



Orientation and Disorientation: Two Approaches to Designing “Authentic” Negotiation Learning Activities

*Melissa Manwaring, Bobbi McAdoo & Sandra Cheldelin**

Editors’ Note: The authors here build on their 2009 writings for this project, which were influential in setting an “adventure learning” agenda. In their new effort, they argue that adventure learning devolves into mere entertainment if it lacks authenticity, and they frame two contrasting approaches to achieving a sense of the real and the consequential.

Introduction

A prevailing characteristic of Western negotiation education over the past several decades is the emphasis on experiential learning – that is, learning by doing – as a significant or even predominant complement to other approaches such as presentations, case analyses, or video demonstrations. While the role-play¹ is perhaps the most common experiential activity in negotiation courses, the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching initiative² explicitly questions a perceived over-reliance on role-plays, asking whether they fall short in giving students an authentic learning experience – that is, one that reflects the richness, complexity, and unpredictability of actual negotiations in which students engage outside of the classroom.

* **Melissa Manwaring** is a lecturer and director of learning assessment at the F.W. Olin Graduate School of Business at Babson College. Her email address is mmanwaring@babson.edu. **Bobbi McAdoo** is a professor of law and senior fellow at the Dispute Resolution Institute at Hamline University School of Law. Her email address is bmcadoo@hamline.edu. **Sandra Cheldelin** is the Vernon M. and Minnie I. Lynch professor of conflict resolution at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University. Her email address is scheldel@gmu.edu.

Authenticity is, of course, a complex concept. Should a negotiation learning activity – whether a role-play, game, or other exercise – be true-to-life or “authentic” in terms of the factual context? In terms of the roles students play or the behaviors they are expected to apply? In terms of the strategic, ethical, psychological, or other issues the activity elicits? What about authenticity in the way in which the negotiation is (or is not) labeled or framed? By their very nature, planned learning activities cannot be authentic in *every* way that a real-world negotiation is – and indeed, there are often powerful pedagogical reasons for certain elements of artificiality (Crampton and Manwaring 2008; Susskind and Corburn 1999). At the same time, it is worth examining whether some experiential activities might offer different forms of authenticity than role-plays do, and if so, whether they might be better-suited than role-plays for certain learning goals.

To support the emergence of thinking and scholarship about alternative pedagogies – particularly those that strive for authenticity – the organizers of the October 2009 Istanbul conference devoted significant time to experimentation with “adventure learning.” Adventure learning activities (described in more detail below) typically comprise direct, active, authentic, engaging, and collaborative experiences that take place outside traditional classroom settings, involve some element of real or perceived risk, and involve the whole person (not just the cognitive). The conference participants (predominantly negotiation instructors) took part in two adventure learning activities with quite different design philosophies, referred to herein as “orientation” and “disorientation.” In the orientation approach, participants are given direct, explicit instructions about what they should do and why. Just as “to orient” means “to cause to become familiar with or adjusted to a particular situation or circumstance” (Webster’s 1999: 772), an orienting learning activity acquaints students with the nature and purposes of the activity. In the disorientation approach (“to disorient” meaning “to cause to lose one’s sense of direction, position, or relationship with one’s surroundings”) (Webster’s 1999: 328), students are *not* explicitly told the nature and purposes of the activity in advance. Instead, they may be given incomplete, oblique, or misleading instructions, or no instructions at all.

In this article, we summarize the constructivist and experiential underpinnings of the widespread role-play usage in Western negotiation education, along with more recent theories of the situated nature of learning that endorse authenticity and encourage authenticity-oriented educational approaches such as adventure learning.

We describe the implementation and results (including participant reflections) of the orienting and disorienting adventure learning activities with conference participants in Istanbul and with graduate students in a replication of these activities in Washington, D.C. We examine the more and less authentic aspects of the orientation and disorientation designs and discuss the benefits and limitations of each. We conclude that “authenticity” is multifaceted; that learning activities that explicitly orient the learner to their nature and purpose tend to be authentic in very different ways than more oblique activities designed to disorient the learner as to their purpose; and that negotiation instructors seeking to design or select “authentic” adventure learning activities should consider which specific types of authenticity best meet their learning goals.

In Search of Authenticity: Constructivism, Situated Learning, and Adventure Learning

As mentioned above, role-plays have been a mainstay of most Western academic and professional negotiation courses for decades (see, e.g., Buntz and Carper 1987; Spoormans, Cohen, and Moust 1991; Williams and Geis 1999; Lewicki 1999; Susskind and Corburn 1999; Fortgang 2000). This is not surprising: in addition to being fun, engaging, efficient, and easily replicable activities that tend to result in positive student evaluations (Wheeler 2006; Movius 2008; Alexander and LeBaron 2009; Patton 2009), the common pedagogical justifications for role-plays are rooted in some of the most prevalent themes of 20th-century education theory: namely, constructivism and experiential learning (Lewicki 1999; Susskind and Corburn 1999; Patton 2009).

Grounded in the work of Lev Vygotsky, Jean Piaget, and others, constructivist philosophy posits that learners actively create (and re-create) their own understandings through experiences rather than passively receiving understanding from a teacher (Fosnot 2005). Experiential learning – or learning by doing – is a natural application of constructivist philosophy, and heavy use of role-plays would seem to be a natural application of these principles to a negotiation curriculum.

More recently, however, negotiation educators have begun to criticize a perceived over-reliance on role-plays and other classroom simulations as a teaching tool (e.g., Alexander and LeBaron 2009; Kovach 2009). A key criticism is that role-plays – while useful for certain pedagogical purposes – are nevertheless too artificial to maximize student learning and skill building.³ While traditional role-plays need not be discarded entirely, the argument goes, they at

least should be supplemented with more authentic learning activities situated in a more realistic negotiation context (Volkema 2007; Weiss 2008; Alexander and LeBaron 2009; LeBaron and Patera 2009).

Implicitly or explicitly, many concerns about over-reliance on role-plays resonate with two themes prevalent in contemporary experiential learning theory: the situated/contextual nature of learning and the corresponding value of authenticity in learning activities (*e.g.*, Vygotsky 1978; Brown, Collins, and Duguid 1989; Lave and Wenger 1991; Wilson 1993; Young 1993; Doolittle 1997; Petraglia 1998; Reeves, Herrington, and Oliver 2002; Driscoll 2004). According to situated learning theorists, learning is not only constructed through experience; it is inextricably related to the context of that experience (Brown, Collins, and Duguid 1989). "Context," like authenticity, is incredibly complex, and can include such factors as the physical, emotional, social, and cultural context (Doolittle 1997). From this perspective, "authentic activities" – or learning activities that re-create as closely as possible the context (key dynamics, challenges, emotions, etc.) of real-world activities – are critical to making learning relevant and transferable (Crampton and Manwaring 2008). Effective education will "provide complex learning environments that incorporate authentic activity" (Driscoll 2004).

In some disciplines, situated learning through authentic activities has long been a pedagogical staple. Classic examples include the residency for medical students, student teaching placements for education students, and flight simulators (followed by actual flights) for aviation students. In others – notably the legal field – alternative pedagogical models such as case discussions have historically dominated, and educators have only recently begun to incorporate more authentic learning experiences that reflect more accurately what professionals actually do in practice. In 1992, for instance, the MacCrate Report by the American Bar Association critiqued law schools for doing too little to teach the skills and values that actual lawyers need (American Bar Association 1992). More recently, legal educators have been challenged anew by the Carnegie report to synthesize the theory, practice, and professionalism aspects of legal education better so that students are ready to practice law when they graduate (Sullivan et al. 2007). While law school negotiation courses traditionally have been more experiential and skills-oriented than most other law school courses (and perhaps more than other courses in the other disciplines in which negotiation is taught, such as management, international relations, or planning), it is nevertheless worth considering whether negotiation educators

can do still more to prepare students to negotiate effectively outside the classroom by providing them with highly authentic learning experiences.

