INTRA 2019
Teaching Negotiators

Transcripts of the presentations, panels, and keynote speech of the 2019 conference of the International Negotiation Teaching and Research Association (INTRA) held at Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan.

INTRA 2019 and The Negotiation Competition 2019 were generously supported by The GAP Partnership, a global negotiation consultancy specializing in the development of negotiation solutions and strategies. https://www.thegappartnership.com/

Kyoto University, Kyoto Research Park, and Eikando Temple also kindly supported INTRA and The Negotiation Competition 2019.

Contents

Introduction

The 2019 meeting of INTRA at Kyoto University brought together some 30 academics and practitioners from eleven different countries across Asia, Europe and the Americas to discuss their projects, findings, and aspirations around the subject of Negotiation. INTRA 2019 was a continuation of the Association's efforts to share ideas and explore the challenges currently facing negotiation training and research.

Three of the sessions, 1, 3, and 6, put a focus on role play simulations and gamification of training. Sessions 4 and 5 as well as the keynote took on training in relation to historical figures as well as personal characteristics and skills. Sessions, 2, 8, and 9 handled the issues of characteristics of great negotiators in terms of training, international contexts, and cooperation among organizations.

Below are lightly edited verbatim transcripts of the INTRA sessions. The individual presentations are also posted. Please refer to them as you read the transcripts.

Session 1: A comparison of on-line and face-to-face negotiation. Jacobus Vos (EADA Barcelona)

Jacobus Philipp Vos graduated in Philosophy from the University of Amsterdam, has taken the EADA Master in Leadership and Organisational Coaching and is certified in LIFO methodology. He is a trainer in managerial skills with broad expertise in Europe and abroad and has worked with several organisations at all levels, from intermediate posts to upper management. He has taught as a visiting professor en different schools and universities such as IESE, Mannheim Business School and Nijenrode Business School and is specialised in the following areas: Leadership and the team, personal development, coaching and coaching skills for leaders, communication and experiential methodology (role plays). He is a senior Associate Professor in the EADA Strategy, Leadership and People Department.

J. Vos: Training for prison guards in Holland. They started a program to help them. Before, people would leave the prison without any notice, if you put even a pencil to the throat of any guard. But then prisoners knew that this was happening too much. So, what was happening was that they closed the doors after some time but once the doors were closed everybody was locked up with a dangerous man who couldn't get out anymore. That's a lot of tension and then they had to go to a phone and then somebody acted. Everybody was trained to pick up the phone for the first time to get rid of the tension.

So we had ... did the whole training from getting the prison guards under control with a wooden knife, get them on the phone and then we had extensive – up to four hour negotiations. ... Over the years, because of our crisis teams. And it was very precise training in negotiation.

So my focus is not much research, rather it's really developing contact with the persons and that's worked. And since 2005 I have been with EADA business school and since four years ago I've been involved with TNC, last year we were in San Francisco in the final, so that makes me nervous for this year. Maybe, I could just have the slides?

So, Negotiation In the framework of the Leadership Development Program and Philosophy of Leadership Development. And negotiation was always part of this. So, Aysha (co-author) is a student of mine in Marketing, who did the numbers.

So this is where we take the students. We have a city campus in Barcelona where they do the hard stuff, the finance and the marketing, and then we have the Leadership Development Program which we do 45 minutes outside of Barcelona, where we train them in different modules. We have ... For the MBA program we have four modules over 10 days. It starts with Leading One's Self, Leading Others, Strategic Leadership, and then an integration module where the students sum up everything that they've learned. In those, 10 days, we used to have a specific and separate negotiation module of two days, where we would only focus on negotiation. After we had done all kinds of presentation skills and we worked on different topics, starting with ... always with the core, getting to know oneself. Creating relationships with others, dealing with diversity and then at a more strategic level and dealing with uncertainty and getting out there, outside of the campus, to Collbató campus.

So, what we have done, then, in those modules, is these kinds of things. With this, we learn how to give feedback, we do our outdoor activities, to help people face their fears. They have to do all kinds of storytelling, trust exercises ... They go into a cave, they do music together. So the idea is to do as many activities as possible. And negotiation somehow was not really as active a learning as we had in the other activities. So, somehow ... So this was also part of learning, having fun.

We moved from Collbató to the city campus. There's a city campus in Barcelona. And there, I was asked, one year ago, to design for 320 people a negotiation competition. And the assignment for it was, "No Human Interaction". And I was completely shocked, because, “So there goes my job!” My job is how to deal with people.

So, I had visited some companies and they had presented me new games. Of course, we turn the market and we found a game which was too expensive for us so we changed that from an individual game to team negotiations. People are negotiating against a machine. Teams of four people, 80 teams of four people, are negotiating against a machine. They get information from this online negotiation training. They get the usual articles that you can read. The Art of Business module is very much the core of it and there is a game. So people are getting into Venice and the media ... All their merchants with their mentor and ... Who can tell them things about how things work in business, and they learn all kinds of negotiation ... Negotiation tricks. They find information throughout the city. And they do six negotiation rounds. Each round gives them points, and their points are measured in ducats. Six different negotiations with scorings, which become increasingly high.

So, we did this week ... Also to save the cost of staying at the Collbató, that was also part of it. In 2018, we had four days, 318 students, 80 teams of four, three people, 6 simulations on the virtual merchants game, and we did one face-to-face negotiation, one of the TNC cases.

Now in April, when I get back, I will have to run again, because we have four days where we do the same. But then, we have one more face-to-face case and we have one virtual case. Virtual case means, in this case, for me, that we're doing negotiation over Skype. So, from two until three, we do negotiation, but you have to do it via Skype. Okay?

So in 2020, I want to set up a new version that might be the start of doing some research. So I'm a professor, I'm going slow, in this case. So the idea is just to gather some idea of what we are doing, and, maybe, throughout the next few days you can help me think of, If you want, if you're interested, in looking for ways how I could set up 2020 in such a way that I can maybe get some data that can help us to think about what ... Where do we get better results? Online? Face-to-face? And what is the effect of online game negotiation training? Because, of course, that's very attractive, people love it, you have a competition. People in companies, they just go and it's so attractive that all 97 percent of the people finish the project. Before, you had online training, which was completed by only 23 percent, and the profile was diminished.

Now, what I have done for ... With the data of last year ... This is program as we had it. So on Monday ... Well, first with their pre-work, 15 days in advance, technical notes, they fill out questionnaires. They make use of the other things that they used already before. The disk profile, personality development team roles, and they have to discuss ... Oh and also, The GAP profile of negotiation. So they gather all this information between the four of them, in first session, from one until three, and they're trained as well by getting some kind of lecture to understand how their profiles fit together and then they can think of what kind of roles they can use in the negotiation team. Then, they have their first exercise playing the game, and they did round one last year. And then, they have to make an entry in the learning journal. So that summarizes our scoring elements.

So, I have three scoring elements. The scores, of six rounds, of virtual training, where they do six different negotiations, which are expressed in ducats. They also have to write a learning journal throughout the three days. And at the third day, they are asked to deliver the learning journal. We had eighty learning journals, had eight people, everybody had 10 learning journal to grade. And we said, "Make sure that you give an A from the best one, a C for the worst, and if there's any other extremely good then you also give them A, If there's another extremely bad you give it a C". Okay? So, this is how we scored the three levels. And from there, we gave them 10,000 points for the As, 5,000 points for the Bs and no points for the C.

Ducats. No clue how to correlate the algorithm from the game with the student. Because we don't know how it works. I don't know how it works.

So, then we had them ... In the second day, we had them watch video clips. Shut down, got them to negotiate a case to give them concepts of what is assertiveness, what is, well, all kinds of techniques. They have to answer questions. And then, form there, they do again, around four or five, they put everything together in the learning journal. And then, after that, they do round six. And then we have the final day, with a demo of TaeKwonDo, a guest speaker gave a kind of TED talk. And then the final two negotiation like we will be seeing tomorrow as well ... Saturday as well in the T&C. And then, the idea was to give them a score by using an app, but this had to be canceled because, time and skills were too limited to be able to do that.

So, this is how it looks in 2019. We've added one more face-to-face role play and we've added one more role play but then using just the Skype ... The Skype chat to work together. And, now we've got an official cinema to do the presentation. And with the cinema, we hope that we will have the WiFi and the slide also. What my idea is, that we can have direct comments from the students on what they like about negotiation, what's going on. So, live comments from 300 people on what's happening. So, I somehow suspect that by analyzing those comments, when they come ... I mean, there will be a lot of trash, but there might be also lots of comments related to direct moments in negotiation.

Which I think is really nice, because this is the way I trained originally. I was sent out, earlier, in the 90s, to companies. And people had their specific negotiation, where I was playing the counterpart. And then you could videotape it or without videotape I could give back, feedback ... Like of this moment, of this moment. Very specifically, where people connecting or not, and where you could make other choices as possible.

So that is going to be this year. So, I'm going to get some data again, on ... And possibly see some correlations. Or not! Because, well ... Those have six rounds of the merchants, resolution of conflicts regarding transport, secret negotiation, negotiation regarding conditions of loans with the managers, collaboration, distribution of sea routes etc. It becomes bigger and bigger, and also, increasing your house ... In the beginning you're just a poor guy on the street and then you end up one of the wealthy, respected businessman in Venice.

The format is still, kind of, old-fashioned. But the games, they are developing now, are getting more and more fancy and really, really attractive. Even for me, who had never done any business gamer, any games before in my life.

This was the case that we used, a face-to-face case from TNC. We used it. And one important element in this part is still, we got feedback from the merchants. The machine gives you feedback on how you've been doing, which is really interesting. Because, we did 80 people ... 80 teams were negotiating face-to-face and they did the negotiation, they got the result but we were not capable of giving them any feedback. So people were missing something in the end, which was requested in the beginning that we design something without human interaction. What they loved the most was the face-to-face negotiation. What they missed the most, was the interaction of the professors and the feedback that was being given.

So now, we're trying to set up a system where we can have some kind of Big Brother idea in all the rooms where those 80 teams are negotiating. Having screens so that I can talk to them from a screen. And have some interviews with people. I can't be there. I have to be in some kind of remote dungeon room in the basement, where I will have to give some kind of feedback on what has been done.

