

The Education of Non-Students

*Eric Blanchot, Noam Ebner, Christopher Honeyman,
Sanda Kaufman & Rachel Parish**

***Editors' Note:** Most people do not take courses – yet they learn new things and change their attitudes and behavior all the time. So far, with some exceptions, our field has taken little advantage of informal avenues for education. This concluding chapter explores how we might foster social change toward better attitudes in negotiation, using various media far outside the classroom setting (electronic games, film and other visual materials, and theater) that can serve as platforms for informal negotiation education. The authors believe our field needs not one or two, but an array of such approaches.*

* **Eric Blanchot** is a mediator and a documentary filmmaker based in Paris; he also teaches negotiation and conflict management for the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and at the Sorbonne, the Ecole Nationale d'Administration, and several other French universities. His email address is ericblanchot@gmail.com. **Noam Ebner** is assistant professor at Creighton University School of Law, where he chairs the online master's program in negotiation and dispute resolution. His email address is noamebner@creighton.edu. **Christopher Honeyman** is managing partner of Convenor Conflict Management, a consulting firm based in Washington, DC and Madison, Wisconsin. He has directed a twenty-year series of major research-and-development projects in conflict management, including as co-director of the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching project. His email address is honeyman@convenor.com. **Sanda Kaufman** is a professor of planning, public policy and administration at Cleveland State University's Levin College of Urban Affairs. Her research spans negotiation, intervention, framing and intractability in public conflicts, participation in public decisions, decision analysis, risk communication, and program evaluation. Her email address is s.kaufman@csuohio.edu. **Rachel Parish** is artistic director of Firehouse Creative Productions, a London-based theater company which specializes in collaborative theater. Her email address is rachel.parish@googlemail.com.

Introduction

The title of the second book in the *Rethinking Negotiation Teaching* series hinted at a reality which even the contributors were, perhaps, not yet prepared to address. For all its innovations, *Venturing Beyond the Classroom* (Honeyman, Coben, and De Palo 2010) was based almost without debate on an underlying assumption which, with an additional year or two of reflection, we now find rather limiting: that education takes place primarily *in* the classroom, whether literally or metaphorically. Admittedly, even for a project that has been described as ambitious, there had to be a limit to what was considered within its scope. We still think that focusing on formal teaching, and organized training of adults in executive-style courses has been productive. Yet the final works of this series would be incomplete if we did not at least attempt to explore what is missing.

Even while challenging traditional practice, the *Rethinking Negotiation Teaching* project has implicitly adopted a set of assumptions which might be summarized like this: everybody negotiates – for jobs, in jobs, for goods and services, within their family, and on and on – wherever joint decisions are necessary. People need to know how to do it, or they will do it badly (i.e., leaving resources on the table, harming relationships, missing opportunities and worse). We teach negotiation. Therefore, if we teach good courses – well-designed and well-executed to change attitudes about conflict and negotiation as well as to provide concrete technical skills – those who sign up will become better negotiators, and their own interests as well as society's will be advanced.

Of course, many of our project participants have questioned whether “good” courses can actually be delivered in the one- to five-day seminar structure typical of the contemporary executive-style training world. But the larger challenge we have barely begun to address is what to do if “students” *don't* sign up for any course, short or long. And, in fact, they mostly don't: what we consider a burgeoning student population in our field is but a small fraction of the total population. Based on the numbers we know, even in the United States – the home of organized teaching of negotiation and allied elements of conflict management – it appears highly unlikely that more than one percent of the working population has ever taken any such course.

Even the most classroom-bound teacher knows that human beings do not learn only in classrooms, or even in teacher-organized settings outside the classroom. Indeed, people learn new skills and change their perceptions all the time. And the vast majority of this attitudinal change and skill development occurs at some remove from

formal “teachers” or “trainers.” Examples of such learning are all around us.

An obvious example of informal learning is use of the Internet. Around 1994, for example, one of the chapter authors found himself tasked by his then employer, a government agency, with developing a strategy that would ensure effective adoption of new computer technology by his professional peers, a notoriously independent-minded bunch of mediator-arbitrators. He began by conducting a survey of his colleagues’ attitudes towards new technology and of their willingness to engage with it. He discovered a phenomenon he had not previously encountered: a distribution of responses that looked like an inverted bell curve with one arm shorter than the other. This meant that attitudes towards technology among this particular professional group were sharply divided, with a few people willing to try anything once and use it again if it worked, a much larger group who would resist using any new technology until dragged into it kicking and screaming, and virtually no one in the middle. Yet only three years later, the entire group was using the Internet on a regular basis.

What happened? Did management threaten, with a directive laden with draconian penalties for noncompliance? Were courses organized, scheduled conveniently and taught by brilliant and enthusiastic trainers? Were those who took such courses rewarded with degrees or certificates? Not a bit. Instead, day-by-day, month-by-month, the culture changed,¹ both internally among a rather inward-focused group and externally.

Internet usage is largely a matter of adoption of technical innovation, and therefore might be expected to follow the Rogers bell-curve model of diffusion of innovation (see, e.g., Rogers and Shoemaker 1971); however,² there are other instances of rapid percolation of attitude change, such as some overtly political issues that go through a similar transformation. One example is the recent change in U.S. public attitudes toward gay rights. Strident opposition to gay rights held public attention for quite a while. It was front-and-center in several conservative strategies for winning state and federal office as recently as the mid-2000s. Yet in the last five years as of this writing, the public perception of this issue – even in its most controversial form, marriage – has gone through a startling transformation. By mid-2012, in a hotly political season in the United States, conservative campaign speeches have made only the most perfunctory mention of the issue. Even the most stalwart of the anti-gay rights candidates appear to have concluded that the issue is at best a distraction and at worst a vote-loser among the population at large. Meanwhile, the military, at one time the locus of much debate in this area, has adopted new

policies with what amounts, in a huge bureaucracy, to crisp dispatch. In short, sentiment seems to have shifted in American society with surprising suddenness.

Neither of these examples of attitude change can be credited to public education, at least in any version of formal teaching and training. There are courses on gay rights in universities; but from casual observation, it is not a random cross-section of the student population that signs up for them. Many employers, as well as schools, offer training in the use of computers. But is that how you, the reader, actually came to use the Internet? We suspect not. In fact, for a while it was a standing joke of family life that the six-year-old child was better at using the Internet than the adults; but school computer courses in most schools do not start in kindergarten.

If formal education and training have only limited reach in the change of some social attitudes and widespread learning of some new technical skills alike, what is doing the main job? One answer, explicated below, is informal education – learning without obvious, direct intervention by a teacher. This approach to learning is something our field has rarely used strategically (with honorable exceptions, e.g., the community-based work John Paul Lederach (2005) describes in *The Moral Imagination*). A number of other fields and disciplines, however, have already recognized the potential influence of informal education in social change, and have invested significantly in research to establish what works and how. We do not need to reinvent this wheel.

What Can We Learn From Other Domains?

Making effective use of research in fields other than negotiation requires making some distinctions to which our field is not yet accustomed; for example, *informal* education is not the same thing as *nonformal* education, though in casual use even professionals often allow these terms to overlap (NAAEE 2004: 36). Education (away from school) can range from a closely-directed experience to one that allows the learner a great deal of choice. Either can be effective if good learning design is observed. Examples of this range might include shopping-mall displays vs. museum displays; public television vs. commercial television; or social marketing vs. commercial advertising. In each pair, either may have an educational effect; but one carries an explicit educational goal, while the other does not. When education *is* an explicit goal, it is more likely to be reached if it has clear and specific objectives and uses accurate information and effective teaching strategies.

Nonformal education refers to education that is not part of a formal certification or degree program. The term is also often used to refer to

learning which takes place away from school facilities but that may address formal schooling requirements, or be part of an organized sequence of educational activities or resources designed to reach specified objectives.

Informal education or *free-choice learning* refers to the learning that occurs when people choose what, when, how and why to learn without any obvious intervention by a teacher.³ People learn when they watch TV, visit a museum, read instructions for how to do something, talk with their neighbors, etc. According to the Institute for Learning Innovation,⁴ free-choice learning is “the most common type of lifelong learning” and is “self-motivated and guided by the needs and interests of the learner.”⁵ Significantly, it is also often the result of an activity in which people engage without necessarily having a conscious desire to “learn” something, at least as they would describe the experience. Most people do not go to see *Macbeth* because they want to “learn” about ambition or murder.

In the context of this chapter, the *free choice* characterization is key to any strategy we might devise for delivering conflict management content. But learning goals can be incorporated into many life experiences when they are designed by a group/team that includes the necessary combination of expertise – a subject matter specialist, an educator, an audience representative.⁶ Our means of delivery must reach people where they are, at least in terms of the delivery platforms – web, social media, TV, movies, theater, newspapers – they visit for information and entertainment. To reach its target, free choice information has to be meaningful to the learners; meet learners’ needs; be at an appropriate skill and knowledge level; and challenge learners within the scope of their existing experience and skills.