So what exactly are authentic learning experiences? Synthesizing the work of numerous researchers and theorists, Thomas Reeves, Jan Herrington, and Ron Oliver enumerated the following characteristics of “authentic activities” in an academic environment:

- 1) Authentic activities have real-world relevance...match[ing] as nearly as possible the real-world tasks of professionals in practice rather than decontextualised or classroom-based tasks.
- 2) Authentic activities are ill-defined, requiring students to define the tasks and sub-tasks needed to complete the activity....[They] are open to multiple interpretations rather than easily solved by the application of existing algorithms....
- 3) Authentic activities comprise complex tasks to be investigated by students over a sustained period of time....They require significant investment of time and intellectual resources.
- 4) Authentic activities provide the opportunity for students to examine the task from different perspectives, using a variety of resources....The use of a variety of resources rather than a limited number of preselected references requires students to detect relevant from irrelevant information.
- 5) Authentic activities provide the opportunity to collaborate. Collaboration is integral to the task, both within the course and the real world....
- 6) Authentic activities provide the opportunity to reflect...on their learning both individually and socially.
- 7) Authentic activities...encourage interdisciplinary perspectives and enable diverse roles and expertise rather than a single well-defined field or domain.
- 8) Authentic activities are seamlessly integrated with assessment...in a manner that reflects real world assessment, rather than separate artificial assessment removed from the nature of the task.
- 9) Authentic activities create polished products valuable in their own right rather than as preparation for something else.
- 10) Authentic activities allow...a range and diversity of outcomes open to multiple solutions of an original nature, rather than a single correct response obtained by the application of rules and procedures.

(Reeves, Herrington, and Oliver 2002: 563-565) (citations omitted).

While some highly complex “mega-simulations” may fit all of these criteria (see, e.g., Weiss 2008), many typical negotiation role-plays fall short in some ways or others. By their nature, for instance, few role-plays have “real-world relevance...rather than [comprising] decontextualised or classroom-based tasks.” With their bounded sets of instructions, few are “ill-defined, requiring students to define the tasks and sub-tasks needed” or require “use of a variety of resources rather than a limited number of preselected references.” Few “create polished products valuable in their own right rather than as preparation for something else.”

Whether or not a learning experience meets the criteria for “authentic activities,” however, misses the point. Activities with intentional elements of artificiality can provide powerful learning experiences (see Crampton and Manwaring 2008); and even activities that meet all the criteria for authenticity are irrelevant if they are incompatible with the teachers’ and students’ learning goals. Rather than asking “how authentic is this activity?,” an instructor should ask “in what ways is this activity authentic – and does that matter with regard to our learning goals?” Two seemingly “authentic” learning activities can nevertheless differ substantially in the ways in which they are authentic – and thus in the specific learning goals they are likely to support. As Karen Barton, Patricia McKellar, and Paul Maharg observe:

One theme running through the many contemporary versions of experiential learning is that of “authenticity” – the correspondence, in some way or other, of learning to the world of practice that exists outside of teaching institutions. The concept is an important one, for it lies at the heart of the attempts by educators since Dewey to address the relationship between learning and life. In dealing with it, we must acknowledge that there are many factors that affect authenticity of task such as context, learner motivation, task, feedback, social interaction, and social presence... (Barton, McKellar, and Maharg 2007: 145).

Turning to the negotiation education context, there are many forms of possible “authenticity” in learning activities: the physical environment; the interpersonal communication and relationships; the resources involved (e.g., “real money”); the emotions and motivations; the availability of external resources; the boundedness of the

problem (or lack thereof); and so forth. Given practical and ethical constraints as well as the unique cultural dynamics of a formal academic environment, it is virtually impossible to replicate every single element of negotiation authenticity in such an environment. So, which elements of authenticity *can* be replicated in a negotiation learning exercise? And how? And what are the implications – pedagogical, practical, and ethical? We examine these questions in the context of a particular approach to authenticity in education.

Authentic activities can take many forms: clinical programs, residencies, internships, apprenticeships, moot court, and so forth. Many of these forms are far from new: for instance, lengthy periods of apprenticeship were required for entry into medieval craft guilds (see Larson, *Not Everyone Gets to Play*, in this volume). A more recent manifestation of the authentic learning approach is adventure education.

Adventure education (also referred to as adventure learning) involves “direct, active, and engaging learning experiences that involve the whole person and have real consequences,” and that bring learners “out of their comfort zone...no matter where the location and how physically risky or active the mode of learning may be” (Prouty, Panicucci, and Collinson 2007: 4). The key characteristics are as follows:

- Adventure learning is *experiential*: participants do something that engages the “whole person” (Prouty, Panicucci, and Collinson) and goes beyond traditional cognitive academic activities such as analysis and discussion. The activity often involves some element of physicality that “raises levels of conscious alertness in the group and allows the subconscious, with its ways of knowing beyond the rational, to directly engage with deeper personal challenges” (Alexander and LeBaron 2009: 187). In the context of a negotiation course, for instance, an adventure learning activity would almost certainly involve students physically leaving the classroom and engaging in some type of negotiation (possibly among other activities such as navigating an unfamiliar city).
- Moreover, the adventure learning experiences must be “*authentic*” and “*real*” in some meaningful sense (Alexander and LeBaron 2009; Doering 2006) – though “authenticity” is highly complex, as discussed above.
- Adventure learning activities are often set “beyond traditional teaching spaces into environments where existing classroom power dynamics no longer apply” (Alexander and

LeBaron 2009) and “traditional hierarchical classroom roles are blurred” (Doering 2006). This need not involve trekking through the jungle or dogsledding across the tundra, but it does generally mean getting out of the usual educational space (e.g., the physical classroom or the online course discussion board), the situated learning dynamics of which can have their own gravitational pull.

- Adventure learning activities also generally involve some element of real or perceived risk (Alexander and LeBaron 2009: 187). In some learning contexts, this may be physical or emotional risk; it may also involve putting something of monetary or other value at stake (see Volkema 2007).
- Finally, adventure learning activities are typically collaborative endeavors: students are offered “opportunities to explore real-world issues through authentic learning experiences within collaborative learning environments” – including both face-to-face and online learning environments (Doering 2006).

Adventure Learning with Negotiation Instructors in Istanbul

In Istanbul, we engaged in two different types of adventure learning activities: negotiating in a bazaar and navigating the city to produce a series of photographs. For the bazaar negotiations, the organizers grouped the roughly sixty participants (primarily negotiation educators and practitioners from around the world) into groups of five or six, striving for diversity in terms of nationality, gender, age, and academic discipline. The groups were given several hours to travel from the conference site to the Grand Bazaar and/or the Spice Bazaar,⁴ to negotiate a purchase of food to share with the rest of the conference participants, and if desired, to negotiate for anything else the group (or any individual in the group) might like to buy. For the photography activity, conducted on the following day, participants were invited to form their own groups and given several hours to travel to a neighborhood of Istanbul with which they were unfamiliar, with instructions to have lunch and produce a series of photographs. The photographs were to represent the group consensus on the best representation of the intersection of the sacred and the secular, the most dangerous thing the group saw, and the most likely location for Istanbul’s Central Intelligence Agency headquarters, along with a group self-portrait. The groups were also told that they should make one change to their instructions (e.g., by eliminat-

ing, adding, or changing a theme). Each group's photographs would be shared with the other conference participants.