Now. This is the example how the introduction is of the learning journal that they receive. But each day they have to fill out something. And then this time, we also ask them to make an executive summary on the last day so that we don't have to read everything before we make the decision on scoring.

Now, what are the average scores? The face-to-face negotiation score got an average score of 43,846. That doesn't tell you anything. But for Remi and Peter I multiplied the score that I got from this negotiation by 60,000. I wanted to give them one third of the weight, of the total that they would receive. And again, I would like to hear your suggestions on ... Now that they have three negotiations ... What multiplying factor would be a good one to give some kind of indication of how we could get the total score. Then, the average online score was 132,000 ranging between 120,000 and 150,000, more or less. The best and the worst teams. And then the journal scores with 13 As 25 Cs, so some people dropped out somehow, throughout the week. They might have done really badly to get a C.

Alright, results testing. Now, face-to-face contribution ... First is the journal score. Well, no linear correlation. There's only three scores, so there's very limited possibilities of getting good correlations, of course. And, now, the face-to-face contribution ... Now the online score. Negative. Yeah, well, we didn't expect that. And then, we only have a weak positive correlation between the online and the journal score.

So, what does it mean? I don't know. What this means, I really don't know because, you might say that people who are more focused and concentrated are reading and following instructions and doing the things well as they're being asked, might get better results in an online game, because you have to do a lot of reading, you have to find and search information. And those are properly, consciously, possibly people who are more, good ... Better at working on writing a learning journal.

But yeah, of course, the big question somehow is between the face-to-face and the online training. How good is online training, one, and can you get better results by not meeting face-to-face, but also just on Skype. What I've noticed, just from a practitioner point of view, we have lots of students coming from Peru, and we have a lot of ... We've got 50 nationalities coming from our school every day, every year. But we've got a large chunk that's coming from Latin America. And we train them in indirect communication, and then, suddenly, the people become much more direct in their communication. So the indirect communication becomes much more direct, and from there, things move forward much faster. I mean, there is some kind of limitation in the English, which is more difficult if you speak. Not only over the mail, but specifically if you're though Skype meetings where we can see each other.

Our face-to-face contributions versus online, no linear correlation between face-to-face scores and online scores. Negative, even. Well, where could we go? Team composition, balance degree of team, country/culture effects, and the profile, we have them all available. So, I don't know where to ... I mean, it's a lot of work, to really, really make some kind of conclusions there, but we have those ... We have all those data. We had them created. We would have to be ... Organize them in a certain way. That might be done in 2020, certainly not this year. I hope, 2019 is gonna be fine just getting though the week.

So, this is where I thought I'd give you to the floor to ask some questions. And I didn't have cards, business cards. But this is my email address from the school. And it says, JP Voss and some people get confused. Why do you say, Koosvos? In Holland, in 1966, my parents said, "Hey! We're very happy with the birth of our son", well, somehow Jacobus became Koos.

J. Vos: So I think I've three to four to five minutes left in the original script to ask questions ... To answer some questions or to open some kind of discussion. Yes, please.

J. Pinto: So, I was just wondering, you could have the journals reassessed. Instead of giving grades, use numerical scores like from 0 to 100, and then on evaluations, maybe that will be helpful.

J. Vos: Yes.

J. Pinto: If you still have access to the journals.

J. Vos: Ah, I could still do them now, do you mean?

J. Pinto: Yeah, yeah exactly.

J. Vos: Right.

J. Pinto: Because somebody else can ... You know in the journal ... Who's assessed the journal didn't ... Did not have to watch the negotiations.

J. Vos: Exactly. So -

J. Pinto: So we can ... We just reassess all of them, but use numericals as we're giving marks out of a 100.

J. Vos: Yes.

J. Pinto: And then there are the correlations to consider.

J. Vos: Yeah. I'm only so stressed for the next week's negotiation.

J. Pinto: Yeah. (Laughing)

J. Vos: Already that I think, I have to ... I have to grade them between Wednesday afternoon and Thursday morning to get the final list. But, yeah. But very good.

J. Pinto: Yes. That is pressure.

J. Vos: Thank you very much. Yes, great. Other questions? Yes, please.

S. Zhang: After the competition you found the winner. But how to evaluate the result? What is the function?

J. Vos: Yeah, well the ... I, also, I didn't include it in the presentation but in the case there is ... There is also ... We also did some correlations in the face-to-face score. I also looked at the total score that the teams made together. So the total teams, the scores, they vary, so if you created more value together the you have probably done better. A win-win situation. And then the relationship there is, of course, also in the TNC, use the SVI as it is being used. I had it in the learning journal this year, but I couldn't see a way how to evaluate it, which the eighty teams and the three different negotiations, how to - I don't know. So, I ... But now, with the suggestion that you can do it later. I might still edit and ask the question not to have it in the scoring for the week, but maybe analyze them later, and ask the students. Definitely, yeah. Thank you very much.

J. Vos: Other ... Just ideas or, just ... Not just to help me but just also to keep the discussion going. Yes, please.

D.C. Vasilescu: Well, it's an assumption, but when you do face-to-face negotiation, there's a certain communication skill you need, a human skill.

J. Vos: Definitely.

D.C. Vasilescu: To interact with people. Online is different, you need a more concise way of writing. And if the online portion performed better, in correlation with the journals ... In the journals you need the same type of skill in order to self-reflect better. And that doesn't necessarily mean that you need the self-reflecting part as well, or as much, when you communicate face-to-face. Except, it's a different skill set you're using. Which is much more likely to be the same skill set between online negotiation like text writing, and writing the text for the journal. So, that's an assumption.

J. Vos: Yes. No, thank you for that. And I ... In our in EADA's leadership development philosophy, the idea is that we always start with self. Self-knowledge and self-management. And this means that if you know yourself better, you have done this introspection already and you have learned this quality of introspection. So I would always say that this introspection somehow should pay off also later in the relationship with us. It should pay off. The, how you execute ... They are still another ... They are still another face.

But yeah, and definitely ... I mean, there is something there which is really important. But we are moving to online, so how ... And I want to save my job (laughs) I want to make sure that there is some place for me. Very selfish.

R. Smolinski: Thanks, Koos, for sharing insights on your exercise at EADA. Really interesting stuff that you're doing there. I was wondering, one thing all throughout your presentation, what is the goal of this? Is the goal to teach them something? Is it a competition format? Is it combining both? Why are they going through this? Why are the students going through this?

J. Vos: I can give a very pragmatic answer. We ... In our original four, five or six modules at Collbató, negotiation was one of the key skills of management. So we wanted them to learn. And practice. Learn, practice, and yeah. So teaching is in the end a goal, definitely.

R. Smolinski: Yeah, okay.

J. Vos: Yeah. So, it has to be at this ... Yeah. The idea of, we substituted ... Because in Collbató people didn't get good results but they felt they didn't have enough ... There is too much thinking as well involved. People in Collbató, we wanted them to be as dynamic as possible and negotiations sometimes moved away from their expectations, set up after one, two or three modules. And learning by doing. This is learning by doing. I mean, we in do in Collbató, we also use actors there, and we use dancers who work with non-verbal communication. My wife's joining me here in Japan. She gives classes in non-verbal communication, not just for public speaking so that you know how to ... But just for being around, being present.

J. Vos: Thank you very much, Will.

W. Baber: Thank you.

Session 2: Finding & Creating Great Negotiators. Peter Kesting, Aldís Sigurðardóttir, Remi Smolinski

Peter Kesting is Associate Professor for Strategy and Organizational Behavior at the Aarhus University, School of Business and Social Sciences. He is co-founder and scientific advisor of The Negotiation Challenge (TNC) and of the International Negotiation Teaching and Research Association (INTRA). Additionally, he is co-founder of the Book&Smile GmbH, an online travel price comparison (exit after a successful trade sale), the Easy2Coach GmbH, an online soccer-training platform, and AllSEQ, Inc., a matchmaker for new gene sequencing services. In his research, Peter Kesting has been working on various aspects of negotiation. Additionally, he is also interested in business model innovation, the conceptual foundations of routine and decision-making, and the history and philosophy of economics.

Aldís Guðný Sigurðardóttir is Assistant Professor at University of Twente in the Netherlands. She has over 20 years of managerial experience including negotiating complex agreements as a director of companies in both the public and private sectors. As a founder and a CEO of a company in the creative sector (founded 2007) she gained considerable management experience as well as a founder and executive director of a consultancy company (2013), where she has been a head negotiator in challenging negotiations on behalf of her clients, which are companies in various public and private sectors. Dr. Sigurðardóttir has also extensive experience in wage agreement disputes and has worked for various labor unions. Moreover, her research area is in negotiation behavior and what affects the performance of negotiators. She was/is a visiting scholar at various universities around Europe (Poland, Iceland, Netherlands, Germany) and has also considerable training experience as she has trained negotiators of start-up companies in Iceland, Poland and in Denmark as well as women leaders and, additionally, executive MBA students for an annual international negotiation competition for years. Her practical experience in negotiation, as well as her experience from research, training, and teaching has provided her a deep understanding on the nature of negotiations and the role of behavioral economics on companies' performance. To conclude, she is at heart a negotiator and loves everything about the process.

Remi Smolinski is a negotiation professor at HHL Leipzig Graduate School of Management, where he has trained generations of successful executives and entrepreneurs. In his research he has focused on theory and practice of negotiation particularly in international settings and innovation management. He was a visiting scholar at Tufts University's Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy and Harvard University's Program on Negotiation and worked as an assistant professor of International Negotiation at IESEG School of Management and as a research associate at Aarhus University. Dr. Smolinski is also an experienced professional specializing in negotiation, strategy, business development, and innovation management in which he actively advises and trains his international clients. Dr. Smolinski is the founder of The Negotiation Challenge (www.thenegotiationchallenge.org), an interdisciplinary international student negotiation competition and International Negotiation Research and Teaching Association for negotiation scholars.

R. Smolinski: The goal is to use the measurement system in a way so that it matches the type of negotiation he or she is seeing.

