

## Reflective Practice in the New Millennium

*Michelle LeBaron & Mario Patera\**

**Editors' Note:** *LeBaron and Patera use their own cultures – Canadian and Austrian respectively – to examine the teaching assumptions of a group of top-flight teachers of negotiation. They discover a number of unstated theoretical assumptions, heavily influenced by Western thought in general and U.S. culture in particular, and demonstrate alternate assumptions which might better guide second generation training.*

---

“[I]n order to broaden and deepen their capacity for reflection-in-action, professional practitioners must discover and restructure the...theories of action...they bring to their professional lives” (Schön 1983: 353).

**Questions from the Future**

“A wise man is one who asks the right questions instead of giving the right answers” (F. Nietzsche).

---

The 2008 Rome conference, *Developing “Second Generation” Global Negotiation Education*, involved scholars who collectively represented hundreds of years of collective experience in diverse areas of negotiation.

---

\* **Michelle LeBaron** is a Professor of Law and Director of the Dispute Resolution Program at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, Canada, and an award-winning teacher. Her email address is lebaron@law.ubc.ca. **Mario Patera** is a tenured social scientist at the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies and Continuing Education at the University of Klagenfurt in Vienna, Austria. He introduced the topic of “Mediation” to five Austrian universities and works as a certified psychotherapist, coach and mediator. His email address is mario.patera@univie.ac.at.

For the first two days of the conference, presenters were observed by their scholarly peers delivering various modules of negotiation training. Because teaching and training are generally done for participants without peers present, the experience held a unique potential for learning.

The training provided to European participants was informed by English-language scholarship reflecting little research or theory from outside the U.S. Unstated theoretical assumptions influenced the pedagogical design and delivery of the program, with role-plays of American-based fact patterns as the dominant vehicles for experiential engagement. In the absence of explicit consensus about what was at the center of our theoretical maps and how to operationalize them in training, certain habits of mind prevailed which shaped the training conceptualization, planning and delivery.

Our aim in this article is to reflect on the pedagogical approaches used at the conference, as well as the theoretical, cultural and worldview assumptions underlying them. From our respective vantage points of Austria and Canada, we propose a protean approach to second generation negotiation education, and trace its implications for curriculum design and delivery across national contexts.

We begin with a number of questions. How did the diverse styles of the conference trainers conform or diverge with respect to an American canon of theory and approaches? What would happen if the conference were to be viewed from a vantage point of fifty years from now, when negotiation education will have evolved further? What would our descendents see, and – imagining that these descendents will be more global and multicultural in their orientations as the world continues to shrink – what would they notice about the cultural and pedagogical assumptions embedded in the training? What paradigmatic shifts can we predict that will deepen the effectiveness of our scholarship and teaching? Finally, imagining that neuroscientists will continue uncovering vital information about learning and practice, what trajectories can we identify to inform current pedagogy?

This time-travel to the future uncovers a truism: it is difficult to get perspective on the present because it is all around us, shaping even our questions. In this article, we seek perspectives that may be revealed years or even decades hence. Recognizing that change is constant and evolution is essential to survival, we examine which additions or changes are important to negotiation teaching and scholarship for it to remain vital, interculturally relevant and effective. Our explorations, informed by our experiences as scholars and educators, aim to generate ongoing dialogue, and also strive to:

- Provide touchstones for examining future trainings, especially as they relate to cultural fluency;
- Examine accepted approaches for fit with neuroscientific findings and principles of reflective practice; and
- Develop ideas and concepts that inform new approaches to training.

