



Bringing Negotiation Teaching to Life: From the Classroom to the Campus to the Community

*Lynn P. Cohn & Noam Ebner**

Editors' Note: Taking your students to the Grand Bazaar of Istanbul, Cohn and Ebner point out, is educational all right, but it is expensive. So they turn their attention to what might be done with adventure learning in the immediate environment of a university. A whole menu of options, it turns out, is readily available.

Introduction

Negotiation, by its very nature, is a practical endeavor. It is a real-world phenomenon, encountered and practiced numerous times in the course of a single day.¹ Reflecting this, negotiation pedagogy always maintains a bridge connecting what is being taught in the classroom with the world students encounter outside of it. Depending on teaching goals, this bridge might be considered a major element of the curriculum (such as in an executive training course) or a less significant one (such as in a course focusing primarily on negotiation theory); but it is always there.

Various teaching methods are used to relate negotiation theories and concepts to real-life situations, such as case studies, eliciting of stories from students' own experiences, analysis of current events or of scenes from television series or popular movies, and other techniques. However, no single method enjoys the same widespread use as that of the simulated negotiation referred to as a "role-play."² ^{2a}

* **Lynn P. Cohn** is the director of the Program on Negotiations and Mediation and a clinical associate professor of law at the Northwestern University School of Law in Chicago, Illinois. Her email address is l-cohn@law.northwestern.edu. **Noam Ebner** is an assistant professor at the Werner Institute at Creighton University's School of Law, where he chairs the online masters program in Negotiation and Dispute Resolution. His email address is noamebner@creighton.edu.

In addition to their value for mediating between theory and reality, role-plays are valued by negotiation teachers for a variety of reasons, including their contribution to concept learning and to student interest and motivation.

However important these goals of role-play might be, the common wisdom that role-play is the *best* method to satisfy these aims has been critiqued from different perspectives in recent years (see Ebner and Kovach, *Simulation 2.0*, in this volume). These include challenges from inside the world of negotiation pedagogy, such as Nadja Alexander and Michelle LeBaron's (2009) critique. They noted (among other issues) the cultural challenges and implications of assuming another's identity; student resistance to role-play for a number of reasons; the difficulty of disassociating one's self from the experience; and the challenge of transferring the experience to real life (Alexander and LeBaron 2009). Additional challenges emerge from the wider literature on use of simulation as an educational tool in the social sciences, where extensive research shows that while role-play certainly delivers the goods in terms of student motivation, the actual *content learning* benefits teachers tend to associate with simulation do not play out in reality (Druckman and Ebner 2008; also see Druckman and Ebner, *Enhancing Concept Learning*, in this volume); students' understanding of concepts they learn through simulation is no better than, for example, the understanding they gain from a classroom lecture.

While it is unlikely – and inadvisable – that role-play would be completely banished from the negotiation teaching agenda as a result of the critique mentioned above (this point is elaborated on by Ebner and Kovach, *Simulation 2.0*, in this volume), the challenge of moving forward and exploring new ways to augment and support the gains of simulation with other types of learning is intriguing. Alexander and LeBaron suggested that teachers begin using a wider array of experiential learning methods, particularly the use of “adventure learning” modules. Adventure learning in the context of negotiation teaching can be defined as participation in a real negotiation experience rather than a simulated role play, coupled with the opportunity to reflect and debrief the experience following the negotiation.

We agree that the resources currently dedicated to simulation should be shared between a wider range of methods. In this chapter, models of learning that allow participants to have *authentic* experiences in real life contexts are suggested. Particularly, we will focus on the use of adventure learning for bridging theory to practice and preparing students for competence in their future interactions.

Adventure learning in negotiation might take on many forms; it could be a direct negotiation assignment, such as the “Go out to the Bazaar and negotiate for something” instructions given to the participants in the Istanbul Rethinking Negotiation Teaching conference in October 2009. Alternatively, it might be assigning students to a task that obliquely engages them in implementing and reflecting on concepts related to negotiation, such as team building, collaboration, emotions and trust. Common examples of such indirect activities might be a ropes course or a survival mission.

