

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of the data collected followed by the discussion of its findings. The data collected was tabulated and the results are presented in table forms. The findings presented in this chapter are mainly the results of the analysis of the interview sessions conducted, video observations, verification list and written comments from the teachers and the specialist informants. All the data collected was principally triangulated between the learners, teachers and the specialist informants. Although no statistical tools were utilised in the analysis of the data, there would be a display of numbers mostly to present the pattern of responses by the learners.

Briefly, the procedure in which the data was collected began with a video recording of learners' performance in the negotiation task in the classroom. After the completion of the task,, all the learners (18) were individually interviewed by the researcher. The learners' responses were audio taped and the responses were analysed by firstly identifying the relevant responses and coding them into certain sections.

These findings were then transferred onto a verification list. (refer appendix D) This list was given to the specialist informants to verify the responses obtained from the learners.

Next, the teachers and the informants reviewed the video recordings of the learners' performance. The teachers were asked to give written feedback on the effectiveness of the learners' performance in the negotiation task. For further analysis, the teachers' perception of factors that contribute to the effectiveness of the negotiation task was then compared with the specialist informants' comments.

Before the discussion of the analysis begins, the researcher briefly recapitulates the objective of this study which was to investigate learners' perception of the effectiveness of business negotiations in which it aimed to answer these following questions:

1. *What are the learners' perceptions of their general understanding of negotiations?*
2. *What are learners' perception of the skills and factors that contribute to the effectiveness of negotiations?*
3. *What are teachers' perception of factors that contribute to the effectiveness of learners' performance in the negotiation task?*

4. What are the specialist informants' perception of factors that contribute to effective business negotiations ?

4.1 Learners' perception of their general understanding of negotiations.

In ESP courses, a simulation is often used as a tool in teaching and learning in order to expose learners to the communicative events that are likely to take place in the real world. Thus, learners are expected to 'learn by doing' the task. At this point, it is assumed that these learners have understood the meaning of business negotiations and the skills required in negotiations.

It is this kind of approach that is believed by ESP practitioners to be one of the ways in which the objectives of the course can be achieved. However, the question is, to what extent are the teachers certain that their learners have actually learnt what is to be learnt through the simulation tasks. Furthermore, how certain are the teachers that all learners doing the same task have learnt or understood the same things.

There is a need here to recapitulate Breen's (1987) emphasis that there exists

" a frequent disparity between what the teacher intends as the outcome of a task and what learners actually derive from it.....the learning outcomes will be influenced by learners' perceptions about what they should contribute, their views about the nature and demands of the task and their definitions of the situation in which the task takes place". (1987 : 23)

Hence, this section reveals the results of learners' general understanding of the task after the task completion. The data was collected through an interview session conducted with the students. Several questions were asked to elicit learners' general understanding of the negotiation task.

The data is presented in a table form and responses are listed and tabulated to indicate the pattern of the responses. The questions asked were as follows:

- Q1. How would you define a negotiation?
- Q2. Do you find negotiations interesting and why?
- Q3. Are negotiations easy or difficult? Explain why.
- Q4. What are the problems that one may encounter in negotiations?
- Q5. How do you find the language used in negotiations?

4.1.1 Learners' perception of the definitions of negotiations.

The table below shows the definitions of negotiations task as perceived by the learners.

Table 5 : Learners' perception of the definitions of negotiations.

Types of responses	Number of responses	Percentage %
a. a discussion to reach a solution.	12	66.69
b. an agreement where both parties are satisfied.	2	11.11
c. a discussion to get a win win situation	1	5.55
d. using of words to present ideas	1	5.55
e. a compromise on a topic	1	5.55
f. a discussion on what we need and what the opponents need.	1	5.55
TOTAL	18	100%

The findings prove that some learners had different ideas of what a 'negotiation' was to them. As listed in the table, 12 out of 18 learners (67%) defined 'negotiations' as 'a discussion to reach a solution'. Two learners agreed that a 'negotiation' was ' an agreement where both parties are satisfied'. Other learners provided definitions which could be similarly interpreted such as

- a. a discussion

- b. a compromise on the topic

- c. a discussion on what we need and what the opponents need.

One learner's response, was of concern to the researcher, and it was the definition of a 'negotiation' as the 'use of words to present ideas'. This response was believed to be rather inaccurate to define negotiation. This is because any form of communication requires the use of words to present ideas, so this definition of 'negotiation' appeared vague.

The conclusion derived is that 95% of the subjects (17 out of 18 learners) had perceived appropriate definitions for negotiations .

4.1.2 Learners' perception to why negotiations are interesting.

The table below provides learners' responses to why the negotiation task was found interesting. The table displays learners' definitions of a 'negotiation'. One has to bear in mind that these responses were obtained after the completion of the task, and it was in the researcher's interest to seek learners' perception of their general understanding of the task after the learners had gone through the simulation. This is important to investigate the outcome of the task.

Table 6 : Learners' perception to why negotiations are interesting.

Types of responses	Number of responses	Percentage (%)
a. challenging and spontaneous	6	33.37
b. discuss to reach an agreement	4	22.22
c. can argue with one another	2	11.11
d. a compromise	1	5.55
e. the way a negotiation is handled	1	5.55
f. an informal discussion	1	5.55
g. exciting	1	5.55
h. interesting but not in terms of its preparations	1	5.55
i. find the best solution for both parties	1	5.55
TOTAL	18	100%

It is important for teachers to counter check learners' understanding of what they have learnt. Teachers often assume that learners have learnt what is taught to them and often neglect to evaluate the process of learning that has actually taken place.

In the case of this negotiation task the aim of using a simulated task was for learners to partly learn about 'negotiations' by doing a negotiation task. Thus, the research question aimed to seek what learners have actually learnt by eliciting information on learners' general understanding of a 'negotiation' task in the business repertoire.

This particular question aimed to investigate learners' interest level on the topic of 'negotiations' and to further analyse learners' perception of an interesting negotiation. The researcher found it necessary to seek learners' level of motivation regarding the task before pursuing to other questions in search of their understanding of the task.

From the table one can see that there is a list of reasons expressed by the respondent in response to why the negotiation task was found interesting. The primary finding was that all of the respondents found the task interesting. This indicates a high interest level amongst the learners with regard to the study of 'negotiations'. The table also indicates responses from the 18 respondents interviewed and the reasons were listed in a table form based on the exact

responses from the learners. The researcher believes that the exact responses should first be recorded before further analysis and interpretations were made.

The reasons given indicated that learners had perceived the task to be interesting due to different reasons. Based on the theory of 'negotiation', some of the reasons listed were relevant while others had raised some queries. For instance, the findings indicated two most favourable responses, one of which was the task was found to be interesting because:

- a. it was challenging and spontaneous (6)
- b. the other was because it was a discussion to reach an agreement (4).

Therefore, it is interesting to see if the specialist informants in later discussion would verify these reasons as the most valid reasons. There were other responses made by individual learners that also reflected the characteristics of a 'negotiation' such as it was interesting because it was perceived to be:

- 1. a compromise
- 2. finding best solutions for both parties
- 3. the way a negotiation is handled.
- 4. an exciting task.

These views are similar to the responses that a negotiation is interesting because it is 'a challenging and spontaneous' task and that it occurs in a form of discussion in search of solutions which forms the majority of responses. However, these responses were expressed in different ways.

As mentioned earlier there were some ideas perceived by learners that the researcher believed were rather irrelevant. Two respondents expressed the reasons for a negotiation to be interesting as:

- a. one can argue with one another' (2)
- b. it was 'an informal discussion'. (1).

The researcher to a certain extent rather disagrees with the two reasons expressed above. Firstly, the former can be interpreted as learners' understanding that a negotiation is more of an argument rather than a compromise whilst the latter is not a true reflection of the nature of negotiations as negotiations often occur in formal discussions. It is interesting to see if the specialist informants' would verify this.