At the same time as we suggest expanding and varying existing approaches to negotiation education, we wonder what students will receive as core ideas if not the “tried and true” approaches that have informed our scholarly lexicons. Yet we also know that any map is not the territory. As negotiation scholars and teachers, we seek maps that are maximally useful and as close to the actual territory participants will encounter as possible. Taking account of the present global territory, we note the following:

- Parties to negotiations will always bring their own cultural and worldview-shaped perspectives, values and ideas about what is effective and appropriate communication;
- Negotiation teachers and scholars also bring their own cultural and worldview assumptions to their work, including the idea that it is possible to train people to increase their effectiveness as negotiators and that training should include theoretical material and skills;
- Inductive scholarship about negotiation is rare – Deborah Kolb’s exceptional book *When Talk Works* (1994) is an example of work that derives understandings from actual practice. Her scholarship suggests that effective negotiators and mediators use a wide range of approaches and skills, and that successful strategies arise from diverse cultural, personal and strategic factors;
- Effective negotiators are resourceful and imaginative, demonstrating creativity and a commitment to reflective learning. In addition to concrete skills, experiential work that fosters these capacities in participants may be more important than teaching a particular sequence and set of micro-skills;
- Effective negotiators are good at relating across differences. Experiential work that builds cultural fluency – the general ability to notice and respond to diverse communication starting points and worldviews, tolerance for ambiguity, and the specific ability to respond effectively to power dynamics and other complexities – is essential to effective practice.

As we considered these features of the global territory of negotiation training, we realized that our collaborative writing process mirrored many of the things we were writing about. We came face to

face with differences arising from the conference and our subsequent collaboration related to communication, framing, relative theory/practice emphasis, and overall approach. Our reflection on the intercultural collaborative process thus became not only a meta-level interest as we explored pedagogical excellence in negotiation; it became a direct source of reflection and learning. This article includes observations arising from our intercultural collaboration as well as research and previous experiences.

One way that differences surfaced between us relates to framing. Caton Campbell and Jayne Docherty (2006) wrote that framing is “a central part of the...pedagogical canon” for conflict assessment and, by extension, negotiation. We discovered differences in the way we framed questions, ranging from Austrian preference for directness to Canadian tendency to mute or smooth edges. We experimented with time and context variables to test ideas originating from our respective standpoints. Our attention to the assumptions underlying our observations struck us as one of the most generative components of our joint work, and something essential to negotiation training and practice generally.

### **Which Cultural or Worldview Assumptions Inform the “First Generation” of Negotiation Training?**

Other authors in this book have explored assumptions that inform first generation negotiation training approaches. As a companion to their observations, we suggest that current approaches privilege:

- Explicit communication and direct confrontation;
- Individualist perspectives on agency and autonomy;
- Competitive assumptions that people will act to maximize individual gains, and can be assisted to extend this behaviour to maximizing joint gains if their own interests are not compromised;
- Action-orientation at the expense of a focus on “being” or inaction;
- Analytic problem-solving;
- Sequential orientation to time;
- Universalist ideas about the international applicability of “interest-based” negotiation;
- Agreement as a central measure of success.

First-generation approaches to interest-based negotiation are not universal, but representative of dominant U.S. American culture and other groups influenced by Western thought. Elsewhere, LeBaron (2003) has set out an argument that the core concepts of interest-based negotiation may not translate well across cultural and worldview differences. We will not cover those ideas again here; they are

best summarized by observing that the academic study and teaching of negotiation are relatively new and arise from a set of assumptions about how knowledge is best assembled and packaged. These assumptions rest on a push for modularization of negotiation training – a desire to encapsulate its precepts and processes into sequential flows of ideas and trainable modules. As post-modern theorists have pointed out, these assumptions are flawed because they assume that relational processes are reducible to such sequences, and that people will act in accordance with these models. Just as the “rational actor” idea has been refuted in economics, it is time that this canon of negotiation checked the validity of its assumptions and formulated an approach more in keeping with what we know about human interaction, motivations and artistry. While this has been done, notably in the *Negotiator's Fieldbook* (Schneider and Honeyman 2006), many of the ideas elaborated there seem not to have penetrated first generation approaches to negotiation training.