As discussed in much of the writing in all four volumes of this project, we especially need to match the diversity of cultures, but different ages and to some extent genders may also demand specialized approaches. (It is not for naught that commercial broadcasting typically identifies the strongest market for a given TV show very specifically as, for instance, females between twenty-nine and forty-five years of age.) This means no single modality is apt to suffice or always succeed. If we are to see changes in the ways people relate to each other to resolve conflicts productively and nonviolently, we need a multiplicity of avenues and vehicles carrying consistent messages to that effect. Therefore, the design of an education experience for free-choice learning must consider many of the same criteria that are important to all education programs – from the point of view that the learner has the freedom to choose whether to participate or withdraw at any moment. Educators need to organize an experience

that answers the question: What will attract and *keep on attracting* the learner to this opportunity sufficiently for the messages to be adopted (learned)?

It is worth noting that the research on free-choice learning is extensive: almost every noun in the preceding paragraphs is a term of art which has been defined rigorously, studied, and strategized in depth. Our field can only benefit from paying more attention to this existing research. In general, however, we propose that people absorb new information and change their attitudes by drawing upon a wide variety of “free-choice” sources, such as the popular press or entertainment industry, and therefore these are likely to become effective venues for broad transfer of negotiation knowledge and skills.⁷

The chapter authors have worked with particular forms of informal education in some depth. We have all noticed the power of electronic media, TV shows, films and theater to disseminate new ideas rapidly and broadly until they become mainstream, as well as to shape attitudes. We explore here what some of these media might contribute to the dissemination of wise negotiation practices. We will focus our analysis on the potential roles of electronic games, film, and theater, in that order. Is it possible that these, perhaps in combination with other media/venues not yet on our horizon, might be employed in some strategic way to improve skills and change attitudes about conflict and its management?

Games as a Vehicle for Informal Negotiation Education

One of the leading pedagogical methods used in formal negotiation education is *play*. Role-play, an imaginative childhood pursuit, is also a specific educational technique used among adults. In fact, simulation games and role-plays are the primary learning method negotiation teachers name when explaining how students come to acquire knowledge and skills in their classes (e.g., Alexander and LeBaron 2009; Druckman and Ebner 2010; Ebner and Kovach 2010). Role-play is only one form of play, however. As Johan Huizinga (1950: 1) put it in the opening to his seminal book *Homo Ludens*, “[p]lay is older than culture, for culture, however inadequately defined, always presupposes human society, and animals have not waited for man to teach them their playing.” Huizinga goes on to say that:

It (play) is a *significant* function – that is to say, there is some sense to it. In play there is something “at play” which transcends the immediate needs of life and imparts meaning to the action. All play means something (1950: 1).

What is play? It consists of a broad group of interactive experiences often incorporating some “serious” (life-like) elements: dominance, interdependence, strength, creativity and more. The presence of these elements allows players to focus on them perhaps more than is possible in real situations, to assess their own skills, and to become adept at assessing others’ abilities. Through testing in play, we hone our real-life skills for dealing with these same elements, or for recognizing and getting around difficult situations where necessary. In that sense, play often provides training for real-life tasks.⁸ For example, children play hide-and-seek, tag or other games that incorporate elements of stealth and speed, of chase and evasion. These games are similar to real preparation for the hunt, or for the battlefield, which is likely their evolutionary source. They serve valuable purposes for members of developed societies as well, for example by providing an opportunity for individuals and groups to build self-esteem – as do other, more complicated competitive games such as chess, or Go. Thus some kinds of play offer children and adults the opportunity to develop abilities needed to survive and overcome obstacles in interactions with others.

Games as a Type of Play

In this section we look at play involving *interactive* pursuits that allow for fairly direct learning of negotiation elements. We focus on games, because millions of people engage in games whose outcome hinges on two or more players’ choices. Role-play and simulations fall in this category. Salen and Zimmerman (2003: 80) define such games as “...a system in which players engage in an artificial conflict, defined by rules, that results in a quantifiable outcome.” Clark Abt’s (1970) definition is even more germane to our purposes: “A game is an *activity* among two or more independent *decision-makers* seeking to achieve their *objectives* in some *limiting context*.” Other authors note that a win/lose outcome is in the very nature of the activity. For instance, according to Elliot Avedon and Brian Sutton-Smith (1971: 405) games require “*a contest between powers, confined by rules in order to produce a disequilibrium outcome.*” The game rules that lead to winner/loser dynamics are those allowing players to intervene in each other’s actions, to interfere and to attack, as each tries to pursue individual goals. Interference is of the essence in differentiating games from other activities. As Chris Crawford put it, if the player can only *outperform* the opponents, but not attack them to interfere with their performance, the *conflict* is a *competition* rather than a *game* (2003: 8). Thus, a race, a spelling-bee or a hammer-toss are competitions, whereas wrestling, Monopoly or World of Warcraft are games. Therefore, most games are not only inherently competitive but extremely so, as each participant

seeks both to maximize his own “take” and to downgrade the opponents’ takes. Consequences for the use of games in informal negotiation education will be discussed next (see also Falção 2012).

In determining which of these categories of play – competitions or games – might be more conducive to inclusion in negotiation education, games enjoy clear advantages over competitions. In the latter, the low level of interaction involved allows for only limited negotiation-type behavior – though competitors sometimes negotiate the rules of the competition, or rulings in the competition. Games provide a high level of interaction and a rich tapestry of elements incorporating, mimicking or reflecting negotiation kinds of behavior. At times, the explicit and implicit rules of the game have to be negotiated; parties are constantly trying, directly and indirectly, to achieve their own outcome even at the expense of others. Whether this is accomplished by brute force, dexterity, quick thinking or eloquent persuasion depends on the nature of the game and the characters involved – just as it does in real negotiation settings.

Thus games offer interesting opportunities for informal education. While they might reach anyone playing games, they especially get to those who play most – children and youth. This seems promising for furthering the goals of our field.

Electronic Games

By far the newest of potential informal education vehicles, electronic games have a dubious record, with respect to our field. There is no getting around the fact that some electronic games have been so violent as to sicken adults with a sensitive disposition. Some researchers claim that the widespread use of such games by children and teenagers has created *negative* social capital. Others counter that children can tell the difference between games and reality, and that such games offer a harmless and necessary avenue for expending natural but violent impulses that would otherwise find expression in real contexts (for a helpful review of this literature, see Barlett, Anderson, and Swing 2009).⁹ Either way, this debate supports our point: if it is possible to design electronic games either to cause adverse social consequences or to allow some people’s violent tendencies to be safely expressed, then the proposition that people learn *something* from games is confirmed. Ironically, the technical learning that occurs when kids use a computer joystick to control fighters and spacecraft in games on the screen may have found a rather grim application in the drones that are replacing expensive fighter aircraft and are “piloted” from a distance, by young operators thoroughly trained on joysticks.¹⁰

Two kinds of games are being advanced for purposes consistent with ours. We owe the first kind to computer industry innovators such

as Jane McGonigal (2011), who are designing games that, besides being exciting and therefore marketable, are also socially constructive. These games include elements encouraging environmental mindfulness and promoting in-game or real-world collaboration by fostering norms under which players, who are also creators of scenarios and designs, allow other players to use their creations. The second kind of game is discussed in Chapter 2, describing a current effort to introduce a complex new form of game that encourages stakeholders in major public disputes to base their arguments on ascertainable facts, rather than passing off bogus allegations as factual (Honeyman et al., *The "Deliberation Engine,"* in this volume).

The game format for delivering informal education has some advantages particularly rooted in the current fascination with electronic technology, the platform for their broad dissemination. It is not just the young who covet the latest in electronic technology. Nor is this technology available only to the moneyed elite or to the Western world. Increasingly, the young in many places around the globe have never known a world without computers or other electronic devices, or even without social media.¹¹

Since we can be reasonably confident that when using electronic devices we can hold the attention of our informal education targets, it is incumbent on us to produce or make use of material – whether short YouTube movies, games, or Second Life experiences – that is well-matched to electronic media, and to offer it in venues frequented by our desired audience. There is precedent for successful delivery of games through social media: Facebook has managed not only to engage numerous members in various games, but even to get them to pay for the experience. Similarly, smartphones and tablets offer game apps that can be played individually or with friends. For instance, Scrabble has gained a new lease on life as an app; new games of strategy with exciting graphics get the competitive juices flowing among young and old alike. Scrabble is not the only board game that has been adapted to social media: Carcassonne, for example, is a captivating strategy game played in a medieval context. Invented in 2000 as a board game, it has crossed successfully into the app world.

But there's the rub, not unlike in film and theater (described below): most games, in any medium, are fueled by the *competitive* spirit of players, and in turn fuel the culture of competitiveness. While competition is appropriate for many games, it has become a reflexive strategy, too often misapplied to real conflicts. We seek to promote some life skills that may not be as exciting, but are likely to affect our reality for the better. In fact we, the academics and professionals singing the virtues of cooperation, need to compete – yes, *compete* – with

the prevailing competition messages so successfully disseminated electronically.