It can be concluded that many learners' positive understanding of the reasons why the task was found interesting reflected the nature of business negotiations. It was mostly understood that negotiations occur in a form of discussion to reach solutions that were perceived to be challenging. Nevertheless there were inappropriate perceptions of an interesting negotiation.

4.1.3 Learners' perceptions to why negotiations are easy or difficult.

The next question elicited learners' perception of whether negotiations are easy or difficult and the responses are shown in the table below.

Table 7 : Learners' perception to why negotiations are easy or difficult.

Types of responses	Number of responses	Percentage %
a. depending on the topic discussed	5	27.80
b. <u>It can be easy :</u>		
• if one is prepared / know his/her stand	2	11.11
• when there is a compromise	2	11.11
• when the person is at ease while negotiating	2	11.11
• when one gets what he wants	1	5.55
• when one understands the issue	1	5.55

<u>It can be difficult :</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to come up with ideas to cooperate • when there is more advantage to the other side • when one is not prepared and lacks knowledge • when one is not at ease with the other party 	1	5.55
	1	5.55
	2	11.11
	1	5.55
TOTAL	18	100%

The table shows that a majority of the learners (5 out of 18) felt that the reason why negotiations are easy or difficult depended greatly on the topic being discussed in the negotiations. Other factors listed were mostly individual responses which the researcher took note of. These factors were perceived to affect the difficulty of the task. The learners believed that negotiations are easy when:

- the negotiator is prepared and know his / her stand well (2)
- there is a compromise (2)
- the person is at ease with the negotiation task . (2)

Two (2) learners perceived that the task can be difficult when one is not prepared and lacks knowledge , perhaps in terms of information on topic of negotiation or opponents' company's background. From the table, one can see that there were actually four (4) learners who emphasised the need for preparation. At this point, the researcher believes that with the lack of preparation and knowledge, it could result in a lack of confidence in presenting one's viewpoints during the negotiations.

There were responses (refer table 7) which could be similarly interpreted though they were expressed differently , such as a response whereby the task is easy when 'one gets what he wants' as compared to the task being difficult when 'there is more advantage to the other side'. This means that the task can be difficult when one party is not getting what it wants and that the outcome of the negotiation is more favourable to the opponents.

However, the individual students' responses were important to note as they may emerge, as important factors perceived by the informants. The conclusion is that , the factors listed were more inclined towards two aspects. One of which is the negotiators' own preparation and characteristics that were noted as important , while the other, is the circumstances in which the discussion progresses. For example, whether there is a compromise between the two parties or whether there is more advantage to one side.

4.1.4 Learners' perception of problems encountered in negotiations.

This section analyses the kinds of problems that were encountered during their negotiations. The table below lists the problems encountered by some of the learners and the number of responses.

Table 8 : Learners' perception of problems encountered in negotiations .

Types of responses	Number of responses
a. the other party is not interested to listen and to compromise.	2
b. when the team needed to decide on the spot	2
c. not enough information on topic	2
d. difficult to contribute ideas when arguments are of advantage to the opponents.	2
e. cannot contribute matters which were not related to his role.	2
f. nervous	1
g. trying to identify points made by opponents	1
h. misunderstanding due to body language	1
i. unexpected questions	1
j. (no problems)	4
TOTAL	18

Only 14 out of the 18 students expressed the problems that they encountered during the negotiation. There were 4 kinds of problems that were expressed repeatedly and they were:

- when the other party is not interested to listen and to compromise (2)
- when the team needs to decide on the spot .(2)
- when there is not enough information on the topic (2)
- difficult to contribute ideas when arguments are of advantage to the opponents. (3)

In brief, more learners perceived the opponent's unwillingness to compromise as a problem when they needed to counter argue to convince the opponents. The researcher believes that this is an important factor as the willingness to compromise between two parties may determine the success of the negotiations.

There were other individual responses from the table, which are worth considering. These responses are possible problems that negotiators could encounter during negotiations such as:

- trying to identify points made by opponents and to respond to unexpected questions'.
- cannot contribute matters which were not his part

- unexpected questions.
- nervous
- misunderstanding due to body language.

Therefore, the conclusion derived from this is that learners were able to perceive several important factors that could create problems during negotiations. However, it is hoped that the informants' verification would indicate other problems that a negotiator could anticipate in business negotiations.

4.1.5 Learners perception of the language used in negotiations.

For further analysis the researcher felt it necessary to seek learners' perception of the language needed in negotiations. Besides, language is the main tool used in negotiations to interact and thus it is important to seek learners' perception on this matter. According to Cotton & Robins (1993), language used in negotiations should be kept simple and clear and one should be able to ask questions for clarification.

Table 9: Learners' perception of the language used in negotiations.

Types of responses	Number of responses
a. language that is easily understood	9
b. simple and clear language	3
c. language must be proficient.	2
d. no complex language needed	1
e. to choose appropriate words	1
f. there is a special language	1
g. tactful	1
TOTAL	18

The results indicated that the most numbered response (9) was the perception of language that is easily understood. In other words, the learners felt that in terms of language needed, the important thing is to use language that is easily understood. Besides, 3 learners perceived the language needed to be simple and clear and 2 learners felt that negotiators need to be proficient in their language.

The researcher believes that these responses are truly important in terms of language needed as confusing language used by one may hinder the other person's understanding of the discussion.

Therefore, the most common perception amongst the learners is that in negotiations, language has to be simple and clear to facilitate better understanding. The researcher, at the same time agreed that it is important for negotiators to use tactful language in negotiations.

4.2 Learners' perception of factors that contribute to an effective negotiation.

The questions below were asked during the interview to elicit data pertaining to this section and they were:

Q 6.: What are the skills needed to be able to negotiate?

Q 7 : Did you have to do a lot of thinking? If so why ?

Q 8 : Based on what criteria would you say that a negotiation is effective?

Q 9 : How do you think should one prepare for a negotiation?

4.2.1 Learners' perception of the skills required to negotiate.

This question elicits information on the important skills to acquire as perceived by learners when negotiating to ensure the effectiveness of a negotiation. The table below lists learners' perception of the skills required and the number of responses shows the number of times each skill had been expressed by different learners.

Table 10 : Learners' perception of the required skills to negotiate.

Types of responses	Frequency of responses
a. must be able to talk	6
b. listen well	5
c. language used in good manner	3
d. co-operation from team members	3
e. think fast and carefully	2
f. able to identify important points to counter argue	1
g. understands what the opponents are saying	1
h. body language	1
i. understands the topic and able to express ideas	1
j. to avoid emotional reactions.	1
k. to be diplomatic and firm	1

The results showed that the most required or important factor (6) was 'the ability to talk'. Many learners felt that a negotiator must have the ability to talk or able to express themselves well. This can be interpreted in several ways, one of which is perhaps that a negotiator should not be passive but participates well in the discussion and are able to make statements and counter argue.

The second interpretation perhaps referred to the fluency of the speakers. In this study learners may have referred to both the former and the latter. This is true of a negotiation where discussions take place. In order to have an effective discussion, there is a need for negotiators to have the ability to talk. As mentioned earlier in chapter one, (page 18), communication is ' the key feature in negotiations' and speaking is part of communication.

The next skill that was repeatedly expressed was to listen well (5). The negotiators should be active listeners in order to follow the discussion of the negotiation to keep in focus and to be able to counter argue statements made by the opponents. The researcher believes that listening well is one important skill in negotiations.

Another skill, which was thought to be important and was expressed a number of times (3) was the use of good and appropriate language. This means that there should be careful considerations of language use in terms of avoiding the use of harsh words and the need to be tactful.

This reflects the nature of negotiation whereby the rapport (as mentioned by Cotton & Robins 1993) between two parties has to be taken into consideration when negotiating to avoid any conflicts that would jeopardise chances of a compromise which can lead to the failure of a particular discussion. It is crucial that negotiators are tactful during negotiations. It is important that a person possesses the three skills mentioned above in negotiations. One should also possess the ability to:

- think fast and carefully
- identify important points to argue.