Why have negotiation trainers been slow to respond to new ideas? We aren't sure, but some of the reasons may include a preference for prescriptive approaches reducible to repeatable modules. By definition, culturally fluent negotiation education would feature a series of tools and processes applicable to different ways of being, seeing and responding to issues and diverse others. These tools are not easily packaged in prescriptive modules. To be responsive to a wide range of differences, these tools must tap flexibility and intuition, drawing trainees' attention to symbolic dimensions of negotiation including perceptions, identities, and worldviews.

Not only are culturally-responsive approaches more difficult to convey in a training format, there are other barriers to their adoption. From a European perspective, U.S. American approaches to teaching and learning focus on the pragmatic and tend to be delivered in sequenced models. European training is generally more theoretically and philosophically informed. This difference is illustrated by contrasting the legal systems in the U.S. with those in most of Western Europe. People from the U.S., whether they always recognize it or not, have been influenced by a common law approach, where decisions create precedents which then govern new cases. Europeans (with the exception of the British) use a civil law approach, preferring recourse to broad legal principles informed by theory enumerated in civil codes. We wonder whether the differences reflected in the legal systems are not reproduced in their respective approaches to negotiation education. Our approach in this article seeks to integrate the European preference for analysis of underlying theories with the North American focus on effective results

in assessing negotiation training strategies. With this in mind, we explore the intention of the conference.

### **What is the Goal of Developing a Second-Generation Approach to Negotiation Education?**

Everyone at the Rome conference was an expert in negotiation, with demonstrated excellence in scholarship and teaching. All shared a desire to take a meta-level look at accepted approaches to pedagogy. Yet it was unclear if we shared clarity of intention. In moving beyond “first generation” approaches, did we aim to

- Make minor adjustments?
- Perfect tried and true methods?
- Find ways to adapt accepted methods to diverse cultural settings? or
- Radically examine the underpinnings of theory and practice?

If our shared interest was radical re-examination, fundamental changes to negotiation education are a likely outcome. We believe that openness to fundamental change is overdue; many methods in current use were developed decades ago, and reflect culturally-shaped perceptions that do not translate well across all nationalities or over time. Such openness requires a double-loop learning approach as described by Chris Argyris and Donald Schön (1978). Single-loop learning involves noticing where something goes wrong and taking steps to correct the problem. Double-loop learning involves questioning the governing principles themselves, looking deeper than presenting problems and corresponding solutions to underlying norms and objectives. A double-loop learning approach to negotiation pedagogy involves re-examining the theoretical basis of our work.

### **What Should Comprise the Theoretical Basis of Second-Generation Negotiation Education?**

We propose that the theoretical foundation for second-generation global negotiation education should be built on sound understandings of constructivism; systems and intercultural theories; new research into learning; and neurobiology. In addition, we argue that the provenance of psychotherapy as a source that informs theory and practice in negotiation should be acknowledged, further examined and deepened. To name a few of the sources, negotiation scholar/practitioners have borrowed from Carl Roger’s client-centered approach; concepts of systemic and family therapy from Virginia Satir and representatives of the Milano School; the Palo Alto School including Paul Watzlawick, Janet Beavon and Don Jackson;

the ground-breaking ideas of Milton Erickson; and solution-focused brief therapy developed by the members of the Milwaukee School, especially Steve de Shazer. Acknowledging psychotherapeutic roots does not constitute an argument that only psychotherapists are qualified to draw from these roots. Rather, it is an attempt to recognize the ubiquitous influence of psychotherapy on ideas of what constitutes effectiveness in negotiation, and to consciously infuse practice with the richness psychological perspectives yield. Finding ways to support and improve psychologically-based intervention skills for professional negotiators (e.g., attorneys, medical doctors, executives, consultants) could enhance both the quality of training and results in the field.