We are receiving some welcome technological assistance from the advances that enable people at different geographic locations to play multi-party games. We are left with the challenge of inventing or adapting some games where “winning” (doing as well for oneself as possible) can *only* be achieved through coalitions and by making sure other participants also do well – the very essence of integrative negotiations. One of the chapter authors, Eric Blanchot, uses such a game (*Diplomacy*) in courses he teaches. There are already other games encouraging integrative solutions, even if their underlying framework is not necessarily conducive to cooperation. (The few attempts at *purely* cooperative negotiation games that limit opportunities for competition have not had commercial success; one example is a project in France in the 1980s.)¹² The models that might present the most interest for our purposes may be certain board games, such as *Republic of Rome*,¹³ and online role-playing games. In the former, the players (usually four or more) represent a senatorial family in ancient Rome attempting to accede to power at the expense of others; but if Rome is destroyed in the process, all lose. Players must therefore help each other to deal with any external challenges. Thus the game is based on the principle of “competitive associates.”

The principle underlying certain online role-plays is that a “master of the game” is in charge of the universe within which players are immersed. The goal is not to win, but rather to survive, solve problems, and make progress. To that end, a player must necessarily associate with *and cooperate with* a group of other players, even if from time to time the player might give in to the temptation to compete. While as far as we know, it is unlikely that the game creators ever thought of their system as potentially conducive to the development of awareness of the benefits of integrative bargaining, we see a strong and as yet underexploited potential. This principle also underlies some multi-player games where cooperation in the selection of tasks can greatly facilitate the characters’ survival. We discuss next some ways in which games could be used for informal negotiation education.

Improving Game-Playing for Negotiation Skills

What needs to be incorporated into play designed to enhance negotiation skills? We suggest that for learning to happen, games must include *at least one* of the following:¹⁴

- *A feedback loop* that gives players information about their negotiation-related actions, and about their effects. Feedback might come in the form of rewards and penalties built into the rules, of peer commentary, or of external input. The clear-

er the feedback, and the more fine-tuned and specific it can be, the more directly the connection can be made between the game and negotiation skills. In that sense, external input (such as by a watchful parent) might be the most effective. However, as any parent knows, interfering in players' entertainment risks backfiring, by decreasing their motivation to engage in the game.

- *An overt negotiation theme:* if players know that negotiation is a key part of the game, they might be better able to draw their own conclusions from their iterated experiences. One might imagine a game called *Plea Bargain!*, where players take on the roles of a criminal and the police, or of a convict and a prosecutor. Participants negotiate with each other for treatment and sentencing, within predetermined constraints (e.g., type of offense committed, degree and value of the accused convict's cooperation, maximum and minimum penalties). Such a game does not require a formalized feedback loop; rather, action and reaction might suffice. Players will intuitively try out different negotiation approaches with multiple counterparts, and figure out for themselves what works. The challenge is to design the game in such a way that players are intuitively able to understand the transferability to reality of what they learn by playing the game.
- *A clear negotiation element:* a game might require one player to receive another's permission in order to do something of importance in the game, with some ability to be punished or rewarded for compliance. For example, a player who lands on another player's territory must either negotiate for the owner's permission to continue, or be docked for three turns. (The player wishing to continue might offer points or other resources, or threaten retaliation, in order to secure the other's cooperation.)
- *A guide to implementing negotiation tools:* games' instructions often contain information on how to perform well in the game. These instructions might include explicit recommendations for negotiation behavior. Picture, for example, the possible effects of changing the instruction guide to *Monopoly* to include a section on "three recommended negotiation approaches."

The Future of Gaming

Before we explore the use of computer games for informal negotiation education, we need to address the following question: Do electronic games provide a suitable environment for developing negotiation

skills, given the nature of human-computer, as opposed to human-human interactions?

At first glance, human-computer interactions seem to contain a limited set of negotiation-type interactions. Indeed, early handheld electronic games in which players faced off against the machine provided no such opportunities (with the exception, of course, of the game's owner needing to deal with requests from friends to "have a game," allowing for patterns of bargaining, reciprocity and log-rolling). However, gamers did not wait long before sophisticated artificial intelligence provided them with a more life-like interaction partner with whom to play. Very quickly, two-player interactive handheld games were developed (such as *Head-to-Head Football*, introduced by Coleco in 1980, or even *BLIP* – a 1977 two-player electronic game manufactured by TOMY in which two players play catch). These games reintroduced the interactive, social element so characteristic of traditional games, as players not only contested on the screen, but also used body language and words to affect the game, and even jockeyed physically for control of the console itself.

Early games designed for gaming consoles and computers continued with the single-player/multiple-players duality. In two-player mode, however, many games allowed for players to either take each other on, or team up and cooperate¹⁵ against the active agent provided by the computer.

The social element of computer gaming received a boost with the advent of mass multiplayer online role-playing games (MMORPGs). The level of negotiation interaction went up. Gamers might be sitting alone in their separate rooms, but they operate together with their tribes, clans, squads or armies, whose other members are frequently available for real-time conversation by chat or by voice through the game platform. To give a sense for just how wide this pool of interactions might be, we note that the most popular MMORPG, *World of Warcraft*, has a "population" of eleven million players. In a game at this scale, introducing elements of negotiation education might have significant effects.

Looking ahead, we see several trends for the potential to create spaces into which negotiation pedagogy might make inroads. One such trend is the increasing sophistication of artificial intelligence engines. The more the computer can interact "humanly" with the player, the more opportunities there can be for negotiation-like interactions. As games develop to allow emotions and thoughts to be expressed and affect game play (see, for example, QuanticDream's *Heavy Rain*, developed for the Sony's PlayStation 3 system), and as they are programmed to recognize, and react to, a variety of player inputs, these

interactions will become increasingly common. Then computer games can be used for negotiation education in some of the ways we have explored, especially when coupled with the trend for Internet-based games to include the option of playing with others, whether friends or strangers.

Another trend is to “gameify” an increasing number of Internet activities. The incorporation of games into social networks to create “social network games” – such as *CityVille* on Facebook, with over eighty million registered players – has made games into social activities where the interaction may be, for many, more important than the outcome (see Wohn 2011). This is a step in our direction as we seek to informally build negotiation skills. This trend can be coupled with the more recent addition of gaming (as a layer of excitement) to more serious-minded, large-scale online activities. One very recent example is *Empire Avenue* (www.empireavenue.com). Participants seek to increase their own “share price,” which is determined by their social capital as measured by the level of their online activity in terms of posts, tweets, blogs, etc. As players’ share value increases, they receive rewards in game currency, status symbols and advanced game capabilities.

Another example of adding gaming to attract and retain participants in otherwise “serious” activities is in the Khan Academy (www.khanacademy.org) materials, also mentioned in the film and visual media section below. The Khan Academy offers a wide array of educational YouTube videos, each explaining a discrete element of math, physics, history, etc., as well as a map for proceeding from one lesson to the next. K-12 students can engage actively with the educational materials. Teachers can follow (in real time) the students who are practicing the concepts they have learned, and can pay them individual attention, either by helping with a question with which they are struggling, or by asking a student who has successfully completed that question to assist others. Students can help learners at their own level or below, not only in their classroom but anywhere in the world. Gameifying this system increases motivation and participation: in addition to earning “energy points” and badges for efforts and success in completing study tasks, students can earn additional levels and status symbols by tutoring others (Khan 2011). In this example too, the nature of emerging interactions among students assisting each other while striving/competing for rewards lends itself to informal negotiation education.

These examples signal the potential inherent in gameifying serious endeavors, such as the Deliberation Engine discussed elsewhere in this volume (Honeyman et al., *The “Deliberation Engine”*). Games are likely to be more effective in informal education for players than for

spectators. Yet there is an art form that has conveyed informal education on a mass scale without the active participation element. Film has shown that learning *is* possible even when relatively passive – at least in terms of attitude changes, if not necessarily in terms of skill development.

Film (and Other Visual Materials on Various Platforms)

We have just over a hundred years of experience with movies as an art form. Throughout its history, film has proven effective in reaching large audiences, even across cultures. When they have been able to cross censorship barriers, movies have communicated to closed and oppressed societies, such as the Eastern Bloc countries, images of a freedom the audience could not experience themselves at the time. It is widely believed that these images helped to foster resistance, creating in the public mind the all-important concepts and possibilities without which regime change would have been impossible to imagine.

Tracing an explicit cause-and-effect relationship between movies and attitude changes is nigh impossible. But paradoxically, the peril that leaders of communist countries clearly perceived in allowing their peoples to see how others lived lends support to this proposition. Thus they have often only allowed the screening of “safe” movies, such as historical movies, or those portraying popular revolts or Western misery.¹⁶ For that matter, to this day Cuba, North Korea, and to some extent China persist in their perception of the risks of allowing a free market in Western movies.

Al Gore’s film *An Inconvenient Truth* is another example of the effectiveness of movies in producing – at least for a while¹⁷ – palpable attitudinal change, in this case with respect to climate change. While most of the public cannot follow or evaluate the contradictory scientific claims and political stances with which they were being bombarded, Gore’s vivid images were persuasive to a considerable proportion of the public. People worried about consequences of unchecked climate change; schools and colleges incorporated lessons in their curricula; and the media offered support for the call to act urgently to combat climate change. Yet this “persuasion success” was followed by a perceptible weakening of the collective resolve to act and forestall climate change. It may be useful to understand what characteristics made *An Inconvenient Truth* as successful as it was, especially in a field that usually attracts only the attention of environmentalists, a small subset of movie viewership. However, the negotiation field needs to understand not only which arguments through what media can produce attitudinal changes, but also what *sustains* them in the face of competition

from a large set of other issues requiring attention and resources – as well as what causes a significant section of the public to conclude after a while that the same movie is selling them “a bill of goods.”