In comparison to these other responses, there is the awareness of what needs to be done in the process of negotiations. For example, 'co-operation' , was repeatedly perceived to be an important skill. From further probing during the interviews it is understood that learners referred to the co-operation between members of the team in a situation where one party is represented by a number of team members. The other skills mentioned are :

- the need to understand what the opponents are saying
- the need to interpret body language
- the need to understand the topic
- to avoid emotional reactions
- to be diplomatic and firm.

The researcher believes that these skills expressed by the learners were relevant in ensuring the effectiveness of a negotiation but needed to be verified by the informants in real negotiations. The conclusion here is that the responses from the learners regarding the required skills in negotiations were perceived from two different points of view. They are one's ability and one's awareness of factors that should contribute to an effective negotiation.

4.2.2 Learners' perception to why thinking is needed in negotiations.

In search of learners' perception towards their contribution to an effective negotiation learners were asked about whether they had to do a lot of thinking in the negotiation. The next table displays the findings of learners' perception to why thinking is needed in negotiations .

Table 11 : *Learners' perception to why thinking is needed in negotiations.*

	Types of responses	Number of responses
a.	a. respond to questions spontaneously.	4
	b. need to counter argue	3
c.	c. need to give concrete reasons	2
d.	d. respond to unexpected questions.	3
e.		
f.	e. how to influence them	1
g.		
h.	f. careful considerations with language use	1
i.		
j.	g. how to prove them wrong	1
k.		
l.	h. be analytical and creative to give alternative ideas	1
m.		
n.	i. to reject or to accept	1
o.		
	j. to defend own ideas and be critical to opponents' ideas.	1
	TOTAL	18

Based on the results gathered from the table, the more prominent findings were highlighted and they were:

- respond to questions spontaneously (4)
- need to counter argue (3)
- respond to unexpected questions (3)
- need to give concrete reason (2)

In brief, one can see that the reasons given were mostly towards the need to respond to questions from the opponents. The most common response was for the need to respond to questions spontaneously. This response can be justified as it is a true reflection of the kind of skills needed since negotiations often occur in a form of discussion where questions and answers are required for clarification purposes. Nevertheless, some of the responses were felt to be rather inappropriate like the need to:

- prove them wrong
- reject or to accept.

This is because the reason to prove them wrong may not be a suitable reaction in negotiations. Furthermore, the idea to prove the opponents wrong may appear tactless and may create animosity, which can jeopardise the chances of a compromise.

The next factor expressed that was a concern to the researcher was the skill to 'reject or to accept'. This may have referred to decisions made. In a negotiation, it may be quite difficult to decide on the spot. Hence, the idea of rejecting or accepting is secondary. The main concern is the discussion that leads to the decision-makings. The next section discusses the factors that contribute to effective negotiations.

4.2.3 Learners' perception of criteria of an effective negotiation.

The researcher felt it necessary to ask learners of their perception towards the criteria of effective negotiations. The researcher intends to seek the informants' verification on the learners' responses to this matter.

Table 12: Learners' perception of criteria of an effective negotiation.

Types of responses	Number of responses
a. both parties agreed with the decisions made	6
b. when agenda is completely discussed and results achieved.	3
c. no emotional reactions	3
d. the other side is satisfied	2
e. when there is a compromise	2
f. when the chairperson managed to handle the discussion.	1
g. when one has alternative plans	1
TOTAL	18

It is evident that the most favourable factor was that a successful negotiation occurs 'when both parties agreed with the decisions made' with 6 out of 18 learners agreeing to this. The rest of the responses listed in the table show that the next factor ranked is 'when agenda is completely discussed and the results were achieved'. Three (3) learners perceived this as one factor that contributed to an effective negotiation. The learners believed that the achievement of the objectives is one factor that determines an effective negotiation.

Three (3) other learners perceived a successful negotiation to occur when the discussion avoided any 'emotional reactions'. This can be interpreted as the 'attitude' factor listed by Cotton & Robins (1993) that is "negotiators should maintain their sensitivity and tact" to avoid any 'hiccups' in the discussion that can hinder any compromises. At the same time, this explains why the need to be tactful during negotiations appeared as one skill or factor that was expressed by certain learners earlier. (4.1.5)

These 3 factors received the most responses and thus were ranked first in comparison to other factors listed in the table. However, the other responses though ranked at the bottom of the list may carry similar weight of importance, as the researcher believes that they are factors that define an effective negotiation. The data from this section will later be triangulated with comments made by the informants in search of verification. The analysis now proceeds to

the discussion of learners' perception of the preparations needed for negotiations.

4.2.4 Learners' perception of the preparations needed for negotiations.

The inclusion of learners' perception on preparations for negotiations was necessary, as the researcher believes that an adequate preparation is one factor that can contribute to an effective negotiation.

Table 13: Learners' perception on preparations needed for negotiations.

Types of responses	Frequency of responses
a. prepare information thoroughly on topic	8
b. know your facts / points	7
c. study opponents' company background	3
d. confident	3
e. know opponents'/ negotiators' characteristics and be prepared for their usual reactions	2
f. dwell on what the opponents say	1
g. have alternative plans to compromise	1
h. team discussion	1

The most prominent factor was the preparation of a negotiation topic (8). Learners perceived that there should be a thorough preparation done on the topic before negotiation. It is worthwhile to note, as learners could have perceived this as essential in determining the success of a negotiation. Perhaps, it was perceived that with a thorough preparation the negotiators would be more confident and better at presenting ideas.

Meanwhile , 'one has to know his points and know his stand' well before negotiating was expressed (7) seven times. This can be considered as an important aspect of preparations needed. Besides, there were also other relevant suggestions. The responses given in (c) and (e) could be interpreted as similar. They are :

- c. the need to study opponents' company background.
- e. know opponents' / negotiators characteristics and be prepared for their usual reaction.

These responses were emphasised by Cotton & Robins (1993: pg 66) that " negotiators should research about opponents' background " as this would perhaps add to the confidence in negotiators. Thus, it is not surprising that 3 learners perceived 'confidence' as one aspect of the kinds of preparations needed for negotiators.

One (1) learner, however, perceived that negotiators should be prepared with 'alternative plans to compromise' and interestingly, Cotton & Robins (1993) mention that one of the effective strategies in negotiations included the ability of negotiators to offer more alternatives during the negotiation. In order for the teams to be prepared with all these aspects, the researcher could foresee that a team discussion is thus necessary as perceived by one of the learners.

The conclusion is that learners seemed to be able to identify the various kinds of preparations needed and majority inclined towards the preparation on the topic of negotiation.

4.3 Teachers' perception of factors that contribute to the effectiveness of learners' performance in the negotiation task.

Three groups of six students were selected to be the subjects of this study. Two groups were chosen from the Business faculty as this faculty represents the major population of the Business English course and one from the Economics faculty. For the purpose of the study's discussion, the researcher has labelled them as B1 and B2 (for Business faculty) and E1 (for Economics faculty).

In order to further strengthen the analysis on the effectiveness of learners' performance in the negotiation task, data was collected through the teachers' written comments. Teachers were required to give their holistic views of each group's performance rather than individual learner's performance. As the nature of a negotiation task is in the form of group discussion it is most appropriate to evaluate each group's performance holistically.

It is necessary to obtain teachers' perceptions on the effectiveness of the task performed as teachers play an important role in determining and evaluating learners' capability of performing the task in the classroom. As an ESP course aims to equip learners with the necessary skills, it is essential for teachers to evaluate the learners' performance to see if the needs are met and this allows an opportunity for ESP teachers to gauge the effectiveness of the course. At the same time, in order to bridge the gap between classroom practice and the real world tasks, these perceptions from learners and teachers need to be verified by the experts, i.e. the specialist informants.