Some years ago at George Mason University, one of us taught a course titled *Theories of the Person* to M.S. and Ph.D. students. The course surveyed ideas from various psychological theorists and practitioners about the nature of human beings, and also integrated social psychological perspectives. From this foundation, we traced the influences of psychological theories on conflict resolution approaches, including negotiation. Participants observed that the class made them much more aware of philosophical and theoretical choice-points that inform practice. Second-generation negotiation educators could borrow from this approach by using psychological theories to explore the underpinnings of assumptions about good practice and to inform approaches to teaching.

Acknowledging the psychological foundations of negotiation would mean a step away from the ubiquitous focus in many training programs on communication prescriptions like active listening, reframing and restating. While attempts to slow down and improve accuracy of negotiation exchanges are useful, psychological work reminds us that there are multiple, culturally-situated ways to effectively communicate and build relationships. Intercultural perspectives underline this idea, emphasizing that “one size fits all” does not work in today’s global society.

Neurobiological findings are also essential sources to inform training and practice in negotiation. We now know more about the linked human needs for bonding and growth that manifest beginning in the womb. These needs surely inform people’s approaches to relationships, including relationships in negotiation. The need for autonomy is also well-established; effective negotiation training needs to reflect all three of these fundamental needs. While John Burton, Mary Clark (2002) and others have long argued the applicability of these understandings to conflict resolution and negotiation, their implications are not reflected in first-generation training. If, as Clark argues, the drives for connection and growth naturally orient

people to cooperation, negotiation training might focus on eliciting these tendencies and integrating them into specific strategies and skills. We know, for example, that the hormone oxytocin is involved in bonding, and that it increases as people develop trust. If people can be coached to display trusting behaviors, oxytocin levels may increase, supporting collaborative negotiation exchanges. Another neurobiological example comes from mirror cells, now known to be the basis for empathy. Learning ways to stimulate mirror cells would add important dimensions to negotiators' repertoires.

Root assumptions about methodologies are also important to consider in training design. We know that energy follows attention, and that we pay attention selectively based on cognitive schemas that shape our expectations and perceptions. The heart of our methodologies will shape not only what seems natural in course design, but the things we notice and encourage in participants. Do we aim to convey singular truths via lectures? Or is our focus on skills deepened by application and reflection? Do we seek awareness and insight, catalyzing a learning community among those present? David Thomas and Kerr Inkson (2003) suggest that effective intercultural training should foster knowledge, mindfulness and behavioral skills. Applying this to negotiation training, we inquire about how our orthodox approaches deliver knowledge, and assist learners in practicing and applying skills while encouraging mindfulness. Our observation is that mindfulness is often neglected in first-generation negotiation training, particularly as it relates to intercultural awareness. Below, we outline an approach designed to incorporate all three elements in negotiation training.

### **Which Ideas Should Inform Second-Generation Approaches to Teaching and Learning Negotiation?**

Current science sheds new light on learning processes. Real learning is always an interaction among systems and environments. Learning is shaped not only by the explicit contents covered, but also the implicit rules informing interactions. This has long been recognized in education, discussed as the "hidden curriculum." Messages concerning the nature of humans and human relations, and moral and ethical values are embedded in teaching and learning (Simon 1997). Given this awareness, it is important to explore how transferable our embedded assumptions may be across worldviews.

Neurobiological findings suggest that learning is optimized when there is a generative combination of familiar and new ideas, and the learning atmosphere is encouraging and supportive (Hether 2006). We also know that when strong emotions are summoned in a training session, lessons are more easily recalled and



applied in actual negotiating situations. Repetition and incremental deepening of ideas are also important to the synthesis and application of learning. Given these findings, effective training should include ample time for reflection, assimilation and integration of ideas (Patera 2001). It should also involve a focus on actual situations that evoke authentic emotions, departing from the ubiquitous focus on simulations that characterizes so much negotiation training.

