exercise on Conflict and Negotiation

Melanie A. Robinson
HEC Montreal

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj>



Part of the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), and the [Organizational Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Robinson, Melanie A. (2017) "I Need That Week Off!": An Experiential Exercise on Conflict and Negotiation," *Organization Management Journal*: Vol. 14: Iss. 3, Article 7.
Available at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj/vol14/iss3/7>



“I Need That Week Off!”: An Experiential Exercise on Conflict and Negotiation

Melanie A. Robinson

Department of Management, HEC Montréal, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

ABSTRACT

This article presents an experiential exercise designed to provide students with an opportunity to develop their knowledge of ways in which conflict may be managed (using the framework proposed by Thomas, 1976) and types of negotiation. Students form pairs and are presented with a scenario in which they have both requested the same week of vacation to attend events. Unfortunately, they are informed that they are unable to take the time off simultaneously. Participants are asked to discuss among themselves, using assigned modes of managing conflict, to determine how the time will be allocated. The target audience is composed of undergraduate students, who may be enrolled in any number of classes related to organizational behavior. To examine perceptions of the exercise, data were collected from a sample of 140 participants. Among the findings, 92.9% of respondents reported that they would recommend that instructors use the exercise in a similar course.

KEYWORDS

conflict; experiential exercise; negotiation; organizational justice; role-play

Conflict in organizations can occur between numerous individuals and across various hierarchical levels. For example, research has shown that conflict, which may be described as “perceived incompatibilities or discrepant views among parties involved” (Jehn & Bendersky, 2003, p. 188–189), can arise with one’s peers, one’s boss, and one’s employees (e.g., Baron, 1989), as well as within both in-person groups (e.g., Jehn, 1997) and global virtual teams (e.g., Kankanhalli, Tan, & Wei, 2007), among other settings. The impetus of the conflict may also vary, such that disagreements centering on task, process, or interpersonal differences (i.e., relationship conflict) have all been found to occur in the workplace (e.g., Jehn, 1997; Jehn & Bendersky, 2003).

The literature suggests that conflict can impact salient organizational variables. However, several authors have noted that these relationships are far from clear-cut, with several potential moderators influencing the effects of the different types of conflict on outcomes (e.g., De Dreu & Weingart, 2003; de Wit, Greer, & Jehn, 2012; Jehn & Bendersky, 2003). For example, meta-analytic results by De Dreu and Weingart (2003) found both performance and satisfaction of team members to be negatively influenced by task and relationship conflict, though it was noted that this negative effect was more pronounced for conflicts grounded in relationships. Among their results, the authors also found these negative relationships to be more

pronounced when tasks were more complex in nature. Additionally, the degree to which relationship and task conflict were correlated acted as a moderator of the relationship between task conflict and group performance, such that the negative relationship was strengthened by stronger correlations between the two types of conflict.

Also using meta-analysis, de Wit et al. (2012) examined the effects of task, relationship, and process conflict on outcomes, as well as numerous potential moderators of these relationships. The results showed that several outcomes were impacted in different ways by one or more of the types of conflict. For example, while trust was negatively associated with all three types of conflict, only task and relationship conflict negatively impacted organizational citizenship behaviors and the degree to which members identified with their groups. Furthermore, task and relationship conflict positively influenced counterproductive work behavior. Cohesion and positive affect were negatively associated with relationship conflict. Additionally, negative relationships emerged for both relationship and task conflict and group performance. Several moderators were also found to influence relationships within the study. One such moderator was the degree to which two types of conflict were correlated (note that additional moderating effects were also found). Thus, the negative relationships between task conflict

and group cohesion, satisfaction, and group performance were more pronounced when both task and relationship conflict were present to a greater degree. Relatedly, the negative relationship between relationship conflict and group performance was more pronounced when process conflict and relationship conflict were present to a higher degree.

Further highlighting the importance of moderators of the relationships between the different types of conflict and outcomes, Jehn and Bendersky (2003) proposed a model examining the effects of task, relationship, and process conflict on two categories of outcomes (namely, performance/creativity and satisfaction/consensus). Drawing upon both a literature review and theoretical rationale, the authors proposed that conflict may at times have a positive influence on outcomes (arguing that task conflict may have a positive direct effect on performance/creativity and that process conflict may sometimes have a positive direct effect on satisfaction/consensus, “depending on time of conflict in the group’s life,” p. 204), while conflict may at other times negatively influence outcomes. Importantly, the authors identify a host of potential moderators that may change the direct effects proposed within their model.