Both activities were authentic in some of the same ways: for example, everyone negotiated "as themselves" and not in an assigned role; the stakes (though small) were real, in that we were spending real money and/or ending up with real photos; and the setting was outside the classroom/conference room – what some might consider the "real world." Yet on closer inspection, the two activities were designed quite differently, and implicated different aspects of authenticity.

The bazaar negotiations, on the one hand, were clearly labeled as negotiations – in the conference agenda and in the oral instructions. We were told that we were going to conduct a real negotiation. Moreover, the very context (Istanbul bazaars) primed us to think about bargaining and negotiation. Many of us planned strategies or experiments on the way there – e.g., "I'm going to try especially hard to learn what I can [or apply what I've learned] about relationship-building" or "Let's set up an experiment to see whether different members of our group receive different first offers from the same vendor for the same piece." So, one could say that the participants were very much *oriented* toward the fact that this was a negotiation activity.

The photography assignment, on the other hand, was not framed explicitly as a negotiation exercise. In the facilitator's words, it was a more oblique activity than the bazaar negotiation. We were not told that the point was to go off and negotiate; we were told to go to an unfamiliar neighborhood of Istanbul and to come back with a set of photos that reflected specific themes. The context in which we did this (heading off to various non-touristy neighborhoods of Istanbul) was less likely to prime us to think about negotiations than a setting like the bazaar, in which negotiations are constant and expected. Thus, while the instructions for the bazaar negotiations explicitly oriented us to the negotiative nature of the exercise, the photography assignment was more of a dis-orienting activity. Given that the participants were mostly negotiation instructors, and that the context was a negotiation pedagogy conference, it is probably safe to say that most participants quickly intuited that there would be some negotiation embedded within the activity. Nevertheless, it is also safe to say that there was less explicit framing/priming toward the negotiative nature of the photography activity, compared with the bazaar activity, and that the stated purpose and context of the photography activity was less likely to prime negotiation schemas.⁵ Immediately upon return from both the bazaar negotiation

and the photography activity, the Istanbul conference participants debriefed their experiences in facilitated small groups.

Interestingly, some of us commented during the second debriefing session that the negotiations that emerged from both assignments were authentic, but in quite different ways – even though the bazaar negotiations seemed at first glance to be the more authentic negotiation activity. Though we were not directly primed to think about and plan for negotiations in the photography activity, negotiations naturally emerged over all sorts of issues, such as where to go and how to get there; what the best photography subjects would be; where and how long to stop; how quickly to continue moving; and when and where to stop for lunch. While none of these were particularly weighty issues, they emerged based on authentic individual interests, preferences, and motivations, and not based on externally-imposed motivations. Moreover, there was an authenticity to the way in which our photography negotiations emerged – naturally and organically, without explicit labeling or priming – which is how most day-to-day negotiations emerge.

At the same time, the seemingly ultra-authentic bazaar negotiations had at least two elements of artificiality. First, the primary motivation/interest (i.e., to negotiate a purchase of food) was externally imposed; and second, we were very explicitly primed to view this as a negotiation activity (which is probably atypical of most negotiations). These contrasts should not be overstated – for instance, the motivation to take certain types of photos was also externally imposed; and the bazaar negotiations did leave room for the emergence of intrinsic preferences/interests around what to buy – but the pedagogical distinction is important. One activity was directly and explicitly framed as a negotiation, with high contextual priming; the other was much less directly framed as a negotiation, with lower contextual priming.

Curious about whether others believed that the differently-designed adventure learning activities had led to qualitatively different experiences and learning outcomes, we invited all conference participants to post summaries of their adventure learning experiences and debriefing sessions to the conference website after the conference. After eight of approximately sixty participants responded, we followed up with a six-question online survey,⁶ and communicated directly with many colleagues to try to boost the number of responses and increase the richness of our data about their adventure learning experiences. Eighteen participants responded to the online survey (some of whom had also contributed summaries of their experiences). Based on our own experiences and

multiple informal conversations with colleagues, we believe that the responses capture a reasonably accurate impression of participant experiences in Istanbul.

Learning From the “Orienting” Activity: Negotiating in Istanbul’s Famed Bazaars

A consistent theme in participant reflections on the bazaar negotiations was excitement about the opportunity to apply academic theory to a “real” negotiation. Many consciously experimented with or watched for particular dynamics, such as rituals for breaking the ice; trust-building moves; the effect of first offers and ultimatums; the role of gender, age, and other observable traits in first offers; and techniques for creating value. When asked what they learned from a participant/student perspective (as opposed to an educator perspective), the participants cited a range of observations, including the pervasiveness of negotiation in everyday life, relevance of communication facility or barriers (especially given the range of primary languages among the conference participants and their negotiating counterparts), the concrete effects of relationships (both within negotiating groups and with counterparts in the bazaar), environmental influences (such as whether business at the vendor’s stall was slow or busy), the role of informal and nonverbal communication, and the confirmation and/or disconfirmation of culturally-based assumptions.

From an educator’s perspective, most conference participants were positive about the idea of incorporating adventure learning into a negotiation course. When asked what they saw as the primary pedagogical purposes of an orienting activity such as the bazaar negotiation, most cited the unique opportunity to introduce negotiation concepts in an authentic manner. More specifically, they commented on the opportunity to connect theory and practice by giving students the opportunity to plan, conduct, and debrief a “real” negotiation, to expose them to authentic dynamics stemming from gender, culture, and language issues, to experience authentic psychological aspects of negotiation such as feelings, worries, empathy, body language; and to increase students’ awareness of their own role in a negotiation.

For those who were not as certain that the bazaar negotiation worked, the questions raised generally centered on the lack of clear learning objectives, making it impossible to assess whether they had been achieved. Moreover, several reports mentioned that the debriefing activity was not sufficient for nuanced reflection on the overall learning of the activity. A few raised the question of whether

there is evidence that this potentially time-consuming approach is more effective than a good in-class simulation.

Learning From the “Dis-orienting” Activity: Navigating and Photographing Istanbul’s Neighborhoods

Several reports suggested that the negotiations that naturally emerged during the “oblique” or “dis-orienting” negotiation assignment (i.e., the assignment to go to an unfamiliar neighborhood of Istanbul and take a series of thematic photographs) were highly authentic in their own ways, with reference made to the give-and-take in group negotiations about where to go and the factors relevant to how individuals influenced their groups’ choices (such as who happened to have a map or a car; who had a strong preference about where to go; cultural norms; etc.). When asked what they learned from this activity from a participant (not an instructor) perspective, the participants cited insights different from those that followed the bazaar negotiations, such as that meaning-making systems are personal, that images can say more than words and evoke strong emotional reactions, that cultural differences can affect perspectives on both images and words (e.g., what does “dangerous” mean?), and that risk-taking and creativity are natural elements of negotiation.

When asked about the primary pedagogical purpose for assigning an oblique, dis-orienting activity such as the photography assignment in a negotiation course, the Istanbul conference participants focused less on the explicit connections of theory with practice (as they had with the bazaar negotiations) and more on the relevance of group dynamics and how the diversity of a group will require participants to explore different ways of thinking. The purposes they cited included: understanding different perspectives, especially given that the same assignment yielded very different results in terms of the photographs; highlighting the importance of framing, partisan perceptions and the “language” of symbols; challenging student curiosity and awareness; presenting students with an activity where they are not explicitly focused on the types of interactions that will be used for purposeful reflection; teaching intra-group negotiation; and highlighting the human factors in negotiation.

Adventure Learning with Graduate Students in Washington, D.C.