As articulated by Parker Palmer (1998), teaching and learning are always reciprocal. In addition, they draw on all aspects of our beings, and work best when this understanding informs design of training structures, activities and goals. We suggest that second-generation negotiation training be seen as an interactive exercise in which:

- Relations between trainers and participants are based on mutuality and openness to examine root assumptions;
- Trainers are not “sages on stage”, but co-learners, with overall responsibility for holding the container of the learning enterprise and infusing theory with meaning;
- Participants take an active role in shaping and deepening their learning process;
- Multi-modal learning addresses multiple learning styles, all senses are engaged, and environmental factors are taken into account, including the physical learning environment and needs for movement and exercise, nutrition and bio-rhythms;
- Learning rhythms are optimized and the psychological space is both open and bounded;
- A mix of configurations is employed (plenary, small and large groups, and individual reflection.)

Training also needs to take context into account. Even if people are naturally cooperative, many of us operate within competitive systems. Our attitudes and habits shaped in the atmosphere of competition need to be examined if we are to achieve optimal negotiation results. How should this be done? Palmer suggests that effective learning happens when the teaching space is both hospitable and charged, meaning environments that are comfortable, but not so relaxed that there is no challenge (Palmer 1998: 74). Neurobiological findings support this observation; we know that emotional structures themselves change when our emotions are engaged. Sometimes, this may mean that participants struggle to wrest their own answers rather than being handed a blueprint for negotiation processes and skills. The most effective training engages emotions and provokes reflection of participants’ “givens” while also providing a safe and hospitable atmosphere (Hüther 2005). Achieving this bal-

ance means examining ways training is constructed and feedback is delivered to be sure they are both welcoming and charged.

Concerning the role of the trainer, Palmer suggests that good teaching cannot be reduced to technique. "Good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher," he reminds us (1998: 10). Palmer (1998: 63) suggests that effective teachers:

- Connect their experience with 'beginner's mind' at the outset of each new class;
- Trust that their and their students' inward and invisible sense of identity is unfolded as it surfaces in outward encounters with others;
- Stand at the crossroads of the personal and the public;
- Evoke emotions as well as intellect, knowing that both are essential to learning.

Second-generation negotiation trainers will use these characteristics as touchstones in design and implementation. They will summon the blend of humility and authority that invites students to bring their whole selves into the room. Together, they will travel the path of cultivating cultural fluency so that relations across difference are fertile and productive. This means that they will strive to be comfortable with ambiguity, as Chris Honeyman (2006) suggests in *The Negotiator's Fieldbook*. They will be secure enough in their own expertise to acknowledge when they don't know the answer to questions. This openness will create a climate of experimentation and creativity rather than rigidity and closely-bounded inquiry.

As well, trainers and participants will be most successful when they work from the awareness that their invisible sense of identity becomes visible in encounters with others. As Parker Palmer (1998) writes, we discover things about ourselves through engaging others. Put differently, powerful trainers draw not only on their experience, but on their identities in mentoring others. When our skills and experience as experts are joined with our identities – who we are – a potent alchemy begins to operate. By modelling this approach, trainers encourage participants to explore the inter-relationships between what they do and who they are. In this spaciousness, participants and trainers uncover new questions and, in response, new hybrid possibilities emerge. The challenge for trainers is to welcome divergences and the marriage of hard-edged "doing" with less obvious qualities of "being" with generosity and encouragement. Second-generation negotiation trainers will actively seek opportunities to seed their knowledge with diverse ideas by collaborating across all kinds of boundaries, and welcoming holistic ways of participating and exploring issues.

## Which Precursors and Follow-Up Are Important to Delivering Negotiation Training?

Just as effective negotiators conduct assessments before jumping into processes, negotiation trainers in the future will inquire about their participants before or at the outset of a training process. They will ask questions like:

- Who are the people attending this negotiation course?
- What are their backgrounds?
- What are their worldviews and cognitive habits?
- What are their cultural starting points?
- What do they already know?
- What strategies and approaches have worked well for them across a wide range of contexts?
- Are there recurrent challenges they face in negotiation?
- What would an ideal negotiator be able to do in the contexts in which they work?
- What do they care about?
- What do they fear?
- What do they value or use as currency?
- What matters less to them than it might to others in different contexts?