Present exercise and key concepts

The research summarized in the preceding section clearly suggests that conflict can have important effects on a variety of organizational outcomes (e.g., De Dreu & Weingart, 2003; de Wit et al., 2012), highlighting the importance of the topic within the field of organizational behavior.

In courses where topics related to conflict are discussed, instructors may make use of a variety of instructional approaches. This article describes an experiential exercise that may be used in such courses, designed to help students to learn about different ways in which conflict may be managed and to distinguish between distributive and integrative negotiation. Key concepts related to the exercise are overviewed in the sections that follow.

The exercise is grounded in experiential learning, defined as “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (Kolb, 1984, p. 38). Thus, the activity aims to enable students to deepen their understanding of the key concepts through active participation in a role-play scenario, followed by a reflection and discussion of their experience.

In the exercise, students form pairs and are presented with a scenario in which both parties are in

need of the same week off for vacation so that they may attend important events out of town. However, their manager informs them that it would not be possible to take vacation simultaneously and asks them to decide amongst themselves how the week will be allocated. Each student is randomly assigned one of the five modes of managing conflict (using the framework presented by Thomas, 1976) and is asked to negotiate the issue with his or her partner using that assigned style. The exercise closes with a plenary discussion regarding the activity, in which students discuss their outcomes (how the vacation time was allocated within their dyads) and apply the key concepts to an analysis of the activity.

Modes of Managing Conflict

Several researchers have examined ways in which conflict may be managed, proposing frameworks to represent behaviors that may be used to manage conflict (e.g., Blake & Mouton, 1964; Rahim & Bonoma, 1979; Thomas, 1976). The current exercise focuses on the typology presented by Thomas (1976), which describes five modes of managing conflict (also described as *intentions*; Thomas, 1992). The author notes that this framework builds on the research presented by Blake and Mouton (1964), as well as on some other studies (see Thomas, 1976, p. 900).

The five modes differ depending on the degree to which one is focused on achieving the interests of oneself (one’s level of *assertiveness*) and those of the other party (one’s level of *cooperativeness*). Using this matrix, one engages in *competition* when one is highly assertive and not very cooperative, *accommodation* when one is unassertive but highly cooperative, *collaboration* when the interests of both parties are stressed, and *avoidance* when the interests of neither party are emphasized. Finally, one *compromises* when one tries to attain a sufficient amount of the interests of all involved.

Distributive and Integrative Negotiation

Negotiation can occur in many types of situations—such as between people, between groups, and between sections of an organization (Lewicki, 1981).

The complexity surrounding negotiation has been highlighted in the literature (e.g., Lewicki, Saunders, & Barry, 2011). Illustrating this point, De Dreu, Beersma, Steinel, and Van Kleef (2007) refer to negotiations as “fuzzy situations” (p. 608), due to the fact that we often lack knowledge of the perceptions of others and because we often have incomplete information when

engaging in them. Thus, the authors argue “negotiators face and manage fuzzy, ambiguous, and messy situations” (p. 611).

While several theories of negotiation exist (e.g., Lewicki, Weiss, & Lewin, 1992; Thompson, 1990), the present exercise focuses on the distinction between the general concepts of distributive and integrative negotiation. *Distributive negotiation* takes a “fixed-sum” approach, whereby the goal is to achieve a win for oneself (Walton & McKersie, 1965, p. 13). *Integrative negotiation* emphasizes solutions that represent a win for all involved (e.g., Walton & McKersie, 1965). Notably, Lewicki et al. (1992) identify “Walton and McKersie’s four subprocesses” (two of which are distributive and integrative negotiation) as “the dominant paradigm” within the negotiation literature (p. 219). Several authors have noted that negotiations often involve both distributive and integrative elements (e.g., Hames, 2012; Lewicki et al., 2011).

Kilman and Thomas (1975, citing work by Thomas, 1976) discuss how the approach taken toward an issue (whether the issue is considered along distributive or integrative dimensions) may relate to the five modes of managing conflict. The authors relate competition and accommodation to the distributive dimension, in that that they represent “taking” and “giving,” respectively. They further associate collaboration and avoidance with the integrative dimension, in that they represent adding to and taking away from the “size of the pie,” respectively. With respect to each dimension, the three other styles are characterized as “intermediate” (Kilman & Thomas, 1975, p. 972).