A.M. Costelloe: And then agree as to which collectively, if there was any way to count them, otherwise you could end up with

R. Smolinski: That's true. That's the reason for the descriptions next to the pluses and minuses and zeros. To help us calibrate our judging experience, we've indicated some observable aspects. It's probably not possible to remove this subjectivity that you're referring to completely,

A.M. Costelloe: If for example you were listening to a distributive negotiation, collectively, in a world in which there were multiple judges, maybe time is limited, then unless you collectively decided that value creation wasn't appropriate, and actually might hinder that time based distributive negotiation. You would collectively need to agree up front that that was something you wouldn't be looking for. And whereas one judge might say, "Well yes, they did that and it would be a plus." and someone else might say, "I think its terrible". If there's any way to appropriately judge when you are collectively judging versus if you are…

R. Smolinski: Right, I get the point. So right here as Peter kindly suggested last night, I think the evaluation system cannot be completely used without further information on the case. So what we discussed for example last night is that each judge would need a description of interests, a description of issues, a description of potential solutions that are attached to an evaluation system.

Our aspiration is to build a universal evaluation system and have additional information specific to the case so that the judges can calibrate that assessment based on both: a universal measurement system and specific information.

Alright, devil's advocate!

P. Kesting: So now I will be the devil's advocate and this is a nice thing – you always have such nice discussions. This discussion and content came from a broader background, a broader question which was: Can we measure negotiation skill? Negotiation performance? Can we measure things like that? And we had some very nice evenings, heated discussions, because I'm more skeptical. If you look, this something that academia is more or less used to, we measure scientists. For example, is a person a better or worse researcher. We have some measurements like a Research Gate score. Or here I have a model taken from a scientific article on research quality. There are different aspects of research quality. Yeah, journal rankings… So you know all these scales. So we have lots of experience with measurement. So if you look into Ludwig Wittgenstein, one of the big

Austrian philosophers, I think he would completely fail. Yet he was one of the most influential philosophers in the world. In the history of research thinking.

If we can extend this conversation to negotiation, there are some critical points which I would like to draw attention to.

So the first one is that we need to weight different outcomes. For instance, is it more the process that matters, or more the outcome? So we are looking into both. But which is more important? Is it more important that people behave like a textbook but get a bad result? Or the other way around, is it the result but the process doesn't matter? I think there is no universal answer. Everybody can find a different answer.

Or is it fairness versus efficiency? That is something we will maybe discuss later. It may be an efficient result that one of the parties is giving much more than the other. But is it fair? So which is more important, fairness, or efficiency?

So we always come to these tension points where there are no universal standards. So if we are measuring we always have to find an answer to these and other questions.

Complexity. You see 14 points here. Can you add more points to that? I could. Everyone could. So there is always a matter of selection. So I think it is good, what we have here, but it is another point to consider. It matters.

What if you do all these points nicely, but you behave completely arrogantly. Then you have perhaps a violation of one of the points, but you destroy the entire negotiation because the other one reacts negatively. It could also be counterproductive.

There are also measurement problems. Based on this I see some dangers in measuring. As good as it seems we need it for the judged rounds. That is not a question. And it's always good to discuss it and improve it. But if we think in broader terms, if you measure things, and these measurements become acknowledged, then people begin to act strategically. That is exactly the next reaction

If we look into research now, top journal publications are our currency. That drives our careers. So people are doing this, trying to get up and trying to make friendships for this purpose. But you can forget about books and competitions like this: they don't count. Even though it is a good thing! So even though you measure things, they may not function as intended.

So that's my Devil's Advocate speech.

<u>A. Sigardurdottir</u>: Yes. I know there are slides already … I am freezing!

I want to pick up from Remi's discussion. I've been training TNC teams for quite some time. … for a couple of years. And now I have the Dutch team. I work in the Netherlands where I teach and train.

What I want to talk about is how I select the teams based on the measurements that I have used. They are quite complicated, but I want to share the criteria with you. I start with a preselection that everyone can participate in. I divide them into groups so I can observe each negotiation. It takes time. I have been working with my team now since May or June last year. Even though I did not know they were going to get into TNC, I did work with them very actively from September when I selected the actual team. So it is an investment. What I do is that when I start to select the team, I look at how they are.

I believe that negotiation is a learned skill. Everybody can become a good negotiator if they want. But because of the time restrictions I really want them to have some advantage over the others. So I work on it with them.

So I select those who are able to communicate, and have good analytical skills, and able to claim and create value.

Then I start to work with them. And what is really important to me is their emotional intelligence. And that's how I see and measure them. They negotiate. And I teach them the emotional intelligence. And what I do is that I divide them into groups then for example I take six of them today and we do a case. Then we have feedback session after the case. Of course we analyze the case. We have a feedback session where I push them to express their feelings and what kind of behavior triggers, what kind of feelings, and how we can fix that and I give them constructive criticism on you shouldn't have done that, maybe you should maybe try this. And you know try to help them to get hold of their emotions and contain them. And they are really able to do better…and they will. But I take another six students, and I will not do the feedback sessions. And then I can compare. And those who I gave feedback sessions, they always do better in the next round. But NOT those who I don't give feedback sessions to, they don't improve. So I believe that training is really important. How you do the training, what you focus on, that's what happened mainly. My efforts are to improve their emotional intelligence, because that is key to good performance. And then again what is performance. What's fair to you may not be fair to me, it's really debatable.

But I believe that emotional intelligence is key to performance both relationship-wise and also regarding the outcomes. And I really do hope that my team will do well.

<u>M. Canal:</u> How many times have your teams won?

<u>A. Sigardurdottir:</u> They have won once. An Iceland team. But others have been ranked 2, 3, and 4.

<u>M. Canal:</u> I think this helps a lot. But it is a lot of investment from our side. There is one more point that I do with my students. It is not only the context of the university, I provide them feedback in their personal lives. For example when they are negotiating for their salaries, all kinds of stuff. So I'm available for them. And that creates a dynamic that they really want to do well for me. Because I invest in them, they want to perform well for me. It is a dynamic of reciprocity.

<u>P. Meerts:</u> Aldis, what do you mean by "control your emotions"?

A. Sigardurdottir: For example, let's say we are negotiating and you are very angry for some reason. I acknowledge your emotions. And I allow you to say whatever you need to say without trying to get you off your anger. And then you will come around to working and listening.

R. Smolinski: …at the survey, at the criteria. Let us know what we can do better. Is there anything that is missing? Is there anything that may be too much? Is there anything that comes to your mind? I'll be taking notes as you guys speak so that we can adjust it and use a prototype more. Alright.

N. Madyar: So I see this more as an individual negotiator evaluation a lot of times, in competitions and outside, it's a team. I didn't see here enough of outcome teamwork together, when you discuss how you select your team, you didn't discuss how much it was individual negotiators because we could have three star negotiators that cannot work as a team.

A. Sigurdardottir: For me, one has to be very good with analogies, there are some really big questions there I also have a final remark. I think it is... Thank you for all your comments also from my side and I think this will only start off the discussion and I think it is a good discussion. So you saw my skeptical words about measuring, negotiation skills, I don't think we can measure it, but we can judge it and we see it.,? you know. Another one has to be very good in communication, like talking to. This is a basic criteria and then the third one needs to have ... kind of if things escalate, he needs to be able to complete stuff.

R. Smolinski: Prof. Madyar?

N. Madyar: You select them individually?

A. Sigurdardottir: Yes.

R. Smolinski: What would you add? What are the observable traits or what are the criteria that you would add to this system that could help the judges evaluate the teams versus individual negotiators? Is there anything in addition that comes to your mind that you would add?

N. Madyar: Sometimes they have a way to communicate among themselves, they take turns or to be all engaged versus a team that has one star negotiator who is doing all the negotiations and the others are just observing. They may have a different role, it may be the best approach for the team for this negotiation, you need them to observe and to give signs but a lot of times when we observe teams and judge them you could see it's a team with one star negotiator and without them the other two would be lost versus they're really working together as a team and they have a system.

R. Smolinski: Is there any evidence that two, three star negotiators don't negotiate better than a diversified team?

N. Madyar: I would say that the team literature has a lot of research on team dynamics, how they manage team processes. Do they plan? Is there a plan if there is a complicated team, how will they resolve it? So, the team literature could inform us a lot more.

P. Kesting: It can be very conscious.

R. Smolinski: Maybe you can share advice on that?

J. Vos: Well this was a technique and question I referred to before does the nine point individual negotiation. But last year my team that went to the final selected themselves. Because I also have an internal competition and people can come up with a team because they're very diverse. But I used The GAP Partnership profiler, it was available for them and they chose themselves on the diversity and complementarity on their profile.

R. Smolinski: Okay. So, you would say “how can we”-

J. Vos: Well we cannot measure that but I'm sure there are criteria because there's 14 criteria that have been measured in that, that might be good. I saw straight away quickly number one, they have some kind of objective where they want to go. In the contest, in the preparation. They share interest but for me the specification interest to be of ... they has to be some kind of objective way one can.

R. Smolinski: So if you look at the description, what you see next to the pluses are the desirable, observable traits that we would evaluate as above average or excellent. In those you would see interests, objectives, you would see a planning sheet and so on. That would be an excellent preparation which I call -

A. Costelloe: There's lots that I think is brilliant. I really like the fact that it's not members based because I think that would really help one from getting "is it a seven? Is it an eight?" I guess the one thing, I'm sort of sitting here wondering is it... the question around fairness? It seems to be something you said. I absolutely agree the other person should not feel stunned at negotiation and shouldn't feel like we've stripped them bare. Is fairness really something we should be looking to judge because from a commercial point of view, it seemed to be when you said "If somebody goes in, and they consciously choose to behave in an arrogant way, they come away with a great deal." I think you implied that to you that would be a great negotiation. I suspect if you asked Walmart if their team went in-

A. Costelloe: Are we trying to teach our teams to negotiate in the real world or in the academic world? Because fairness is really subjective and actually you can go in as a commercial negotiator, and you can choose to behave in a certain way, and you go in with the objective of coming out, from a commercial point of view, with a deal for your company. And I don't believe that is the same as going in for world peace or ... but we need to be conscious these are people who we are training to go into the real world.

R. Smolinski: Fair point, fair point.

P. Kesting: But beyond this I agree that's very subjective, but we also know from research that its very important, feeling fairness.