The rather short half-life of *An Inconvenient Truth* likely has multiple causes, but one equal in salience to the movie’s dire predictions for the future was the current severe economic downturn, which overtook public attention. Thus one hypothesis to be explored is that to be persuasive (and therefore useful for informal education) movies need to propose messages that either tap into already salient concerns (content) or arrive when few other concerns would compete (timing).

Films are routinely used in formal education, in recognition of their potential – for better or worse – to deliver direct or indirect information about past and present, as well as messages that might, and do, affect contemporary outlooks and behaviors. For better, the popular knowledge base can be enriched, and positive attitudinal and behavioral changes can be addressed, with relatively little effort. For worse, some of the same considerations apply.

One example of “for worse” from the standpoint of negotiation education are films that can and do make violence look like the socially approved choice of the brave, with no downside other than red paint splashed over the screen. They can also communicate a view of history that corresponds less to the facts than to the filmmaker’s special pleading. (*Triumph of the Will* and other Nazi films by Leni Riefenstahl are merely the most notorious among a long and deplorable list of propaganda movies in the service of various dictatorial regimes.) The same audience aspects that make films a convenient and effective way of promoting positive social change – such as people’s thirst for being entertained, and their general lack of factual knowledge against which can be pitted safely a fabricated reality that appears deceptively real (nowadays in 3-D!) – can yield results that society as a whole might not have sought.

For all of these reasons, two of our main challenges in using film as a vehicle for informal education are: 1) to design materials that carry *our* messages and that work well with both old and new platforms, as they are used by different audiences, and 2) to find the appropriate avenues for disseminating effectively the kinds of conflict management behavior we as practitioners and teachers find most constructive. These are not simple matters.

In the classroom experience of a course that uses film, an instructor can select the movies and the messages to be brought out, and can use debriefing to ensure that the desired message has actually reached the students. In contrast, informal education through films offers neither control over the message nor the opportunity to mitigate

through debriefing any unintended messages. Success is possible – for example, the TV mini-series *Roots* helped to change long-entrenched erroneous perceptions and understandings of history. The work of Jacques-Yves Cousteau (and more recently, Gore’s documentary *An Inconvenient Truth*) are powerful examples of successful outreach, communicating rather complicated, science-laden notions to a broad audience. But for worse, conspiracy-peddling movies (such as those related to President Kennedy’s assassination) influence views of even recent history based on scant or decontextualized evidence. Thus, we should keep in mind that the film vehicle for informal education is a two-edged sword, precisely due to its ability to persuade through images. The same effects – changes in knowledge, attitudes and behavior – can operate in directions we seek, but also in directions we might consider undesirable.

Unless we devise an alternative form of delivery, the films we would consider helpful in portraying useful conflict management patterns have to be good enough to compete with the avalanche of movies in the marketplace, a daunting number of which model exactly the behaviors we most want to discourage. Perhaps we should instead construe “movies” as merely one example of a broader category of visual media. From this larger perspective we might include, for example, the kinds of short videos that “go viral” on YouTube or Facebook. Lest skeptical readers think that videos teaching negotiation skills informally might never rise to the level of viral, we might argue that even a lower level of success could still make a meaningful contribution – and that some examples¹⁸ already exist of successful teaching of skills on such platforms. One example already mentioned is the *KhanAcademy* on YouTube, which already has more than 3000 videos to teach math and science skills for all ages.¹⁹ Its success can be credited not least to a perfect match between message and venue: if the public we are attempting to reach tends to frequent YouTube, the likelihood of reaching them is considerably increased if we actually use YouTube. At the less-than-viral level, there already exists a considerable collection of YouTube-based negotiation videos, including film clips, cartoons and real negotiations. However, unless one already knows that negotiation insights might be useful and searches for them, the likelihood of stumbling upon such videos is rather small. Reaching out to large audiences informally will clearly require something more.

But can film foster, specifically, the emergence of conflict management modes such as (integrative) negotiation and mediation? One factor favoring such a societal role for films is that in general they tend to have a mimetic power on the audience: people want to be like

their heroes. The news constantly reminds us, however, that people do not necessarily establish a direct link between fiction (and more generally, the representations carried by the broadcast media) and the reality they experience every day. This observation can be extended to video games, despite the controversy arising after each case of a violent crime perpetrated by a supposedly compulsive player.

More generally, citizens of countries anchored in a Judeo-Christian culture tend to maintain a distance between the images they see reflected in the contemporary media and their reading of reality, perhaps partly because they have had a longer time span to adjust. In general, the nuances of the relationship between image and reality are specific to different cultures, and demand our attention. Charles Tesson, former editor of *Les Cahiers du Cinema* and a specialist in Asian cinema, has argued that in terms of how images are processed by viewers there is a strong distinction between Judeo-Christian cultures and Asian cultures, driven by significantly different religious traditions. Image representation in the latter, he states, is less reflexively questioned and more likely to be uncritically accepted. Tesson mentions several "Asian change blockbusters" in this context. For example, he describes *Madame Freedom*, a 1957 Korean film, as a commercial as well as attitude-change success in its home market. This film revolves around the liberties taken by men but also, and more importantly, by women in couples. The main female character emerges from her shyness to assert her freedom to work, to socialize, to earn money and retain control of it, and to have love affairs. This movie became a classic for a generation of women who found in it a representation of their desire for emancipation.

The behavioral mimetism that characterizes the relationship between spectator and the role played by an actor is even more striking in the case of Indian consumers of Indian films. Bollywood is a good illustration of a cinema that manages to maintain a conspicuous moral tone. And in India, the cinema still has a greater influence than TV.²⁰ Directors can become real gurus, and film companies aware of their roles and responsibilities develop audacious movies. The films they produce provide for the audience a code of permissiveness and a scale of acceptable transgressions. Indian cinema has thus inherited the traditions of both sacred and profane theater. Like theater, Indian cinema's implicit philosophical stance is no longer to disseminate religious texts, but rather to promote a change of mental models.

One example is *Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge* (in English, *The Big Hearted Will Take the Bride*), a 1995 Bollywood film about forced marriage and the need to allow young people to choose their spouses. The father of the heroine is an Indian native living in London. He rejects

modern culture, and requires his daughter to return to India to marry the man he has chosen for her. During a journey in Switzerland the girl falls in love with a “modern” Indian young man, who also lives in London, but does not fit her father’s image of the ideal husband – he is Europeanized, drinks beer, etc. The option of the girl being kidnapped by her lover is clearly entertained; but eventually the young man agrees to submit to the rules set by his intended’s father. This gesture of submission, however, leads in turn to changes in the father’s outlook. He ends up accepting the possibility of breaking with tradition, and allowing his daughter to choose the man she loves. For the filmmaker, the father represents the benevolent state. It has been argued that village Indian viewers watch movies like this one with a measure of naiveté: in their eyes, beyond embodying his role, the actor really *is* the character he represents.

Some films intended to carry a social message have had unforeseen uses and contradictory consequences. Consider *The Battle of Algiers*, the 1966 Italian-Algerian film by Gillo Pontecorvo. It chronicles the struggle of the Algerian National Liberation Front (FLN) and the military victory of French paratroopers, using methods of counterinsurgency – displacement, torture – that led to military victory being undermined by loss in the battle for “hearts and minds.” This film has been used by intelligence services in Latin America to train their officers and prepare them for fight against rebel movements, and more recently by the Pentagon to show how a battle against terrorism can be won (in Iraq). Similarly, *Objective, Burma!*, a movie directed by Raoul Walsh (1945), served to train Israeli Haganah recruits. There are clearly risks in assuming that a film will be perceived, or used programmatically, in accordance with the maker’s intentions.

Can negotiation and mediation processes provide suitable topics to make *good* movies, or to become part of a screenplay that captures the public’s fancy? This question is the film version of the theatrical requirement of “a crackin’ good show” (see the next section) and is just as essential to sustained ability to produce new works on behalf of or in relation to our field. Movies about police hostage negotiators, while often exciting, have had a tendency to elicit eye-rolling among actual police hostage negotiators, despite their frequent claim to have hired expert advisers (Honeyman 2001-2009). Their educational value is thus suspect. One of the pillars of a good script, meanwhile, is the personal journey that forms and transforms the main characters. The change they undergo is the result of their adventures and of their choices. This speaks to the audience, which also vicariously lives the characters’ experiences. Some filmmakers believe that through mimicry, this vicarious experience can trigger positive (or negative) change

in spectators' behavior. It was said that members of the Mafia – the real one – were so impressed by Francis Ford Coppola's movie *The Godfather* that the movie had a strong impact not only on the public at large, but also on the gangsters' culture.