Therefore, the researcher has chosen to triangulate the findings from teachers and learners with that of the informants. This study also intends to seek justification in Breen's (1987 :23) claims, regarding the " frequent disparity between what the teachers intends as the outcome of a task and what learners actually derive from it ".

As this concerns an ESP course it is crucial that the data be triangulated with the comments from the specialist informants to see its validity. The teachers' comments were presented in table forms according to the individual performance of each group (Groups B1, B2 and E1). The evaluation involved two teachers, T1 who taught two groups (B1 and E1) and T2 who taught Group B2. Thus only two teachers' comments were analysed in this study.

The results in tables 14, 15 and 16 show the comments made on the performance of the three groups by the respective teachers. Teachers were asked to comment on the effectiveness of the learners' performance in the negotiation task and to observe factors that contribute to its effectiveness. The teachers' perception of the groups' performance differs greatly whereby group B1 was perceived to be '**effective**', group B 2 was '**not very effective**' and group E 1 was '**real effective**'.

4.3.1 Teacher's perception of the effectiveness of group B1

The discussion on factors that contribute to the effectiveness of each group's performance will begin with group B1 that involves students from the Business faculty. The teacher perceived this group performance of the task to be 'effective'. Several factors were pointed out by the teacher that were perceived

as factors that contributed to the effectiveness of the group's performance. The factors were listed in the table below.

Table 14 : Teacher's perception of the effectiveness of group B1

Group B1 Teacher 1	
Factors that contribute to the effectiveness of learners' performance	
(+) positive	(-) negative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existence of agendas laid out by both teams. • Students understood their roles well • Students displayed confidence when presenting ideas. • tolerated each others' views • portrayed good active listeners. • points were thoroughly discussed • decisions were obtained after each point discussed • team members were co-operative in supporting each other. • All points discussed were summarised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some had lack of eye contact • body gestures were a little bit awkward • language used <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ were not used excessively ■ some interruptions were not properly done ■ used too direct language/ less tactful • Approach was not too favourable since two main decisions on positions of CEO and personnel were easily given.

Interestingly, there were two factors perceived by the teacher that were listed by Cotton & Robins (1993) as techniques of effective negotiations. They were:

- a. good active listeners.
- b. summary of all points discussed.

Other factors listed by T 1 could be viewed as positive indications of effective negotiations (refer table14 : pg 116). Most of the factors attributed to learners' roles that were perceived effective in terms of :

- understanding their roles well
- displayed confidence
- tolerated each other's views
- co-operation amongst team members.
- points were thoroughly discussed

There were also positive points perceived in the way the meeting was conducted. For example:

- the existence of the agenda - laid out by both teams
- decisions were obtained after each point discussed
- all points discussed were summarised

Thus, these were factors that were perceived to be effective by the teacher. However, T1 perceived primarily body gestures and the language use as factors that had hindered the effectiveness of the task performance. The teacher felt that the learners' body gestures were 'a little bit awkward'. This could refer to the way the learners were sitting which may have appeared less relaxed. Perhaps it showed the discomfort that the learners were facing during the negotiation.

T1 emphasised that the language of negotiation was not used excessively. This could refer to the language used by the participants that lacks the use of more business terms or phrases in the discussion. Additionally, T1 also mentioned that the participants did not interrupt properly and the language used during the discussion was found to be less tactful. All the factors listed regarding the language use could have affected the natural flow of the group's discussion, which could have caused the performance to be rather ineffective.

4.3.2 Teacher's perception of the effectiveness of group E1.

In comparison to group E1 (students from the Economics faculty) whose performance was perceived to be 'real effective', T1 had perceived this group's performance to be better than the former. From table 15, one can see that several of the factors expressed were similar to that of group B 1.

Table 15: Teacher's perception of the effectiveness of Group E 1

Group E 1 Teacher 1 Factors that contribute to the effectiveness of the negotiation task.	
(+) Positive	(-) Negative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • brief explanation of the gatherings. • agendas from both teams were laid out. • good language used. • alert • students understood their roles excellently. • co-operation from team members. • they were good listeners. • both teams handled the decisions well. • they portrayed good personalities there were peacemakers • communication skills- were fluent, voices were clear, points easily understood. • good eye contact: showed interest and respect. 	<p>NO COMMENTS</p>

The teacher perceived the effectiveness to have been contributed by the way the learners performed the task and the way the meeting was handled . Furthermore, the teacher perceived the participants to have appropriate body gestures and better language in terms of the use of business terms.

The factor on body gestures and language use seemed to be the determinant of a real effective negotiation task as perceived by the teacher. It is interesting to note that Cotton & Robins (1993) have not listed body gesture as a factor that should contribute to an effective negotiation. These learners' performance of the negotiation task was perceived to be more effective than the previous group discussed.

4.3.3 Teacher's perception of the effectiveness of group B2.

The comments made on group B2, who were also students of the Business faculty, indicated that the group's performance was 'not very effective'. One has to bear in mind that their own teacher, that is T 2, evaluated this group. The table shows that the factors listed were perceived by the teacher to have hindered the effectiveness of the negotiation task performed.

Table 16: Teacher's perception of the effectiveness of group B 2

Group B 2 Teacher 2 Factors that contribute to the effectiveness of the negotiation task.	
(+) Positive	(-) Negative
NO COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • task looked more like a mini presentation of each role • abandoning suggestions put forth as the other party disagrees • unable to respond spontaneously • took some time to digest the ideas proposed and could not give appropriate response • were uncertain of team's objectives. • were not aware of their limitations: to what extent were they willing to negotiate.

It is interesting to review one factor identified by the teacher which was listed as one of the contributory factors of effective negotiations in Cotton & Robins (1993) and it was the fact that the learners were perceived to be 'unaware of their limitations'. In other words, the extent to which they were willing to negotiate.

Cotton & Robins (1993) emphasised that negotiators need to set their own limits to help them negotiate comfortably and confidently. This was part of the preparations needed to negotiate.

The other factors listed, to a certain extent could have hindered the effectiveness of the negotiation task. The teacher's primary concern was towards the way the ideas were presented which were perceived to be an equivalent to a 'mini presentation'. This could refer to the presentation of facts and figures by the respective groups. Besides, she also perceived the 'abandoning of ideas put forth' and the 'time taken by the learners to digest the proposed arguments' as factors that did not contribute to the effectiveness of the task.

Generally, both teachers seemed to have identified factors that were thought to have contributed to the effectiveness of learners' performance of the negotiation tasks. It is important to cross-check these perceptions with that of the informants for verification purposes.

4.4 Verification of learners' and teachers' perception of factors that contribute to an effective negotiation.

The researcher has divided this section into three parts and they are:

1. Verification of learners' responses to their understanding of negotiations by the informants.
2. Verification of learners' perception of contributory factors of effective negotiations.
3. Verification of teachers' perception of contributory factors of effective negotiations.

These procedures were adopted to triangulate the learners', teachers' and informants' perception of factors that contribute to effective negotiations. Therefore, the main findings of this study were based on the verification by the informants.

Two specialist informants were engaged to verify factors or responses provided by the learners and the teachers to link the gap between classroom practice and the real world situation as proposed in the triangulation model. These informants were chosen on the basis of the nature of their job situations that require them to negotiate (refer appendix G).

4.4.1 Verification of learners' perception of their understanding of negotiations.

In order for the specialist informants to verify the responses provided by the learners, a verification list was devised based on learners' responses on their understanding of a negotiation task. The learners' responses in the verification list were:

1. paraphrased into statement forms
2. arranged in descending order according to the highest number of responses derived. (refer appendix D) .