A. Costelloe: The feeling? So, I'm sitting here knowing I've got 100 apples, and I chose to offer you two, and I may even claim that I have five. That's not fair but from my company perspective it is commercial.

J. Pinto: Could I just rebut this point please because I don't in the real world this is a sustainable strategy. Because you do this once, and you get a good deal the first time but sooner or later people will know you had 100 apples, and you claimed you had five. In future that is going to have a reputational effects.

A. Costelloe: But then it comes down to the type of negotiation, which was the original question.

J. Pinto: No, but all these and the real world, 99% of the negotiations are integrative and long term relationship negotiations. In the real world, Walmart doesn't change suppliers every quarter, the same supplier supply to Walmart and Walmart's always the extreme example because they have the monopoly power. But most other companies that are not Walmart, have a mutual reciprocal dependency on their suppliers. So they cannot afford to try and cheat them every time or vice versa. So in a real world, fairness is probably more important than you act than it were because two students negotiate now, never see each other again.

R. Smolinski: I think it's a very good point A. Costelloe thank you very much for sharing this side. When we designed this we had in mind the fact that we mostly let the judges observe negotiations where value creation is possible. And in that case, using fair standards becomes much more important in the face of... Which means it's context dependent, that's your main point, yeah?

A. Costelloe: Yeah.

R. Smolinski: We'll have to think about how we calibrate for context dependency, maybe there should be a filter that we put on the valuation sheet depending on the type of negotiation that the judges are observing.

A. Costelloe: Well just even acknowledge. You know?

R. Smolinski: Or zeros? Thank you.

A. Costelloe: Yeah, yeah.

P. Meerts: My problem is fairness versus efficiency, in the European Union fairness is efficient.

R. Smolinski: We'll have a very nice negotiation round on Saturday morning. I don't want to tell any more details because there are coaches among us, but we will do the debriefing on Saturday afternoon. Where, we exactly will discuss this point. We are both, Peter and I, excited to see how the teams solve this dilemma. Maybe there will be something also fore signs all of this because neither of us has an idea how the tactical solutions ... we know what theoretical solutions are. But we are at the same time, we're absolutely sure, both of us, that it's not going to be the case in the competition. Saturday but for now we'll share some things, so.

S. Zhang: When we observe student behavior, what behavior proves a good negotiator? But you know I run competitions in China. Some students lost. Debate, is a good skill for negotiation. But after completion, they debate with me! I'm good, very good, but I'm the oldest. I found, your model value limiting. Maybe my question first has to do... May I use debate in negotiation? How to use debate skills in negotiation? May I relate debate skills in value claiming? Clear?

R. Smolinski: Yes. I think, if I understand this question correctly, I think you were referring to rhetoric, how important is rhetoric? The ability to explain, the ability to articulate, the ability to justify and so on. I don't know. That's the true answer. The reason why it's not there because we didn't find any studies that correlate eloquence or rhetoric to negotiator results. If any one of you knows about studies like that, that either say "The more eloquent I am, the better results I negotiate." Or "The higher rhetorical, the better the rhetorical skills, the better the negotiate outcomes." Please share I don't know any of this.

R. Smolinski: In fact, I tend to think that cognitive skills such as the ability to analyze, structure preferences, in my personal opinion, are much more important in a negotiated result than the ability to repeat things, to say stuff, to debate. I think those who focus on the debate very often end up with that loss because they end up... The experience from the past "TNCs", they end up explaining the same things over, and over, and over again in different words. Rather than that, they should use their cognitive abilities to create potential options for potential solutions. So, I don't know any, that's why it's not there, but it doesn't mean that it's not important, maybe it is important. If anyone knows any studies that go in that direction, please share, we'll add more.

M. Canal: I have a question and wonder why you state some things in positive ways, some in neutral ways, and some negative. Instead of dragging them all, in like a neutral way, and then you can grade them with minus, zero, or plus. Because they are measuring different things, I don't know if you would be able to do it for some?

R. Smolinski: I don't see that line anymore.

M. Canal: Another thing, coming back to what N. Madyar was saying about the teamwork, I remember the old format you were using, that was more simple, was including something about teamwork. So, I wonder why you are not including it here and I think what N. Madyar was saying was very subjective to measure with. When you decide to have roles, some on the team, and one of them is being more protagonistic then you can assure that he is a star and the other two are not doing so much by working on other things, they make the tasks more complex. For instance, did the judge also see the team while they are preparing the script?

R. Smolinski: That's exactly the point we're including the first criteria. I want the judges this year to deal with their teams during the preparation.

M. Canal: Wow!

R. Smolinski: That's the only way to assess the first point because without it we wouldn't be able to make a judgment on the quality of preparation and all know how that works, so that will be a change. Thank you very much for these points, I was not aware of the positive, neutral, and negative formulations but it's correct I recall that some of them are formulated as, "Lack of" and some of them are, "This is there and this is that". I'll have a look at it this evening and see where I can neutralize all of them and if it's possible I can then find the best solution.

R. Smolinski: Concerning teamwork, I don't know what's better, I really don't know, and that's again the point of N. Madyar's points. If you guys have some indication how a judge who observes a team negotiation could say "Which team, generates a better result? A team where there is one speaker or a team where everyone speaks equally? Or a team that communicates intensively within the team or the team that doesn't?" I don't know, if there are recent results on that you will for sure include it in our evaluation sheet. The reason it's not there is because we realized in the past, that some of the judges liked when one person talked and the other judges liked when many people talked.

M. Canal: Yeah exactly.

P. Kesting: And exactly how you are.

R. Smolinski: Exactly.

P. Kesting: It's not going to be if, but it's also how.

W. Baber: And why.

P. Kesting: And why.

W. Baber: And why, because you should be able to see the situation is appropriate. So, I teach this to my students as "High complexity but low team cooperation/experience", means you need a spokesperson and opposite when you have a team that is very familiar with each other and has worked together a long time. Then, "low medium complexity", they can really completely integrate and finish each other's sentences.

<u>R. Smolinski2:</u> Yeah that's right, yeah.

<u>R. Smolinski:</u> And that means it's context dependent. Which means if we add a criterion it has to be something that reflects the context dependency that A. Costelloe mentioned earlier. It depends not only on the structure of the case but also on-

<u>I. Vanenkova:</u> Their relationship.

<u>R. Smolinski:</u> On the relationship within teams, which we basically don't know.

<u>R. Orr:</u> You do know, I'm an observer of all this stuff but I spent 15 years on the payroll of the state department. One thing in this document is empathy. You really have to understand the other side's feelings. I would say that the concept of empathy is not nearly as negotiated. Without empathy you lose relationship. So that's the one thing I would say. The second point I would raise is, with all the planning you have you always understand the qualifying motivations. That's a rule. When I negotiated the cellular phone deal here in Japan or even the Dreamliner inputs. How many times did we break out, I can't even tell you. I think we have to be very careful about that and understand it.

<u>R. Smolinski:</u> Thank you very much. We try to capture empathy under moral wisdom, it's not as present as probably it should be, because I just looked it up. It's present just in the negative evaluation, I think we should make it more explicit.

<u>R. Orr:</u> I think it's such a big deal that I don't know how to avoid it.

<u>J. Pinto:</u> A couple of things on the scaling, the description of the zero is not sometimes as it appears to be completely neutral. It seems to be sometimes skewed a little bit towards the positive. In the single minus sense, double minus sense like where it's got the single plus and double plus, it might be more helpful to specify what a double minus is, and what a single minus is. Rather than just have a common description for both and expect the rater to have a judgment as to the more extreme form of this behavior and less extreme form. Because sometimes the statement is kind of conflating, some more extreme behaviors with some less extreme behaviors and expecting the rater to make the judgment. Might as well have a descriptor for each line, that might be just simpler.

<u>R. Smolinski:</u> Okay, I see. The stricter we become, the more integral it will be for us to calibrate and judge.

<u>J. Pinto:</u> I used to be a human resources guy at Procter & Gamble, you have to specify each line of the pervading scale.

J. Pinto: Evaluation's been done by thousands of managers across the whole globe. Then if they're not clear about what each point of the scale implies, each one will use their own judgment of what is more extreme and less extreme and you won't have the consistency across judges.

R. Smolinski: Point well taken. Point well taken.

A. Costelloe: I agree. I totally agree.

R. Smolinski: By creating an appearance of perfection, which in the context of what the speaker correctly pointed out, in a context where measurement is hard or almost... it's extremely hard. In other words, we could do that, that's fairly easy, but that would make it on the contrary to what we believe, it would make it either more difficult to judge or it would make the discussions, the calibration discussions, probably even more intense. But its... The reason why there are pluses and minuses, that is to help the judges during the calibration discussion and come up with a ranking. So two pluses means one of the best things I've seen, one plus means above average. And at the end of the day, what needs to happen is nine negotiations, nine judges that will observe nine completely different negotiations, will have to come up with a ranking. So ultimately, assigning points, or adding more observable behavior probably would make this for us difficult to calibrate the observations among each other, because we were observing completely different things. And we have completely different backgrounds.

R. Smolinski: But point well taken. We were thinking about more of a helping the judges...let's say, end the discussion on is it a top team, above average, average, below average or the worst possible. And even with this, we'll have to rank nine teams. Which means we'll have additional discussions on is your two plus team better than my two plus team. Or if I observe that most of the characteristic except one, can you accept... do you observe most of the practice, except that the other one, which one's more important? And these are the discussions that the judges need to...

J. Pinto: A couple of things that matter. Post-settlement settlement is not necessarily a factor, right? If the team comes up at the pre-top... So again, it's not mine to... get more two pluses because they have the scope to do post-settlement settlement, while others might not.

R. Smolinski: True.

J. Pinto: So one broad suggestion I could give is perhaps, because some points are very micro... like, first off, communication is split up into three, so those could be maybe either removed or combined and the scaling could be more... so you have fewer items set on seven rather than fourteen, but each point on the scale, the five point scale for each one is more clearly leveled. That might reduce, manage the complexity you're talking about.

R. Smolinski: Okay, all right. Thank you.

A. Costelloe: So the point about watching the teams prepare is really good. The reality is that many of the teams prepare in their first language, not English. How is that meant to work?