In this chapter, we will explore incorporating adventure learning into a course offered in any higher educational setting including a business school, law school, undergraduate or graduate program.³ The goal is to create a menu of adventures that complement and reinforce the learning in such classes. The following categories of learning modules range from adding some adventure to classroom experiences to ranging outside of the classroom setting to the campus or surrounding community:

- 1) A classroom experience with real implications for the student;
- 2) A role play set in a real-world setting, in which students engage with professional negotiation opposites;
- 3) An assignment in which students negotiate for themselves;
- 4) An assignment that involves the student applying a key concept from the course out-of-class;
- 5) An opportunity to observe or participate in real-life negotiations of others; or
- 6) An out-of-class experience not involving negotiating directly but which allows the student to transfer learning from the adventure to their understanding of negotiations.

In crafting activities involving adventure learning, we suggest looking at venues and resources close at hand. While taking your students to Istanbul’s Grand Bazaar might be a wonderful idea, few institutions have the resources to permit such a trip; moreover, for adventure learning to be practical and motivating, the focus should be on participating in the exercise rather than on costly travel to a distant location. And, as it turns out, the average university campus and surrounding community offer multiple venues and opportunities for adventure learning. Providing students with close-at-hand training grounds, by means of changing the way they approach familiar surroundings and interactions, is likely to heighten motivation, in addition to reducing the investment of time and effort necessary to participate in the activity.

Creating Real Implications for Classroom Experiences

When involved in a traditional role play simulation, students take on the interests, character and judgment of a fictitious persona. Students report that the separation of themselves from the person they portray at times allows them to avoid responsibility for the judgment calls which they make on this other's behalf: "While I would never have done that, my role allowed or even encouraged that choice." Being in character may also give students the sense that extreme bargaining choices and ethical calls do not have significant consequences since the negotiation "was not real." The fact that role plays typically involve outcomes with pretend benefits and losses furthers this disconnect. Some teachers use a range of methods to incorporate a dose of real-world stick-and-carrot in simulations.⁴

Below, we take this further, suggesting that teachers overcome this disassociation from the negotiation experience by augmenting their curriculum with small, but real, negotiation experiences that have real implications for the students and in which they must act on their own behalf, right there in the classroom.⁵ If course participants actually experience the consequences of their decisions, they may engage more authentically in both the negotiation and the learning that flows from the exercise.

Negotiating for Food/Drink

Every teacher knows the value of providing food and drink to the class. Students are notorious for always being hungry, thirsty and broke. Allowing the students to negotiate over food and drink choices to be enjoyed during the class provides an immediate sense of what good negotiation skills can accomplish (Press and Honeyman, *Second Dive into Adventure Learning*, in this volume).

In the *Trading Up* negotiation created by Jay Folberg, participants value what different food items in the drink, candy, fruit and pizza categories are worth to them based on their own preferences. Items from these categories are then randomly distributed to the students and they are then allowed to engage in several rounds of negotiation with an increasing number of counterparts each round. Following the final round, each student can see how they were able to increase the value of their items through the process of negotiation.

Negotiating a Team Contract

Negotiation courses often involve team exercises or projects. For example, in the Negotiation Workshop at Northwestern University School of Law, participants work in teams of six throughout the semester to explore a key negotiation concept which must be tested outside of class, written up and presented to the class. Invariably

team members complain that others did not carry their weight in terms of ideas, work and time invested in the assignment.

Leigh Thompson, an expert on effective teams, has created a team contract which can be used by students to commit to expectations about team members' behavior and consequences for breach of the contract (Thompson 2007). Underlying this contract is the notion that as students themselves design and impose the consequences, the repercussions of failing to live up to the agreement might be more effective than externally decided penalties. Examples of consequences students agree on include grade penalties or the obligation to feed the group.

Negotiating for Your Grade

Some teachers try to bring home the insights of the negotiation course in a very direct way: by having students negotiate for their grades. One teacher shared that for the students' final project in his negotiation course, he has students negotiate with each other, in groups of three to five, over the number of points they will each receive for the final project itself. As the final project is worth about thirty percent of the final course grade, students' negotiation skills can significantly impact their overall course grade. To drive home the point that sometimes in the real world, to counter-phrase an old adage, "it's not how you play the game, it's whether you win or lose," students are not graded on the negotiation skill they display – but they are awarded the amount of points agreed on, directly reaping their negotiation outcome.