While we valued the reactions from Istanbul conference participants to the two adventure learning activities, we also recognized that

conducting these activities with educators at a negotiation pedagogy conference might produce somewhat different results than conducting them with students in a negotiation course. We hypothesized that the negotiation educators at the conference – being familiar with negotiation theory and hyper-conscious of negotiation dynamics in action – would be more likely than most to plan for, experiment with, and purposively attempt to influence overtly labeled negotiations. We also assumed that the educators would be more likely than most to anticipate, notice, and participate intentionally in the negotiations that emerged organically from the more oblique photography activity – thus not being truly “dis-oriented” regarding the activity’s purposes, particularly in the context of this conference.

A few months after the Istanbul conference, therefore, Cheldelin ran versions of the orienting and disorienting activities with her graduate-level, semester-long course on *Reflective Practice*, located in the greater Washington, D.C. area. The course comprised thirty students in a graduate program on conflict analysis and resolution, most of whom had not yet had any formal training in negotiation theory or practice.

The first of several “practices” in Cheldelin’s course was a three-week module on negotiation, during which students were asked to form self-selected groups of three or four and, on their own time: 1) conduct a negotiation; and 2) produce a photograph that reflected the intersection of the secular and the sacred. Each student submitted a brief reflection paper on their experiences, and the students debriefed both within their adventure learning groups and as a whole class: our analyses of their experiences draws from each of these sources. Like the Istanbul activities, the Washington, D.C. activities were conducted outside the classroom in small groups, involved “real” negotiations and stakes, and included one activity that explicitly oriented students to the negotiation elements, as well as a more oblique activity intended to disorient students regarding the negotiation elements. There were a few structural differences between the two sets of activities: the D.C. graduate students conducted both exercises in the same groups and on the same day while the Istanbul conference participants did so in different groups on different days; and the graduate students focused on a single theme for their photography exercise while the conference participants sought photographs depicting multiple themes. In most significant respects, however, the pairs of activities in D.C. and Istanbul were similar, except for the critical fact that the Istanbul participants were familiar with negotiation theory and highly attuned to negotiation dynamics (particularly in the context of a negotiation pedagogy con-

ference), whereas the D.C. participants – sophisticated as they may have been in other areas – were generally unfamiliar with negotiation theory and presumably substantially less attuned to negotiation dynamics.

Learning From the “Orienting” Activity: Negotiating In and Around Washington, D.C.

In response to the general instruction to “go out and negotiate something,” Cheldelin’s graduate students conducted a range of real-world negotiations. These included bargaining over the purchase of scarves and other clothing articles at local markets, bargaining over used book prices, securing the lowest-priced hotel package for a weekend in New York, replacing a lost cell phone, and procuring an alcoholic beverage without providing proper identification. The students’ reflection papers demonstrated that they understood there were many negotiations taking place – not just the intended negotiation over a purchase or service, but also the intra-group negotiations over how much money was going to be spent, who would spend it, what they wanted to buy, and where they would go. As one student noted, “The planning phase was initially a negotiation between the group members to determine what we were going to purchase and where we were going to purchase the item.”

Several additional themes emerged from the reflection papers, demonstrating the broad learning potential of the direct, orienting activity. For instance, some students identified cultural constraints on negotiation – sometimes associated with their own anxieties about negotiations that involved money – as reflected in two remarks:

- I was nominated to negotiate on behalf of the group as I had previous experience in such matters back home in Ghana. I was a bit surprised though when both Mary and Michelle informed me they were pretty bad negotiators when it came to making purchases but I guess in a country where most of the prices of items are fixed there will not be much opportunity for anyone to haggle on the price for goods and services.
- I have been responsible for negotiating tremendous contracts in the oil industry, but have never actually negotiated the price for something to purchase for myself. We do not have the bargaining culture in my family.

Several others identified gendered issues in negotiations and wanted to explore them, especially the extent to which gender matters when paired with other strategies such as building rapport:

- We wondered why it was so easy for the woman in our group to get a 20 percent discount, while the man struggled for a number of minutes. We postulated that this could be a consequence of sex/gender, culture and strategy. Perhaps the foreign woman merchant responded better to a foreign woman buyer who spoke to her in a friendly manner.
- I think that because I [being a male] was personable with the old man, that I had been to his village...we were able to create a positive relationship.
- Even under these rigid circumstances where price could not be easily negotiated, it did appear that certain gender issues – feminine characteristics such as warmth, and a non-threatening manner – can also be used to soften the setting of negotiation.

In addition to highlighting cultural and gender influences on negotiation, the orienting exercise deepened the class discussion about key negotiation dynamics and processes. Sample themes in their reflections included:

- Agency: As a third party, depending on the nature of the object and the stakes, I would do my best. But if I had to negotiate for myself, especially for some goods or services, I would certainly need someone to do it on my behalf. I guess this is all due to the way I have been brought up, and due to other factors. [This launched a full-class discussion of various factors involved in conducting a successful negotiation.]
- Ethics: At the conclusion her positive attitude towards the situation made me feel horrible about even having the audacity to ask her to risk her livelihood for one beer beverage. [This launched a class discussion about ethics and negotiation. Throughout the course “the beer incident” became a metaphor for ethical issues.]
- Interests and relationships: All she really wanted was for us to go away so she could take care of other customers. It was an interesting negotiation piece, and the biggest thing I learned from it is there is no real way to cover all the variables, no way to always know what the positions and interests are, unless you have a deeper connection with the person you are negotiating with, deeper than ours with the stall lady anyway. [This became part of the full discussion of prioritizing variables.]

Like conference participants in Istanbul, overwhelmingly these students enjoyed the exercise (even though some were anxious about having to negotiate):

- I felt we had a very positive experience and good value for the money; ...I was also happy that the girls had purchased something from Ecuador since I knew the money would go back to this man's family back in his country; we all agreed that the experience was positive and that the negotiation was easy.
- I feel as though the negotiation was an overwhelming success for my group.
- I was not really interested in getting an extremely good deal, as much as I was in completing the assignment and moving on with my life!
- I must say that I was euphoric that we had accomplished our group goal – and had a good time doing it.
- In retrospect, I am reminded how my own fear of incompetence sometimes gets in the way of trying new things that may actually be successful. I also sometimes assume the worst outcomes will happen when there is no real indication that is the case....I am anxious to hear how it went for the other groups.

One student, in particular, was able to articulate her concerns about the assignment and use them to consider her own areas for growth and development. She was part of a group that went to the Eastern Market in Washington, D.C. to negotiate for outerwear for children from an Ecuadorian vendor:

I had been dreading the prospect of having to conduct a purchase negotiation ever since we were given the assignment. I didn't want to have to go through that kind of situation. I've negotiated prices before but only when I've had to (e.g., living in post-Soviet Russia) or really wanted something....In retrospect, there are all sorts of things I could reflect on: how helpful it was that my comrades spoke Spanish and that one of them had been to the country; how well the three of us got along and worked together; how nice it was to discover that market there. However, I keep coming back to the thought that it feels to me that I came unprepared by not having enough money. I wonder if subconsciously I did that on purpose. Almost like I thought it would mean I wouldn't have to do the dreaded negotiation. While I could ruminate uselessly over that shameful thought, perhaps it is more useful to wonder how other parties sabotage negotiations – purposefully or subconsciously – so that they damage or delay the process....But I keep coming back to me...what does

this all mean for me for future negotiations? What if it's not just during market negotiations that I freeze up? And I also keep thinking to myself that I wish I'd held eye contact a little longer when saying goodbye. I've thought about that several times since the transaction.

This student shared her concerns with the class and it resulted in a lengthy and thoughtful discussion about emotions, preparation, language, culture and sabotage. Though these were her personal reflections, other students were able to relate to the conversation and offer their experiences or perspectives on the issues.