Could the search for compromise through negotiation and the highlighting of integrative solutions provide useful motors for fiction and, more generally, for documentary or fiction movies? We would need to overcome some major difficulties:

- Competition and the ensuing conflict are clearly driving forces behind the vast majority of films, just as in theater. To excel, to discover oneself, to accept oneself, to win over a loved one, all this while overcoming difficulties through “personal challenges” – these ingredients drive many plots. Notions of cooperation or the search for integrative solutions are difficult for writers to exploit in an equally exciting way. Scenes of negotiations in recent films, such as *True Grit*, are notable for distributive tactics more apt to garner admiration for the characters' devious skills than to model integrative approaches. In fact, they confirm cultural beliefs about how to conduct negotiations (mostly using a host of distributive tactics, each more marginally ethical than the next).
- Negotiation and mediation are quintessentially joint rather than unilateral decision-making processes. But acting unilaterally is usually one of the keys to the success of a movie character. The hero is called upon to decide, to respond and react, often quickly. However, not only does it take time to achieve results through negotiation and mediation, the use of those processes presupposes that the hero recognizes interdependence with others, and is ready to accept that other people may have different approaches with logics of their own.
- We teach students to take the time to study the specifics of a context. This contravenes the typically Manichean perspective of movies. Thus it is unclear whether the complex reality of negotiations can provide fodder for even the most adroit screenwriter. Yet there are encouraging exceptions; the fact that they are few speaks to the difficulties they faced. Some of them – *Citizen Kane* comes to mind as to complexity, if not as to a “cooperative” hero – have been extremely well-received. In a lighter vein, the Billy Crystal/Robert De Niro partnership in *Analyze This* offers plenty of psychological complexity. On television, *The West Wing*, which has rapidly become a classic, is chock-full of complex negotiation behavior, including believable dilemmas, coalition-building and trade-offs.

Nevertheless, by nature long-drawn-out, more complicated and less dramatic than unilateral decision, negotiation and mediation are often either relegated to second place or entirely absent from television or movie plots. The quest for victory is an easier story line with which to inspire the public than the search for an acceptable compromise.

How might we incorporate into a documentary what we usually teach in negotiation courses? There are at least two ways to do this. One way is to do it non-explicitly. Another way is to make it the central or at least secondary subject of the movie. In the first alternative, we are presented with many options, as long as what we teach is diverse and can be exemplified by many situations. However, the principle of cooperation underlying “integrative bargaining” is difficult to surface or to illustrate without showing an actual negotiation. But except for some specific cases and particular subjects, it is rare to find integrative bargaining negotiation scenes or situations in a movie. On the other hand, the principles that guide interactions in communication, including those underlying active listening and those that aim to reduce perceptual asymmetries, can be illustrated. For example, it is possible to draw the viewer’s attention to the need to consider multiple viewpoints.

One of the authors, Eric Blanchot, attempted to do just that in a film on the role of North-African sharpshooters in the victories of the French army in 1942-45. The avowed aim was to reconcile the memories of the French of Algeria – i.e., those who resettled in France after 1962 – with the memories of Algerian immigrants, and more broadly of immigrants from the Maghreb, regarding events they recall of the voluntary sacrifices their parents and grandparents made during World War II. People bring up these sacrifices as the basis for their claims to greater equality, in the spirit of a republican logic inherited from the French Revolution and inspired by the Athenian democracy (which expanded the rights of citizenship to the ship rowers who had participated in the naval victory over the Persians). On one side were the memories of a rather reactionary colonial army (in the spirit of Pétain), sometimes close to the extremists of French Algeria. On the other side, there was the movement behind the “march of the Beurs,”²¹ considered to be politically to the left of the left. The perceptual asymmetries are extremely strong and polarized. The filmmaker’s intention was to avoid offending against either of these two streams of memories, but rather to attempt to foster bilateral empathy, to help these two groups open communication between two closed universes by appealing to the “superordinate goal” of promoting a shared pride and solidarity among these former combatants.

Two immediate consequences followed for the movie participants and for the subject of the movie. In one, Eric was forced to exclude a great Algerian figure, Ahmed Ben Bella, who fought in 1940 and then in Italian and French campaigns of 1943-44. Although Ben Bella agreed to be interviewed, Eric did not include him in the movie, because his voice and his face would have reminded many French of the Algerian war and of the loss of this territory, which would have rekindled the passions around the war. Similarly, Eric had to abandon any mention of the Sétif massacres and of the brutal repression of the May 1945 riots in Algeria (resulting in tens of thousands of victims). Combatants in Europe at that time had not been apprised of this repression (many were to leave soon after for Vietnam). These choices, open to criticism by those representing the memories of the victims, seemed essential for any reconciliation to succeed. Thereafter, to allay the suspicions of “pieds-noirs”²² veterans, the author had to reassure them about the movie, and avoid making it seem to argue against them.

In the body of the movie, this translates into superimposed claims that may seem contradictory, and lacking in any attempt to choose between the several logics and several interpretations of the shared lived events. For example, did the fighters have a political consciousness, and had *they* aspired to independence? Or were they simple “fellahs”,²³ following their leaders with no other purpose than their individual survival? Both contentions are present in the film, one following the other. Two “original French” veterans – one from the Vosges and one from Alsace – contend with empathy that the fighters from the colonies should have been awarded French nationality. None of these direct witnesses have criticized these choices, although no one was fooled by them. It is never easy to reduce perceptual asymmetries, and to encourage empathy and mutual listening. This movie was rather successfully shown on many French TV channels, and has been seen in North Africa as well (where, however, it unsettled Algerian intellectuals present at debates that followed the screenings).

The other alternative mentioned is to make movies whose very subject deals with negotiations, and analyze, for example, the rules and/or the practices of actors. In 2006 Eric made two documentaries: *The Time for Debating* and *The Age of Negotiations*, both focused on French union-management negotiations. Several clips show how the actors should behave in a good negotiation (interspersed with the Quebec contract bargaining model). Negotiators discuss past experiences and several experts explain how this arena came to be, how it has evolved since the 1920s and with which participants. Several clips allow for a comparison of the views of management and of union representa-

tives. The subject of the reduced workweek illustrates an integrative negotiation, with the zone of possible agreement, the importance of the relationship, principal-agent tensions, and the constructive use of ambiguity. The movie was appreciated by both union and management representatives as well as by the politicians who have watched it, including some close to the presidency of the Republic (but it has not been aired again since then, and has therefore not been a *commercial* success).

We are confronted here with an added difficulty. Like the 1995 film *Our Friends at the Bank*, showing two years of debt negotiations between the World Bank and Uganda, Eric's films necessarily tackle complex problems. Having tested them with uneducated audiences, Eric is certain they are very accessible, sufficiently clear, and quite understandable outside the circles of power. However, although these subjects – business negotiations, unemployment insurance, etc. – are part of current everyday life, television channels are hesitant to show them. They self-censor whenever the topics have the potential to be difficult and provoke anxiety, which might translate into poor ratings. This creates added obstacles for movies that would benefit the general public by showing the underpinnings of a system that affects all citizens.

Does this mean that we should not enter the “belly of the beast” and talk about such negotiations? It is probably more accurate to say that we must reassure broadcasters by broaching less politically controversial topics, less marked by confrontation than union-management contract negotiations. Avoiding overly technical subjects such as the national debt might also be advisable. For example, a film about mediators of rural agricultural conflicts in the United States would pose fewer challenges. An exotic touch is probably helpful. This amounts to teaching negotiations by using situations that are simpler and less politically laden. For example, this is the case of Jihan El Tahri's movies, on the Cubans in Africa,²⁴ the negotiations that led to the independence of Namibia, or on the ANC,²⁵ which showed the negotiations that led to the end of apartheid in South Africa.

The future of negotiation movies may lie with fiction, and with TV series, but the success of reality TV as well as of “stealth” negotiation scenes embedded in some kinds of documentaries gives us hope. For instance, TV wildlife conservation series have sometimes included relevant stories of negotiation, particularly when the subject was deforestation. And on a less elevated level, the very popular reality TV shows may offer special opportunities. We might imagine an entire genre of “reality negotiation” shows (similar to “Court TV”). One such show could be set at a used car dealership. Alternatively, there are ne-

gotiation sidebar possibilities (or mediation alternatives) to all of the Judge Judy/People's Court-type shows; it would be relatively inexpensive to film negotiations before or after the judge rules in a dispute. This could attain a suitable level of drama even while modeling some integrative negotiation strategies. On the fiction side, a first U.S. series with a mediator as heroine, the recently produced *Fairly Legal*, seems to have attracted a relatively large audience. However, it is too early to take stock of even this one explicit commercial foray into our field. Although we are unlikely to be able to persuade more scriptwriters and producers to see the dramatic possibilities of the world of negotiation and mediation, this does not mean we should give up. The very existence of such a series produced for a highly competitive television market should encourage us to persevere.

This brings us to the third platform for teaching negotiation informally (after electronic games and film) – theater. It is becoming apparent that for our purposes there are at least two different ways of looking at theater: as an art form observed from outside, similar to the movie-watching experience just discussed, or as an active experience close to what the *Rethinking Negotiation Teaching* project has been developing under the heading of “adventure learning.” We will discuss these two alternatives in succession.

Theater as Observed Art

Readers of this chapter are likely to be familiar with some of the Greek tragedies; merely mentioning them may be enough to note that the history of this art form extends back more than two thousand years. From early on, theater plays served to explore in a public/communal way a variety of conflict situations, and ways – some rather brutal – of coping with them. Plays often mirrored their time, reflecting and reinforcing codes of conduct some of which (we are glad to say) are out of favor nowadays. Since violence is frowned upon at least theoretically, perhaps theater can now serve not merely to mirror this rather well-established societal attitude, but also to demonstrate some peaceful ways out of conflicts that would otherwise be tackled violently.

