

A Look at a Negotiation 2.0 Classroom: Using Adventure Learning Modules to Supplement Negotiation Simulations

*Salvador S. Panga, Jr. and Gwen B. Grecia-de Vera**

Editors' Note: Panga and Grecia-de Vera analyze initial experiences with adventure learning from a Philippine perspective. They conclude that in a number of ways, the experimental exercises showed serious flaws – and yet demonstrated the potential of adventure learning to provide authenticity, risk, challenge, and context.

“All...by nature desire to know. An indication of this is the delight we take in our senses; for even apart from their usefulness they are beloved for themselves....With a view to action, experience seems in no respect inferior to art, and men of experience succeed even better than those who have theory without experience.” (Aristotle)

Introduction

One highlight of the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching conference in Istanbul was the introduction of adventure learning activities, which we took as forming part of “Negotiation 2.0 Apps” – pedagogical applications that may be used whether in relation to Negotiation 1.0 or 2.0 theory and practice. The conference organizers explained that these activities were designed in response to the conference outcome in Rome¹ the previous year. While conference participants appeared

* **Salvador S. Panga, Jr.** is secretary general of the Philippine Dispute Resolution Center, Inc. His email address is sspanga@phpeplaw.com. **Gwen B. Grecia-de Vera** is director of the Institute of International Legal Studies and an assistant professor at the University of the Philippines College of Law. Her email address is ggdevera@up.edu.ph.

to have enjoyed the trip to the Spice Market and being accompanied to various places of interest in Istanbul, some have expressed a variety of concerns about employing adventure learning in negotiation training. (See the other chapters in this volume.)

In our contribution to this volume, we explore what adventure learning is, how it can contribute to both the teaching and learning experience in the context of the negotiation classroom and executive training session, and what lessons in the four stages of the adventure learning cycle can be used to enhance other experience-based tools that are already in use for negotiation teaching and training. We will begin by sharing what brought us to Istanbul, including why we are particularly interested in exploring adventure learning and what we understand adventure learning to be, and discuss its early applications. With these as backdrop, we share what our adventure learning experience in Istanbul was like and, taking these experiences, discuss what we perceive as its limitations. We will conclude with our perspective on bringing adventure learning to the negotiation classroom or executive training course, with a brief account of how it might be received in the Philippine setting, and on what particular elements can be appreciated and taken to contribute to what is already taking place in negotiation training.

Our Journey to Istanbul: Exploring Philippine Themes in Negotiation

We joined the Istanbul conference with several specific goals. The Institute² for which we are working had earlier made a decision, consistent with our law school's vision of engaging in research and capacity building relevant for its stakeholders, to seek linkages with other academic institutions with a view to mutual learning, exchange of information and possible collaborative opportunities. Among those areas we wanted to explore was how recent developments in ADR theory and practice could be applied to our local concerns, whether in the areas of public policy dispute resolution, environmental management, economic development and policy formulation, or in the conduct of private transactions.

On a lesser scale, but no less important, we also wanted to see to what extent these new perspectives could inform our own understanding of the field, both in the way we perceived it and in the way we conveyed our appreciation of it to others. In particular, we hoped that the initiatives to review Western and interest-based negotiation theory and subsequently develop a second generation curriculum might present a unique opportunity for us to impart a Philippine, and perhaps Asian, perspective, provide a venue for pilot-testing any modules, courses or programs that may be developed, and partici-

pate in any post-program evaluation. With these goals in mind, we approached the organizers to allow us to participate and we were gratified by their quick and positive response.

We came upon quite interesting results as we began our preliminary work in preparation for our participation in the Istanbul conference. With a little over three months between receiving project approval³ and the October conference in Istanbul, we moved quickly, without forsaking deliberation, to organize a set of activities that would allow us to examine local and primarily academic literature on negotiation theory and practice, and survey the availability of negotiation content in various Filipino academic institutions (specifically in law and business). In September 2009, we called a consultative meeting involving participants from government, private sector and academe to see whether there are perspectives to negotiation different from the philosophy, viewpoints and approaches of the Western, interest-based model; approaches and processes that participants have found particularly helpful in their respective fields; and whether there are principles and processes participants would like to include in designing a Filipino negotiation curriculum or training program. We were fortunate that our invitation to the consultative meeting was warmly welcomed; participants from different sectors, including private companies and law firms, affirmed the importance of thinking and talking about negotiation, whether as a mode of alternative dispute resolution or a transactional tool.

Most participants acknowledged having been involved in one form of negotiation or another, whether at home with their family, in the workplace with a co-worker or superior, in school or in the law firm. Significant thinking on negotiation that came out of the consultative meeting (which we hope to discuss extensively in a post on our blog at <http://iilsclaw.blogspot.com> or in a separate publication) helped us understand the perception and uses of negotiation and negotiation training in our local context.

Dean Antonio G. M. La Vina, lead negotiator on the United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (REDD) at Copenhagen, after reflecting on his extensive experience negotiating public issues (from environmental concerns to peace process), led the conversation on what happens when consensus fails and differences prove irreconcilable. He shared his perspective on the imperative of reaching an agreement on process in negotiations involving public issues, which can be, as he calls them, "perpetual negotiations" (considering how negotiations of international agreements have lengthened).