Learning From the “Disorienting” Activity: Photographing the Secular and the Sacred Around Washington, D.C.

In addition to conducting a negotiation, the Washington, D.C. graduate students were instructed to work with the same group members to produce a photograph representing the intersection of the sacred and the secular.⁷ This “disorienting” activity was intended to elicit intra-group negotiations, though the activity was not framed as a negotiation and students were not explicitly primed to notice the negotiations that arose.

In their reflection papers – the subject of which was supposed to be the entire group outing, including the explicit negotiation and the photography activity – only two of the thirty students addressed the photography activity. Most of the students may have been sufficiently “disoriented” as to the purpose of the activity – even though it occurred during a three-week unit titled “Negotiation” – as to not recognize the negotiations either as they occurred or during their individual reflections.⁸ The two students who did address the emergent negotiations in the photography activity demonstrated awareness of their own thinking about negotiation, as well as of the negotiations themselves:

Our first class activity, forming groups to find a photo that represents the intersection between the sacred and the secular and to negotiate a purchase, *led me to realize that negotiations – big and small – are a part of our everyday interactions.* Forming the groups themselves was really the first negotiation. This was followed by negotiating a mutually convenient time to meet and then negotiating with my boyfriend to reschedule the shopping and cleaning we had planned to do on the night that worked best for my group to get together.

When my group met, negotiations continued [*emphasis added*].

We actually negotiated about a number of things on Saturday – what time and where we would meet – what item we would negotiate a price for – where we would eat lunch – what our image of the intersection of sacred and secular would be – how we would get to Arlington Cemetery – *and the dual concern model came to mind each time we agreed [emphasis added]*.

After submitting their reflection papers, the students sent their photographs to the teaching assistants who in turn enlarged them to poster-size and displayed them around the classroom. The photographs reflected varied and interesting images, with the U.S. Capitol building representing a recurring secular symbol (compared with the mosque as a dominant sacred symbol in the Istanbul photographs). For nearly two hours student groups presented their images to the other groups and discussed the processes by which they had selected, created, and interpreted the images. Cheldelin observed that most of this discussion focused on the intra-group negotiations, demonstrating awareness *at this point* of the negotiations that had occurred during the activity – even though there was little evidence that students had recognized the negotiations as they were happening, or even as they wrote their individual reflections. The discussion included observations on the benefits of brainstorming and collaboration, and on the processes by which they resolved disagreements over which image would best represent the assigned theme.

In general, both the reflection papers and the class discussion indicated that students found the exercises useful. They were able to recognize explicit negotiations as they occurred and more organic, emergent negotiations in retrospect (if not in real time), as well as demonstrating an understanding of the negotiation concepts and dynamics in play.

Implications for Negotiation Instructors

Based on our own experiences, the participant summaries, and the participant survey responses from the adventure learning activities at the Istanbul conference, and based on student reflection papers and class discussion from the parallel activities in the Washington, D.C.-area graduate course, we have developed the following tentative conclusions about what two different approaches to adventure

learning can offer negotiation students or scholars of different levels of sophistication.

Learning Opportunities From “Orienting” Activities

Direct adventure learning negotiation activities that explicitly orient participants to the negotiative nature of the exercise (such as the bazaar negotiations in Istanbul or the more open-ended “go negotiate something” activity in Washington, D.C.) can offer:

- Multiple forms of authenticity, particularly environmental/contextual authenticity, authenticity of interpersonal dynamics such as gender and cultural issues, authenticity in the counterpart’s motivations and behavior, and in some cases, emotional and psychological authenticity (such as the potential anxiety or exhilaration of conducting a real negotiation). For participants relatively new to the study of negotiation, and particularly if the activity is conducted early in the course, this might serve to highlight the complexities of negotiation, to reinforce the relevance and utility of negotiation theory, and/or to provide a shared experience – a shared reference point – with which to connect concepts and issues that arise later in the course. For more sophisticated participants – or if the activity is conducted late in the course, perhaps as a capstone – the activity could provide an authentic context in which to notice or test theories and/or to apply particular skills – which leads directly to the second learning opportunity:
- An opportunity for participants to be highly intentional about how they approach the negotiation aspects of the activity, because they are oriented to its nature and purposes. For instance, they could (at the direction of the instructor or of their own accord) watch for particular dynamics such as anchoring or relationship-building moves, consciously attempt to apply particular skills or techniques, or even conduct mini-experiments.⁹ Less advanced students might simply try to observe certain dynamics or their own behaviors and reactions; more advanced students might be more purposeful about participating in the negotiation, as mentioned above.
- An opportunity for students to collaborate in a meaningful way and build relationships, particularly at the beginning of a course. Participants in both the Istanbul and the Washington, D.C. activities commented on the intra-group bonding effect the activities created.

Comments from Istanbul participants reinforced the notion that an orienting adventure learning activity can offer different opportunities early in a course (or with less advanced students) than later in a course (or with more advanced students). Several observed that the intra-group relationship-building effect would probably be more useful and relevant early in a course or workshop rather than at the end. Others noted that, with the rich array of negotiation concepts that might arise from such an activity, it might be most appropriate as a capstone experience, because students will have more ability to articulate their experiences in negotiation terms at the end of a course than at the beginning.

Learning Opportunities From “Disorienting” Activities

On the other hand, the more oblique, indirect activities that intentionally disorient students as to the negotiative elements – or that at least leave those elements implicit – seem to offer somewhat different forms of authenticity, such as authenticity regarding the unpredictable and organic way in which negotiations often arise – *without* framing or labeling or opportunity for preparation, as well as authenticity in the interests motivating those negotiations and in the emotions and psychological reactions that accompany them.

Because the negotiations that arise in a disorienting activity are less expected than those in an orienting activity, the disorienting activity provides a context in which to assess participants' attunement to negotiation opportunities. Early in a course – particularly with introductory students such as those in the Washington, D.C. course – the disorienting activity can also offer a baseline for student self-assessment: How do they really behave when a negotiation (or negotiation opportunity) arises naturally, without the neat frame of role-play instructions? Do they notice the opportunity? Do they recognize it as a (potential) negotiation? Do they consciously employ analytical, relational, cognitive, or other negotiation skills? With more advanced participants such as those at the Istanbul conference (or later in a course), a disorienting activity can provide a vehicle for assessing the extent to which participants have developed their ability to notice, recognize and exploit negotiation opportunities – in other words, their ability to apply in authentic practice what they have already learned in theory, and perhaps in the more framed and primed context of role-plays.