Some plays and artists give voice to a message at a critical time or place. They give us models for bravery or eloquence, or illustrate the capacity for endurance and hope of the human spirit. The present-day campaign of the Belarus Free Theatre and the 1993 production of *Hair* in Sarajevo are two such examples. Mark Fischer (2008) suggests:

The work of Dublin's Abbey Theatre contributed to the cultural movement towards nationalism and the foundation of the Republic of Ireland [and] . . . Terence Rattigan's thinly disguised gay play *Table Number Seven*, written when homosexuality was illegal, (was identified) as a "milestone" in the "shifting nature of public tolerance [that] shows the capacity of art to anticipate legal reform."

Similarly, riots prompted by the production of *Behzti* in Birmingham (U.K.) in 2005 revealed issues around censorship and gender inequalities in the Sikh community. This revelation shook the community and generated a new public discourse on these and related issues.

In recent years formal theater has lost some of its currency, with broad audiences attracted to more accessible and affordable entertainment media, such as television, movies and Internet. Yet theater remains influential in cities where "opinion leaders" live; also, a number of films and TV productions continue to originate on the stage. Theater is, moreover, a regular component of nonformal education for schoolchildren (as a popular after-school activity) and for college students (who also view theater as an outlet for their creative aspirations). In many places, it also functions on a community level, partly through amateur theater groups.²⁶ Furthermore, although the number of Broadway or West End productions may be down, the social attitude change effects of the surviving productions seem undiminished. Commentators have cited *Angels in America*, for example, as having had an influence on U.S. public attitudes toward gay rights; similarly, a distinguished series of mid-twentieth-century theatrical works had a widely discussed role in changing white attitudes toward African-Americans.

Theater offers an immediacy and intimacy of contact, and a vividness that may contribute to the effectiveness of informal learning. However, using theater plays as a direct vehicle for informal education may be limited in reach, as this medium must now compete with so many other avenues and modes of entertainment. Therefore, we should explore ways to conserve the advantages and overcome the drawbacks of this medium by bringing theater elements onto newer platforms with large traffic, such as the Internet. For example, as proposed in the section on games, we might design short (YouTube-length) productions incorporating negotiation and conflict management aspects, to be disseminated not only through YouTube but also other portals such as TED,²⁷ whose motto is "Ideas worth spreading." Its 2011 project TED-ED has in fact called on educators to submit precisely this kind of educational material, and as of yet it has no section on negotiation.

Theater as Experiential Education

There is a second sense in which theater could be employed in the informal teaching of conflict management. The *making* of theater (and the making of films or electronic games, for that matter) is rife with conflict, yet the mantra of the field is “the show must go on.” As a result, some theater companies (not all) may constitute a kind of crucible in which daily practice models some (not all) negotiation notions and practices our field hopes to teach. It is possible to imagine that instead of managing conflict in order to put on a show, the coin might be turned over by deliberately putting on a show in order to create an authentic and engaging form of adventure learning (see generally Alexander and LeBaron 2009, as well as numerous other discussions of adventure learning in volumes 2, 3 and 4 of this teaching series). The premise of such an endeavor is that working, living, and collaborating with people who are different from us might function as a kind of training camp for the management of conflict situations.

Theater is an inherently collaborative endeavor. Some theater groups, however, particularly seek to embrace this collaborative essence, and to develop each aspect of the creative process to be as rich and layered as possible. One of the authors, Rachel Parish, founded such a company. We describe next an example of that company’s experience, which illustrates the kinds of issues it finds important to consider in producing a play.

Process

This group does not start with a script. Instead, it assembles a team of artists to *develop* an idea for a play. The idea is developed through joint research, discussion and brainstorming. The team then develops a method of engaging the public with creative activities surrounding the themes of the play, and gathers real-life stories around the subject, which are then used as source material for assembling the play. The artists develop the play, and eventually a script is created for a production that is then performed. Both artists and non-artists actively contribute (in different ways) to the play-making process. But a high level of professionalism, of theatrical craft, is an ongoing demand throughout.

Two ideas anchor this type of process: 1) The show is more important than any one person/group’s ideas, and 2) *no one* knows what the show should or will be until it emerges from the joint efforts. The show is not a thing, or a “product”; it is a meeting of minds, and a new collaborative event between an audience and the players in a particular time and space. This is reminiscent of Ken Fox’s (2009: 22) description of negotiation as a dialogic process “where new meaning

is made and remade.” The group’s actions and thinking throughout the process are guided by active listening and consensus building.

Starting a New Production

One new production began with a week-long brainstorm with a group of artists. The theme of the week was “The contemporary relationship to belief.” The group explored the theme by sharing personal stories, anecdotes and targeted research, and also by creating improvisations, writing and staging ideas. One of the stories shared during that week was a childhood memory of a preschool classmate:

There was a child named Superjohn, who always wore a Superman outfit, and seemed to have superpowers. He was bald, and had to go away often. When he went away, you felt scared, because you knew he was doing something dangerous, but you knew, in your 4 year-old logic, that if anyone could do it, Superjohn could, because he had superpowers.

This story sparked a number of questions and ideas, and became the basis for the production “*Superjohn, A Play for All the Family*”: an adventure story about how children use their imagination to cope with adversity. It is told through the eyes of two children, John, a child with leukemia, and his “savior sister,” Star.

A creative team of director, writer, and designer developed the story line further. At the outset, all three generated ideas for images and narrative together. As months went by, each took on an increasingly specialized role. They identified additional stakeholders (below) and brought them into the team in different ways that fit their respective needs and circumstances. As stakeholders became engaged, the show evolved and adapted its direction to the new information and feedback.

The group has the following core question and answers constantly in mind:

- How do we arrive at a show, any show?
- *We listen (with all of our senses). We make “offers” (in their term-of-art theater sense, and using a range of communications; see Johnstone 1979), and then we listen some more. We adapt. We work laterally, making both direct and indirect offers. We keep contributing until we move closer to the show. The show is an event – it is a meeting between audience and players in a particular place and time. During that meeting, new meaning is made – and perhaps new attitudes are forged.*

Identifying Stakeholders

In addition to conducting research, the theater group contacted hospitals and charities that deal with childhood cancer. They set up a partnership with an oncology clinic in North London, and began working with medical professionals and sitting in on chemotherapy sessions. They met children with cancer and their families, and learned firsthand about the multiple aspects of treatment. Then they ran creative workshops, and held one-on-one interviews with people from across the sectors involved in childhood leukemia-related issues. At the same time, the theater group began involving family theaters in London, and established a partnership with a theater to support the group along its first stages of development.

The group drew up a list of stakeholders. These were numerous: local government councils where the activities are taking place, the Arts Council England, local schools/teachers/students, national childhood cancer charities, national theater venues, local families, medical charities, related interest and activist groups.

Essential questions in identifying stakeholders are similar to those asked by public policy mediators: *Who is this play for? Who is it about? How do we get in contact with them? Who needs to know about this project?* The group begins by engaging the immediately obvious stakeholders, and listening to what they say. They find out that there are certain issues of which they weren't aware before, or that were obscure even to those immediately involved. The group then engages with the people or groups thus discovered. This parallels (for obvious reasons) the "snowball" technique for convening a group of stakeholders when building consensus around an initiative or mediating a public dispute.

Defining the Objectives of the Play

Some of the objectives of our example production are specific to the situation; one is common to all theatrical ventures.

- 1) Make a play that explores an issue, such as, in our example, the role of *imagination* in dealing with adversity from a child's point of view.
- 2) Make a play that deals (in this instance) with issues surrounding childhood cancer, providing insight into
 - a) the relevant science;
 - b) the experience of the child's family;
 - c) the relationships between the medical professionals.
- 3) Provide opportunities for members of the public, both with and without an experience of the issue, to *participate* in the creative process. In the given example, integration and cohesion between kids and families with and without cancer experiences are promoted.

- 4) Make a play that is “a crackin’ good show,” and one that will have wide appeal for a general family audience. The group is, after all, one of *theater* professionals.

Does this start to look relevant to negotiation and conflict management professionals, and their teachers? Like negotiators and conflict management professionals, the theater group must ask the right questions; identify all the stakeholders; find direct and indirect ways of bringing the stakeholders into the process at the earliest stage possible; develop means of communication between people with vastly differing needs; and still, remain subservient to the unifying goal (acknowledging here that the goals of a theater company differ from those of the conflict manager of a public conflict).

How has this process worked in the theatrical environment? As Rachel’s company has found, the most important action by far is to identify the main *theatrical* goal, and to make sure that everyone commits to that goal before they begin the work: “we are going to make a really good show.” Rachel admits she does not know at the outset how that will be achieved, and none of the other collaborators – artistic, medical, patients, producers – knows either. But they all share a unified objective.

At the outset, it is natural that everyone should have different views and wants. If anyone said “we’re taking *x* position” early on, that might alienate some of the present stakeholders, not to mention those yet to be identified. The topic of childhood cancer in our example is a sensitive one, providing many opportunities for messing up in some way. However, the group articulates from the outset that “we’re going to find something *together*.” Group members resolve to travel down an exploratory path, and arrive at an event. This event is their unifying goal – and thus their greatest asset for collaboration. It yields a production that is bigger than the individual, larger than anyone’s ownership of ideas, a clearly more attractive prospect than sticking intransigently to one’s own viewpoint. Each group member has very different reasons for wanting to reach that goal. But everyone, especially Rachel as the “leader” of this process, must be committed to this subservience to the shared objective.