Professor Evelyn (Leo) Battad, Director of the University of the Philippines College of Law, proposed a rights-based approach in negotiation (as opposed to interest-based) when developmental issues are involved. She added that this may also be the approach that applies in a collectivist culture such as the Philippines (it is interesting to note, however, that some participants disputed the claim that the Philippines is a collectivist culture). They were joined by experienced negotiators in stressing the importance of turning to disciplines in psychology, technology and leadership in developing “Negotiation 2.0” thinking and teaching methodology.

Despite the presence of experienced negotiators among the participants and the recognition of the centrality of negotiation to many undertakings in the public sector, we were surprised to find that our survey disclosed only two full texts on negotiation, with only one discussing Filipino values applied in the context of negotiation and that, of the major law and business schools in the National Capital Region, only three offered negotiation courses.⁴ Representatives from two public agencies confirmed having received training in the interest-based approach.⁵ One participant, a member of a local law firm, affirmed the importance of lawyers having negotiation skills, but gamely shared that, after reading all the chapters of *Rethinking Negotiation Teaching*, he was overwhelmed by the discussion of a second generation negotiation or “Negotiation 2.0,” while he remained unsure of what the current theories and practices are.

This led our project team to identify the following as areas requiring the Institute’s intervention: 1) development of a negotiation curriculum for the law school classroom; 2) design of training module/s for government trade negotiators; conduct of seminars and workshops to aid our government negotiators in learning (and teaching) how to articulate the national interest and design consultative methods to ensure that stakeholders are engaged; and 3) a study of how indigenous methods of negotiation and dispute resolution may be adopted to form part of the current thinking on negotiation theory and practice.

Professor Nieves Confesor⁶ of the Asian Institute of Management described our endeavor in the field of negotiation as contributing to the creation of a community of practice. We are hopeful that our efforts will indeed be fruitful and meaningful. Our interest in learning about “Negotiation 2.0” and adventure learning as an output of the new thinking in negotiation is inspired by our desire to understand the development of negotiation theory and practice in the global setting to the extent that it can inform and improve negotiation teaching, training and learning in the Philippine context. While at the Istanbul conference, we were keen on not only making

a contribution to what might become “Negotiation 2.0,” but also in observing what tools we can integrate in the negotiation classroom we will be developing for our law school, and possibly for other institutions. We are interested in learning about adventure learning, having experienced it ourselves in Istanbul, and what it brings to negotiation teaching and training and if we might make use of it in the Philippine negotiation training classroom.

Understanding Adventure Learning and its Applications

Unlike other forms of experiential learning modes, adventure-based learning is a type of educational or therapeutic program in which activities or pursuits that are physically and/or psychologically demanding are used within a framework of safety and skills development to promote interpersonal and intrapersonal growth (Luckner 1994: 57, citing Bagby and Chavarria 1980). Adventure learning draws on the work of many education scholars, including David Kolb who, in 1984, suggested a circular model of learning involving four stages that flow from each other. These four stages involve: 1) concrete experience; 2) reflection on the experience on a personal basis; 3) abstract conceptualization (whether through the derivation of general rules describing the experience or the application of known theories to it); and 4) active experimentation, or the construction of ways of modifying the next occurrence of the experience, which then leads to the next concrete experience and so forth (Kolb 1984: 68-69). Kolb defined experiential learning as “the process whereby knowledge is created by the transformation of experience [and] results from the combination of grasping and transforming experience” (Kolb 1984: 41).

Drawing on Kolb’s work, Aaron Doering sought to merge the concept of “experience-based learning” with “inquiry-based learning” (or learning derived from the student’s pursuit of answers to their own questions rather than memorizing facts) and called it “adventure learning” (Doering, citing Bransford, Brown and Cocking 2002; National Research Council 1999). Doering used adventure learning in the context of online experience. A team of educators and explorers conducted various adventure learning activities, such as a 3,000-mile dogsled trip in 2004 from Yellowknife, Northwest Territories, Canada, to the north end of Baffin Island, stopping at seven Inuit communities along the way, while primary and high school students worldwide interacted online directly with the participants, several subject matter experts, the native community members and their own instructors.⁷

The emphasis on authenticity, participation, collaboration, dialogue and openness to inquiry explains adventure learning's attraction as a negotiation training tool for scholars of the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching project, one stated objective of which is to "critique contemporary negotiation pedagogy and create new training designs." Indeed, the project's main purpose is to compel us to revisit our understanding of the concepts, ideology and approaches underlying negotiation theory; evaluate the extent to which they are, or remain to be, applicable and relevant across cultures, nationalities and contexts; and explore new ways by which these can be improved in the twenty-first century.

Much of the scholarship that came out of the first conference in Rome produced a thoughtful and incisive analysis of current negotiation philosophy. Summarizing the incredibly rich and insightful scholarship that came out of Rome, the following core themes stand out:

- 1) The first-generation negotiation model envisions the negotiation process as linear, methodical and sequential, one that involves moving the negotiation along a rational and strategic process (Fox 2009: 22).
- 2) First-generation negotiation philosophy is characterized by the following key principles, namely:
 - a) Explicit communication and direct confrontation;
 - b) individualist perspectives on agency and autonomy;
 - c) competitive assumptions that people will act to maximize individual gains and can be assisted to extend this behavior to maximizing joint gains if their interests are not compromised;
 - d) action-orientation at the expense of focus on being or inaction;
 - e) analytic problem-solving;
 - f) sequential orientation to time;
 - g) universalist ideas about the international applicability of interest-based negotiation; and
 - h) emphasis on agreement as central measure of success (LeBaron and Patera 2009: 48).
- 3) The linear and sequential first-generation model does not accurately capture the real nature of negotiation, which "is a dynamic and emergent process where every communication move potentially changes everything that follows" (Fox 2009: 22). Consequently, the "modularization of negotiation training" (defined as a "desire to encapsulate its precepts and processes into sequential flows of ideas and trainable modules") (LeBaron and Patera 2009: 49), a concept that

naturally follows a linear view of the negotiation process, would not work well in a system that conceives of negotiation as a complex/nonlinear process.