The following charts summarize some benefits and drawbacks of the orienting and disorienting adventure learning approaches, and compare them to more traditional classroom experiential activities:

Orienting Activities		In-classroom setting	Out-of-classroom / adventure learning setting
Definition	Learning activities in which the nature and/or purposes are explicit; students understand what they should try to do and why		
Examples	<p>Role simulation with explicit instructions to apply particular concepts/skills (e.g., presentation/readings on value creation techniques followed by a role play in which students are instructed to attempt to create value).</p> <p>“Deliberate practice” drills in which students practice particular micro-skills, receive feedback, and refine their attempts.</p>		
Benefits	<p>Opportunity for conscious application and practice of theory/advice. Classroom exercises can be tailored to highlight particular issues or dynamics. Use of the same exercise for all students facilitates instructor and group understanding of the context as well as cross-student comparisons. Compatible with “deliberate practice” approach to behavioral skill-building.</p>		
Limitations	<p>Can raise concerns about applicability in the “real world.” Opportunities for preparation and practice may be limited by the nature of the exercise (e.g., students may not have the option to conduct additional research or preparation beyond the bounds of the instructions).</p>		
		<p>Opportunity for conscious practice and application of theory / advice. Certain aspects of the activity (e.g., non-student negotiation counterparts, “real” stakes, possible great discretion in how to prepare for and conduct the activity, inherent unpredictability and complexity) may more closely replicate “real” negotiations. Can serve as icebreaker / relationship-building exercise.</p> <p>Can pose logistical and ethical challenges. Variations in context and experiences can make cross-student comparisons difficult.</p>	

Figure 1 – Orienting Activities

Disorienting activities		In-classroom setting	Out-of-classroom / adventure learning setting
Definition	Learning activities with at least some oblique or hidden purposes; students are not explicitly told (or are only partially told, or are misled about) what they should try to do and why		
Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -“Unfreezing” exercises (e.g., Argyris & Schön’s X-Y Exercise) -Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma exercises (e.g., Oil Pricing or Populator) in which the stated goal of the exercise (e.g., to maximize profits) may mask additional purposes (e.g., to highlight interrelationships among behavior, trust, and reputation) -Role simulations with hidden/non-obvious “twists” (e.g., simulations in which both parties have a strong incentive to negotiate but which are structured such that no deal is possible that is better than both parties’ BATNAs) 		
Benefits	<p>Can generate powerful “a-ha” moments. Can predictably (from the instructor’s standpoint) highlight particular dynamics and insights. Can help assess negotiation “executive function”: i.e., capacity to recognize negotiation opportunities and apply negotiation skills without explicit direction.</p>		
Limitations	<p>Can generate resentment; repeated use can raise students’ suspicions and incent them to “game” simulations by looking for “the catch.” May be more appropriate for current skill assessment and making a memorable point than for practice / development.</p>		
	<p>Adventure learning activity in which the stated goal of the exercise may mask additional purposes (e.g., students may be told that the goal is to explore an unfamiliar neighborhood in small groups and return with a series of themed photos, while the unspoken purpose is to reflect on the negotiations that arise organically within the groups)</p>		
	<p>Can offer authenticity in motivation, emotions, interests, and “organic emergence” of negotiation opportunities. Can help assess negotiation “executive function”: i.e., capacity to recognize negotiation opportunities and apply negotiation skills without explicit direction. Can serve as icebreaker / relationship-building exercise.</p>		
	<p>May be difficult to justify or explain exercise; may be difficult to motivate students. May be more appropriate for current skill assessment than for practice / development.</p>		

Figure 2 – Disorienting Activities

Challenges to Incorporating Adventure Learning Into Negotiation Teaching

In addition to the benefits and opportunities described above, there are, of course, challenges to the use of adventure learning in negotiation teaching. While most of the Istanbul conference participants were positive about their experiences and about the potential to use adventure learning for negotiation teaching, a small number of participants questioned whether the activity accomplished any more than building group rapport and camaraderie. They noted that it may not have been worth the time commitment required for its execution, and it was generally conceded that this activity might be impossible in a short (one- or two-day) training format, given the requisite time commitment.

In response to survey questions about how likely they were to use adventure learning and about challenges they foresaw in doing so, the Istanbul conference participants identified a number of considerations, including:

- The potential difficulty of making the adventure learning activity relevant to teaching and learning objectives, and determining the right time in the course (sequencing) for an adventure learning activity to be meaningful. We attempt to address these concerns above, identifying specific learning opportunities for both orienting and disorienting activities either at the beginning or at the end of a course.
- The complex and uncontrollable nature of a “field” experience, in which the dynamics are far less predictable than those in a role-play. This characteristic of authenticity means that the instructor should have a clear plan for debriefing the exercise – whether that plan involves focusing on particular concepts and dynamics such as the influence of culture, or whether it involves working with whatever questions, observations, and reflections the students bring from the experience. Without some sort of reflective debriefing activity – whether a discussion, reflection paper, group presentation, or other follow up – the learning activity runs the risk of being reduced to a fun field trip.
- The need for a suitable environment (e.g., an alternative to Istanbul’s Grand Bazaar, for those based further afield) or context in which to conduct the activity – particularly a direct negotiation activity. Cheldelin’s experiment in the Washington, D.C. area indicates that students need not have access to a traditional bazaar in order to engage in real-world negotiations: they demonstrated substantial creativity in finding negotiation opportunities, ranging from an attempt

(by a student old enough to legally drink alcohol) to purchase beer at a campus bar without the requisite photo identification, to attempts at bargaining over the prices of various goods and services (clothing items, hotel reservations), to an attempt to negotiate a free or discounted replacement for a lost cell phone.

- Other opportunities might include inviting students to negotiate for a reduction in their credit card interest rates¹⁰ or to create the most value possible from one dollar.¹¹ A disorienting adventure learning activity poses a slightly different problem: it is not particularly difficult to find an environment in which students might take photographs, for instance, but it might be a challenge to frame the activity so that students are sufficiently disoriented regarding the negotiation aspects while still being adequately motivated. One educator at the Istanbul conference suggested having groups of students take photographs of the “best” and “worst” negotiators they saw – which permits not only reflection based on the explicit activity of representing negotiators in images (e.g., the relevance of identifying characteristics such as race, age, gender, and attractiveness; attention to context, such as negotiating bail versus resolving a marital dispute; and/or noting stereotyping or in-group preference tendencies) – but also reflection based on the more oblique activity: the inevitable, organic, intra-group negotiations over whom to photograph, and how and why.¹² Another educator suggested looking to locally significant places or events for ideas on how to frame a disorienting activity. She noted that her law school building was about to be demolished to make room for a new building, and that she planned to ask student teams to take photos of their favorite locales in the old building – not revealing until later that a secondary (or even primary) purpose of the activity was to elicit intra-group negotiations and to assess students’ real-time attunement to these negotiations.¹³
- Ensuring that adventure learning is (and is perceived to be) a legitimate graduate level activity, including careful consideration of how to grade it, how to make it a significant challenge, and how to frame the assignment so the activity is taken seriously by students and faculty peers. As many of the Istanbul participants commented, it is particularly important for the instructor to be clear (at least to himself or herself) about the goals and objectives for adventure learning activities, to provide for some form of reflection or de-

briefing, and to have a plan (perhaps even a rubric) for the way in which student work will be analyzed and/or assessed. With clear goals for the activity and reflection – even if these are not disclosed to the students until later – the instructor can facilitate student meaning-making from the experience. Disorienting activities in particular may risk appearing frivolous to others – at least at the outset – but grounding them in clear learning goals and assessment criteria can help ensure their relevance as well as their perceived legitimacy.

Conclusion

We believe, based on our own experiences as adventure learning participants and on the debriefing sessions and written data from the Istanbul and Washington, D.C. experiments, that adventure activities can offer powerful learning opportunities for negotiation students. Accordingly, they are well worth considering as a supplement to (not necessarily a replacement for) more traditional teaching tools such as role-plays and case analyses. Not all adventure learning activities are created equal, however, and negotiation instructors interested in using them should bear in mind the following:

- First, designing an “authentic” negotiation learning activity is not as simple as it may sound. There are many forms of authenticity – including environmental, behavioral, psychological, motivational, and developmental – and it would behoove instructors to consider which elements of authenticity would best serve the learning needs and goals for the particular group of participants.
- Second, a negotiation instructor may wish to consider the pros and cons of a more direct, explicit, “orienting” adventure learning activity (like the bazaar negotiations) versus a more indirect, oblique, “disorienting” learning activity (like the photography assignment). Why might an instructor choose one over the other? What are the implications of each, from a curriculum design perspective? In general, more direct, orienting activities seem to be more useful for prescriptive purposes (such as conscious attention to particular dynamics or deliberate application of certain skills), while more indirect, disorienting activities seem better-suited to descriptive purposes (such as assessing students’ ability to notice and/or act on organically emergent negotiations and negotiation opportunities).
- Third, an instructor should consider the best point or points in a course to incorporate adventure learning. Applied earlier

in a course, adventure learning can provide a baseline for assessing students' current capacities, ground the course content and provide a reference point to which students can connect concepts and theories learned later in the course, motivate students to learn more and improve their skills, and create a cohesive, relationship-building experience that can influence the class dynamic for the remainder of the course. Applied later in the course (perhaps as a capstone experience), it can offer opportunities to connect theory and practice, to assess students' abilities to transfer their learning from the classroom to the outside world, and to enrich students' understanding of various concepts and theories and the complexities of how they arise in authentic practice.