The present exercise incorporates both topics, encouraging participants to apply their knowledge of each to the performance of a role-play activity and to an analysis of the experience.

Organization of the Article

In the following sections, I present the learning objectives, procedure, timing of the exercise, materials required, and suggested debriefing questions for the exercise. In the latter portion of the article, I discuss the results from a study examining perceptions related to the exercise ($N = 140$ participants) and conclude with a summary of the activity and a discussion of the limitations of both the exercise and empirical study.

Let the exercise begin!

Overview of the Exercise

The present exercise uses an experiential learning approach (using role-play) to help students to develop

their knowledge of the ways in which conflict may be managed (as identified by Thomas, 1976) and types of negotiation. Additionally, as the scenario lends itself well to a discussion of fairness, concepts related to organizational justice are further incorporated into the debriefing session that follows the exercise.

The instructor begins by asking students to form pairs. Each student selects one of two possible roles (for which the gender-neutral names of Jessie and Peyton were selected) to play during the activity. Prior to class, the instructor prepares one piece of paper per student, upon which one of the five modes of managing conflict is written (sample materials for this step are provided in Appendix A). At this stage, participants are told that this paper contains the mode of managing conflict that they will be asked to use during the exercise, but are asked to not open the paper until the scenario has been fully read and to avoid revealing the mode that they have been assigned to their partners until the activity has been completed. These instructions are also presented on visual aids at the outset of the exercise (see Appendix B for sample content for visual aids).

When running the exercise, I prepare two separate bags of papers upon which the modes are printed. One bag contains the modes to be distributed to participants portraying Jessie and the other holds the papers to be handed out to participants playing Peyton. To further differentiate the bags, the papers for each role are printed on a different color paper. Each piece of paper is then folded and stapled closed.

The instructor next reads the scenario to the class (see Appendix C for the instructor’s script). In it, a manager—played by the instructor—meets with two employees from his or her department, named Peyton and Jessie. Both employees have requested the same week off, in the hopes of attending important events out of town (Peyton wishes to attend a family reunion, while Jessie has qualified to participate in a competitive sporting event). However, the manager informs them that it would not be possible to take time off simultaneously. The manager then suggests that the two employees discuss the issue together to decide how the week should be allocated. Participants are given several minutes to negotiate among themselves and to finalize a decision. The debriefing session follows.

To make the scenario more engaging, I ask students to help build important features into the story. At four points in the scenario, participants are encouraged to call out details that become key elements of the script. Specifically, students contribute to the scenario by suggesting the cities to which each employee will travel, how long it has been since Peyton has seen his or her

Table 1. Components and timing of the exercise.

Component	Timing
Instructor overviews the activity; participants are asked to form pairs and select roles; instructor distributes papers with an assigned mode of managing conflict to each student	5–10 minutes
Instructor reviews key concepts	5–10 minutes
Instructor reads the scenario; participants are given time to discuss the issue and come up with a decision	10 minutes
Debriefing session	10–20 minutes

family members, and the sporting event that Jessie has qualified for. This interaction helps set the tone for the activity and generates interest in the exercise. Notably, the literature suggests that instructors can play a very influential role in such exercises (e.g., Certo, 1976) and that the enthusiasm of instructors is beneficial in experiential learning (e.g., Saunders, 1985, 1987). Underscoring its importance, research has found enthusiasm to be positively related to participants' reported intrinsic motivation and psychological vitality in both a correlational and an experimental study (Patrick, Hisley, & Kempler, 2000).

Learning Objectives

Three learning objectives underlie this exercise:

- (1) APPLY knowledge of the ways in which conflict may be managed and the types of negotiation to a realistic problem.
- (2) EVALUATE the effectiveness of different ways of managing conflict and negotiation styles used in a specific situation.
- (3) APPLY knowledge of organizational justice to the assessment of a specific situation.

To help students achieve these learning objectives, I find it useful to review key concepts related to the exercise—namely, the five modes of managing conflict and the definitions of distributive and integrative negotiation—at the start of the activity, before the scenario is read to participants. However, I only review the different types of organizational justice after we have begun to discuss perceptions of fairness during the debriefing session, encouraging students to tie their answers back to the types of justice that had been discussed earlier in the semester.

Target Audience, Timing, and Materials Required

The target audience is composed of undergraduate students, who may be enrolled in any number of classes focused on topics related to organizational behavior. The activity requires 30–50 minutes of class time, depending on the number of discussion questions

included in the debriefing session and the length of time devoted to the review of relevant concepts. A breakdown of the estimated timing for each component of the exercise is presented in Table 1.