Central to all these themes is the idea that emotion, nuance, context and culture are as essential to negotiation (and as critical to its outcome), as logic, reason, interest identification and value-maximization.

Apart from critiquing the philosophical and ideological underpinnings of contemporary negotiation theory, several Rome conference scholars have also sought to address the perceived inadequacies in the delivery and teaching of negotiation content, and suggested alternative approaches to negotiation training. Notably, Nadja Alexander and Michelle LeBaron identified the limitations of role simulations, in which students are asked to assume certain identities, and to learn negotiation concepts, strategies and techniques while in these roles. Apart from the fact that assuming identities other than one's own may be perceived in some communities and in certain contexts as disrespectful or nonsensical (Cohn et al. 2009: 333), they point out that role playing "takes people 'out of their skins' into a synthetic situation that may have little relevance to their lives, and limited transferability to actual negotiations" (Alexander and LeBaron 2009: 183). They argue that continuous self-evaluation and reflection, the internalization of new approaches and the ongoing implementation of new strategies, are key to effective learning. These, in turn would be enhanced not by asking students to assume identities that they may only have had a few minutes to familiarize themselves with, but rather to undergo real, authentic experiences involving risk, challenge and genuine emotions in situations that may have real meaning to them, thus ensuring that the experience and lessons learned will be retained (Alexander and LeBaron 2009: 183-184).

As an alternative, or at least as a supplement, to the inherent artifice of role plays, they propose using the adventure learning model as a means to boost the negotiation experience, introduce authenticity and genuine emotion to the exercise and encourage reflection and self-awareness. In their words,

[a]dventure learning activities take participants beyond traditional teaching spaces into environments where existing power dynamics no longer apply...in their new environment, a range of skill sets are in demand and participants must negotiate their place in the new world order" (Alexander and LeBaron 2009: 188).

Taking Part in Adventure Learning

Taking off from Alexander and LeBaron's criticism of the inherent artifice of role plays, the Istanbul conference organizers designed two negotiation exercises as a learning laboratory to explore adventure learning possibilities. The central theme for these two exercises was "authenticity as priority." Both required the participants to leave the classroom and engage in real-life negotiations with their colleagues based on certain tasks assigned.

In the first exercise, the conference participants were placed in groups, pre-selected to maximize diversity in nationality, gender, age and race, and given the following instructions: go to the Spice Market as a group, and together decide what food to buy, then negotiate a purchase, and bring it back to the university to share with the rest of the conference participants during debriefing. Groups were also asked to be mindful of and observe any perceived rituals and contexts that underlay the bargaining. The organizers suggested that groups may engage the sellers in conversation regarding their concerns, experiences and strategies, to test whether the sellers' responses would differ if they were told that the group was interested in making a purchase or informed that there was no intention to conclude any transaction.

It seemed to us that conference participants welcomed the exercise and were delighted at the prospect of exploring a place characterized in the travel guidebooks as a "must see." The Spice Market proved to be an appropriate setting for the first adventure-based learning activity. Located next to the Yeni Mosque, right at the southern end of the Galata Bridge on the Golden Horn in the Eminonu District, and accessible by taxi from the conference cite (Bilgi University), its vast number of goods – from spices, dried fruits, nuts, seeds, to the colorful and fragrant Turkish delights, as well as its diversity of merchants, ensured almost immediately that the experience would be rich and memorable.

In the second exercise, the conference participants were again asked to form groups, this time self-selected. Each group was then tasked to choose any neighborhood in the city with which its Turkish member was not intimately familiar. The groups were then given the following instructions:

- 1) Agree on something that represents the crossroads of the sacred and secular, and take a photo of it.
- 2) Agree on and photograph something that the group believes represents the most dangerous thing seen during the walk around the city.

- 3) Agree on and photograph something that the group believes is the most likely to be the “unmarked” Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) headquarters in that part of Istanbul.
- 4) Agree on a self-portrait that best captures the sense of the group.
- 5) Add or change one thing about the assignment that would make it a more effective learning experience for negotiation students.

Both exercises appear to have been designed to explore the negotiation process on several levels. In the first exercise, the groups needed to engage in a multi-issue conversation to consider, among others, the following: 1) what to buy; 2) how to make the selection (i.e., should we agree on the item first, and then check out the stores to see who offers the best product at the most reasonable price, or should we explore the bazaar first, see what’s being offered, and *then* decide what to buy?); 3) deciding on a reservation value; 4) agreeing on a negotiation strategy or several strategies; 5) identifying one or more negotiators for the group; and 6) deciding which seller or store to buy from. Moreover, they needed to agree on the *process* for reaching agreement, by deciding on a facilitator and agreeing on a procedure to resolve any disagreement or debate arising from the consideration of any of the foregoing.