The informants were required to identify the most appropriate responses and to give remarks for further clarification or specification. The analysis discusses informants' verification on learners' perception of their general understanding of the task, which focuses on these statements:

- 1: *The definition of a negotiation is...*
- 2: *A negotiation task is interesting as...*
- 3: *A negotiation can be easy or difficult when...*
- 4: *Problems or difficulties encountered during negotiations...*
- 5: *Language used in negotiations...*

In all the tables, learners' responses are listed in the first column, followed by the number or frequency of response. Columns A and B represent the informants' perception of the statements which are marked with a tick. The remaining columns of 'Remarks A' and 'Remarks B' are columns for comments or clarification made by the informants.

4.4.1.1 Verification of learners' definitions of negotiations.

The table below indicates learners' definitions of negotiations.

Table 17: Informants' verification of learners' definitions of negotiations.

Learners' perception		A	B	Remarks A	Remarks B
a. a discussion to reach a solution.	12	✓			b. ideal situation ...most negotiators may only try to achieve own targets at the expense of others
b. an agreement where both parties are satisfied	2	✓	✓		
c. a discussion to get a win-win situation	1	✓			
d. using words to present ideas	1	-	-		
e. a compromise on a topic	1	-	-		
f. a discussion on what we need and what the opponents need	1		✓		f. mainly to achieve results. Discussion may be part of process)

It is shown in the table that the majority of learners' perception (12) on the definitions of 'negotiation' as a discussion to reach a solution was verified by one of the informants. A definition that was commonly verified by both informants was 'to come to an agreement where both parties are satisfied'. Informant B however, believed that, this definition would apply to an "ideal situation but most negotiators may only try to achieve own targets at the expense of others". This is the kind of situation that learners should perhaps take note of.

The other definitions perceived by learners that were verified by the informants could be interpreted under the same category as 'an agreement where both parties are satisfied'. This shows that learners' responses to these factors were valid responses to the definition of negotiations. Thus, in the definition of a negotiation as 'a discussion of what we need and what the opponents need', informant B felt that this refers to achieving results with the discussion as part of the process in getting what the two parties need.

4.4.1.2 Verification of learners' perception to why negotiations are interesting.

The table below indicates informants' verification on learners' perception of why negotiations are interesting.

Table 18 : Informants' verification on learners' perception to why negotiations are interesting.

Learners' perception		A	B	Remark A	Remark B
a. challenging and spontaneous	6	✓	✓	a. spontaneous response is OK but not spontaneous decisions	a.spontaneous responses require adequate preparation.
b. discuss to reach an agreement	4	✓	-	b.mutual agreement even though not the best solution)	d. compromise requires both parties to achieve own targets
c. can argue with one another	2	-	-		
d. a compromise	1	✓	✓		
e. the way a negotiation is handled	1	✓	✓		
f. an informal discussion	1	-	-		
g. exciting	1	-	-		
h. interesting but not the preparation	1	-	-		
i. find the best solution for both parties	1	-	-		

Factors that were verified by both informants were:

- challenging and requires spontaneous response.
- a compromise.
- the way a negotiation is handled.

It shows that both informants verified the highest number of learners' responses (6). Nevertheless, there were responses agreed to by only one of the informants, which the researcher felt essential to include and it is :

- a discussion to reach an agreement

It is interesting to note that although this response was not verified by one informant , 4 learners responded to this. Informant B may not have included these two factors, as he may have perceived the two factors to be similar to that of a 'compromise'.

Furthermore, the fact that negotiations were perceived to be 'challenging and requires spontaneous response' similarly reflect the learners' perception that negotiations are 'challenging to listen to what the opponents have to say'. The two added responses by informant A can be classified under these categories.

Thus, it is important to note the three factors derived from the learners' perception, were verified by the informants.

However, the informants made remarks that needed considerable attention. Both informants commented on the learners' responses that a negotiation task is interesting because ' it is challenging and requires spontaneous response'. According to informant A, "spontaneous response is OK but not spontaneous decision" and informant B on the other hand, emphasised that " spontaneous response requires adequate preparation". An adequate preparation on the part of the negotiators allows the negotiators to respond spontaneously but not to the extent of spontaneous decisions. This means that decisions made during negotiations should not be spontaneous, as decision-makings need careful consideration.

This implies that teacher should not expect learners to make decisions in a negotiation task as it is emphasised that decisions may not be reached in one discussion. This means that it is possible for decisions to be deferred.

4.4.1.3 Verification of learners' perception on why negotiations are easy or difficult.

Table 19: Informants' verification of learners' perception on why negotiations are easy or difficult.

Learners' perception		A	B	Remark A	Remark B
a. depending on the topic discussed	5		✓		a. preparation before a negotiation and how far each side is willing to compromise rather than topic.
b. <u>It can be easy</u> :					
• if one is prepared and know his stand	2	✓	✓		
• when there is a compromise	2				
• when the person is at ease with negotiating	2	✓	✓		
• when one gets what he wants	1	-	-		
• when one understands the issue	1		✓		• understand issues is very important
		-			
c. <u>It can be difficult</u> :					
• to come up with ideas to cooperate	1	-	-		
• when there is more advantage to the other side	1	-	✓		
• when one is not prepared and lacks knowledge	2		-		• unpreparedness will lead to other party having advantage
		✓			
• when one is not at ease with the other party.	1	✓			

In section 4.1.3, most learners felt that a negotiation can be easy or difficult depending on the topics or issues discussed in the real world. Therefore, the researcher felt the need to look further into this factor as one of the informants (Informant B) agreed to this with further clarification. He explained that it is "the preparation on the topic before the negotiation and how far each side is willing to compromise that is essential". Thus learners need to be aware of this matter. Perhaps, what is meant here is the topic on its own will not determine the difficulty of the negotiation task but it should be the preparations prior to a negotiation and the extent to which any one party is willing to compromise on it.

Here, learners should be aware that in the real world it would be difficult if one entered a negotiation without any preparation. Furthermore, there should be a limit to the extent in which a party can compromise in a negotiation as according to Cotton & Robins (1993 : 66), "negotiators need to set their own limits to help them negotiate more comfortably and confidently ".

Thus, analysis indicates that both informants agreed that a negotiation could be easy when:

- one is prepared and knows his stand
- there is a compromise.

Informant B added that it could be easy also when:

- one understands the issue.

These responses from the learners were strongly verified by both informants, which made them relevant factors for effective negotiations. At the same time, both informants agreed with learners' perception that negotiations can be difficult when:

- one is not prepared and lacks knowledge.

This strongly shows how important preparation is prior to a negotiation. These informants verified another two interesting factors and they were:

- when you are not at ease with the person and
- when there is more advantage to the other side.

These two factors derived from the learners' responses indicated that it is important for negotiators to be aware of these, as problems may arise when personality conflict exists between negotiators. This may lead to problems between the two parties and inevitably a failure to reach a decision. That is why Cotton & Robins (1993) have emphasised the need to research about opponents' business background as it helps towards smooth flowing discussion.

Another factor which was given emphasis was a negotiation can be difficult when there is more advantage to the other side. This kind of situation may be encountered at times by most negotiators but an adequate preparation may allow negotiators to give appropriate and reasonable responses to the opponents to lead to a compromise.

4.4.1.4 Verification of learners' perception on problems encountered during the negotiations

For further discussion, the researcher will proceed with the verification of learners' perception of problems that may arise during negotiations. In analysing learners' general understanding of a negotiation task, the responses concerning the problems and difficulties encountered during negotiations was addressed. Informants were also required to verify the problems perceived and the results are displayed in the table below.

Table 20: Informant's verification of learners' perception on problems encountered during negotiations.