Prior to class, instructors should prepare the papers specifying the modes of managing conflict that participants will be asked to use during the exercise. Papers are then randomly distributed to participants at the outset of the activity, which allows for a vast array of combinations of modes of managing conflict to be present within the dyads (alternatively, instructors may choose to assign specific combinations of roles to teams).

Debriefing Session

The debriefing session is very important, as it is intended to help students learn from an experiential activity (Dennehy, Sims, & Collins, 1998). Several suggested discussion questions, along with notes for instructors and reflections from past experiences running the activity, are presented in Table 2.

Perceptions Related to the Experiential Exercise

In order to assess perceptions related to the experiential exercise, the activity was run in multiple sections of an undergraduate course. Questionnaires were then distributed to respondents who consented to participate in the research study. The results from this study are presented in the sections that follow.

Sample

The exercise was run in five sections of an undergraduate course at a large Canadian university. I first contacted two instructors teaching the course and obtained permission to visit their classes to conduct the activity (one instructor taught two of the sections in the sample, while the second instructor taught three sections in the sample). The exercise was run at the start of the last class of the semester in three of the sections and at the start of the second-to-last class of the semester in the other two sections.

Participation in the study was completely voluntary. While the exercise was run for all students present,

Table 2. Discussion questions and notes.

Discussion Question	What decision was reached during the exercise? Were you happy with the outcome?
Notes and Reflections	This question is intended to break the ice for class discussion and to allow students/pairs to share the outcomes of their negotiations with the class. A large number of potential decisions are possible, depending on the combination of modes assigned within dyads.
Discussion Question 2	What type of negotiation did you use during the exercise? What type of negotiation did the other person use?
Notes and Reflections	The class may analyze whether a distributive or integrative approach was used. As an example of an integrative approach, participants may decide to team up and train another employee on the key duties to be completed, thus allowing them both to take the full week off.
	The instructor may also ask students how the mode of managing conflict that they were assigned influenced the type of negotiation used.
Discussion Question 3	Did the way in which conflict was managed and/or the type of negotiation used affect the decision? For example, did it impact how satisfied you were with the decision? Did it facilitate reaching a decision, or make it more challenging to reach a decision?
Notes and Reflections	To stimulate class discussion, the instructor may inquire whether the parties used styles that facilitated the decision or made the decision more challenging. To extend this point, the instructor may ask if students would have adjusted their behavior (i.e., switched to a different mode) if they had not been assigned a mode during the activity and what factors may have influenced their decision to do so.
Discussion Question 4	If you had not been given a mode of managing conflict to display in the exercise, what mode might you have used and why?
Notes and Reflections	This question allows participants to consider way(s) that they may have approached the conflict, had they not been constrained by modes assigned to them in the exercise.
	Instructors may find it useful to ask students how the context presented in the scenario might influence their decision. Several researchers have noted the effects of the situation or context on one's selection of mode with which to manage conflict (e.g., Callahan, Benzing & Perri, 2006; Rahim, 2002; Wall & Callister, 1995) and one's approach to a negotiation (e.g., Harinck, De Dreu, & Van Vianen, 2000). This can be a very useful point to introduce during the debriefing session, as it asks students to consider how the ways in which they may choose to approach a conflict can differ depending on the situation at hand.
Discussion Question 5	Do you think that the strategy used by the manager in the scenario was fair? Why or why not? How might you have tried to make the situation be perceived as more fair?
Notes and Reflections	The context presented within the scenario (whereby the manager places all responsibility for the allocation of the vacation time in the hands of the two employees) provides participants with the opportunity to discuss their perceptions of the fairness of the manager's actions.
	The literature on organization justice has focused upon three main categories of justice perceptions. <i>Distributive justice</i> (e.g., Adams, 1963) focuses upon the extent to which one views the allocation of outcomes to be just. <i>Procedural justice</i> (Thibaut & Walker, 1975) centers upon one's perceptions of the fairness of the manner in which the decisions pertaining to outcome(s) have been made. Finally, the belief that information related to the said outcome has been relayed in a timely and respectful manner informs one's perceptions of <i>interactional justice</i> (e.g., Bies & Moag, 1986). Meta-analytic results by Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng (2001) show that perceptions of fairness (where the authors examined distributive, procedural, and two dimensions of interactional justice – namely, interpersonal and informational fairness) influence a large number of salient outcomes.
	In the present exercise, perceptions of distributive justice will likely be impacted by how the outcome is allocated. The process used to determine the outcome may or may not be viewed as fair, thus reflecting perceptions of procedural justice. As one example, the fact that the employees were placed in the position of having to negotiate their vacations amongst themselves may not be viewed as procedurally fair, as other employees in the company may not be required to negotiate vacation time with their colleagues. As a second example, the lack of clear policy for how to assign vacation time may also be discussed. Finally, the class may consider their perceptions of the interactional fairness of the situation. Here, students may focus on the way in which the manager treated the employees. Notably, if the manager's behavior is perceived as unjust, the class may then discuss what the manager might have done differently to increase the perceptions of organizational justice in the eyes of the employees.
	As noted in the Procedures section of the empirical study, a worksheet was distributed to participants at the end of the activity, upon which the discussion questions that would be covered were written. A subset of the full sample (forty-nine participants) chose to submit their worksheets along with their questionnaires. Sample written comments, either reflecting perceptions of the fairness or unfairness of the manager's actions, are presented below. As these sample comments demonstrate, perceptions of the fairness of the manager's behavior vary.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Yes, since the conflict could have been resolved by the 2 people who were affected. If the manager would have made the decision, then it would not be fair for both parties” • “Yes, empowering employees is always good” • “Yes, allowed employees to come to an agreement, avoiding feelings of favoritism” • “Not fair, because it could be that one person is bad at defending their point” • “No, the manager took the easy way out” • “No, it wasn't fair because it may create conflict between employees” • “No, she avoided conflict by leaving the decision with the employees. She should've stayed for the discussion. This way, other arguments may have been brought up”
	As the discussion continues, I encourage participants to link their ideas more specifically to concepts from organizational justice. For example, instructors may probe further in the discussion with such follow-up questions as: <i>Which of the types of organizational justice would this idea represent? What are some of the factors that influence perceptions of procedural justice (or other types of justice, depending on the focus of the discussion)?</i>