A. Costelloe: Actually that's not their fault, isn't it? I mean it's hard enough being in a different second and possibly a third language.

R. Smolinski: The competition is in English. So it is harsh, but if we believe that preparation is important, that's the only way for us to judge it. So we have to die with one of the deaths. The death is either more complexity for students or excluding something which is important as an evaluation principle. So death is one destiny for all of us. We just get to choose which one is less painful.

A. Sigardurdottir: Normally, just to add on it, normally teams are really international even though they are from one country. My team has a Turkish guy, a Dutch guy and a German, so none of them are, you know, they are very diverse... and that's the case for many teams.

D.C. Valescu: So first, just to the last point. The moment you introduce the requirement as English only there is a definite favoring teams that have maybe which is hard to deal with. It is something that happens pretty often in... especially at our university teams and the same nationality stick together, but that's another thing. It's something to be aware of. Sometimes kind of favoring the language you are training. If you are training in English all the time, even in the course, then of course it is going to be easier. If you are training in the native language and you are only performing in English it can be difficult.

D.C. Valescu: Anyway, back to the main topic, ideally I have some experience... we do a lot of the projects in our department where we do projects with businesses and help them get together teams of people that can negotiate things. And one of the most important things here is different controls for different skill sets. It's not just all the controls for the team but for components of the team being different things and being responsible for different parts of the negotiations. So that means it is not the start negotiators, they are all stars in their own portions of the negotiations. So of course it has to work together well as a team and all that... it's natural. It is not necessarily the same topic, or the same skill set. Which is very important, because if it would be the same skill set, then they would argue a lot on the same part. And this for us works for us very well in all the teams we prepared. So perhaps one of the items here could be in collaboration internal and in collaboration external with the competitors. There are two different things

R. Smolinski: Collaboration is there and let's say within the team, what is better? And that is exactly the decision we have to make, before we include the criteria. Because we have to assign a plus to something and a minus to something. Other than that, if we are not able to say, we cannot add criteria, because the criteria would say in collaboration and then one person would evaluate with two pluses that they didn't have to discuss during the negotiation because they did it already during the preparation. Somebody would evaluate exactly that feature with two minuses because they did not do it.

R. Smolinski: So I think it is called a challenge, let me just... lots of good remarks with very good points and I will work on it in the evening and see what we can add before tomorrow. And I am very happy that you guys shared your thoughts on our draft. That is really helpful. What we need to bear in mind is that what we put there where criteria where we knew based on research that this is better and this is not so good. We will work on the descriptions, we will make them more neutral as possible, make them precise, if possible, whatever possible. Thank you so much for all these points, that's my homework.

P. Kesting: I also have a final remark. I think it is... Thank you for all your comments also from my side and I think this will only start off the discussion and I think it is a good discussion. So you saw my skeptical words about measuring, negotiation skills, I don't think we can measure it, but we can judge it and we see it. We can see that negotiation better or less better and we could now experience the complexity in it, but I think it is really important to this discourse the very important discussion. Thank you for starting this, for suggesting this and we have a break now.

Session 3: Role Play Gaming in negotiation training, Jason DeLuca (Smarter Faster Games)

Jason De Luca is Managing Director at Smart Partners KK, Tokyo as well as head of Smarter Faster Games, a company dedicated to applying Role Game Playing (RPG) to corporate education in areas such as Human Resources and Negotiation. Currently, Smarter Faster is developing a corporate training drawing on the best approaches of negotiation pedagogy, management research, and role playing. A Certified Management Consultant and Certified Process Professional, Jason speaks fluent Japanese and has been in Japan over 20 years.

The first portion of this session did not, unfortunately, record properly. Therefore it starts with dialog from the audience.

A. Costelloe: Would you personally give your feedback to the group or individually?

J. DeLuca: Of course. Yeah. I mean, that would come after the case is ... but yeah, I mean, it'd be based on the learning. But again ... and I was mentioning this to Steve just a moment ago ... what I wanted to create was a platform, so regardless of which type ... I mean, different negotiation companies, that they have their different kind of focuses.

I just wanted to create the platform so that they could come in, and the case studies would be there. And, then, the facilitator themselves could come in, and they would emphasize different things for their lessons.

M. Canal: Which topics are you teaching, or what it is the participants are supposed to learn going to the game?

J. DeLuca: Well, again, that would also come to what the particular lessons of the facilitator has. So, we do have some general kind of stuff that we have in the rule book.

But again, it's more of a platform. So, the idea is that that particular facilitator would have things he or she wanted to focus on. And the game itself just provides that platform. You've got the case studies, the resource tokens. You use dice for some stuff, for event cards and that sort of thing. So, it gives a bit more freedom to the particular facilitator. They just now have the world to use, and he or she can kind of decide which specific learning points they wanted to focus on.

M. Canal: Is this including an explanation of the cards?

J. DeLuca: We don't go too far into that, because again, different teachers and different companies would have their own methodology that they would want to plug into it. So, what I thought would be interesting would be just to create the world and create the story, and have the case studies. And all the stuff's there, so that then they could walk up and say, "Oh, great, I've got my materials I really want to cover, but now I can just use this case study for it." And because we fully own the story and everything else, one of the customers could come to us and say, "We want you to change the stories up a bit. We're focused more on this." We can do that kind of a customization for them.

R. Smolinski: Jason, who are your customers? Are those …?

J. DeLuca: For this? No one, as of yet.

R. Smolinski: Who is the target group. Professors? Coaches? Is it companies?

J. DeLuca: Honestly, I didn't think that far into it. I wanted to create something fun. And so, yes, there might be a school that might want to pick this up in order to use this to teach negotiation to the students who've done some play testing here.

It might be a company like Amazon. We are talking to them about some stuff. They might want to use it in terms of their approach. They have their own style of negotiations, their own methodologies. They might want to use this just as a platform for that.

I just wanted to distribute it, just so that, essentially, anybody could pick it up. We have another game with role playing, and we do have customers for that. It's a similar type of a story-based methodology.

W. Baber: Yeah, what I'd like to say for this, about this, is that the users, the customers, are more ready for this, I think, than they were even ten years ago, so I think there's more professors that at willing to go out on a limb or don't even see it as a limb to run a role-playing session. So, we use a lot of simulations which have various levels of role playing and so on. But to use a whole milieu, you create the platform, and the characters operate within it, and they have their logic within that. I think more and more people are willing to do this, and more, also, in the corporate world, are comfortable with this kind of thing.

J. DeLuca: I was just coming from the perspective of the delegates and the students that are sitting there. And so, the play test that we've done back at my office and stuff, back in Tokyo with some of the places that we'd go, they just liked it. It was just fun.

I said, "Look, I mean, it's nice to have all the case studies going in one direction, so when you do one, and then this happens, and then you do a little bit more reading of the story, and then you learn a little bit more."

It's just kind of, you know ... and again, with third act and stuff, you kind of find out some interesting things with the story. I don't know, if you're going to be spending three days of your life or four days of your life doing something, it's kind of nice that you as a group have gone through all these situations together as a journey, you know?

M. Canal: I don't know if you have thought about it, but most of us are teachers.

J. DeLuca: Yeah.

M. Canal: I would like to know more about your tool and ...

J. DeLuca: Sure.

M. Canal: We are your potential clients, so maybe you can facilitate the thing to us, and we see if we can make up part of your future.

J. DeLuca: I'd love to do that.

W. Baber: Did you bring the cards?

J. DeLuca: I ... I left ... I had them. I ran off without them ... I can ... I'll have to show it to them later.

W. Baber: All right.

J. DeLuca: But I'd be happy to facilitate. Just not right now.

M. Canal: Okay. Good.

J. DeLuca: But again, I wanted to create a platform, and that was the main thing, so whomever ... when you have your own methodology for it, that's what you'll be doing, but it's just kind of nice to have lots of toys and stuff that you can use, and not have to take a large budget to make it, because of the resource tokens and the maps and all this other stuff.

We invested heavily in art and in experts to do what they did, so here's a look at the drawing by our artist.

M. Canal: Thank you.

W.Baber: Okay, it appears at this point that we have missed my part of the schedule. We'll try to work it into the afternoon order of sessions. So let's stop for lunch now, and can we return here at 11:40? That'll give us a pretty good time for lunch. Then our keynote speaker will speak, and we will continue.

Keynote: Negotiation in Japan in the contexts of business and government, Robert Orr, Former US Ambassador to Asian Development Bank

Robert Orr served as United States Ambassador to the Asian Development Bank (ADB) from September 2010 to 2016 including holding the position of Dean of the Board of the ADB, first American so elected in history. He was from 2007-2010 he was Chairman of the Board of the Panasonic Foundation and concurrently Vice Chair of the National Association of Japan-America Societies.

In the Spring of 2019, the Government of Japan formally conferred the Order of the Rising Sun, Gold Rays with Rosette on Former Ambassador Orr.

Dr. Orr was President of Boeing Japan from 2002 to 2007 during the development of the 787 Dreamliner, 35% of which is made in Japan. Prior to joining Boeing, Ambassador Orr was Vice President and Director of European Affairs for Motorola based in Brussels an previously was Vice President of Government Relations for Motorola Japan. In that capacity he successfully led the negotiations that opened up the cellular phone market in Japan.

Additionally, the Ambassador has also spent many years in academia. Between 1985 and 1993 he was a professor of Political Science at Temple University in Japan with two years off to run the Kyoto Center for Japanese Studies and the Stanford Center for Technology and Innovation at the Stanford Japan Center in Kyoto. His book ***The Emergence of Japan's Foreign Aid Power*** published by Columbia University Press won the 1991 Ohira Prize for best book on the Asia Pacific.

Dr. Orr's career worked for two years as Legislative Assistant to Congressman Paul G. Rogers (D-FL) from 1976 to 1978. From 1978 he served on the House Foreign Affairs Asia Subcommittee. From 1981 to 1983 he served as Special Assistant to the Assistant Administrator of Asia in the U.S. Agency for International Development.

The Former Ambassador holds a B.A. in History, cum laude, from Florida Atlantic University, an M.A. in Government from Georgetown University and a Ph.D. in Political Science from Tokyo University. He speaks German and Japanese fluently. He is also a member of the Board of Governors of the Pacific Forum in Honolulu, Hawaii.