A different take on this type of activity was reported by Roger Volkema. Rather than have students negotiate with each other, he had them negotiate with him, their teacher, for their grades (Volkema 1991).⁶

In order to be true learning opportunities, we suggest that these experiences must be accompanied by a debrief process reflecting on what transpired and what might be learned from that. If not, this is simply a real-life negotiation.

Role Playing with an External Opposite

Participants in a negotiation course get to know each other very well throughout the class. They become comfortable with each others' negotiating styles. Sending students to participate in an exercise with a counterpart who is not a classmate can add an element of surprise and the unknown to the negotiation experience.

While there are ways to do this that are simply enhancing the role-play (such as having students negotiate with students from an-

other class, or another university; see Ebner and Kovach, *Simulation 2.0*, in this volume), other approaches might upgrade this into a more effective learning exercise with higher degrees of realism and motivation. For example, law students can be assigned to negotiate the role-play with a real lawyer from the surrounding community.⁷ While the scenario is still technically a role play, the fact that the students will go to a law firm, government office or other professional setting to meet with a stranger with more exposure to the real world gives the experience an importance and authenticity which is different from in-class exercises. Multiple real-world motivations are triggered: facing the challenge, succeeding at a challenging task and achieving or maintaining “face” vis-à-vis the professional, the teacher or the rest of the class.

This type of exercise can be an effective last class experience for students for a number of reasons. First, students, perhaps mistakenly, often believe that professionals who have graduated and been in the workforce will be effective negotiators regardless of their training or approach. Thus, facing them as counterparts is a great challenge and confidence builder. For some, seeing good negotiators in action creates a desire to continue to develop their negotiation skills as a professional. Other students come to the realization that as a result of their skills coupled with their understanding of negotiation theory, they are far ahead of those with work experience who negotiate without this understanding or training.

Using Students' Real-Life Negotiations

Negotiation teachers routinely remind students that negotiations are constantly occurring in their lives. Some teachers encourage students to bring their real life negotiations to class in order to create or drive home this relevance. This might be done by inviting students to present stories that will be used as learning opportunities for the class. Another, more structured approach might be to start each class with a student report on a real negotiation in order to reinforce how the learning can be practically applied. By having students prepare for and analyze these actual negotiations just as they do the simulations, the opportunity is more likely to ensure that the students will be able to apply the principles learned in the classroom beyond the context of the simulation in which the principles were first learned. The following is just a partial list of the types of real life negotiations that many students face:

- 1) Negotiating with a landlord or Housing Office
- 2) Negotiating with a roommate over coexisting
- 3) Negotiating with students on a class project

- 4) Negotiating with the school administration regarding a policy or decision
- 5) Negotiating with a student group regarding a policy or decision
- 6) Negotiating with the Financial Aid Office
- 7) Negotiating with a future employer
- 8) Negotiating with a business for a donation, discount or benefit

Alternatively, some teachers use these real life experiences as a basis for a written assignment, in which students analyze their own negotiation using the principles learned in class.

While these are worthy exercises in their own right, they are not in our opinion “adventure learning” unless a stronger tie-in is created between the real-life negotiation and the classroom discussion. One way to do this is to follow a student’s story presentation and class discussion with the class offering specific recommendations. The storyteller might choose to adopt a certain course of action based on these recommendations, and volunteer to tell the class, in the next lesson, how this played out in reality. The second session will include a discussion of the effect the chosen actions had on the negotiation dynamics. We would recommend that teachers using such a method add on a very clear caveat, warning students not to conduct experiments on issues that are of significant importance to them.

Designing a Real Negotiation Experience to Challenge a Student

The typical negotiation course sets out clear learning objectives for the class. Once these goals are identified, a syllabus is created to achieve these learning targets. Requiring that students go out into the world to practice and apply the key learning concepts will provide an enjoyable, practical and most likely memorable experience, a true “adventure.”

However, motivation is only one of the pedagogical reasons justifying this type of adventure learning. Here are some other considerations that in our experience tip the scales in favor of incorporating at least some adventure learning activities into a negotiation course:

- The progression formed, presenting students with incrementally challenging situations – learning skills in class, practicing them in theory (on paper or in class discussion), trying them out on each other in simulations and, finally, taking the opportunity to practice these skills in the real world.