questionnaires were distributed only to those students who chose to participate in the research study. In total, 140 participants (46.4% male, 53.6% female) completed questionnaires. The number of respondents per section ranged from 22 to 42 students. Participants averaged 21.04 years of age ($SD = 3.14$) and were mostly business majors.

Procedure

At the outset of the session, I introduced the exercise to the class and overviewed the instructions for the activity (see the instructions in Appendix B). After students selected their roles, I distributed the sealed papers containing the modes of managing conflict that participants would be asked to portray. Next, I overviewed two key concepts related to the exercise—namely, the five modes of managing conflict identified by Thomas (1976) and the definitions of distributive and integrative negotiation.

I then read the instructor's script to the class, inviting participants to help build four key details into the story (i.e., the sports competition for which Jessie had qualified, the cities to which both employees would travel, and the number of years that had passed since Peyton had last visited many of his or her family members who would be present at the reunion). Once the scenario was read, I asked students to open the papers upon which their assigned modes of managing conflict were printed and to discuss, in pairs, to determine how the vacation week would be allocated. After the majority of the dyads had completed their discussion, I distributed a worksheet to each student on which the discussion questions were presented, with space below each to record their thoughts prior to the class discussion.

At the completion of the activity, I invited students to participate in the optional research study on their perceptions of the experiential exercise. Students who agreed to participate signed a consent form and answered a three-page questionnaire.

Measures

The questionnaire included several measures, as described below.

Demographics. Data were collected pertaining to the age, gender, and major (within their studies) of participants.

Subscales from the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory.

Items from three subscales of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (e.g., Ryan, 1982) were included to measure perceptions related to the activity. Seven items assessed

interest/enjoyment—a measure of the intrinsic motivation of participants related to the exercise. Five items measured *effort/importance*—gauging the degree of effort that participants put forth toward the activity. Finally, seven items assessed *value/usefulness*—examining perceptions of the value of the exercise (where items for this subscale were slightly adapted for the current study). Participants responded to each item using a 7-point Likert-style scale, ranging from 1 (*not true at all*) to 7 (*very true*). All scales demonstrated acceptable reliability in the present study, with $\alpha = .88$ for interest/enjoyment, $\alpha = .82$ for effort/importance, and $\alpha = .91$ for value/usefulness.¹