In putting together *Superjohn*, everyone involved in the process had to think and work in new ways. They had to learn new ways of communication, and practice active and multisensory listening. They had to adapt. They had, to put it in the terms of the *Rethinking Negotiation Teaching* project, to develop and practice their skills at negotiation, in a complex, iterated, and authentic way.²⁸

And they never set foot in a classroom situation throughout.

Conclusion

“Conclusion” is, perhaps, an odd word to use at this juncture: we believe we are at the very beginning of a new direction. We will cheerfully admit that as of this moment, we have only the beginnings of an idea as to where this direction might lead us. To begin, it seems probable that we will need not a few, but many approaches and a variety of venues. Then, the strategy for each approach will need to take into account at least its *known or likely* strengths and limitations, for our purposes (such as age-based preferences among specific media such as YouTube, the risk of a film being subjected to a use or interpretation quite contrary to its makers’ intent, or a game being found boring because it is designed with too much collaboration and not enough competition).

Beyond this, we could speculate that the collaborative theater process described above may be easier for, say, a local community or church group to imagine adapting to their own needs than is electronic game development, with its daunting level of investment by commercial players. But it will take significant further thinking and experimentation even to approach any conclusions as to what varieties of theater (observed or, particularly, participatory), film or YouTube-like media, and games (electronic or other) might provide for the general public some degree of what our roughly 100 colleagues have worked hard, these past years, to update for formal teaching and training. It will take still more work, no doubt by an expanded cast of characters, to begin to reap measurable results. Yet at the beginning of the past thirty years’ formal teaching and training of negotiation and related fields there were many fewer committed players than are available today, and as a first generation’s work goes, the results were not too shabby.

That said, it is time to recognize that one of the great strengths of our field – its numerous, committed and often ingenious teachers – has inadvertently kept our attention away from what may be an even more fruitful area of future inquiry. Simply put, our field has been highly dependent on the enrolled, organized teaching and training of new negotiators and mediators, to the point where even many of the better *practitioners* earn a significant part of their living from relatively formal teaching and training. In such an environment, it is only natural that the current project should have focused on the revamping of formal methods of education and training. There has been more than enough to do. The relatively little attention paid to the mechanisms by which most of humanity has actually learned most of what it knows and does has been not only a near-inevitable consequence, in

the “short term” characterized by budgets, workloads and timetables, but a price well worth paying – for a while.

But no longer. This is an appropriate point to conclude the *Rethinking Negotiation Teaching* project, and to start to think about what our field might need next.

Notes

The authors thank Elaine L. Andrews, director emeritus of the University of Wisconsin’s Environmental Resources Center, for her advice in the preparation of this chapter.

¹ Admittedly, one moment of this gradual progression may be viewed as “teaching,” loosely construed. Having appreciated the depth of the resistance to the new technology, our protagonist sought some way of introducing doubt into the certainty of “this isn’t for me.” He discovered a website which, using reports from drivers throughout the United States, identified the locations of the favorite speed traps of every police force in the country. His colleagues, midnight mediators all with a geographic range of practice covering tens of thousands of square miles, were at unusually high risk from speed traps. He innocently sent them the link – which was well-received. The effect of this single gambit is not verifiable. It is a matter of record that behavioral change did occur; however, it seems doubtful that a single identifiable moment of “informal teaching” could have been the all-powerful key.

² There are other models that fit better with other kinds of situations, and that would reward study once our subject is fairly launched; but the differences are beyond the scope of this initial chapter.

³ Note that indirect learning, from a peer who has been trained, is a mode that falls between the two poles described here, formal and informal. Two examples by Shmueli, Wallace, and Kaufman (2009) describe such teaching and learning in a Washington, DC gang environment, and in Bedouin villages in Israel. The teaching was tailored to each case but did not reach everyone. Instead, in both cases it was directed at leaders, who in turn taught conflict management skills through their own behavior and by instituting deliberation rules within their groups that amounted to teaching integrative negotiation.

⁴ <http://www.ilinet.org/display/ILI/Home> (last accessed June 18, 2012).

⁵ <http://www.ilinet.org/display/ILI/Home> (last accessed June 18, 2012).

⁶ For example, conservation programs, which have been studied extensively are most likely to be effective when developed by a team that includes a natural resource expert and an educator, and when they are designed to enhance related goals of a network or organization.

⁷ For an overview of free-choice learning, see Institute for Learning Innovation, <http://www.ilinet.org/display/About/Free-Choice+Learning> (last accessed June 18, 2012.) One application tailored to our field can be found at Honeyman 1999.

⁸ Sometimes it is not so covert. “The playing-fields of Eton” have been famously influential – but in their relationship to British colonialism, and therefore the generation of conflict, have had a great deal to answer for.

⁹ The arguments around the effects of violent games on youth mirror the debates surrounding traditionally gory childhood stories (including *Mother*

Goose and other favorites). In that case too, some argue that children have understood and enjoyed these stories for centuries without any ill effect, while others would “sanitize” or forbid them to avoid children’s exposure to rather extreme depictions of violent acts (consider, for example, *The Old Woman Who Lived in a Shoe*, or *Hansel and Gretel*).

¹⁰ While at this stage we were unable to find rigorous research results to support this notion, it seems widely accepted by the public, which is, in itself, a particularly telling indication of acknowledgement of the power of games (see, e.g., Singer 2009 and Gamepolitics.com (2010) at <http://www.gamepolitics.com/2010/06/07/time-spent-playing-videogames-pays-drone-pilots> (last accessed June 18, 2012).

¹¹ To get the measure of the information technology generation, consider Beloit College’s Mindset List at <http://www.beloit.edu/mindset/2015/> (last accessed June 18, 2012). It opens with:

This year’s entering college class of 2015 was born just as the Internet took everyone onto the information highway and as Amazon began its relentless flow of books and everything else into their lives. Members of this year’s freshman class, most of them born in 1993, are the first generation to grow up taking the word “online” for granted and for whom crossing the digital divide has redefined research, original sources and access to information, changing the central experiences and methods in their lives.

¹² An excellent example of such a role-playing game, *Animonde*, was created by “croc,” a French author, in 1988. *Animonde* is a game in which players are looking for internal peace and good relationships with others, as a way to create miracles(!) Unfortunately it was not a great success in the marketplace – unlike the same author’s next game design, *In Nomine Satanis – Magna Veritas* (1989), which was very violent.

¹³ *Republic of Rome* covers the period from 264 B.C. to 43 B.C. Three scenarios cover the Early Republic (roughly the era of the first and second Punic Wars), Mid Republic (the era of the Gracchi), and Late Republic (the time of the Roman civil wars and Julius Caesar). Each player represents a faction in the Roman Senate, with a collection of senators rated for their oratorical and military skills, popularity with the people of Rome, and most importantly, political influence. The goal of the game is to have one of one’s senators amass enough influence to be declared “Consul for Life,” or, barring that, have one’s faction have most total influence when the maximum number of game turns has been played.

Within the game, Rome is threatened by foreign enemies and potential popular unrest. The heart of the game involves players managing the state’s affairs in a series of mock Senate sessions, wherein proposals are made and voted on (with votes proportional to each player’s total influence) to elect officers of the Senate (the Consuls and Censor, and in times of extreme emergency, a Dictator) and governors of provinces; to spend money to raise or disband legions and fleets; to appoint leaders to fight Rome’s enemies with said military force; to enact land reforms to mollify the populace; and to prosecute Senators for putative ethical lapses, among other things. While pursuing their own individual goal of increasing their faction’s influence, the players must co-operate to ensure that Rome is not overwhelmed by foreign threats, popular unrest, or bankruptcy, causing Rome to fall and all players to lose (although if a player’s faction is in rebellion *against* Rome, they may win in such a situation). Within this framework, the players use diplomacy, al-

liances, persuasions, prosecutions, graft, bribery, murder and even conspiracies to advance their cause.

¹⁴ With these options in mind, we suggest some other practical channels through which negotiation education might be advanced, besides the electronic media on which we focus in the text:

- Creating a “negotiation play” variation of familiar and popular games, and including them in the instruction manual. For example, police procedural fiction has popularized the negotiations between local police and the FBI over cooperation in solving high-profile cases, with each seeking to maximize what they get and minimize what they give. This might be internalized into a new variation of the game of *Clue*, in which, as it is traditionally played, participants act individually, hoarding their information zealously, in pursuit of the murderer of Mr. Boddy.
- Providing guidance to parents: Game instruction manuals (such as that of *Monopoly* or *Risk*) could include information on how parents might develop their children’s negotiation skills, utilizing opportunities presented by the game.
- Creating negotiation-themed games: These might be new board games (perhaps *Plea Bargain!* will become a reality, or the reality show *Shark Tank* might develop a home edition).