With these questions answered, formulating an effective training program is easier. Of course, the questions cannot necessarily be answered in advance, nor comprehensively. People live fast-paced lives; they come (justifiably) to training courses expecting to receive well-packaged information that will give them concrete ways to improve their practice. Yet, if they are to be truly assisted in this improvement, we owe it to them to ask these questions. Otherwise, we risk delivering a course that is irrelevant, not useful or insulting (either because it is far too sophisticated or far too simplified for those in attendance).

Culturally, there may be an expectation that the “expert” discloses the trade secrets of negotiation. This cultural expectation may be met by naming the importance of situating any process around the people in it – whether training or a negotiation process. Time spent exploring the “who” will lend relevance and credibility to the “what” and “how” to be pursued as the training continues.

Of course, even thorough preparation and awareness of participants’ contexts and perspectives will not be enough to guarantee effective training. Trainers should include participants in exploring expectations for the training and its effects on their practices. This can be done effectively using paradoxical techniques. For example, a trainer may ask whether participants expect to return after the training to “business as usual”. The intended effect of the question

is to stimulate participants to ask themselves how they will integrate the training material so they can modify their approach to negotiation following the training.

A related area of concern for second-generation trainers is post-training follow-up. How do we know whether and how skills are transferred and applied in real life settings? The prospects for adequate transfer could be enhanced by asking participants questions like:

- Which skills or processes may not work in my personal or professional contexts?
- Why might they not work?
- Are there ways the skills or processes may need to be adapted to fit with my personality and communication style, or cultural settings where I find myself?
- What could keep me from applying the skills I've just learned?
- What fears do I have about my ability to apply the skills I have learned? How can I counter those fears?
- How can I get the support I need to apply these skills in professional contexts?

This kind of inquiry can inoculate against discouragement if participants try to apply skills and encounter difficulties. It also helps them plan for success as they envision integration of new skills into their repertoires, a powerful strategy that makes successful application more likely. Ideally, actual follow-up is also a component of training programs, when participants come back after applying skills and strategies to reflect and revisit the above questions in the light of their experiences.

Time is an essential aspect of training design, as evidenced by the above discussion of the importance of pre- and post-assessment and reflection. Many participants in the Rome conference shared the assumption that most groups of business people will not devote more than two days to negotiation training. Trainers therefore choose content that will fit within that time frame. This assumption about time also extends to the way content is delivered. Facing time pressure, the tendency is to "front-load" as much content as possible, minimizing opportunities for engagement and dialogue. This approach undermines both single-loop and double-loop learning because it does not offer opportunities for multi-directional exchange, complex problem engagement, peer learning or reflection on skills or core assumptions. Second-generation trainers will question time-related assumptions, and experiment with new frameworks and models that stretch training programs over time to facilitate ongoing feedback and integration. They will consider time not a limited re-

source to be filled with maximum information, but a space stretching forward and back where relationship and reflection animate choices.

## Motivation and Emotions in Second-Generation Negotiation Training

Understanding and working effectively with emotions are essential for effective negotiation. Science has delivered sound proof that there is no human reaction or thought not linked to an emotion. What would negotiation training look like that placed emotional intelligence (the ability to regulate, use and respond to emotional states) at its center? Palmer suggests that “intellect works in concert with feeling, so if I hope to open my students’ minds, I must open their emotions as well” (1998: 63). Thomas and Inkson (2003) suggest that emotional intelligence should be combined with social intelligence (the ability to interact effectively with others) and cultural intelligence to inform effective practice. While the classic definition of “interests” takes emotions into account, it reduces them to an analytic category rather than fostering the capacity to name, activate and engage them in effective practice.