- The saving of in-class time by assigning out-of-class activities. This type of exercise is easy to set up and conduct between lessons without sacrificing class time.
- The degree of empowerment students often undergo by seeing the concepts play out in real life. In our experience, even if a student's real-world attempt turned out to be unsuccessful, their newfound ability to explain *why* they were not successful in the interaction has positive effect.
- The opportunity for group-building (a powerful side-effect of real-world experiences on classmates). Students often self-organize into pairs or small groups to gain support and motivation for engaging in these activities. Teachers can encourage or require this.

In this section we will suggest three ways of structuring this type of activity:

- 1) An activity in which students experience a particular course concept or a specific element of negotiation;
- 2) An activity in which students practice a particular negotiation skill; and
- 3) An activity in which students engage in a full-blown real-life negotiation process for the purpose of learning from the adventure.

1) Experiencing and exploring individual course concepts

This type of assignment requires that students engage in an interaction in which they will experience and manage a key lesson from the curriculum. For example, if the desired teaching goal is to teach students that money is not the only, or even the main, interest in all negotiations, have them go out for lunch in teams without any money. To amplify the challenge, students could be instructed that they may not disclose that they are doing this for a class. If the desired teaching goal is to have them explore the value of understanding the other's point of view before being understood, ask them to identify a problem or decision that they are facing with someone in their lives. They should plan to schedule a session with this person during which they may not speak about their own perspective, but rather listen to where the other is coming from and reflect back on their understanding. In the class debrief, the instructor could explore how the students' understanding of the situation changed and whether new approaches for dealing with the situation emerged. Just as important, students could identify their own feelings during the listening session as well as any challenges.⁸

2) Practicing specific skills

Teachers can identify very specific micro-skills or micro-dynamics for students to practice in the real world. For example, if you want to have students practice assertive behavior – including its potential positive and negative effects – have students go to a restaurant and return something they ordered to the kitchen, or make a phone complaint to a service provider.⁹ Roger Volkema (2007) described an activity in which he gave students a package of sponges he bought – and instructed them to attempt to return them, without a receipt, to a retail store – without knowing where the sponges had been bought. Students went to a store of their choosing, which in all likelihood was *not* where the sponges had been purchased, and attempted to return the sponges.¹⁰

Alternatively, it might be something you can send students out to do, on campus, in a thirty to forty-five minute timeframe in the middle of class. For example, if you want to have them practice asking for concessions, assign them to ask someone standing at a photocopying machine if they can cut ahead of them for just a few pages. If you want them to practice information gathering, assign them all to engage a stranger in conversation and learn three things about the other.

Another advantage of incorporating the real-world practice of individual skills in our classes is that this type of assignment can be tailored to suit the needs of individual students. Ideally, students in negotiation courses are encouraged to reflect on their individual strengths and challenges throughout the course. Some of these attributes are evident from their pre-class lives and some emerge as they learn to apply the negotiation theory presented in the class. Along these lines, in the spirit of full adventure learning, negotiation teachers and students could partner to create individualized challenges to address the participant's learning needs.

There are a number of approaches to designing individualized challenges. The instructor could meet with each student in order to explore specific needs and options. Alternatively, the students could partner with each other and as an assignment, identify each other's needs, create the challenge, and provide a written analysis of how it worked.

To illustrate the concept of individualized challenges, let us meet Christine, an undergraduate student enrolled in a twelve-week negotiation workshop. Christine is proficient at creating rapport, exchanging information and breaking impasse once negotiations are underway. She reports that she is uncomfortable negotiating with counterparts who raise their voices, interrupt her or put her on the

spot with questions or tough bargaining. In the challenge creation phase, exploring her history with these behaviors and their impact on her negotiation choices would be helpful. Identifying alternative strategies and coping techniques is key. At this point, Christine identifies people in her life who display the behaviors that stress her. Her challenge is to approach one of them with a request and implement an alternative approach when faced with the other's challenging behavior. The experience can then be debriefed in an individual session with her teacher or assignment partner and perhaps the whole class.

Students are always asking for more feedback on their individual skills and judgments in their negotiations. The concept of personalized challenges meets this request head on. Students examine themselves as people and negotiators and work to reach a new level of effectiveness.