It was only after resolving these issues that the group could move on to the next set of negotiations to pursue their principal goal of securing a food purchase. In this negotiation, another multiple set of issues was involved. Participants had to consider whether in the context of Turkish bazaar negotiation dynamics, 1) bargaining was an accepted or even expected part of the sale; 2) there were certain types of goods whose prices were considered fixed and non-negotiable (e.g., bar-coded items); 3) it was expected to engage the seller in a conversation before making a purchase; 4) it was considered good form to haggle with a merchant, then defer closing the sale in order to see whether another merchant is able to offer a better price for the same item; or 5) how many offers and counter-offers would be considered permissible before a final offer would be accepted.

The participants also had to contend with commercial practices different from what they were used to. Instead of the expected negotiation dance from merchants of offers and counter-offers, many of the sellers seemed willing, even eager, to engage the buyers in a conversation, and appeared genuinely curious to find out where the buyers came from. On one hand, participants felt uneasy and a bit wary of the glib and charming sellers who seemed able to assess the

participants' aptitude and endurance for bargaining based on their respective nationalities. One merchant explained that Americans were by far the easiest to sell to, as they seemed embarrassed to bargain, and would at most engage in only one round of offer and counter-offer. The Canadians were next, as they would only bargain for three rounds at most, while Russians were at the far end of the scale, since they preferred to chat for several hours before even making an offer. On the other hand, the impression that the majority of the merchants were nice, and were willing to engage customers in a lengthy conversation created a moral dilemma for many participants, as they felt they had an obligation to purchase something from the merchants' shop (even if they had not wanted to do so originally), to compensate him for his time.

The second exercise was also intended to be a lesson in communication and group dynamics, where the participants were supposed to engage in a process of reaching common agreement or consensus on the foregoing tasks. However, unlike the first exercise, the tasks that the participants were asked to agree on appeared to be pointless and disjointed, and did not seem to trigger any particularly intense emotion or debate that would have converted the assignment into a meaningful exercise. As this exercise was being debriefed, the general sense from the participants was that since very few identified with the questions posed, and since the objectives of the exercise were neither clearly delineated nor readily ascertainable, no one felt particularly invested in them to have a strong opinion or position either way. The result was that, for many groups, the participants simply took advantage of the down time to enjoy a casual chat, a nice lunch and generally have a good time with the group. Although the instructions were complied with, there was no active discussion or engagement by the participants, and choices were agreed upon simply by acclamation without close scrutiny or examination.

While the designated tasks were potentially emotionally charged and controversial, this promise did not translate well on the ground. Several reasons predominated: either the themes did not resonate with the participants; or there were no challenges to overcome or penalties sustained by ill-considered or erroneous negotiation decisions; or the learning objectives were not readily ascertainable; or for some, the exercise did not work simply because, despite the intermittent rain, it was a beautiful day in Ortakuy and it seemed wrong to waste it on what appeared to be a meaningless exercise. While the last reason may seem frivolous or superficial at first blush, it underscores the need to design adventure learning exercises that challenge the participants emotionally and intellectually.

In the Spice Market exercise, the participants were parting with their own money, and they needed to make certain that what they bought was worth it, that they did not feel shortchanged or cheated, and that they, along with the rest of the conference participants, would eventually enjoy the food purchased. Moreover, since in the debriefing they would be expected to recount their adventure learning experience, it was also psychologically important for the participants to have a meaningful negotiation so that they would not feel compelled to relate that they were pushovers. Challenge of the same degree, however, was not attached to the second exercise. There was nothing to win or lose, whether materially, psychologically or emotionally, so there was no pressing need for the group members to engage either in competitive or collaborative behavior to achieve an objective. This made it so much easier for the participants to simply go out and have fun. Some of the conclusions we have are consistent with the findings of Melissa Manwaring, Bobbi McAdoo, and Sandra Cheldelin, who provide a detailed critique of the Istanbul conference adventure learning activities, as well as a subsequent replication of those activities with graduate students in Washington, D.C. (Manwaring, McAdoo, and Cheldelin, *Orientation and Disorientation*, in this volume). They identify authentic and artificial elements and describe the first adventure learning as “direct, explicit, “orienting,” as against “indirect, oblique, disorienting.” They offer negotiation instructors guidance on designing adventure learning activities, taking into consideration these characteristics.

Our Evolving Thinking on Adventure Learning

From what we experienced and observed in Istanbul, the adventure learning model appears to offer significant opportunities for robust student/trainee participation, collaboration and engagement. The activities in which we participated demonstrated and confirmed the potential of adventure-based learning to provide authenticity, risk, challenge and context identified by the Rome conference scholars as necessary in making training relevant and promoting transferability to actual negotiations.

How did we feel about adventure learning? Is it indeed a negotiation 2.0 app and a tool that we would consider integrating into a law school course on negotiation? Did we find a new lamp for our old one during our stay in Istanbul? In answering these questions, we first take the day one training session offered by Kenneth Fox and Manon Schonewille as a typical executive negotiation course (attempting some new content and methods as well as showcasing best practices of “Negotiation 1.0”), and then the ideas from the

Rome conference to assess how adventure-based learning exercises may contribute to the delivery of the negotiation training content.