Perceptions of the exercise. Participants were asked whether they would recommend that instructors use the exercise within their courses (“Would you recommend this exercise to be used by [instructors in the course in which data were collected]?”), selecting from two answer choices (yes or no). Space was provided for participants to elaborate on their answer, as well as for any general comments related to the activity. Additionally, participants were asked to assess the degree to which they felt that the exercise helped them to learn about the key concepts (“Do you feel that this exercise helped you to learn about the topics of conflict and negotiation?”). Responses were based on a 5-point Likert-style scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Results

To address missing data, a decision rule was adopted whereby scores for the 7-item scales would be computed only in cases where three items or fewer were missing and scores for the 5-item scale would be calculated only in cases where two items or fewer were missing. Using this decision rule, no scores were missing for participants in the study.

Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the three subscales are presented in Table 3. The means for each of the subscales suggest that participants perceived the exercise to be interesting ($M = 5.14$, $SD = .92$) and useful ($M = 5.26$, $SD = 1.05$). Though the mean for effort/importance is lower ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 1.12$), it is notably above the midpoint of the 7-point scale. These results therefore provide evidence that participants in the study perceived the exercise positively.

Further supporting this point, an overwhelming majority of respondents (92.9%) indicated that they would recommend that instructors teaching the course use the exercise. Though some participants provided critical feedback related to the exercise (sample

Table 3. Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations.

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3
1. Interest/enjoyment	5.14	.92	—		
2. Value/usefulness	5.26	1.05	.73**	—	
3. Effort/importance	4.32	1.12	.67**	.57**	—

Note. *N* = 140 observations.

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed).

comments include “I didn’t like that me and my partner got the same [mode of] managing conflict” and “It was alright, but I think it might be beneficial to allow students to know their styles before explaining them”), many respondents expressed positive opinions about the activity. Illustrative positive comments include “I feel as though it’s a good way to get students to remember key concepts because this was a memorable activity,” “It combines real world scenarios with concepts from class,” and “It was a fun exercise and simple yet challenging at the same time.”

The results also suggest that participants perceived that the exercise helped them to learn about the topics of conflict and negotiation ($M = 3.87$, $SD = .88$), with 84.3% of participants in the study ($n = 118$) reporting that they at least agreed with the question presented in the questionnaire. More precisely, 15% of the sample selected the answer choice *strongly agree*, 69.3% selected *agree*, 7.1% selected *neither agree nor disagree*, 2.9% selected *disagree*, and 5.0% selected *strongly disagree*.²

Conclusion

This article introduced an experiential exercise that was designed to help students develop their knowledge of modes of managing conflict (using the framework proposed by Thomas, 1976) and types of negotiation (i.e., distinguishing between distributive and integrative negotiation). Grounded in experiential learning, the exercise provides participants with the opportunity to negotiate a hypothetical issue (a scenario in which two employees are in need of the same week of vacation to attend important events out of town and are asked to decide between themselves how the time will be allocated), using assigned modes of managing conflict. The debriefing session allows participants to apply their knowledge of these key concepts, along with a discussion of organizational justice, to an analysis of the situation that they experienced in the exercise.

Data related to perceptions of the exercise were collected from a sample of 140 participants. Notably, 92.9% of respondents reported that they would recommend that instructors teaching a similar course use the

exercise. The results therefore suggest that the exercise is an effective tool that may be used by instructors to enhance learning of the modes of managing conflict and types of negotiation.

Limitations

The random assignment of modes of managing conflict to participants may represent a limitation of the exercise, given that participants may not be very familiar with the style that they are asked to employ in the activity. As a variation of the exercise, instructors may therefore choose to assign the negotiation style instead (i.e., asking participants to engage in distributive or integrative negotiation) and ask participants to use a mode of managing conflict that fits with the style that is assigned to them.³

Limitations of the empirical study must also be acknowledged. First, the recommendations that instructors teaching a similar course use the exercise were assessed via a single-item measure with a dichotomous response option (yes/no), which may inflate the results.⁴ Relatedly, perceptions of learning from the exercise were also examined using a single-item, self-report measure. As such, results related to these two items should be interpreted with the aforementioned caveats in mind.

Notes

1. Note that the reliabilities for the effort/importance and value/usefulness subscales are based on $N = 140$ observations, while the reliability for the interest/enjoyment subscale is based on $N = 137$ observations.
2. Based on 139 observations.
3. I thank two anonymous reviewers for this suggestion.
4. I thank an anonymous reviewer for this suggestion.