Christine's example calls attention to another element always present, to one degree or another, in adventure learning – risk. Interacting with a real counterpart raises the stakes considerably. The outcome of the interaction has implications well beyond the classroom and into the future, for better or worse (see also Honeyman and Coben, *Half-Way to a Second Generation*, in this volume).

3) Negotiating for the adventure: whole-process activities

A structured way to have students bring negotiations they conduct in the real world into the learning process would be in the form of an ongoing assignment. Ask students to commit, a few lessons into the class, to holding a particular negotiation, which they will engage in as a class requirement. They will have to submit a brief write-up of the context/situation for approval ahead of time (this will enable the teacher to evaluate that it is an interaction of suitable scope and meaning for the purposes of the assignment on the one hand, and to conduct a risk assessment on the other). The chosen negotiation might be one of the student-typical interactions noted in the previous section, or any other: at work, at home, with a mobile phone provider or credit card company, etc. You might ask them to announce their intentions in class (although, depending on the nature of the proposals, you might exempt some of them for personal reasons, or just skip this step altogether).

Depending on how much time you consider suitable to devote to this adventure exercise, or have available for this purpose, you might then assign students to conduct a breakdown of strategy analysis and negotiation elements as preparation, either in a one-page paper, in a small group discussion or in a five to ten minute presentation to the whole class. Students can be given a time frame in which to

conduct these negotiations, ranging from “by the next lesson” to “over the course of the next three weeks” or so. Finally, students will have to conduct a post-negotiation analysis, in the form of a paper or a class presentation. This structure might be expanded or reduced, based on the number of students in class, time available, etc.

This teacher-initiated adventure-negotiation might turn out to be much more valuable than a semi-structured, ad-hoc “case-study” of a story a student decided to raise in class, or a “choose a negotiation you’ve experienced and write about it” assignment – due to the degree of mindfulness and deliberation involved in the planning, consulting, implementation and debrief.

An Opportunity to Observe or Participate in the Negotiations of Others

Once students are grounded in negotiation theory, the opportunity to understand its application is invaluable. One method used in many educational contexts, but less so in the negotiation context, is giving students the opportunity to learn from watching and participating in the negotiations of professionals. For example, doctors, therapists and teachers must complete internships or student teaching which provides them with real life experience and the support of an expert in the field.

This observation need not take place over a long period of time; watching even one negotiation could be meaningful. Students could be given the opportunity to observe a settlement conference or mediation in order to examine the application of negotiation skills in the dispute context. On the deal side, witnessing a real estate agent work through the sale of a house from start to finish would bring many necessary skills to light, as would sitting behind the one-way glass in a police interrogation room or a used-car dealership.

A truly novel learning prospect would involve connecting students to groups or individuals in need of negotiation expertise who cannot afford to obtain such assistance in the marketplace. On the dispute side, this could be accomplished in a mediation advocacy clinic like that at Hamline University School of Law, where law students provide free representation to alleged victims of employment discrimination in cases where the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has offered early intervention mediation. To obtain experience negotiating transactions, students could partner with small business clinics like that at Northwestern University School of Law, or local centers that provide professional advice.

Facilitating Negotiation Insights From “Non-Negotiation” Activities

The study of how people negotiate has crossed into many disciplines including psychology, neurology, physiology and biology. Clearly, there are many experiences which may not directly involve negotiating which can offer insight into negotiation.

Professor Leonard Riskin has challenged participants in his classes and workshops to become mindful of their feelings and thoughts (Riskin 2009). He gives each class participant a raisin and invites them to experience the raisin on various levels for a period of time. This awareness of the raisin’s texture, feel, taste and appearance makes the experience of eating the raisin surprisingly rich. This experience opens the group up to a discussion regarding how individuals experience the practice of negotiation, mediation or conflict resolution in terms of self-awareness. Professor Riskin encourages the class to use mindfulness in their negotiation and mediation practices.

Similarly, those who are able to incorporate meditation and breathing techniques into their negotiation practice may have an advantage in terms of patience, endurance and dealing with emotions. Yet, these practices are far from ubiquitous in the average negotiation course. Or, perhaps, we are just looking at the wrong side of the world.

Several articles have done comparative analysis of how negotiation relates to other creative disciplines. For example, our esteemed colleague Judge Jack Cooley examined what jazz music (Cooley 2007) and magic (Cooley 1997) could teach about best practices in negotiation and mediation. Ranse Howell, a negotiation specialist based in London who also happens to be a professional ballroom dancer, has explored the connection between learning how to dance and learning how to negotiate (see Howell and Cohn, *Two to Tango*, in this volume).