Motivation is also important in designing and implementing effective training. How can participants effectively be motivated to examine their habits of attention, and modify their approaches? Neurobiological research suggests that there is a need for positive reinforcement as well as constructive feedback about learning edges. It also indicates that first-person testimonials and role-taking experiences can provide useful models for target skills. Generally, double-loop learning as described by Argyris and Schön (1978) may increase motivation because it is aimed at interrupting assumptions to stimulate change. When people experience the limitations and bounded lenses of their habitual perceptions, they are more motivated to change.

Motivation is also heightened when people experience the benefits of cultivating two simultaneous levels of perception, focusing on interactions *and* inner processes of interpretation and meaning-making. As Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela (1987) remind us, it is not understanding which should be our aim, but the understanding of understanding. The very thought “I have understood,” leads to closure. In many intercultural encounters, trusted models and theories which seemingly explain differences may cause us to lose touch with actual situations.

### Toward Protean Negotiating: Cultivating Virtuosity

Taking a step back, we ask what will happen if current approaches to negotiation training are not reconsidered. Will the field flourish? Will orthodox ideas continue to be exported around the world? Or will these ideas be sidelined because they do not translate well across cultural and worldview boundaries? It is our hope that a wide range of changes that take new bodies of work into account will be proposed, and adopted. Perhaps we need a period of a hundred flowers blooming to inform a protean approach to negotiation training; one where creativity, imagination and flexibility infuse method and content.

Of course, the devil is in the details. Combining the diffuse elements we have described with specific starting points will not be easy. There is an argument that virtuosity cannot be cultivated without a basic foundation. No one sits down to play a Beethoven sonata with studied perfection until they have played endless études and studies. While that is true, work on perception and thin-slicing (Gladwell 2007) suggests that humans have incredible abilities to take in situations, assess them and act quickly from those assessments. The building blocks we most need, then, may not be definitions of interests and interest-based negotiation, but more diffuse understandings of our perceptual and relational habits and potentials. Making those explicit and building on them may be a fertile and useful way forward.

Charles Hampden-Turner and Fons Trompenaars (2000) draw a distinction between diffuse and specific starting points in communication. The approach we are advocating borrows from each side of the continuum. Intercultural interactions, especially those that involve identity and worldviews, require diffuse approaches. These dimensions of human experience are not reducible to specifics, yet need to be engaged for effective negotiation to take place. The tendency of first-generation trainers to base negotiation training on the tried-and-true principles of *Getting to Yes* (1982) has kept our collective attention riveted on material, instrumental aspects of negotiation. Yet, for example, we know that notions like separating people from the problem do not translate well into collectivist cultures. There is doubt about its applicability in individualist settings as well. Few people we have trained have had the detachment to do this 'mental surgery' on their own processes. Incorporating these understandings into negotiation training and practice suggests a wholesale re-evaluation of some essential ideas of the field, including a cultural audit of their universality.

We argue, with Peter Adler (2006), that second-generation negotiation scholarship and teaching must be protean – it must equip

people to adapt, shape-shift and create new synergies in the moment. If these capacities are central to effective negotiation, the following implications for teaching unfold:

- Authenticity is essential: synthetic situations may not translate well across cultures, partly because they may arise from different root assumptions about how people behave and should behave; as well, in some cultural contexts (for example, for some indigenous peoples in Canada) it does not make cultural sense to pretend an identity other than your own (Alexander and LeBaron, *Death of the Role-Play*, in this volume). Rather than attempting to justify and explain the synthetic role-play methodology, we should be finding ways that work *interculturally*, adapting to specific cultural sensibilities and cultivating openness to completely new approaches;
- Teaching methods that blend arts and science (including understandings of neurobiology) have the most promise going forward. If we want to help people develop creativity, resilience, tenacity and cultural fluency, we need to help them expand self and other-awareness;
- Mindfulness is essential to effective training. We need to know something of our inner terrains – how we work, what we tend to see, what we may miss for tending not to see it – and encourage participants in training to do the same. How many negotiation processes have been unsuccessful because of a negotiator’s blind spot or their inability to realize that something they tend to disregard is of paramount importance to their counterpart? The number is probably huge;
- Teaching methods that integrate somatic, emotional, spiritual and cultural dimensions will be more powerful than those that stay on the apparently safer road of the analytic and cognitive. We are so much more than cognitive beings!