- Finally, regardless of how, when, or with whom an instructor uses adventure learning, he or she should have a clear set of learning goals in mind (whether or not these are made explicit to the students), along with a plan for debriefing or reflecting on the exercise. This helps ensure that the activity is a basis for learning, in addition to being a fun and perhaps relationship-building experience.

In sum, adventure education can offer different forms of authenticity depending on whether students are explicitly oriented to the activity's nature and purposes or whether they are intentionally disoriented through more oblique instructions. Negotiation educators can maximize the learning opportunities from these "authentic experiences" by tailoring their design and timing to fit the participants and their learning goals. No travel to Istanbul – "that fabled bridge between east and west" (Gloom 2005) – is required for orientation and disorientation, or for the adventure.

Notes

¹ By "role-play" we refer to an exercise in which two or more students are given instructions to assume certain facts, goals, and other information regarding a particular "role" – such as that of a buyer or seller – and are asked to negotiate with each other based on those instructions. While some role-plays are designed to be highly dynamic and complex – in some cases, directly connected with real-world events – most are relatively static in that students are bound by the instructions they are given, and somewhat predictable in that they are designed to elicit particular dynamics (though human factors ensure that they are never completely predictable) (see Weiss 2008). The term "role-plays" in this article refers to the latter form. For examples on negotiation-oriented role-play, see the Program on Negotiation Clearinghouse, <http://www.pon.org/catalog/index.php> (last visited May 14, 2010); and the Dispute Resolution Research Center,

<http://www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/drrc/teaching/index.htm> (last visited May 10, 2010).

² A multi-year effort to critique contemporary negotiation pedagogy and create new training designs, spearheaded by Hamline University School of Law in cooperation with the JAMS Foundation (www.jamsadr.com/jams-foundation), JAMS International ADR Center (Italy) (www.jamsadrcenter.com), and *Negotiation Journal*. This project – which pays particular attention to cultural considerations in the content and design of negotiation education – centers around a series of workshops for negotiation educators and practitioners in Rome, Istanbul, and Beijing; the October 2009 conference at Bilgi University in Istanbul was the second of the three. See http://law.hamline.edu/dispute_resolution/second_generation_negotiation.html.

³ Other concerns about role-play use stem from lack of empirical evidence regarding the transfer of in-class learning to authentic out-of-class negotiations (see Movius 2008) and culturally-situated assumptions about learning styles and preferences (see LeBaron and Patera 2009).

⁴ See generally, Istanbul Government (English) website <http://english.istanbul.gov.tr/> (last visited May 14, 2010). Both the Spice Bazaar (sometimes called the Egyptian Spice Bazaar or Mısır Çarşısı) and the Grand Bazaar (also known as the Covered Bazaar or Kapalıçarşı) are located in the historic center of Istanbul, on the European side of the Bosphorus, and are famed both for the variety of merchandise on offer and for the constant, overt bargaining processes (many items are not labeled with prices, particularly in the Grand Bazaar). The Spice Bazaar dates to the seventeenth century; the Grand Bazaar dates to the fifteenth century and is one of the oldest and largest continuously operating covered markets in the world. See <http://english.istanbul.gov.tr>.

⁵ Other researchers have demonstrated the significance of framing to the way in which participants are likely to interpret, approach, and experience the exercise: for instance, the framing of an iterated Prisoner's Dilemma game as "The Community Game" or "the Wall Street Game" was far more predictive of students' approach to the game than their perceived collaborative or competitive tendencies (see Ross and Ward 1996). Here, too, the framing was different: the trip to the bazaar was framed as a negotiation, while the photography activity was framed as a photography activity.

⁶ The six questions were: 1) Please answer the following as though you were a negotiation student who had just participated in the Day One adventure learning activity from Istanbul ("Negotiating the Grand Bazaar"), and were reflecting on the experience for your professor: What were two or three things you learned or had reinforced from your "Negotiating the Grand Bazaar" experience? 2) Please answer the following as though you were a negotiation student who had just participated in the Day Two adventure learning activity from Istanbul ("Negotiating Images of Istanbul" – the photography activity), and were reflecting on the experience for your professor: What were two or three things you learned or had reinforced from your "Negotiating Images of Istanbul" (photography activity) experience? 3) Now put your negotiation teacher hat on. What would be your primary pedagogical purpose(s) in assigning an activity comparable to the Day One adventure learning activity ("Negotiating the Grand Bazaar")? 4) Please

keep your negotiation teacher hat on. What would be your primary pedagogical purpose(s) in assigning an activity comparable to the Day Two adventure learning activity (“Negotiating Images of Istanbul” – i.e., the photography activity)? 5) How likely are you to use adventure learning in your negotiation teaching, and why/why not? 6) Please speculate as to what you think the biggest challenge would be for you to use adventure learning effectively in teaching negotiation.

⁷ This replicates one piece of the “dis-orienting” activity in Istanbul, which involved self-selecting groups, navigating to an unfamiliar neighborhood, taking a series of five to six themed photographs (one of which was to represent the intersection of the sacred and the secular; others involved themes such as a group self-portrait, the most dangerous thing the group saw, and the place most likely to be the Central Intelligence Agency headquarters in Istanbul); and changing at least one of the rules.

⁸ It is also possible that some students misunderstood the assignment, assuming that the reflection paper was the work product for the explicit negotiation activity and that the photograph itself was the work product for the more oblique photography activity. As these were not the instructions, however, it seems unlikely that twenty-eight out of thirty students had the same misunderstanding. More likely, at least some of them simply did not notice the intra-group negotiations over the photographs or did not consider them negotiations worth analyzing – though it became clear in the full-class debriefing sessions that multiple intra-group negotiations did occur.

⁹ As an example, one group in Istanbul experimented with a variation on Ian Ayres’ well-known study (Ayres 1991) on car dealerships in Chicago, where white male experimenters received the best (lowest) offers and black female experimenters received the worst (highest) offers. Members of the group – which was quite diverse in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, and national origin – separately approached the same Grand Bazaar stall to inquire about the price for the same carved wooden box, to find out whether they would receive different opening offers (see Schneider 2009). The group members’ familiarity with the Ayres research and curiosity about its cross-cultural implications undoubtedly contributed to this approach to the activity.

¹⁰ We thank Professor Clark Freshman of Hastings School of Law for this example, which he uses with his own negotiation students.

¹¹ For instance, a student might negotiate with a local restaurant for a \$20 gift certificate, in exchange for the dollar and a promise to distribute the restaurant’s takeout menus to the entire class (an idea inspired by a similar feat by Professor Robert Bordone of Harvard Law School, whom we gratefully acknowledge).

¹² Thanks again to Professor Clark Freshman of Hastings School of Law.

¹³ We thank Professor Andrea Schneider of Marquette University Law School for this example.