Students are likely to come forward with similarly creative suggestions, once this idea has been broached with them. While you might not be qualified or inclined to expound on any of these, you might consider having students conduct their own adventure learning experience regarding them. For example, if a class discussion identifies three to four different fields/disciplines/activities which students connect metaphorically or practically to negotiation, you can then ask them to divide into groups according to these activities. Students will choose to participate in the group whose topic interests them the most. The group will plan an activity involving that other field and participate in it. For example, if students raise martial arts as a related field, they could go to an aikido lesson. Fi-

nally, each group would then hold a discussion drawing parallels between the activity and negotiation concepts.

Conclusion

Surely this article only scratches the surface of the possible adventure learning opportunities that negotiation teachers can include in their courses. Adventure learning also requires that we be adventure *teachers*, with a willingness to let go of a rigid script and to go with the flow of authentic experiences and validation of feelings inherent in this model. As we open up to the concept of adventure, the journey will take us away from controlled content, out of the classroom and into disciplines where negotiation courses have dared go not.

Notes

¹ That is not to say that the field of negotiation lacks a theoretical body of knowledge. Rather, we argue that negotiation theory, which has provided us with numerous perspectives on how to capture this type of human interaction in frameworks and models, is, for the main part, grounded in observations of practice, and ultimately aimed towards improving practice.

² Interestingly, this prevalence of role-play holds true even in courses purporting to be purely theoretical, and not focused on skill-building – in such courses, educators use role-play to advance conceptual understanding by immersing students in a real-life, albeit simulated, experience in which these concepts play out. In courses focused on skill-building, it seems almost redundant to comment on the degree to which simulations fill this theory-to-practice role.

^{2a} In this chapter, we use the terms “simulation” and “role-play” as generic references to experiential-learning-oriented activities, commonly labeled “simulations,” “games,” “simulation-games” and “role-play.” While the literature on simulation and gaming differentiates between various terms (see Crookall, Oxford, and Saunders 1987), the literature on negotiation, for the most part, does not. Our usage of the terms is not intended to influence the debate on the way these activities are conducted or the delineation between them.

³ We are focusing on this setting due to the wide degree of latitude and teacher discretion it provides, and – as we shall stress – the ready-made training-ground provided by the university campus. In the non-academic setting, such as the executive training workshop, more thought and experimentation needs to be done regarding the method’s suitability and possibilities for its implementation; we hope to address that in a successor edition to this book. Open questions include what potential adventure learning modules might look like in such a time-condensed training setting, whether including such modules will affect the popularity or marketability

of such trainings, and how facilitators can be sure that key concepts are covered.

⁴ One easily incorporated approach to creating small consequences for negotiation choices involves upgrading simulations into something with real consequences by means of rewarding students who performed well in their simulations with in-class perks (such as scheduling priority or the opportunity to dictate the snack for the following session). One instructor allows students to pick from a gift bag which typically contains a mix of gag gifts and books or calculators that might be useful in future negotiations. This system creates an enjoyable and positive association with negotiation choices and injects a reflection of real-world motivation into the simulation environment. Another teacher offers \$10 to each of the two best-performing individual students in a simulation. As the simulation regards distribution of money, this reward is an even closer reflection of the simulated negotiation outcome. Negotiation choices also result in negative consequences and the possibility of penalties associated with those choices could also be employed. Possible penalties include requiring a student to collect or distribute material, bring a snack, or report on an outside reading. We are not aware of any faculty using such a direct penalty approach. However, Volkema (2007) describes a series of activities running through his course in which students do pay a symbolic price for poor outcomes. And, as we shall discuss, some teachers create systems in which students lose out as a result of poor negotiation – not as a penalty, but simply as they did not achieve their goal. Of course, the instructor must determine what behaviors or outcomes warrant the perk or penalty. A student who uncovers her counterpart's interests through good questions and active listening would be a candidate for a perk while a student who makes unwarranted concessions might warrant a penalty. Yet there are often many potential "right" or "wrong" choices in a given negotiation, depending on the context created by the parties. One option is to allow the class to vote on who they learned the most from each week, whether from a good or poor judgment call. Another is to focus on negotiation outcome. Still a third is to have each simulation observed by a scorer, who would be instructed to award points for certain moves and tactics. For other ways of adding real-life motivation into a simulated exercise (for example, through the simple method of grading students on their performance and outcomes and including this as part of their overall course grade), see Coben, Honeyman, and Press, *Straight Off the Deep End*, in this volume.