Learners' perception		A	B	Remark A	Remark B
a. the other party is not interested to listen and to compromise	2	-	-	b. could be an answer but since negotiation is a process, decisions could be deferred. f. seek clarification	
b. when the team need to decide on the spot	2	✓	✓		
c. not enough information on topic	2	✓			
d. difficult to contribute ideas when arguments are of advantage to the opponents	2		✓		
e. nervous	1	-	-		
f. trying to identify points made by opponents	1	✓	✓		
g. cannot contribute matters which were not related to his role	1	-	-		
h. misunderstanding due to body language	1				
i. unexpected questions	2	✓			
j. (had no problems)	4	✓			

The findings from the analysis of this section revealed that the informants had also encountered the same problems as the learners in real world negotiations. Nevertheless, it is interesting to take note of the comments made by the informants. Firstly, both informants perceived 'the team having to decide on the spot' as a negative factor. According to these informants, one may face problems as in some negotiations, there is a need to find an answer to the

discussion rather than decisions as decisions can be deferred and can only be achieved after extensive discussion. This is why the informants clarified that spontaneous decisions were not advisable. (refer section 4.4.1.1)

Another important finding is the problem of 'identifying points made by opponents' where both informants commented that it was not primarily to identify the points but more of seeking clarification from the opponents and this pose problems or difficulties during a negotiation.

Both informants agreed that there would be a problem when the opponents are not willing to listen and compromise. Informant B explained that this could lead to a deadlock that is best avoided as a deadlock in a discussion means a failure in the discussion and this will inevitably lead to ineffective negotiations.

4.4.1.5 Verification of learners' perceptions on the use of language in negotiations.

The researcher has included learners' perception on the kinds of language needed during negotiations. This was perceived to be of importance as language is the tool for interaction to take place and in the case of negotiations, language used could be one factor to determine the effectiveness of the task.

Table 21 : Verification of learner responses to the language use in negotiation.

Learners' perception		A	B	Remarks A	Remarks B
a. language that is easily understood	9	✓	✓		a. maybe useful to overwhelm opponents
b. simple and clear language	3	✓			
c. language must be proficient	2	✓	✓		
d. no complex language needed	1				
e. to choose appropriate words	1	✓	✓		
f. there is a special language	1				
g. tactful	1	✓			

Three aspects were highlighted and agreed upon by both informants and they were:

1. the language that is easily understood
2. choosing appropriate words.
3. negotiators must be proficient.

In other words, language that is easily understood refers to language that is simple and clear and choosing appropriate words refers to using tactful language. The informants also emphasised that speakers must be proficient and this justifies learners' perception of the ability to talk in negotiations. In conclusion, learners' respective responses on the use of language were mostly agreed by the informants, which is one positive finding in this research. Thus, learners should be aware that they must be able to express themselves well in negotiations.

4 .4. 2 Verification of learners' perception of the skills and criteria that contribute to effective negotiations.

This section discusses the verification by the specialist informants of learners' perception of the required skills and the criteria that were perceived to contribute to the effectiveness of negotiations. The statements were as follows:

- 1: *The required skills to negotiate are...*
- 2 *Thinking skills needed in a negotiation...*
- 3: *Criteria of a successful negotiation are...*
- 4: *Suggestions for a good preparation...*

These four questions elicited the factors that learners perceived to have contributed to the success or the effectiveness of their negotiation tasks. These responses were the outcome of the 'learning by doing' negotiations in the Business English class. Thus, the researcher views these as learners' contribution to the task, which is why these responses were studied for the discussion of this section. The specialist informants' verification on these responses indicated the criteria that contribute to the success and effectiveness of the negotiations. The researcher deals with the responses accordingly.

4.4.2.1 : Verification of learners' perception of the required skills in negotiations.

Table 22: Informants' verification on learners' perception of the required skills in negotiations.

Learners' perception	F	A	B	Remarks A	Remarks B
a. must be able to talk	6	✓	✓		a. more analytical and logical thinking
b. listen well	5	✓	✓		
c. language used in good manner	3	✓			
d. co-operation from team members	3	✓			
e. think fast and carefully	2	✓			
f. able to identify important points to counter argue	1	✓	✓		f. analytical skills
g. understands what the opponents are saying	1	✓	✓		g. part of preparation is to predict opponents' argument
h. body language	1	✓	✓		h. interpreting body language.
i. understands the topic and able to express ideas	1	✓	✓		
j. to avoid emotional reactions	1	✓			j. emotions will cloud thinking
k. to be diplomatic and firm	1	✓	✓		

(* F : Frequency of responses)

The results above show that informant A verified all the required skills mentioned by the learners and thus, a positive finding in the analysis. Learners seemed to know the appropriate skills needed in negotiations. However, informant B was rather selective and only agreed with some of the listed responses with remarks given to clarify or specify the responses elicited from the learners.

Both informants had agreed with the learners' perception that in a negotiation it is important to have the following skills. They are :

1. ability to talk
2. the ability to listen well
3. able to identify points
4. know what the opponent is saying.
5. interpreting body language
6. understands the topic and able to express ideas
7. avoid emotional reactions.

It is worthwhile to consider the remarks given by informant B as it may prove to be useful to the learners. He emphasised analytical and logical skills that will allow negotiators to be able to predict opponents' arguments and interpret opponents' body language. These are the skills that were perceived by the informants as important contribution that determine the effectiveness of a negotiation in the real world situation.

In short , it was found that generally, learners were able to perceive the skills required in negotiations and the skills perceived were parallel to the informants' perception of skills needed to contribute to effective negotiations.

4.4.2.2 : Verification of learners perception on whether they had to do a lot of thinking in negotiations.

The researcher had also elicited learners' perception on the thinking skills required and suggestions on preparations for negotiations which were included in the verification list. These two types of responses indirectly indicated what learners had actually contributed in ensuring the effectiveness of the task .

Table 23 : Verification of learner responses to the thinking skills needed in negotiations.

Learners' perception		A	B	Remarks A	Remarks B
a. respond to questions spontaneously	4	✓	-	a. again not in decisions ,rather than counter argue better to give alternatives	a. more of logical than spontaneity
b. need to counter argue	3	✓			c. logical and analytical
c. need to give concrete reasons	2	✓	✓		
d. respond to unexpected questions	3	✓	✓		
e. how to influence them	1	✓			g. finding counter arguments to present
f. careful considerations with language use	1				
g. how to prove them wrong	1	-	✓		
h. be analytical and creative to give alternative ideas	1	✓	✓		
i. to reject or to accept	1	-			
j. to defend own ideas and be critical to opponents' ideas	1	-			

With reference to table 23, it can be interpreted that the informants viewed the factor of 'responding spontaneously' as rather inaccurate as informant A specified that spontaneous decisions is not advisable but to respond with better alternatives is more applicable. This implied that decision makings in negotiations should not be spontaneous as they may jeopardise the chances of clinching business deals.

Informant B added that it is not so much the spontaneity of responses but more of the ability to give logical responses to questions posed by the opponents. It can be seen that there were three factors viewed by the informants and they were for negotiators to be :

1. analytical
2. able to give logical reasons
3. creative in coming up with alternative answers or solutions.

4.4.2.3 Verification of learners' perception of criteria of an effective negotiation:

In addition to the skills above , the researcher has also investigated learners' perception of the criteria or factors that contribute to the success or effectiveness of the process of negotiation holistically.

The discussion now proceeds to the verification of factors or criteria that were perceived to contribute to a successful or effective negotiation.

Table 24 : Informants' verification on learners' perception of criteria of an effective negotiation.

Learners' perception		A	B	Remarks A	Remarks B
a. both parties agree with the decisions	6	✓	✓	b. results are not necessarily achieved in one meeting	b.results set by both sides
b. when agenda is completely discussed and results achieved	3	✓	✓		
c. no emotional reactions	3	-	-		d.both parties have to be satisfied
d. the other side is satisfied	2	-	✓		
e. when there is a compromise	2	✓	✓		
f. when the chairperson manage to handle the discussion	1	-	-		
g. when one has alternative plans	1	-	-		

A positive indication is that the results proved that the informants verified learners' most common perceived criterion of an effective negotiation, which is 'both parties' agreement to the decisions made' (6) . Most importantly is that about half the learners' responses were agreed by the informants.