About the author

Melanie A. Robinson is an assistant professor in the Department of Management at HEC Montréal. Her research interests include leadership, followership, forgiveness, and pedagogical research. She can be reached at melanie.2.robinson@hec.ca.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 422–436. doi:10.1037/h0040968
- Baron, R. A. (1989). Personality and organizational conflict: Effects of the type A behavior pattern and self-monitoring. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 44, 281–296. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(89)90028-9
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43–55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.
- Callahan, G. A., Benzing, C. D., & Perri, D. F. (2006). Choice of conflict-handling strategy: A matter of context. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 140(3), 269–288. doi:10.3200/JRLP.140.3.269-288
- Certo, S. C. (1976). The experimental exercise situation: A comment on instructional role and pedagogy evaluation. *Academy of Management Review*, 1(3), 113–116. doi:10.5465/AMR.1976.4400877
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.425
- De Dreu, C. K., Beersma, B., Steinel, W., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2007). The psychology of negotiation: Principles and basic processes. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (2nd ed, pp. 608–629). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 741–749. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.741
- de Wit, F. R. C., Greer, L. J., & Jehn, K. A. (2012). The paradox of intragroup conflict: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2), 360–390. doi:10.1037/a0024844
- Dennehy, R. F., Sims, R. R., & Collins, H. E. (1998). Debriefing experiential learning exercises: A theoretical and practical guide for success. *Journal of Management Education*, 22(1), 9–25. doi:10.1177/105256299802200102
- Hames, D. S. (2012). *Negotiation: Closing deals, settling disputes, and making team decisions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Harinck, F., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Van Vianen, A. E. M. (2000). The impact of conflict issue on fixed-pie perceptions, problem solving, and integrative outcomes in negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 81(2), 329–358. doi:10.1006/obhd.1999.2873
- Jehn, K. A. (1997). A qualitative analysis of conflict types and dimensions in organizational groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 530–577. doi:10.2307/2393737
- Jehn, K. A., & Bendersky, C. (2003). Intragroup conflict in organizations: A contingency perspective on the conflict-outcome relationship. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 25, 187–242. doi:10.1016/S0191-3085(03)25005-X
- Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., & Wei, W. (2007). Conflict and performance in global virtual teams. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 23(3), 237–274. doi:10.2753/MIS0742-1222230309
- Kilmann, R. H., & Thomas, K. W. (1975). Interpersonal conflict-handling behavior as reflections of Jungian personality dimensions. *Psychological Report*, 37, 971–980. doi:10.2466/pr0.1975.37.3.971
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lewicki, R. J. (1981). Bargaining and negotiation. *Journal of Management Education*, 6(2), 33–42. doi:10.1177/105256298100600207
- Lewicki, R. J., Saunders, D. M., & Barry, B. (2011). *Essentials of negotiation* (5th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Lewicki, R. J., Weiss, S. E., & Lewin, D. (1992). Models of conflict, negotiation and third party intervention: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(3), 209–252. doi:10.1002/job.4030130303
- Patrick, B. C., Hisley, J., & Kempler, T. (2000). “What’s everybody so excited about?”: The effects of teacher enthusiasm on student intrinsic motivation and vitality. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 68(3), 217–236. doi:10.1080/00220970009600093
- Rahim, A., & Bonoma, T. V. (1979). Managing organizational conflict: A model for diagnosis and intervention. *Psychological Reports*, 44, 1323–1344. doi:10.2466/pr0.1979.44.3c.1323
- Rahim, M. A. (2002). Toward a theory of managing organizational conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 13(3), 206–235. doi:10.1108/eb022874
- Ryan, R. (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 450–461. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.43.3.450
- Saunders, P. (1985). Enthusiasm awareness in the experiential classroom. *Developments in Business Simulation & Experiential Exercises*, 12, 41–44. Retrieved from <http://sbaweb.wayne.edu/~absel/bkl/vol12/12al.pdf>
- Saunders, P. (1987). Enthusiasm awareness in experiential learning. *Journal of Management Education*, 11, 21–30. doi:10.1177/105256298701100403
- Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Thomas, K. W. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M. Dunette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 889–935). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Thomas, K. W. (1992). Conflict and conflict management: Reflections and update. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(3), 265–274. doi:10.1002/job.4030130307
- Thompson, L. (1990). Negotiation behavior and outcomes: Empirical evidence and theoretical issues. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3), 515–532. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.515
- Wall, J. A., Jr., & Callister, R. R. (1995). Conflict and its management. *Journal of Management*, 21, 515–558. doi:10.1177/014920639502100306
- Walton, R. E., & McKersie, R. B. (1965). *A behavioral theory of labor negotiations: An analysis of a social interaction system*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Appendix A. Sample printout for modes of managing conflict