R. Orr: Today I will talk about three things, the first is Motorola and the development id the cell phone industry in Japan. The second issue I'd like to talk about is the pricing access issue that we negotiated for something that you may be familiar with, something called the Dreamliner when I was president of Boeing 77 Dreamliner. So, I was very deeply involved in that negotiation. I wasn't the top leader, but I was part of the decision team.

The third thing that I thought I would touch upon is the negotiation that I was involved in relative to ... It was Uzbekistan while I was United States Ambassador to the Asian Development Bank. That one, at the end of the day, didn't turn out as well as we had hoped. So I'd say two were clear cut winners, one more clear cut than the other. And one didn't work out. At the end of the day, I think it probably did work out of the last one, but not while I was there.

Now, the thing about market access for Motorola for the cellular phone, understand a little bit of the migration long before your time before there was cell phones as you know them today, or today they're iPhones and whatnot. But there was actually something called a Brick. This was in the '80s and this thing looked like a walkie talkie or something. And it migrated on beyond that and then, eventually we came to the flip phone. And the phone I'm talking about now is the Motorola flip phone.

Now, it was not directly about having market access for the flip phones themselves. The key issue was something called bay stations. And these bay stations allow you to connect, right? Without having bay stations that are relative to the system that you make for the phones they don't work. So, if I used a Motorola phone and I came in here expecting ... in those days, midnight is to get on the NTT system, it wouldn't work. So, it effectively eliminated your market access.

So, our job was to get the Japanese government to sanction bay stations that were consistent with Motorola technology. And that's what they tried to block consistently. NTT and the Japanese government were in cahoots of course. And so, that was the challenge. Now, the cell phone market in Japan in 1994, the cost of leasing. You could not buy a cell phone in Japan in 1994, you had to lease it. And the cost was about $1500 US dollars to lease a phone, right?

So, as a consequence, the people who were mostly leasing phones in Japan were two groups. One, very high business executives, and two, yakuza, the gangsters. And so, if you used the cell phone, which I could do in Japan after we had the agreement, a lot of people thought I was connected with the mob because they were the only ones they thought could use these things.

The other thing is, as a consequence, in 1994, January, there were only 150,000 users of cell phones in Japan, okay, and that was it. So, one day in February of 1994, unbeknownst to me, we were working on this issue, trying to figure out how to do it and the United States Trade Representative at the time was somebody named Mickey Kantor, this was under President Clinton. And to my great surprise, one day I'm literally watching CNN and Mickey Kantor is on CNN on TV waving one of our cell phones around saying, "We're gonna go after Japan on this thing."

Well, that was sort of a surprise because I knew I was going to be on the forefront. Bear in mind, I had come into Motorola only six months before not knowing which end of the cell phone to put to my ear. I have a PhD in fluid science. I was a college professor, and I was brought into Motorola for what I knew about Japan, I was a Japan specialist. But I didn't know anything about the technology. So I was in a real challenge to learn the technology.

And I thought what the engineers did was genius, that no one could do. I was amazed. And they thought what I did by knowing Japan, they thought that was genius and brilliant, so it worked out to get together. So, with that announcement there was an explosion of activity. So, my strength was, I knew the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, I knew the Japanese diet very well, I knew nothing about the Ministry of Post and Telecommunications. I didn't know anybody over there, so I had to get up to speed real fast.

And so, we developed a strategy based on two levels. Now, the company that would be implementing the Motorola phone system was called, Inno Zushin, doesn't exist anymore. And this company was going to be our ally but they were hanging in close with the NTT and company. Other Japanese companies were not happy about the monopoly that NTT and company had. In fact, behind the scenes, they were saying to me and to others, "Motorola-san. Ganbatte! Do your best. Go after them."

And I would turn around, I'd say, "Great. Why don't you come in the room with us?" And the answer was, "No." No way they wanted to be caught pushing back. They held our coat. They held our coat while we went in as the foreigner and raised hell. So, we created a two-step team. My colleague, a fellow named Frank Sanda was a Japanese who had grown up in North America. A PhD, University of Toronto, he was an engineer, knew that stuff. And he had great connections with Inno Zushin.

My role was higher up with the government, interacting with the American Embassy, interacting with the top load of the Japanese government. We called Frank ura-man, which means behind the scenes. And I was omote-man, man on top. Didn't mean I was on top of him per se, but in terms of who I was dealing with. So, omote-man and ura-man. That's how we negotiated. Two steps. Ura-man had to do his job before omote-man could go forward. And that meant also interacting with the US Embassy.

Now, there was a triangular relationship between the Embassy, the US State Trade Representative, and Motorola. In the beginning, we loved the USTR, United States Trade Representative. We loved them, because they were tough guys. They were hammers. And they wanted to push it. The American Embassy was smooth relations, calm, smooth relations, right? But, they were not moving fast enough on our issue. USTR wanted to go after them, so they were our friends. I won't mention the future in this issue I'm going to talk about. Role switch. Role switch.

So, we went forward and we started these negotiations on that level. Let's see, so everything we negotiated was passed on to the United States government. To the

Ambassador at the time, who became my mentor, was a fellow named Walter Mondale, former Vice President of the United States. He was the Ambassador of Japan. And we worked very closely, but they always were trying to say, "Don't go too hard." And the USTR would come in and say, "Let them go. Let them do it."

So, that's the way the negotiation we would try to ... We also had to be very specific. We were not interested in 89 or 80 base stations being built out, we were not interested in 170 base stations built out. We wanted 129 precisely, because we knew that would do the job. And we did not want them if we asked for too much, coming back and say, "Weather impediment, we can't build them all." So, we knew through intelligence precisely what to ask for. And so, that's the basis of what we went forward.

So, overtime, we worked this out, went back and forth. Ura-man would go out drinking with the Inno Zushin guys, and I was getting fed info. We very, very rarely met face-to-face over the table. Very rare. It was all around the sides. And the people who met face-to-face was the United States Embassy and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. And those were the ones ... And we were feeding into it because there had to be two agreements. There had to be an industry-to-industry agreement, and there had to be a government-to-government agreement.

So, in this vein, and so we got down toward the endgame and we were at the point where they had agreed to everything that we wanted. It was really striking. Part of the reason I believe, is because so many other Japanese industries, they knew by this point, they knew they were lining up with us. They also wanted to see change, but they didn't want to get involved. So, the last stroke I can remember very well, because we went to the Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications, there was supposed to be a press conference and they had me at two press conferences.

But wait, I guess, let me go backward. Before we get that, let me include the very last step on how we actually broke the barrier itself. I mentioned to you how USTR had been our ally, right, all along, and the Embassy was weak. Well, the problem was, is the USTR started to make the cell phone issue a policy issue for the United States. In other words, they wanted at one point to say, "If the Japanese side did not comply with the agreement to the 129 bay stations, that we could bankrupt, essentially, Inno Zushin, could bankrupt them. It was a complex mechanism how to do that.

Well, we at Motorola did not want to have anything to do with the bankruptcy of a Japanese company, I can tell you that right now. That one was not high on our wish list. We were interested in a business deal, we didn't give a crap about the policy issues at that point. We wanted a business deal. So, what happens, Motorola and the American Embassy become best friends. The USTR becomes the outsider.

So, I can remember the Washington Post calling me up one Saturday morning, rumor was out there that this thing was close. And my friend, Paul Blustein, who actually wound up moving to Japan is a neighbor of mine now, but he was a Washington Post reporter. He called me up, he said, "Yep," he said, "You got anything ..." And I had a stack of newspaper reporters calling. I didn't reply to any of them. I wanted the Washington Post.

So, I had a stack and Paul calls me, he says, "Skipp," called me at home, he said, "What's going on? You got anything for me?" And I had not talked to the press at all and I just simply said, "Paul, industry sources say ..." and I leaked all over the table. And it pinned USTR's ears back. They couldn't move after that because apparently, the agreement was already there. So, they backed away.

And so then we had this agreement in hand. We go to the Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications that night. Mondale is in one room, we're in another, we have to have the government to government agreement first and then, if we could get it through the press conference, we could to the corporate industry to industry agreement. The Japanese weren't ready. And they wanted to put in the final language, they wanted to use what in Japanese is called, *katakana*. It's a phonetic alphabet, but they wanted to use an English word for the precise technology and they wanted to use English. We did not want that. We wanted the kanji. We wanted the Japanese precisely. *Katakana* could be too widely interpreted.

So, luckily my colleague who I promise to introduce you to, Jim Foster, was an excellent Japanese speaker. He caught it. At one point, Mondale, when they were in that mix, Mondale said to the Embassy people, "Okay, I guess they're not ready. Let's go," and walked out the door. And that sort of changed life. And the Japanese agreed. And then we could not figure out in the industry, where is everybody? This thing should be over by now. Why are we waiting? So, that story was relayed to me afterward. So, then we had the government-to-government press conference and the business-to-business and it sealed the deal.

Now, results. That was in the end of April, 1994. The other thing we had pushed for was something called COAM, Customer Owned and Maintained, COAM, because we wanted to be able to buy phones, not lease them. And so, what happens? In November 1994, the deal was signed in April of 1994. Remember how many users of cell phones there were in Japan in January? 100. In November there were 30 million. Okay? Remember the cost of leasing, $1500, right? In November, it was $80 to buy.

It revolutionized the whole sector. Motorola went from zero percent of the market to 24% overnight. Now, there are lots of reasons why Motorola didn't maintain that, and that's a different story. But, that is the story of the selling of the phone deal in a nutshell. So, let me move on ... How much time do we have here? Let me move on to Boeing Dreamliners 787.

Now, I mentioned I was in Motorola for many years. And then, when I went to Brussels to be head of Motorola in Europe, my other mentor, Walter Mondale called me up and said, "Skipp, I'm pushing you with Boeing. Gotta go now. Bye." Click. I had not the foggiest idea what he was talking about. So, it turned out they had hired a guy named Thom Pickering who had been a seven-time US Ambassador who became my other mentor who hired me into Boeing, to be president of Boeing, the president and CEO of Boeing in Japan.