Experience-based learning has been part of the negotiation training toolkit for some time, whether in the form of simulation and role-plays or games. Means have been explored on how to enhance these activities. Writing nearly fifteen years ago, John Barkai shared how he ran a combination of simulation and observation learning by video demonstration, using the story of the orange which he called the Ugli Orange Negotiation (Barkai 1996). Though simple, he was able to use the simulation to introduce two major negotiation and ADR themes,⁸ and explore the importance of communication, by the use of creative debriefing activities (Barkai 1996). Similar strategies were employed by Fox and Schonewille throughout the sample training course, which covered negotiation concepts and skills training, including discussion of basic negotiation concepts (Shell's bargaining style, unassisted negotiation, best alternative to a negotiated agreement (BATNA), worst alternative to a negotiated agreement (WATNA)) and employed various activities, such as group dynamics, fish bowl, games and even negotiating lunch. It is difficult for us to see how these activities, also experience-based, cannot have continued relevance in the training classroom of the future. Indeed, Alexander and LeBaron explained "[e]ven if role-plays are kept in the standard toolkit of trainers, varying experiential vehicles to address different elements of a negotiation would facilitate learning by those with diverse learning styles and ways of paying attention" (Alexander and LeBaron 2009: 185, citing Sogunro 2004).

We agree with the observation made by some Rome conference scholars that "[n]egotiation training is ready to graduate to its second generation [and that] this advancement requires retention of past best practices but also moving forward with new approaches to influence the future of negotiation [skills] training" (Cohn et al. 2009: 330). Discussions in the Istanbul Conference, as well as those in the Rome Conference, indicate an ever-growing list of areas that ought to be covered – negotiation across cultures, the role of psychoanalysis and social psychology, negotiation training for leadership, and understanding the role of emotions. It does not seem adequate then to approach adventure learning as part of the 2.0 environment without considering in which areas of negotiation training it can have the most efficient impact.

According to John Dewey, "all genuine education comes about through experience (but)...not all experiences are genuinely or equally educative" (Dewey 1939: 25). It is not enough to design a few hours of adventure, challenge and risk for a measure of authen-

ticity to be achieved or to attain the transformation of the experience that makes for the creation of knowledge and acquisition or enhancement of skill. The preparation that is poured into developing a negotiation course involving various models that primarily include or make use of adventure-based learning does not culminate in having covered safety parameters and logistical concerns. Adventure-based learning activities can deliver powerful structured experiences. But as John Luckner and Reldan Nadler point out, "to merely provide an experience, albeit a powerful one, and to expect the student to return home and to sort it out for himself is to invite failure" (Luckner and Nadler 1991).

We need only reflect on the second exercise during the Istanbul conference to validate this point. Groups were asked to agree on a photograph that best represents the sacred and the secular. This is a loaded question, particularly since each group had members from different countries and cultures. But without a clear sense of the learning objective, whether from the trainer or participant end, the possibilities presented by the exercise were not exploited and participants were left to reflect on their own. Remember that the emphasis of some of the Rome scholarship is on the delivery of authenticity. But this is not authenticity for authenticity's sake. Adventure-based learning and its potential for providing authenticity is looked upon as a negotiation 2.0 app because of what can be accomplished in completing its four stages – the creation of knowledge and skill through the construction and transformation of experience, consistent with the conception of negotiation as a dynamic process where "every communication move potentially changes everything that follows" (Fox 2009: 22).

It is worthwhile to revisit here the four stages, widely accepted as noted above, for experience-based learning: the delivery of a concrete experience, an opportunity for personal reflection, abstract conceptualization and active experimentation, and construction of ways of modifying the next occurrence of experience. While each stage is essential, it is suggested that planning and processing are key elements. The importance of adequate planning cannot be overstated when it comes to integrating adventure learning in negotiation training. When we speak of planning, we refer to a wide range of concerns, stretching from determining and setting out clear learning objectives and perhaps learning outcomes, to training the program designer and the trainers, moderators and facilitators involved. While trainers or leaders in adventure-based learning experiences are generally and primarily tasked to oversee safety, provide skills instruction and facilitate interaction and engagement, they are also

often charged with preparing the training design, program and specific modules. In the same way that a variety of interventions are available to the outdoor adventure learning activity (for team-building and similar applications), there is a range of ideas to help the trainer design a program and prepare one for a negotiation setting. We emphasize importance not only of trainer preparation (see Ebner and Efron, *Get Ripped and Cut Before Training*, in this volume), but thorough planning, even to the extent of briefing participants before they get to the training seminar or classroom. Planning must also consider framing for transfer (of knowledge and skills), an essential component of experience-based learning.

Certainly insights about transfer gleaned from the training literature are also relevant to adult educators who work in a wide range of contexts. As Rosemary Caffarella points out, "training is an element of the [planning] process that is receiving increased attention as both participants and sponsors of education and training programs demand more concrete and useful results" (Caffarella 2002: 205). Unfortunately, the adult education literature also suggests that few education and training programs actually account for transfer in either the planning or implementation phase of programming. Too often the application of what is learned in education programs has been left to chance (Caffarella 2002: 209).