AVOIDANCE
AVOIDANCE
COMPETING
COMPETING
ACCOMODATING
ACCOMODATING
COMPROMISING
COMPROMISING
COLLABORATING
COLLABORATING

Appendix B. Sample content for visual aids

Slide	Content
1	Title slide: Experiential exercise: Time for some improv!
2	Instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Form pairs. – Select who will play each role (one person will be Jessie and one person will be Peyton). – I will pass out a piece of paper to each person. The student playing Jessie will receive a green paper and the student playing Peyton will receive the yellow paper. Don't open it until I mention to during the exercise!
3	Instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – I will read out a scenario and you will be asked to improv/role play based on the scenario that I present. – The class will need to help me to build the scenario. As I read it out, some pieces of information will be missing. You can yell out an answer quickly! – At the end of the exercise, we will discuss several questions. I will pass out a paper so that you can discuss them in the pairs that you performed the exercise first and write down your ideas. Then, we will share our ideas as a class.
4	Concept overview: Before we begin, we will overview two key concepts for the exercise: modes of managing conflict and types of negotiation.
5	Modes of managing conflict: The typology presented by Thomas (1976) is included within the slide and discussed with the class.
6	Types of negotiation: The concepts of distributive and integrative negotiation are briefly defined and explained to the class.
7	Instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – I will next present a scenario in which you will have a conflict situation to discuss in pairs. – The piece of paper you received specifies which mode of managing conflict you should adopt during your discussion. – Wait until I finish reading the scenario to open it up. – Do not show it to the other member of your team until the skit is fully completed!
8	Building the scenario: JESSIE City in which it will take place? How long has it been? PEYTON What sport? City in which it will take place?
9	Discussion questions: What decision was reached during the exercise? Were you happy with the outcome? What type of negotiation did you use during the exercise? What type of negotiation did the other person use?
10	Discussion questions: Did the way in which conflict was managed and/or type of negotiation used affect the decision? For example, did it impact how satisfied you were with the decision? Did it facilitate reaching a decision, or make it more challenging to reach a decision? If you had not been given a mode of managing conflict to display in the exercise, what mode might you have used and why?
11	Discussion questions: Do you think that the strategy used by the manager in the scenario was fair? Why or why not? How might you have tried to make the situation be perceived as more fair?
12	Closing slide: And finally ... Give yourselves a round of applause!

Appendix C. Instructor's script

Manager: Hello everyone! How is your day going? [Provide the class with the opportunity to respond].

I'm so glad that I ran into you both at the same time, as I need to talk to you about something very important. You might remember that I asked everyone in the department to email me with the details about any weeks that you need to take off for vacation this year, as I need to finalize the schedule by the end of today.

You both indicated that you want to take the same week off next month as you both have very important events that you want to attend out of town. Peyton—You mentioned that you have a family reunion and that the planning for this event has been ongoing for the past three years! I forgot what city it is going to take place in though—can you remind me? [Give the class the opportunity to select a location.] Oh, that's right! How long has it been since you have seen all the people who will be at the reunion? [Allow class to suggest an answer.] I can definitely see why this is such an important event for you.

Jessie—You also said that you need that week off because you need to travel to a sports competition that you qualified for. You mentioned how few people actually qualify for this event! What type of sport do you participate in? [Allow class to suggest an answer.] Where is the competition held this

year? [Give the class an opportunity to yell out a destination.] That sounds like a lot of fun.

I feel really bad about this. I know that you both really want this week off. Peyton—you have a major family reunion and Jessie—you have a big sports competition that you have qualified for. Both are out of town and it's not like you can reschedule the events. The problem I have is that you are the only two people in the company who can perform your tasks, and, unfortunately, I just don't see how I can accommodate both of your requests. I'm very sorry, but

I just don't see how it can happen. I know that you must be upset right now.

I thought that the best way to handle the situation would be to put the decision about who will get the vacation time in your hands. So, I will step outside for a few minutes and give you that time to discuss the problem and decide how it will be resolved. I'll come back in soon and then you can let me know what the outcome of the discussion is.

[Allow time to discuss.] Okay, so what is the decision?