References

- Alexander, N. and M. LeBaron. 2009. Death of the role-play. In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. DePalo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- American Bar Association, Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar. July 1992. *Report of the Task Force on Law Schools and the Profession: Narrowing the Gap*. Available at <http://www.abanet.org/legaled/publications/onlinepubs/maccrate.html> (a.k.a. the MacCrate Report) (last accessed May, 14, 2010).
- Argyris, C. 1982. Reasoning, learning, and action: Individual and organizational. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ayres, I. 1991. Fair driving: Gender and race discrimination in retail car negotiations. *Harvard Law Review* 104: 817-872.
- Barab, S. A., K. D. Squire, and W. Dueber. 2000. A co-evolutionary model for supporting the emergence of authenticity. *Educational Technology Research and Development* 48: 37-62.
- Barton, K., P. McKellar, and P. Maharg. 2007-2008. Authentic fictions: Simulation, professionalism and legal learning. *Clinical Law Review* 14(1): 143-93.
- Brown, J. S. and P. Duguid. 2000. *The social life of information*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Brown, J. S., A. Collins, and P. Duguid. 1989. Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher* 18(1): 32-41.
- Buntz, C. G. and D. L. Carper. 1987. A conflict management curriculum in business and public administration. *Negotiation Journal* 3(2): 191-204.
- Crampton, A. and M. Manwaring. 2008. Reality and artifice in teaching negotiation: The variable benefits of "keeping it real" in simulations. *Teaching Negotiation* 2(1) (copies accessible at <http://tinyurl.com/ye4ywzx>) (last accessed May 14, 2010).
- Dewey, J. 1938/1997. *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Touchstone.
- Doering, A. 2006. Adventure learning: Transformative hybrid online education. *Distance Education* 27(2): 197-215.
- Doering, A. Adventure learning: Situating learning in an authentic context. *Innovate* 3(6). Available at <http://www.innovateonline.info/index.php?view=article&id=342> (last accessed May 14, 2010).
- Doolittle, P. E. 1997. Vygotsky's zone of proximal development as a theoretical foundation for cooperative learning. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* 8(1): 83-103.
- Driscoll, M. P. 2004. *Psychology of learning for instruction*, 3rd edn. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ebner, N. and Y. Efron. 2005. Using tomorrow's headlines for today's training: Creating pseudoreality in conflict resolution simulation games. *Negotiation Journal* 21(3): 377-394.
- Fortgang, R. 2000. Taking stock: An analysis of negotiation pedagogy across four professional fields. *Negotiation Journal* 16(4): 325-338.

- Fosnot, C. T. (ed). 2005. *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice*. 2nd edn. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Friedman, V. J. and R. Lipshitz. 1992. Teaching people to shift cognitive gears: Overcoming resistance on the road to Model II. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 28(1): 188-136.
- "Gloom with a view," review of *Istanbul*, by Orhan Pamuk. *Economist* (April 19, 2005) 375:71.
- Herrington, A. and J. Herrington. 2005. *Authentic learning environments in higher education*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing.
- Houde, J. 2007. Analogically situated experiences: Creating insights through novel contexts. *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 6: 321-331.
- Kenworthy, A. L. 2010. Service-learning and negotiation: An educational "win-win." *Journal of Management Education* 34(1): 62-87.
- Koo, G. 2007. *New skills, new learning: Legal education and the promise of technology*. Berkman Center for Internet and Society Research Publication Series, No. 2007-4. Available at http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/publications/2007/New_Skills_New_Learning (last accessed May 14, 2010).
- Kovach, K. 2009. Culture, cognition, and learning preferences, In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. DePalo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Lave, J. and E. Wenger. 1991. *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- LeBaron, M. and M. Patera. 1999. Reflective practice in the new millennium. In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. DePalo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Lempereur, A. P. 2004. Innovation in teaching negotiation: Toward a relevant use of multimedia tools. *International Negotiation* 9(1): 141-160.
- Lewicki, R. J. 1999. Teaching negotiation and dispute resolution in colleges of business: The state of the practice and challenges for the future. In *Teaching negotiation: Ideas and innovations*, edited by M. Wheeler. Cambridge, MA: PON Books. Originally published in 1999 in *Negotiation eclectics: Essays in memory of Jeffrey Z. Rubin*, edited by D. Kolb. Cambridge, MA: PON Books.
- McAdoo, B. and M. Manwaring. 2009. Teaching for implementation: Designing negotiation curricula to maximize long-term learning. *Negotiation Journal* 25(2): 195-215.
- Movius, H. 2008. The effectiveness of negotiation training. *Negotiation Journal* 24(4): 509-531.
- National Research Council. 1999. *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*, edited by J. Bransford, A. Brown, and R. Cocking. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Patton, B. 2009. The deceptive simplicity of teaching negotiation: Reflections on thirty years of the negotiation workshop. *Negotiation Journal* 25(4): 481-498.

- Peterson, R. A. 2005. In search of authenticity. *Journal of Management Studies* 42(5): 1083-1098.
- Petraglia, J. 1998. *Reality by design: The rhetoric and technology of authenticity in education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Prouty, D., J. Panicucci, and R. Collinson. 2007. *Adventure education: Theory and applications*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Reeves, T. C., J. Herrington, and R. Oliver. 2002. Authentic activities and online learning. In *Quality Conversations: Proceedings of the 25th HERDSA [Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia] Annual Conference, Perth, Western Australia, 7-10 July 2002*: 562-567.
- Ross, L., and A. Ward. 1996. Naïve realism: Implications for social conflict and misunderstanding. In *Values and knowledge*, edited by T. Brown, E. Reed, and E. Turiel. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schneider, A. 2009. Does the Ayres study work in Istanbul? *ADR Prof Blog*. Available at <http://www.indisputably.org/?p=622> (last accessed May 14, 2010).
- Spoormans, H., J. Cohen, and J. Moust. 1981. The course on negotiation at the faculty of law, University of Limburg, Maastricht, The Netherlands. *Negotiation Journal* 7(3): 331-337.
- Sullivan, W., A. Colby, J. Wegner, L. Bond, and L. Shulman. 2007. *Educating lawyers: Preparation for the profession of law (a.k.a. the "Carnegie Report")*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Susskind, L. E. and J. Corburn. 1999. Using simulations to teach negotiation: Pedagogical theory and practice. In *Teaching negotiation: Ideas and innovations*, edited by M. Wheeler. Cambridge, MA: PON Books.
- Taylor, D. 1994. Inauthentic authenticity or authentic inauthenticity? *TESL-EJ* 1(2): A-1.
- Volkema, R. J. 2007. Negotiating for money: Adding a dose of reality to classroom negotiations. *Negotiation Journal* 23(4): 473-485.
- Vygotsky, L. S. 1978. *Mind in society: The development of higher mental processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Webster's II New College Dictionary*. 1999. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Weiss, S. E. 2008. Mega-simulations in negotiation teaching: Extraordinary investments with extraordinary benefits. *Negotiation Journal* 24(3): 325 - 353.
- Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wheeler, M. 2006. Is teaching negotiation too easy, too hard, or both? *Negotiation Journal* 22(2): 187-197.
- Whetten, D. A. 2007. Principles of effective course design: What I wish I had known about learner-centered teaching 30 years ago. *Journal of Management Education* 31: 339-357.
- Williams, G. R. and J. M. Geis. 1999. Negotiation skills training in the law school curriculum. In *Negotiation eclectics: Essays in memory of Jeffrey Z. Rubin*, edited by D. Kolb. Cambridge, MA: PON Books.
- Wilson, A. L. 1993. The promise of situated cognition. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* 57: 71-79.
- Young, M. F. 1993. Instructional design for situated learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development* 41(1): 43-58.