This aspect of planning is particularly important because, as Luckner and Nadler (1991: 19) stress, adventure-based learning activities lend themselves to creation of a condition of disequilibrium that is critical to the notion of transfer (real life skills transfers) and "durable cognitive and affective shifts." Planned chance events are catalysts in this regard.⁹ Sufficient thought and effort invested in the planning of an adventure-based learning activity, of whatever dimension or duration, will consider questions of inclusiveness, the physical ability of participants to take part in the activity, any additional financial cost which may hinder either actual participation or impact the process of negotiation, or necessity of employing a certain gender, age or race mix. It is helpful to recall here that for the first adventure learning activity in Istanbul, participants were asked to break into pre-selected groups for both the activity itself and the following debrief. (We queried the organizers as to the intention behind the grouping and whether, in their view, the goal, whether learning objective or otherwise, was achieved. They responded "We deliberately structured debriefings so that the debriefing group would have perspectives from multiple adventure learning teams, reasoning that the groups themselves would individually debrief during transit. The structure for debriefing the second exercise collapsed, however, when the groups returned at such diverse times.")

(For more, see Honeyman and Coben, *Half-Way to a Second Generation*, in this volume.)

The pretense in role-plays allows dissociation, and in certain instances, invites the participant to review his action and reaction with a degree of detachment. The detachment provides an objective space for the participant to consider how he might improve upon his performance, particularly if he is considering an application of learning in a real negotiation. But if adventure-based learning activity gets us so close to what is real, will we have the detachment to assess objectively how our knowledge can be broadened, our skills enhanced, or our performance corrected? This concern and our examination of adventure-based learning as a teaching or training tool also led us to materials emphasizing the importance of processing.

During the Istanbul roll-out of adventure learning, the activities were each designed to conclude with a period of debriefing. It is interesting to compare the debriefing sessions which were conducted right after the completion of each exercise. For the Spice Market activity, conference participants were assigned to debriefing groups whose composition was intentionally different from that with which they explored the Spice Market. Each debriefing group had a facilitator who managed discussions and the exchange of stories. The debriefing for the second adventure learning activity was done with all conference participants together. Photographs taken were flashed on the screen, and a representative from each group explained how the decision to present the particular photograph was reached. In the particular sessions in which we participated, we found the discussion interesting, but not directed. One participant with an interesting story to tell can easily “capture” the debriefing. While this may provide the entertainment adequate for trainees to fill in their “happy sheets,” it misses the opportunity for transference. These observations lead us to suggest not only specific preparation for the trainer or the acquisition of certain set of skills and traits for a trainer involved in debriefing, but also designing debriefing with specific goals. What Alexander and LeBaron argue for in approaching role-plays, we believe is also true for adventure learning – “debrief specifically and completely;” “resist the tendency to relegate debriefing to an afterthought or a rushed invitation for general comments.” The primary reason for processing is that adventure-based learning experiences are rich in symbol, metaphors, feelings, mixed with typical behavior patterns. Participants involved in adventure-based activity are engulfed and at times overwhelmed with new stimuli. “Processing teases out the richness of the experience so it stands out and apart, like the important lines of a page underlined

with a yellow highlighter” (Luckner and Nadler 1991: 3). Processing is a developmental endeavor of discovering patterns and unique outcomes of the participants. It is a liberating and generating process that helps construct a new reality or make up new meanings from their experiences.

For the Istanbul conference activities, we feel that participants could have benefited from further meaningful, specific and constructive feedback, but wonder how this can be made possible when monitoring of the activity was not pursued, and participants and their respective groups engaged in the activity without a facilitator, instructor or coach accompanying them. We also note literature on adventure-based learning activity emphasizing the need for “follow-up” – to check on the participants and the application of knowledge beyond the training program.

Here we turn to the “gold standard” for training evaluation developed by Donald Kirkpatrick in 1959. The Kirkpatrick assessment measures trainee reaction to the (negotiation) program, accomplishment of learning goals, application of improved negotiation skills, and improved outcomes in negotiations (Kirkpatrick: 1994). In the Kirkpatrick model, we note that one form of measurement is using evaluation forms to determine trainee reaction to the negotiation program. As explained by Lynn Cohn and her colleagues, “typically, feedback from trainees is obtained solely from evaluation forms that participants fill out after each session. These sheets are often referred to as ‘happy sheets’ due to the tendency for trainees to express positive feelings about the training, particularly if they have been entertained” (Cohn et al. 2009: 336). We agree with Cohn and her colleagues that “[t]hese evaluations are clearly important but do not capture both qualitative and quantitative analysis” (Cohn et al. 2009: 336).¹⁰ Where negotiation training incorporates adventure-based learning activity, Kirkpatrick’s model ought to be revisited, and proper processing included, not only as part of the four-part cycle embedded in adventure-based learning activity, but as a measurement tool, if not at Level 1, perhaps throughout the four levels.

Bringing Adventure Learning within Philippine Themes in Negotiation

Our discussion of adventure learning would not be complete without bringing it closer to our local concerns and taking it within our context and culture. For this purpose, we recently organized a small group meeting involving three negotiation teachers, one from a business school and two from different law schools. In our conversations with them we encountered the same questions which Alexander and LeBaron posed:

[h]ow do trainers legitimize the use of non-mainstream learning experiences, especially in “serious” disciplines such as business and law? How do we avoid making fools of ourselves? And what about the students? Are we not placing them in an extremely vulnerable situation? What if they just aren’t artistic or adventurous? Even worse, what if we aren’t? (Alexander and LeBaron 2009).