⁵ While not "true" adventure learning as per the definition above, this is somewhere in between adventure learning and role-play. The real-life ramifications of the role-play are intended to mobilize reactions and thinking patterns that would characterize real-life interactions – even if these are only implemented on a reflection of a real-life interaction.

⁶ In this article, Volkema discusses many issues that came up in his experiments with negotiating for grades: the power differential between teacher and students, the need to be very clear on the negotiated agreements, issues

of fairness, the tendency of students to delay having the negotiation and more (Volkema 1991). In addition, he discusses other issues such as the ethical ramifications of involving unwitting third parties in adventure learning (e.g., a landlord with whom a student is assigned to negotiate, without a real intent to rent) that are relevant both to his chapter and to others in this book.

⁷ Of course, this exercise involves the teacher securing the assistance of quite a few external participants. This assignment would certainly be an easier proposition in small classes as opposed to larger ones. Teachers might send a call out to alumni practicing locally, or assign a teaching assistant the task of tracking down and securing assistance. The number of lawyers needed might be cut in half if the teacher asks them if they would agree to conduct a role-play twice. Another possibility is designing a role-play in which the story-line incorporates a party with two participants (e.g., husband and wife, two business partners, etc.) negotiating with a second party flying solo (the lawyer); designing a three-party negotiation simulation, in which students play two roles and the lawyer a third, is yet another option. Another approach is to have the students do the legwork – assigning them to find a local lawyer or businessperson to negotiate with. In our experience, this usually works quite well; the teacher’s administrative role is reduced to approving the opposites, once students bring in their agreement, and sending out role information. Sometimes, the teacher will need to use her own network to land opposites for a few students who were unable to secure one for themselves. But the approach to “opposites” could itself be structured as a gradable exercise.

⁸ Of course, this exercise could be – and in most courses, is – done with classmates; however, experiencing the benefits and challenges of active listening in a conflict that is impacting the student’s life will surely be more meaningful and a next step towards capacity to implement this tool naturally in unplanned interactions.

⁹ Doubtless, some of the suggestions we made here have ethical dimensions. We are detailing specific activities just for examples of what could be done, without taking a stance on what *should* be done. For an overview of ethics challenges, hopefully many of which will be systematically addressed in book three of this multi-year project, see Honeyman and Coben, *Half-Way to a Second Generation*, in this volume.

¹⁰ “Students achieved a range of outcomes, including some who obtained a refund higher than what Volkema had originally paid!” (Volkema 2007: 479).

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. De Palo. St Paul, MN: DRI Press.

- Cooley, J. 1997. Mediation magic: Its use and abuse. *Loyola University Chicago Law Journal* 29: 1-75.
- Cooley, J. 2007. Mediation, improvisation, and all that jazz. *Journal of Dispute Resolution* 2007: 305-385.
- Crookall, D., R. Oxford and D. Saunders. 1987. Towards a reconceptualization of simulation: From representation to reality. *Simulation/Games for Learning* 17(4): 147-170.
- Druckman, D. and N. Ebner. 2008. Onstage, or behind the scenes? Relative learning benefits of simulation role-play and design. *Simulation & Gaming* 39(4): 465-497.
- Folberg, J., D. Golann, L. Koppenberg, and T. Stipanowich. 2005. *Resolving disputes: Theory, practice, and law*. New York: Aspen Publishers.
- Riskin, L. 2009. Awareness and ethics in dispute resolution and law: Why mindfulness tends to foster ethical behavior. *Texas Law Review* 50: 493-503.
- Thompson, L. 2007. *Making the team: A guide for managers*, 3rd edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Volkema, R.J. 1991. Negotiating for grades: Theory into reality in the classroom. *Journal of Management Education* 15(1): 46-57.
- Volkema, R. 2007. Negotiating for money: Adding a dose of reality to classroom negotiations. *Negotiation Journal* 23(4): 473-485.