So, that meant I had to learn a new industry. I knew a little bit about aerospace thanks to the fact that my father had been with NASA during the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo programs. So, I had a rough idea from the outside as a kid. But, I had a lot to learn. So, I was responsible for the military sales and for commercial. Now, by 2005, 2006, we had a new product that we were pushing hard that we thought would revolutionize flight in many ways. It was called the 786 or, originally, the 7E7. E7 is always experimental and then they give it a number, so 787, the Dreamliner.

Now, Boeing had it very different from Motorola. I used to say when I was in Motorola, I'd go to the Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications. I'd put my flak jacket on first. Line up my weaponry, my gun's over the shoulder and get ready to go out. Boeing, it was, I'd go over to METI, the Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry and it was, "Ah, Boeing-san. Red carpets." We invested one billion dollars a year into this country. They loved us, right?

And so, we had a special relationship with the Japanese. We had been in Japan since 1953. And the biggest customer in the world for Boeing was Japan Airlines. And ANA was number four. So, it was a big deal. And so, we wanted to invest as much as we could. The 777, triple 7, 12% of that airplane was built in Japan. Gradually things were moving up. So, when it came to the 787, we proposed to build 35% of the airplane here. Including the wing box, which had never been given outside the country. Essentially, the wings.

So, we had to negotiate pricing with the people who do that in manufacturing. And these people were called the Heavies or *juko* in Japanese. Mitsubishi Heavy Industries (MHI), Kawasaki Heavy Industries (KHI), and I forget the others offhand, but these were the Heavies. But the real main player was Mitsubishi Heavy, which would do the wing box. So, we had to negotiate the pricing on that. It was very, very tenacious, because we were trying to drive that price down as far as we could. And we were meeting a tremendous amount of resistance. Let me see if I can ...

And so, the question was, do we push them so hard, and it was a school of thought in Boeing, you push them way down. You get them down to really, a modicum of price. It's almost embarrassing, you just drive the hell out of them really. Another thought was reputation and the empathy question I raised before. And I was very strong on long-term relationship, and I am always. I think long-term relationships are really key, especially in this country.

I had made a lot of ... A lot of my negotiation with this had taken place long before this issue came up. It took place in a couple of really nice bars in Tokyo. I'm not kidding. I mean, one of the most important things in Japan is relationship-building. And by the way, when I discuss this stuff with my Japanese partners, make those connections, made that time investment. Never did I talk about airplanes, ever. Just off the charts, off the board.

We'd talk about things ... Japanese are baseball fans, I'm an American. That's a no-brainer, right? So we talked baseball for hours. We talked about golf. We talked about art. I knew each one's interest. So, it was a trust-builder. So, when I sat across the table finally, in a series of tables, they knew me pretty well. And we could actually get down to do some really solid issue.

Now, there's one exception that I mentioned about over lunch. We had one negotiator who came to Tokyo who got so upset. And I wasn't in the room then. He took a bottle of water, he threw it against the wall. And I was not a happy puppy when I heard this. And I said, "Tell Jim when they get back I need to talk to him." So, they came back and I said, "I can't believe this. You didn't do that, did you?" He said, "I just got fed up with them. I just got fed up. They weren't moving on this issue or that issue."

And I said, "Jim, you know, you're a lucky guy." He said, "Yeah? Really? Why?" And I said, "Because we're not in Seoul." I said, "If this was Seoul, the Koreans they would have thrown you out the window and they wouldn't have thought twice about it. They'd have just dumped you. Good bye." I said, "Japanese won't do that, but they'll never forget. They'll never forget. And so, in this country, reputation is everything. Have a nice flight back to Seattle. You're done." And I kicked him out of the country.

I could not have that reputational thing hanging around our neck. So, at the end of the day, we succeeded. We got a reasonable price. And now, many of you all are flying 787s, and we're very proud of that airplane, and I still am. But that was basically how it ran. And if you have any other questions, please do but I'm trying to respect time and have enough for some questions.

Now, the last thing I wanted to talk about was an issue that didn't work out to well in my negotiating experience. And this was one when I was United States Ambassador at the Asian Development Bank. I was from 2010 to 2016, a very, very proud appointee of President Barack Obama, because I was a political appointee not a career person. And what happened was, I was alerted that ADB had a major project that was going to be implemented in Uzbekistan.

And I didn't follow it that closely, but my German colleague did. And he came to me one day and he said, "Skipp, you know that your engagement project is going to be built through an area, a cotton area where they use slave labor down to the age of eight?" I went, "Really?" So, I sent a cable to Washington. I said, "What's the story? What are you guys hearing about it?" The Labor Department came back and said, "It's true. Vote no."

The Department of Treasury said, "Yep. Vote no." The State Department came back and said, "Not so fast." So, this is the other thing you deal with in negotiating, at least in the government sector. You're not only dealing with external players, you're negotiating internally sometimes. And this is one that I was caught up in negotiating with three government departments. Now the reason why the State Department was saying, "Don't be so fast with your no," was because Uzbekistan was a transit route for our supplies in Afghanistan. We couldn't afford to ignite that.

And they had already said, using my name as Ambassador, and the German Ambassador, his name, "If those two Ambassadors vote no on this project, you can forget about your supply line to Afghanistan." Well, now the Germans had less stake because they didn't have it as their supplier on the line. They had other ways to connect with Afghanistan, but we didn't. So, what we had to do was often what happens in a negotiation like this, we had to kick it upstairs. It no longer was in my pay grade. It went to the National Security Council.

And Susan Rice, who was the National Security Adviser of the president made the call, and she said, "Abstain." And abstention is a “no” vote without banging your fist on the table, essentially. So, the Germans said, "No." They voted against it. And then there were other European countries who did, too. Not all of them, but there were others who voted no. The Europeans were actually very forthcoming on this. So, we abstain, and the end of the day, the swing vote was Japan.

And Japan, the leadership of the Asian Development Bank is always Japanese, so they had made the commitment to Uzbekistan. And they voted yes, so we lost. And so, it was implemented as such, including the slave labor in Uzbekistan. What we were able to get from the Japanese… And by the way, I work really close with the Japanese leadership. It's one of the reasons why President Obama sent me to the Asian Development Bank was because I was the first Japanese speaker the United States had ever sent there, because they wanted to work closer with Japan.

But, what we were able to get it from the Japanese. We were able to get from them a promise that they would go back and renegotiate any future arrangements with Uzbekistan and say, "ADB will no longer support anything associated with slave labor." There's still some bumps in the road there. They managed to get the slave labor age raised from 8 to 15. But, it's one of these things where eventually, I think that this will go away, but we made that progress. But that immediate deal that I'd hoped we would win on, it didn't work out. We lost the immediate one. So, with those remarks, I'd be happy to open the floor up for any questions you might have. I purposely wanted to leave a little bit of time.

P. Kesting: Do you see a structural difference between political and business negotiations, because you have done both, and what's the difference?

R. Orr: Well, I think for one, government is vastly bigger, so I mean…

P. Kesting: Well, how much bigger?

R. Orr: Just bigger. I mean, we have so much ... With an international organization, every country handles it differently. Some countries, they don't care what the IO, the International Organization, is they just send somebody out there and let him do his thing. The United States government up until, forgive me, up until the current administration was very engaged in International Organization. We were big believers in it.

So, we had everybody and their brother want to have a place. I had Labor Department to deal, I had EPA to deal with, I had the US Agency of International Development, I had the State depending upon the issue if it touched on their area, believe me, they would be in the room. It's a little bit different with industry because the focus is a little more narrow. It's product.

For example, with the Motorola cellular phone deal, I mean, there was maybe, 10 or 15 people who I all knew who were players on this. I mean, the CEO wasn't engaged on this. The same thing with Boeing, I mean, we had commercial airlines, the military had nothing to do with it, our military business was out of it. And so, it was just narrowly focused on that group. And in that case, we had maybe about 10 or 20 who were decision-makers, who were players.

But, when you're Ambassador, you ... Even like economic development. The Pentagon could weigh in on that, and they do. I remember one time, we had a case where we were trying to get more money, not only for the ADB but for other economic development issues. We had a US General who testified in favor of more economic aid. He very famously said, "Mr. Chairman, give us more economic aid in diplomacy or give me more bullets." I thought that was pretty succinct! Told the story! And there's a lot of truth in that. So, a little more diversity in the development, yeah.

P. Meerts: Well, it's interesting what you said about the trade development because it's not only about slave labor it's also about the environment, because cotton pollutes enormously. And there are estimates that it makes 90% of the population sick because of all the residue and all that sort of pollution. But I would be interested in, would you know a little bit more on the question of Japanese negotiations style? It's great here, the reputation here saying things like that very important for informal negotiations, but as you said, they are extremely motivated. This is where you can move, probably. But still, let's say, if we are negotiating with Japanese, what would be your tips?

R. Orr: Don't introduce anything new suddenly.

P. Meerts: Yeah. It's “no surprises”.

R. Orr: Bad idea. Yeah, no surprises. Well, the Japanese word, what's called digging around the roots, *nemawashi,* make sure you do a lot of *nemawashi* away from the table. That way everybody knows what's going to happen. The worst thing you can do is go into a meeting with a Japanese counterparts and all of a sudden, decide you're going to conquer the world or introduce something drastic. And then, you're going to get silence. And then you're going to get, "We'll get back to you." And then you're going to get three weeks of delay.

P. Meerts: I guess that's running the track.

Yeah. Yeah, I mean, it's just the way it is. And so, the hard thing for me was, I knew that, but you try to coach some people who are above your pay grade about that. And then they go in, and they think they're a little bit smarter than the rule, and they introduce these hot topics. And they walk out and they'll say, "Damn Japanese, never trust them," kind of thing, right?

Well, you can, you can trust them, but there's a game plan. And we have our own game plan, and the Japanese have got to learn our game plan, too. It's not a one-way street. They've got to learn our deal. And most of the foreign minister people get it pretty much. Not the other agencies, but the foreign ministry people do. So no, that's a really important point, no new tricks in the box. That's my advice, is first thing, don't talk surprises.