Apart from these questions, our local context provides a unique challenge to negotiation thinking and the design of training programs or classrooms, particularly for our Institute, since we have been tasked to develop training modules specifically for the law school classroom (and possibly clinical legal program) and for government agencies dealing with sensitive and at times controversial public issues. Current literature, particularly from the West, acknowledges that negotiation training has become widespread – whether in its two-day executive form or in various disciplines (particularly law and business):

The ability to negotiate effectively is now recognized as a core skill for professionals, union/management teams, government officials and community leaders. During the past several decades, negotiation training programs have flourished. These trainings are popular in part due to the universal relevance of the skills taught. Furthermore, negotiation trainings can be extremely entertaining and interactive while providing learning opportunities. Typical negotiation programs are one to two days in length, cover the essential theory of negotiation, and provide opportunities for trainees to participate in negotiation simulations (Cohn et al. 2009: 329-330).

Negotiation training is not as widespread in the Philippines, however, and the added challenge for us is the state of negotiation training in the Philippines – not widely available, possibly costly, and not consistently delivered. (See Grecia-de Vera, *Can We Engineer Comprehensiveness?*, in this volume.) Some of the methods employed in negotiation training that have already been found tiresome, or oblique, may not be viewed in the same way when used in the Philippine context. Nor does it appear that any one method has gained consistent usage, with the effort to simultaneously ensure that materials put to actual use are suited for cultural and social aspects that are uniquely Filipino. While one trainer sources her materials from Har-

vard's Program on Negotiation, another tries to develop her own case studies, drawing from Philippine sources; while some public issues are negotiated using indigenous methods,¹¹ some public sector negotiators are learning to grapple with national and sectoral interests from foreign experts. The rather basic research we have conducted thus far discloses that we have yet to derive the shape of what the negotiation classroom or training session is for the Filipino and, perhaps, the Filipino overseas. But it seems we have not even fully explored the current tools that were extensively reviewed in the Rome conference, and we have yet to apply the same critical review of interest-based approaches in the Philippines.

With *Sikolohiyang Pilipino*¹² and related social psychology theory informing interpersonal, and even organizational, relationships in the Philippines, the application of adventure learning, indeed all experience-based learning activities, must be viewed in the context of and with sensitivity towards culture. True, role-plays, for example, have been shown to be disrespectful and nonsensical in some cultures, but an ill-designed adventure-based learning activity can also implicate problems of culture. Let us take that Spice Market exercise. Whether participants correctly received it as primarily involving bargaining and haggling, such a perception can deter participants from participating. In certain cultures, bargaining and haggling are not permitted, or are viewed with some disdain; yet in others, individuals would simply feel uncomfortable engaging them even in the context of the marketplace.

One of the Filipino negotiation teachers to whom we presented ideas from the Istanbul conference shared her personal view of negotiation as self-reflection, and working with that framework in mind, remarked that in the Philippine context it is not the bargaining setting or reality in the classroom that will work to surface her concept of negotiation, but rather activities given to self-reflection. Another joined the conversation to say that an activity similar to the Spice Market adventure will not necessarily present a degree of risk or challenge that will complete the cognitive shift, since Filipinos are culturally accustomed to settings involving bargaining and haggling.

Conclusion

We count ourselves fortunate to have been part of the Istanbul conference and to have seen firsthand adventure learning models in the context of negotiation training. We see that negotiation scholars will be examining this new application with great interest. But from what we experienced, we are quite confident that, if not adventure learning activity as a whole, certain elements can be taken to enhance the classroom for negotiation, by also reviewing first genera-

tion tools and incorporating second generation elements including, for example, the important lessons on planning and processing. Our experience in the Istanbul conference and the collaborative efforts that were established as a result, as well as our encounter with adventure learning, are now part of our thinking as we continue to explore indigenous modes of dispute resolution and forms of negotiation practices that can inform or otherwise be integrated in mainstream negotiation training and the application of adventure learning in three settings: our law school classroom, in locally delivered executive negotiation courses involving private transactional concerns and disputes, and in the development of theory, practices and tools specifically for the public sector, for high impact issues of national and public importance.

Notes

¹ The Rethinking Negotiation Teaching project, a four-year project to develop “second generation” global negotiation education, was launched in 2008 in Rome, Italy. During the four-day Rome conference, the first two days were used to showcase the best of a traditional twelve-hour executive negotiation course, which then served as a learning laboratory for participating scholars to review towards the creation of “second generation” negotiation training designs. See Honeyman, Coben, and De Palo (2009).

² Institute of International Legal Studies, part of the University of the Philippines Law Center.

³ To prepare and make meaningful our participation in the Istanbul conference, a project proposal involving a consultative conference, research particularly in the area of indigenous modes of negotiation and dispute resolution, and preparation of negotiation course curriculum for the law school and a three- to five-day training course for government trade negotiators, had to be submitted and approved.

⁴ These are the Asian Institute of Management, the Ateneo de Manila University School of Law, and the University of the Philippines College of Law. We are currently validating the information we earlier received based on our survey.

⁵ A set of government negotiators in the area of international environmental law received training on mutual gains approach from Professor Lawrence Susskind of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the late 1990s.

⁶ Prof. Nieves Confesor is a core faculty member of the Center for Development Management, Asian Institute of Management. Her areas of teaching and research include strategic negotiation and conflict management, public policy, and leadership and management of change. In 2005, she was appointed member, and later Chairperson, of the Philippine Government Panel in negotiations with the Communist Party of the Philippines-National Democratic Front-National People’s Army. She served as Secretary of the Department of Labor during the administration of the late President Cora-

zon C. Aquino (<http://www.aim.edu.ph/faculty2.aspx?id=60&cat=fulltime>) (last visited May 14, 2010).