The next common factor was that a successful negotiation can be determined by 'the completion of the agenda discussed with the results achieved'. The completion of an agenda's discussion perhaps shows that there were no or fewer problems that negotiators had to deal with. The results achieved were clarified by the informants to depend on targets or results set and agreed by both parties in the discussion.

Informant A commented significantly, that results, however may not necessarily be achieved only at one meeting. This means that results may be achieved after several meetings which is an important point to consider. The analysis above shows that learners were able to perceive the criteria of an effective negotiation.

4.4.2.4 : Verification on learners' perception on preparations needed in negotiations .

In terms of preparations for negotiations, it is interesting to seek the verification by informants of what was perceived to be needed to ensure the effectiveness of a negotiation. The findings in table 25 indicated several suggestions for the kinds of preparation needed for a negotiation task which were agreeable to the specialist informants. The researcher found this to be an essential response and has decided to include this aspect in analysing learners' perception of factors that contribute to effective negotiations.

Table 25 : Informants' verification of learners' perception on the preparations needed in negotiations.

Learners' perception	F	A	B	Remarks A	Remarks B
a. prepare information thoroughly on topic	8	✓	✓		a.extensive preparation is compulsory
b. know your facts / points	7	✓	✓		
c. study opponents' company background	3	-	-		
d. confident	3	✓	-		
e. know opponent's / negotiators' characteristics and be prepared for their usual reactions	2	✓	✓		
f. dwell on what the opponents say	1	-	-		
g. have alternative plans to compromise	1	✓	-		g. depending on own targets -compromise may not be suitable
h. team discussion	1	✓	✓		h. very important preparation

* F : frequency of responses

The researcher believes that after learners had gone through the process of negotiation , learners would subsequently be aware of the required skills in a negotiation and thus, would be able to provide suggestions for the preparation needed prior to a negotiation task.

The results from the verification by informants revealed that a majority of the responses were verified by the informants. It is important to note the remarks made by informant B whereby he emphasised the preparations to be crucial on the topics as well as the discussion with team members. He also commented on the suggestion to have alternative plans before negotiations in the case where a compromise is not feasible and this depends greatly on the company's own target.

Informant A, on the other hand, verified 'confidence' as a suggestion for a good preparation. This implies that in order to be confident during the negotiation, one has to be well prepared for the discussion in terms of all the factors verified in the table above.

The conclusion is that learners were able to perceive the appropriate suggestions for the kinds of preparation needed prior to negotiations. This was verified by the two specialist informants.

4.4.3 Verification of teachers' perception of factors that contribute to the effectiveness of learners' performance in the negotiation tasks.

This section discloses firstly the findings of the analysis of informants' holistic impression of the three groups' performance and the discussion will focus on the strength and weaknesses of the negotiation task .The verification was done by comparing the informants' perception of the effectiveness of the negotiation task to teachers' evaluation of the group's performance. Both informants were required to observe the group's performance and to provide written comments on the effectiveness of the groups' performance.The data from the informants was displayed in table 26 (refer appendix H)

The researcher had summarised the comments made on the effectiveness of the group's performance to facilitate further discussion and the analysis of each groups' performance is dealt individually.

4.4.3.1 : Verification of teacher's perception of factors that contribute to the effectiveness of Group B1.

a. *The strength of the negotiation.*

One of the factors which was agreed upon by both informants was that one of the teams had ' presented better use of facts and data' in their negotiation. Informant A justified this by commenting on the good use of visual preparation and better arguments given by one of the teams. Although informant B perceived that this group had 'presented' a structured meeting' that allowed an understanding of the discussion, informant A on the other hand, believed that ' the objectives and purposes were not properly laid out'. Perhaps ,informant B was referring to the agenda of the meeting that was laid out for the understanding of the discussion .

One factor which was identified by one of the informants as a factor that contributed to the effectiveness of the groups' performance was the ' summary provided by the chairperson ' and this means that it is an important point to note. Similarly, this is one factor listed by Cotton & Robins (1993: 67) as one of the strategies that determines an effective negotiation.

b. The weaknesses of the negotiation.

Nevertheless, the findings in table 26 (refer appendix H) revealed that one of the teams in the group had ' agreed with decisions made by the opponents easily'. The team was found to make immediate decisions and easily 'accepted opponents' arguments'. This is an important point to note as informant A perceived this as a lack of the team's confidence in their own proposal.

Another interesting factor that was also perceived as ineffective was the fact that ' there was a personal attack ' by one of the team members on the other. This reflected that emotions were involved in the discussion and this according to the informants should be avoided. Furthermore, it was commented that participants in the group ' were not relaxed ' which could again reflect the lack of confidence between the negotiators.

c. Informants' vs. teachers' comments.

As the method adopted in the analysis was a triangulation of data ,the findings above were cross-checked with teachers' comments in search of verification . With reference to table 14 the results showed that this group's performance was perceived to be only 'effective' as compared to the third group (E1) which was perceived by the teacher to be 'real effective'.

Some of the teacher's comments on the positive factors of this group's performance were also identified by the informants and they were :

1. the agenda laid out by both teams.
2. all points discussed were summarised.

However, there were certain factors which were perceived differently between the teachers and the informants and they were:

1. students displayed confidence when presenting ideas.
2. tolerated each others' views.
3. points were thoroughly discussed
4. decisions were obtained after each point was discussed.
5. team members were co-operative in supporting each other.

While the teacher perceived the existence of confidence amongst the learners, the informant thought otherwise. Perhaps, the teacher's comment depended on the confidence in speaking rather than the confidence in the information presented as pointed out by the informant. In addition, the fact that the teacher's positive perception of team members 'tolerating the views of others' was reversibly thought as an ineffective factor by the informant.

The fact that the decisions were obtained after each point, was seen as an effective factor by the teacher, the informants, on the other hand, had negative perception of this. This is because it shows that the negotiators were easily persuaded to agree with the decisions made.

The teacher had listed factors that posed problems to the group's performance which included the 'lack of eye contact' and 'awkward body gestures'. The latter could be interpreted as informants' point that the learners were not relaxed.

The teacher felt that language was not used excessively and that some interruptions were not properly done by certain negotiators. This perhaps referred to the inappropriate ways certain negotiators had interrupted in the discussions. This may have affected the flow of the discussion. Furthermore, the teacher 's perception of using direct language emphasised informant's comment on the involvement of 'personal attacks'.

Besides these problems, it is interesting to note that according to the teacher, the approach was not too favourable as two main decisions were easily agreed upon. This was verified by the informants themselves. Thus, there are some conclusions that can be derived from this analysis and they are :

1. some of the teachers' perception on the effective factors contradicted with the informants'.
2. there were factors that were perceived by the teacher which appeared positive on the surface but the informants' specification and clarification had resulted in the factors to be rather negative.
3. some factors which were perceived as of primary importance by the teachers were perceived to be of secondary importance by the informants in contributing to the effectiveness of this group's performance.

4.4.3.2 Verification of teacher's perception of factors that contribute to the effectiveness of group E 1 in their negotiation task.

Group E 1 refers to the third group of learners selected to represent the Economic students who took the Business English course. The factors affecting the effectiveness of the negotiation task were listed in the table .(refer table 27 in appendix H). The analysis begins with the analysis of the specialist informants' perception on the strength and weaknesses of the negotiation task.

a. The strength of the negotiation

The results of the analysis shows that generally there existed some slight differences in the perception of the specialist informants regarding the effectiveness of the learners' performance.

Both informants managed to identify several positive factors that were perceived to have contributed to the effectiveness of the task. It was the way the negotiation was handled and most of the credits were given to the CEOs . Informant A said the group had a 'good conduct of meeting' whilst informant B commented that there 'was good command of language by both CEOs'.