In addition, the kind of dialogue we have had writing this article would enrich second generation training with double-loop learning. Co-trainers who counterpoint in planning and delivery between self-observation and questioning on one hand, and content and best practices for negotiation on the other, are more likely to deliver excellent courses. We found that our culturally-shaped tendencies were not only stylistic or superficial. The ways we were comfortable expressing ideas point to deeper differences in ways of paying attention, what we value, and our goals as educators and practitioners. While we as co-authors have reached consensus on many points, the sometimes challenging process of reaching agreement has taught us at least as much as the outcome. We have worked through different

starting points and found meeting places between optimism and pessimism; directness and indirectness; low and high context communication; and individual and collective accountability. Based on this experience, we conclude that courses delivered by culturally different trainers are likely to be far richer than those given by single trainers alone. Participants will not only hear a greater range of ideas about negotiation, but will have a powerful model of intercultural collaboration in the way the training is presented.

If the approaches in this article were adopted, what would second-generation negotiation training look like? What would it feel like for those who expect a routinized series of steps that will “set them up for success?” We argue that it would look more like real life, and that training that mimics real life is more likely to be useful. As a map draws closer to the territory, the map is a more helpful tool. As a map is used, specifics will emerge that can be addressed in ways that speak to multiple learning styles, needs and expectations. This is a future to embrace with enthusiasm.

## References

- Adler, P. S. 2006. Protean negotiation. 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.
- Argyris, C. and D. Schön. 1978. *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Caton Campbell, M. and J. S. Docherty. 2006. What's in a frame? 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.
- Clark, M. E. 2002. *In search of human nature*. London: Routledge.
- Fisher, R. and W. Ury. 1981. *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Gamm, U. und P. Patera. 2004. Mut zur qualität – Ein plädoyer für mehr qualität in der wirtschaftsmidiation. *Zeitschrift für konfliktmanagement* 6:267-272.
- Gladwell, M. 2005. *Blink: The power of thinking without thinking*. New York: Little, Brown and Co.
- Hampden-Turner, C. and F. Trompenaars. 2000. *Building cross cultural competence: How to create wealth from conflicting values*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Honeyman, C. 2006. Using ambiguity. 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.
- Hüther, G. 2006. *The compassionate brain: How empathy creates intelligence*. Boston: Trumpeter.



- Hüther, G. 2005. *Biologie der angst: Wie aus stress gefühle werden*, 7th edn. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck.
- Kolb, D. and associates. 1994. *When talk works: Profiles of mediators*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- LeBaron, M. 2003. *Bridging troubled waters: Conflict resolution from the heart*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Maturana, H. R. and F. J. Varela. 1987. *The tree of knowledge: The biological roots of human understanding*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Palmer, P. 1998. *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Patera, M. 2001. Reflexionskompetenz – Qualitätskriterium für (künftige) mediatorInnen. *Zeitschrift für konfliktmanagement* 5: 226-229.
- Schneider, A. K. and C. Honeyman (eds). 2006. *The negotiator's fieldbook: The desk reference for the experienced negotiator*. Washington, DC: American Bar Association.
- Schön, D. A. 1983. *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Simon, F. B. 1997. *Die kunst, nicht zu lernen. Und andere paradoxien in psychotherapie, management, politik*. Heidelberg: Carl-Auer-Systeme.
- Thomas, D. C. and K. Inkson. 2003. *Cultural intelligence*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