¹⁵ As technology became more sophisticated, this mix of individual gaming – allowing for limited or no “useful” interactions – and joint gaming has held, although one can see areas of overlap. For example, in *Age of Empires*, a series of strategy games in which players develop a civilization and aim to achieve regional domination through a mix of technological development, resource gathering and force, players can chat with each other – and can change their diplomatic status towards one another to neutral, ally or enemy, based on the outcome of their talks. They can even set up a tribute-paying mechanism. This negotiation element is not only integrated into the multiplayer version, but into the single-player mode as well (albeit in a limited fashion), with the computer playing the role of the other civilizations, changing diplomatic status, or demanding that tribute be paid.

¹⁶ The rare Western movie that made its way to the public (such as *Acapulco* or *The Young Ones* in Romania) managed in no time to overturn years of communist indoctrination about the wretched lives of people in the West! The pendulum swung in the opposite direction: not a few among the public came to believe that Westerners really lived as in these musicals. Movies cannot be credited with the social change that took place in the Eastern Bloc at the end of the twentieth century. It is likely, however, that they helped create an idealized image of Western societies that offered an alternative, though they may also have contributed to later disillusionment (and nostalgia for the old communist regimes) that some people experienced, as their new life in freedom failed to match this image. Analyses of the “Arab Spring” events have also mentioned dynamics of social change similar to those in the Eastern Bloc. Again, images of life in the West contrasted with life in Middle Eastern and North African countries are widely believed to have led to people’s desire to enjoy the political freedoms they saw exercised in Western movies and television series. In both the Eastern Bloc and Arab Spring examples, the reality is so complex that no single factor can be convincingly linked causally

to a specific event or societal effect. However, it does seem that at least the leaders of totalitarian countries believe firmly in the negative effect movies have on their ability to control their subjects, or they would not expend the effort and treasure that they do in order to prevent the “corrupting” Western messages from breaking through. All current dictatorships are in firm control of the media to which their peoples have access, and prefer to produce mass entertainment “in-house.” As added proof of the effectiveness of movies in persuading the masses to a certain point of view, polls indicate that large majorities in totalitarian countries hold firm views about people and places they have never seen – and broadly subscribe to conspiracy theories that were widely disseminated through regime-produced movies and television productions.

¹⁷ The recent and surprisingly rapid decay of interest in environmental issues and particularly climate change seems primarily due to the competing economic worries that have engulfed people’s attention in the United States and other countries. It is far from clear, however, that the young are equally distracted.

¹⁸ See, e.g., http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7rzq2Bq_EsA&feature=fvvr (last accessed June 18, 2012); <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JwjAAGGi-90&feature=related> (last accessed June 18, 2012).

¹⁹ See http://www.ted.com/talks/salman_khan_let_s_use_video_to_reinvent_education.html (last accessed June 18, 2012).

²⁰ We lack confidence that readily available figures for India are authoritative, but as of 2007 a New York Times article (www.nytimes.com/2007/02/11/business/yourmoney/11india.html?_r=1&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss, last accessed June 18, 2012) calculated that about half of Indian households had a television, at 103,000,000. This figure seems at odds with a database maintained by www.nationmaster.com, which estimates 63,000,000 television sets in India (www.nationmaster.com/country/in-india/med-media, last accessed June 18, 2012.) But either way, it is widely understood that a huge number of Indian citizens do not have ready access to television, while even the higher TV figure compares with movie viewership figures of 2.86 billion – the highest in the world, by a large margin (see above [nationmaster.com](http://www.nationmaster.com) page, citing UNESCO Institute for Statistics.).

²¹ The March for Equality and against Racism (*Marche pour l'égalité et contre le racisme*), labeled the Beurs March (*Marche des Beurs*) by French media, was an antiracist march that took place in France in 1983, beginning in Marseille on October 15 with thirty-two persons and arriving in Paris on December 3 with more than 60,000 marchers. It was the first national antiracist demonstration ever held in France, on the model of the nonviolent actions of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Gandhi. Its two main demands were a ten-year residence permit for foreigners and the right of foreigners to vote.

²² Pied-Noir is a term referring to French citizens who lived in French Algeria before independence. Specifically, Pieds-Noirs include settlers of European descent, from France or other European countries, who were born in Algeria.

²³ A fellah is a peasant, farmer or agricultural laborer in North Africa.

²⁴ *Cuba, une Odyssée Africaine*, un documentaire de Jihan El Tahri, ARTE 2007.

²⁵ *Behind the Rainbow* un documentaire de Jihan El Tahri, ARTE (2009).

²⁶ See for example the discussion of the social and even conflict-management uses of theater which the city culture of Vancouver has developed, in LeBaron and Honeyman 2006.

²⁷ TED describes itself as follows:

TED is a nonprofit devoted to Ideas Worth Spreading. It started out (in 1984) as a conference bringing together people from three worlds: Technology, Entertainment, Design. Since then its scope has become ever broader. Along with two annual conferences – the TED Conference in Long Beach and Palm Springs each spring, and the TEDGlobal conference in Edinburgh UK each summer – TED includes the award-winning TEDTalks video site, the Open Translation Project and TED Conversations, the inspiring TED Fellows and TEDx programs, and the annual TED Prize. <http://www.ted.com/> (last accessed June 18, 2012).

²⁸ For more on the sometimes unusual methods of “teaching” implicated in this setting, see Honeyman and Parish 2013.

References

- Abt, C. C. 1970. *Serious games*. New York: Viking Press.
- Alexander, N. and M. LeBaron. 2009. Death of the role-play. In *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. DePalo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Avedon, E. M. and B. Sutton-Smith. 1971. *The study of games*. New York: Wiley.
- Barlett, C. P., C. A. Anderson, and E. L. Swing. 2009. Video game effects – confirmed, suspected, and speculative: A review of the evidence. *Simulation & Gaming* 40(3): 377.
- Crawford, C. 2003. *On game design*. Indianapolis, IN: New Riders Publishing.
- Docherty, J. S. 2010. “Adaptive” Negotiation: Practice and Teaching. In *Venturing beyond the classroom: Volume 2 in the rethinking negotiation teaching series*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Druckman, D. and N. Ebner. 2010. Enhancing concept learning: The simulation design experience. In *Venturing beyond the classroom: Volume 2 in the rethinking negotiation teaching series*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Ebner, N. and K. Kovach. 2010. Simulation 2.0: The resurrection. In *Venturing beyond the classroom: Volume 2 in the rethinking negotiation teaching series*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Falçao, H. 2012. A competition without losers. *Assessing our students, assessing ourselves: Volume 3 of the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching series*, edited by N. Ebner, J. Coben, and C. Honeyman. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Fischer, M. 2008. The plays that change the world. *The Guardian*, September 16. Available at www.guardian.co.uk/stage/theatreblog/2008/sep/16/theatre (last accessed June 18, 2012).
- Fox, K. H. 2009. Negotiation as a 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.
- Honeyman, C. 1999. *The alternative court: Covering dispute resolution*. *IRE Journal* Jan/Feb 1999: 13-15. Columbia, MO: Investigative Reporters & Editors, Inc.

- Honeyman, C. 2001-2009. Personal correspondence with three present and former chief hostage negotiators of the New York Police Department (copies on file with author).
- Honeyman, C., J. Coben, and G. De Palo (eds). 2010. *Venturing beyond the classroom: Volume 2 in the rethinking negotiation teaching series*. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Honeyman, C. and R. Parish. 2013 (forthcoming). Make a move. In *Make movement matter: Conflict, dance and neuroscience*, edited by M. LeBaron, C. MacLeod, and A. Acland. Chicago: American Bar Association.
- Huizinga, J. 1950. *Homo ludens: A study of the play-element in culture*. Boston, MA: The Beacon Press.
- Johnstone, K. 1979. *Impro: Improvisation and the theater*. London: Methuen.
- Khan, S. 2011. *Let's use video to reinvent education*. TED Talk, March 2. Available at www.ted.com/talks/salman_khan_let_s_use_video_to_reinvent_education.html (last accessed June 18, 2012).
- LeBaron, M. and C. Honeyman. 2006. Using the creative arts. In *The negotiator's fieldbook: The desk reference for the experienced negotiator*, edited by A. K. Schneider and C. Honeyman. Washington, DC: American Bar Association.
- Lederach, J. P. 2005. *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace*. Oxford University Press.
- McGonigal, J. 2011. *Reality Is broken: Why games make us better and how they can change the World*. New York: Penguin.
- NAAEE, 2004 *Nonformal environmental education programs: Guidelines for excellence*. North American Association for Environmental Education. Available at <http://eelinked.naaee.net/n/guidelines/posts/Nonformal-Environmental-Education-Programs-Guidelines-for-Excellence> (last accessed June 18, 2012).
- Rogers, E. M. and F. F. Shoemaker. 1971. *Communication of innovations: A cross-cultural approach*. New York: Free Press.
- Salen, K. and E. Zimmerman. 2003. *Rules of play – Game design fundamentals*. London: MIT Press.
- Shmueli, D., W. Warfield, and S. Kaufman. 2009. Enhancing community leadership negotiation skills. *Negotiation Journal* 25(2): 249-266.
- Singer, P. W. 2009. *Wired for war: The robotics revolution and conflict in the 21st century*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Wohn, D. Y. 2011. Reciprocity in social network games and generation of social capital. Available at <http://src.acm.org/2011/D.YvetteWohn.pdf> (last accessed June 18, 2012).