The researcher found that most of the other factors perceived tend to be factors that ensured a good flow of the discussion. For example, informant A felt that:

- the chairperson was able to control the direction of discussion
- there was a good conduct of meeting

and informant B, commented that :

- the introduction by the chairperson allowed all present to understand reasons and purpose of the meeting
- the agenda showed structure of meeting
- summary at the end of meeting
- a good discussion process before reaching agreement.

All the factors listed above proved that the ' good conduct of meeting ' was the most prominent factor in the effectiveness of the negotiation. There were also other relevant factors expressed by the informants. Informant A perceived the team to have used figures and data to their advantage which could be interpreted as a good strategy to ensure the effectiveness of the negotiation task. This could be interpreted as reasons to why 'both sides were able to present company's position' as commented by informant B.

b. The weaknesses of the negotiation

However, informant A perceive several factors which were perceived to be rather negative as compared to informant B. The factors were as follow :

- the team members were making quick decisions without exploring the alternatives
- they were negotiating without presenting the bottom line especially the financial status
- they were not consistent in using figures to support arguments.

It was interesting to see that informant A thought that the PCFB group was not able to counter argue and this was in a way supported by a comment from informant B that at one point the PCFB's CEO was allowing the other team to control the agenda. This is one factor that could reflect the importance of the group's spokesperson.

c. Informants' vs. teachers' comments

In triangulation with the teacher's comments, this group was perceived as 'real effective' by the teacher (T1). The factors identified by the teacher (refer appendix F) focussed on the skills required for an effective negotiation.

For example:

- good use of language
- alertness
- good listeners
- good personalities

- good eye contact and
- good communication skills : fluent ,clear voice, points easily understood.

However, this could be the reason why the learners' performance was perceived as 'a good discussion process before reaching an agreement' by informant B but 'lacking in terms of development' by informant A. Some of the other factors listed were more inclined towards criteria that contributed to a well structured meeting such as :

- a brief explanation of the gatherings
- agenda from both teams were laid out
- both teams handled the decisions well

T1 did not perceive any negative factors and this is why the teacher's perception of the group's performance was 'real effective'. This contradicted with the informants' perception as there were factors in the group's performance that should greatly be taken into consideration. As mentioned earlier, informant A had emphasised some points that had caused the task to be less effective.

The conclusions that can be derived from these findings were that :

1. Teacher's perception of the effectiveness of learners' performance could have been influenced by a well structured meeting and language fluency amongst members. This could be one reason why the teacher concerned had overlooked the development of the negotiation as pointed out by the informants.
2. The way a negotiation is being handled can be considered as one contributory factor to determine the effectiveness of a negotiation task but is not the primary factor as there are other factors that primarily determines the effectiveness of the task in reaching agreements .

4.4.3.3 :Verification of teacher's perception of factors that contribute to the effectiveness of Group B 2 .

Group B2 consists of students from the Business faculty. The factors that affected the group's negotiation task was listed in detail in table 28. (refer appendix H).

a. *The strength of the negotiation .*

Basically, one of the positive factors which was perceived by both informants was the good presentation of facts and figures by both teams in the group. Informant A stated that the teams had a good presentation on the financial status whilst informant B stressed that there were good visual preparations by both teams. This is justified by informants' agreement that the positions of both teams were well stated which means that each team had managed to make a good stand in the discussion. This is again supported by informant A who had perceived a good strategy being adopted by the group by taking all aspects into account in making their stand. Besides, informant A also commented that the group had used positive points in seeking clarification.

Thus, one can conclude that the group had managed to state its stand clearly with the supporting facts that were presented. This is a good indication of factors that contribute to the effectiveness of the task. Another positive point which was identified by both informants was the fact that one of the teams managed to provide several alternatives in reaching its decisions as informant B had identified PCFB team's ability to offer alternatives in the discussion.

Next, it was positively noted by informant A that the group had deferred decisions to future discussion when decisions were difficult to make during the negotiation. This is interesting, as the idea of deferring decisions to later discussion was one of the factors verified and clarified by the informants in learners' responses as criteria that contribute to a successful negotiation.

Furthermore, in light of language used in negotiations, informant B had commented that "the good use of language by PCFB allowed them to overwhelm the other team", in contrast to ACFB's group as informant B had perceived them as "not able to counter argue due to language command and preparation". Therefore, the lack in language proficiency can hinder a good presentation of arguments or counter arguments. Language can then be seen as one of the contributory factors of an effective negotiation. 'Language', is an important factor for an effective negotiation.

Another interesting comment made by informant A was the group members appeared relax to informant A in contrast with the comment made on group B1 whereby they were perceived to be less relaxed. This perception was probably influenced by the good preparations by both teams in terms of the facts and data in presenting their arguments.

b. The weaknesses of the negotiation

However, one important comment made by one of the informants was the presentation of the financial figures. Although they had prepared well on the financial status as commented earlier, informant B showed some concern regarding the presentation of the financial figures as it was not linked to any part of the discussion. This may be justified by focussing at the comments made on the way the meeting was conducted.

According to informant B, the chairperson (the CEO) of one of the teams lacks confidence as he was not able to control the meeting, hence the meeting had no direction. Furthermore, informant A specified that the objectives were not clarified at the opening of the meeting. This shows that in handling a negotiation discussion, it is important that the meeting is well structured .

c. Informants' vs. teachers' comments.

In triangulating the comments made of the informants to that of the teacher, it was found that the teacher had perceived this group's performance as 'not very effective'. T2 seemed dissatisfied with the group's performance and had listed some factors that were perceived to have caused an ineffective negotiation.

The teacher had expressed that :

- the task looked more like a mini presentation of each role.

It is worth noting that this perception could refer to informants perception of a good presentation of facts and data. Thus, while the teacher perceived this as an ineffective factor the informants perceived otherwise. The researcher believes that the teachers' perception of the task that looked like a mini presentation could be related to the informant's comment that the presentation of financial figures, for example was not linked to any part of the discussion. Furthermore, the lack of a structured meeting appeared as negative to the teacher.

One of the factors perceived by the teacher was the group seemed to be 'abandoning suggestions put forth as the other party disagrees'. This, however, was not identified by the informants. Perhaps, the informant's perception of ACFB's inability to counter argue coincided with the teacher's comment above . This could repeatedly be the cause of the lack of structure in the meeting which was handled by the chairperson. Interestingly, the teacher had also perceived the team's uncertainty of their objectives. This is justified by informant A's comment that the objectives were not clarified at the opening of the discussion.

Thus, the teacher's comment that the group was not aware of their limitations could be justified. In other words, the learners were unsure of the extent to which they could negotiate which was perceived as important to the teacher in ensuring the effectiveness of a negotiation task. This is a valid factor that contributes to an effective negotiation as Cotton & Robins (1993:67) had identified that 'negotiators need to set their own limits to help them negotiate more comfortably and confidently' .

Nevertheless, there was one factor which clearly contradicted with that of the informants' and it was:

- the group took some time to digest the ideas proposed and could not give appropriate response.

This is perhaps due to the fact that the teacher was not aware of the need to consider decision makings carefully in negotiations as emphasised by the informants in earlier discussion. The informants had advised against responding spontaneously in making decisions as immediate decisions may jeopardise chances of a compromise. That is why the need to defer decision makings in negotiations may be necessary.

However, the teacher could have been more concerned with the learners' inability to counter argue as noted by the informants which was perceived by the teacher as their inability to respond spontaneously.

The conclusions that can be derived from these findings were that:

1. Teachers' perception of the group performance tend to differ greatly with that of the informants in giving their holistic views of the group's performance.
2. As teachers do not have first hand knowledge in negotiations as compared to the informants, the way the learners' performance was evaluated was perceived differently.
3. The teacher seemed to be more concerned with the ineffective factors and thus, overlooked the positive factors. Hence, the evaluation of the group's performance was 'not very effective'.