⁷ Some of the project activities included an “education day,” where team members worked together to create multimedia-enhanced reports (including trail updates, photographs, audio and video clips and interactive movies) for posting to the website, weekly chat sessions, where the online students communicated directly with the expedition members or with subject matter experts; and regular student interactions through collaboration zones available through the web site. School instructors were also provided a pedagogical framework (consisting of a curriculum and activity guide containing instructional materials, discussion questions and learning activities for different modules) pertaining to different activity levels appropriate for varying grade levels).

⁸ The two major negotiation and ADR themes John Barkai referred to in his article “Teaching Negotiation and ADR: The Savvy Samurai Meets the Devil” are the themes of underlying interests and communication.

⁹ Planned chance events refer to indirect experiences that the student has not actually self-selected, yet which occur because they have agreed to participate on the course (Luckner and Nadler 1991).

¹⁰ We would have happily filled out a happy sheet following the first day of the conference.

¹¹ Among the Kalinga, negotiators are called *mansasakusa*. During the consultative conference on negotiation practices held by the UPLC-IILS (see footnote 3), Basilio Wandag at the legal affairs office of the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples shared that a *mansasakusa* assumes the role only upon being accepted by the community and after undergoing certain rites and rituals.

¹² Sikolohiyang Pilipino is anchored on Filipino thought and experience as understood from a Filipino perspective. The most important aspect of this definition is the Filipino orientation. “Filipino behavior has been analyzed and interpreted in the light of Western theories. Since these theories are inevitably culture-bound, the picture of the Pilipino has been inaccurate....” The lesson from psychology may be true for negotiation. “Reservations regarding the appropriateness and applicability of Western models in the Third World setting have been expressed by a growing number social scientists. The Philippines experience has proven that approaching psychology using these models cannot encompass the subtleties of Asian cultures” (Pe-Pua and Protacio-Marcelino 2000).

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.
- Andres, T. 1998. *Negotiating by Filipino values*. Manila: Divine Word Publications.
- Bagby, S. and L. S. Chavarria 1980. *Important issues in outdoor education: ERIC/CRESS mini reviews*. Las Cruces, NM: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

- Barkai, J. 1996. Teaching negotiation and ADR: The savvy samurai meets the devil. *Nebraska Law Review* 75: 704-749.
- Bransford, J., A. L. Brown, and R. R. Cocking (eds). 2002. *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Caffarella, R. S. 2002. *Planning programs for adult learners: A practical guide for educators, trainers and staff developers*, 2nd edn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohn L., R. Howell, K. Kovach, A. Lee, and H. de Backer. 2009. We came, we trained, but did it matter? In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Cooney, L. and L. Epstein. 2001. Classroom associates: Creating skills incubation process for tomorrow's lawyers. *Capital University Law Review* 29: 361-381.
- Dewey, J. 1938. *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Doering, A. 2007. Adventure learning: Situating learning in an authentic context. *Innovate* 3(6), available online at www.innovateonline.info/pdf/vol3_issue6/Adventure (last accessed June 18, 2010).
- Fox, K. 2009. Negotiation as post-modern process. In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Gastardo-Conaco, C. 2007. Filipino social psychology. In *General psychology for filipino college students*, edited by L. A. Teh and M. E. J. Macapagal. Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Higgs, J. (ed). 1988. *Experience-based learning*. Sydney: Australian Consortium on Experiential Education.
- Honeyman, C., J. Coben, and G. De Palo (eds). 2009. *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Jacobs, B. 2008. Teaching and learning negotiation in a simulated environment. *Widener Law Journal* 18: 91-112.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. 1994. *Evaluating training programs: The four levels*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Kolb, D. 1984. *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lao, F. and P. Lao. [need year]. *Profitable negotiating techniques: Strategies for getting what you want while helping others get what they want*. Pasig City, Philippines: Anvil Publishing, Inc.
- LeBaron, M. and M. Patera. 2009. Reflective practice in the new millennium. In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Luckner, J. 1994. Effective skills instruction in outdoor adventure education, *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance* 65(1): 57-61.
- Luckner, J. and R. Nadler. 1991. *Processing the adventure experience: Theory and practice*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

- Luckner, J. and R. Nadler. 1997. *Processing experience: Strategies to enhance and generalize learning*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.
- Menkel-Meadow, C. 1984. Toward another view of legal negotiation: The structure of problem solving. *UCLA Law Review* 31: 754-842.
- Merriam, S. and B. Leahy. 2005. Learning transfer: A review of the research in adult education and training. *PAACE Journal of Lifelong Learning* 14: 1-24.
- Nelken, M. 1996. Negotiation and psychoanalysis: If I'd wanted to learn about feelings, I wouldn't have gone to law school. *Journal of Legal Education* 46: 420-429.
- Nelken, M., B. McAdoo, and M. Manwaring. 2009. Negotiating learning environments. In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Nelken, M. 2005. The myth of the gladiator and law students' negotiation styles. *Cardozo Journal of Conflict Resolution* 7: 1-25.
- Pe-Pua, R. and E. Protacio-Marcelino. 2000. Sikolohiyang Pilipino (Filipino psychology): A legacy of Virgilio Enriquez. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* 3(1): 49-71.