R. Smolinski: You have a vast network of international business, politics, and diplomacy, right? By the way, thank you for sharing your thoughts. I'm really appreciating this. And it's been really amazing for all of us. But coming back to my question, best network, right? So, the best negotiator you know, business, politics is who?

R. Orr: Are you saying historically?

R. Smolinski: Historically, from memory, and-

R. Orr: Lyndon Johnson, no question.

R. Smolinski: Lyndon Johnson?

R. Orr: Oh, absolutely, yeah.

R. Smolinski: Why?

R. Orr: Oh, Lyndon, masterfully went behind the scenes and understood everybody's needs. It was unbelievable. I mean, he got things through the Congress. See, everybody thinks about Lyndon Johnson and the war in Vietnam. I do. I mean, I was that age. My draft number was 99. It's why I joined the US Coast Guard and Reserves. I didn't want to be drafted and go to Vietnam to be honest about it, right? But, the initial civil rights legislation, people forget, that didn't come from John F. Kennedy. I'm talking about the '50s. He got southerners to support civil rights legislation in 1957, the first Civil Rights Act.

Come on man, that doesn't happen! He got northern Midwesterners who shouldn't even care to become vibrant warriors for civil rights for African American people, because he absolutely knew how to cut the deals. He knew what the interests were in every party, and he knew how to deliver on them. I just think Lyndon Johnson. You read stories about LBJ and you just think, "No, it can't be." So, take a hard look at LBJ as a negotiator. And it's not negotiation ... People think about negotiations so often as one guy sits here, and the other guy sits there. It's not that way. I mean, so much of this stuff is played out in all kinds of different fora.

And certainly, Lyndon Johnson wasn't grand at that kind of thing. He had something called the Johnson treatment. Mondale told me about that. He says, "Very intuitive." He would get you in a room and talk to you ... he was six foot, almost 6'4." And he would get this far from your face. He'd crane over you, it's called the Johnson Treatment. And beat the hell out of you like that. There's a famous story with George Wallace and how he got the Voting Rights Act to be implemented in Alabama. It was not being implemented. It had been passed. And George Wallace, the governor of Alabama wasn't doing shit to implement the law.

And LBJ was furious, this was his law. Calls Wallace to Washington. Before he comes into the Oval Office, old George is giving a nice press conference right in front of the White House. He's denouncing Johnson, denouncing the Civil Rights Act, denouncing the Voting Rights Act. He comes in. Now, you have to understand, Lyndon Johnson's couch purposely had a section in it which had sunk. True, sunk. So, you would come in and you would sink. And LBJ had his chair that he would lean over you, the Lyndon Johnson treatment. It was intimidating.

That's a violation of your space, right? Right? I mean, that's intimidating your space. That's your territory, right? So, he says to Wallace, he says, "Now, George, I…" his southern accent always deepened when he spoke to southerners, he said, "Now, I know you ain't been implementing that there Voting Rights Act. You can't do that." He says, "It's the law of the land." And Wallace says to him, "Now, Mr. President, you know I ain't got that kind of power. I ain't got that kind of power." He said, "George, don't you tell me that. I just saw you outside giving a press conference." He said, "You were so convincing I almost agreed with you."

So, they went on like this. And finally he says again, Paul says again, "George, I just ain't got that kind of power down there." Johnson craned over him again, he says, "George Wallace, don't you shit me. Don't you shit me George Wallace, I know you've got that kind of power. You're the great governor of Alabama. Everybody respects you. You're the man."

He kept playing on that ego. And finally, he says to him, "Now, George Wallace, what do you want? What do you want George? You want a great statue down there in Alabama." He says, "George Wallace, he's loved. He celebrated humanity. He was a great man. Or, do you want some goddamn scrawny patch in the ground that says, 'George Wallace, he hated ...' which do you want?" George Wallace walked out of the room and he says, "I'm believing in voting rights."

P. Meerts: Really good.

R. Smolinski: I'm not going ask for the worst presidential negotiator, because we know him.

R. Orr: I'll come back to that.

W. Baber: We should point out that Skipp is a presidential history specialist, so we have couple hundred years of interesting information to get out of you.

R. Orr: Well, I taught in my home state. And of course, it was called History of American Presidential Elections from Washington to Trump. So, I covered all 56. And actually, when Barack was considering his run, I sat down with him for about 90 minutes and the Senator captured talk about ... He asked me to give him five of my favorites, so I did.

W. Baber: I'm afraid that we are out of time.

R. Orr: Okay, thank you very much.

W. Baber: ... I want to give you this sake made here in Kyoto. Sake is a traditional Japanese drink. And this is made by a shinise firm which is over 100 years old. And the successor to the management of the company is one of our students here.

R. Orr: Well, thank you very much. You're very kind.

Session 4: Great Negotiators in History and Training, Paul Meerts (Clingendael Institute)

Paul Willem Meerts (1946) studied Political Science and International Relations at Leiden University in The Netherlands. He obtained his MA in 1973 with a thesis about Turkey between its first and second coup d'état, and his PhD in 2014 on 'Diplomatic Negotiation, Essence and Evolution'. He worked as a researcher at the University of Groningen (1974) and at the University of Leiden (1975-1978) on

Dutch political / parliamentary issues, thereafter at the Netherlands Society for International Affairs (1978-1982) which became the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', where he had the opportunity to create and direct the Clingendael Academy (1983-1989), a training centre for Dutch and foreign diplomats and civil- and military officers. He then became Deputy General Director (1990-2006) and Advisor to the General Director (2006-2011). Parallel to this he has delivered seminars on international negotiation in a hundred countries around the world. He has been visiting professor at the College of Europe in Bruges (2006-2017). After his official retirement he became Senior Associate of Clingendael Institute (2011-2018) as it hosted the Processes of International Negotiation (PIN) Program (2011-2017) of which he was a member (1999-present). In 2017 he founded the PIN 'Program on International Negotiation Training' (POINT).

P. Meerts: And George Wallace was a lucky man, because if were in medieval times, somebody would just open the floor and he would just go down into the dungeon, talking about Dungeons and Dragons. They're might be a dragon there. So, it's amazing. I think that to me, just to connect to who was the best negotiator maybe in history. To me, it's the priest Talleyrand, a French negotiator in Vienna who managed to keep France a little bit bigger than France was before the Revolution.

Can you imagine, Napoleon lost the wars and then France at the table, which was very difficult in Vienna, but it's not the story. I'll talk a little bit more maybe about it in my speech on Saturday. But that is the negotiator who saved France, because the way he worked there was building trust and at the same time, betraying everybody. But betraying them in such a way that they could not really act against him. This was amazing. And why was he there? He was there because the Austrians, Metternich, very much needed them, the French, against the Prussians. The friends of the enemies of your enemy are your friends and things like that.

And Talleyrand, he used all kind of tactics and strategies. One of the tactics was, he took the best chef of Paris with him to Vienna. So that everybody of the delegations wanted to go to the French Embassy to sit around the table with Talleyrand because the food was so good. Somebody wrote an article about that gastronomy diplomacy. And so, Talleyrand's amazing, just a few more words on him but then I will start with the things I wanted to talk about.

But Talleyrand actually was in a very bad position, because he had a permanent limp. And so, his family thought, "We have to buy him a priesthood, a little bit special," not that he ever did anything for the Catholic Church, but at least he got a salary. Talleyrand was a supporter of the Ancien Régime. However, he understood it could not survive. He supported the Revolution. He supported Robespierre. He understood, obviously, it would not survive. He helped them to put him under the guillotine. He then supported the Directoire. He understood the Directoire could not survive.

So, he helped to bring them down together with Napoleon. Napoleon hated him, he called him a bag of shit. But Napoleon needed him because he was the best negotiator and he was the Minister of Foreign Affairs. He saw Napoleon would not survive. He helped to bring down Napoleon. He supported the Bourbon King. He saw this was a stupid king, so in 1813, there was a revolution against the Bourbon king. And then, he helped the Duke of Orléans to gain the throne. Orléans said, "Well, Monsieur Talleyrand, where is your loyalty? And he said, "My loyalty is to France."

But his loyalty was also to his own pockets, because these ministers were not fair, so he had to blackmail everybody. Collect as much money as he could. Amazing. To me, that's the best, at least, diplomatic negotiator, because he was firm but flexible. The profile of the principle effective negotiator is firm, but firm of content, of power, firm of interest, firm of the art of negotiation, but flexible and soft. That's the relationship. That is also exploration, being creative. I think good negotiators will also have to be creative. In that sense, indeed, it is the art and science. Art in the sense of having this kind of capacity but also science in working for both sides instead of serving one.

Well, the president of the United States had a book written, The Art of the Deal. Already, The Art of the Deal, meaning: it's art, me, Donald Trump, I know how to do this. You can't, it's not science, it's art. Only I know how to do that.
And it is about the deal. It's not about relationships, it's not about the process to take you from A to B, it is about the deal. Fine. Interesting, on page number one, he writes or has had written, it goes like that, "What you have to do to be an effective negotiator is to take a very tough stand and then don't give up." And he's quite successful about that because he knew they're already softening up because Mexico and Canada already made a better deal with him. But this is the situation where he can project his power on his opponents, and then it works.

But if you're going to negotiate with Mr. Kim Jong-un, who doesn't have the constituency, and can do whatever he wants or whatever the people around him want him to do. Then, you cannot project your power over him. And then, you're not in the same situation. And then this stupid bargaining might not work, and might boomerang, and that's exactly what it did. And it is amazing that they had these talks in Singapore and then, Hanoi, without preparation. Without proper preparation. I think that has to do with ego. It's also E-gotiation because of the ego of Trump, and the ego of Kim Jong-un who wanted to show to his country that he was the one negotiating with the president of the United Sates, the strongest country in the world.

What propaganda. Oh, really? I mean, he gained a lot out of that, right? And because they didn't want other things to talk about that. So, he was in a sense, unprepared, and so the whole show didn't go off. As Tom said, there are situations where you have to walk, that walking makes more sense. In this case, he had to walk out along with his deal. So preparation, as we all know, is very important. And is this new? Is this new that actually, before an international conference start a deal has already been made? That it will not have the conference if they know there will not be a final agreement, right? Is this new? It's amazing. It's not new at all.

I read an article about the Crusades. And in the Crusades, Richard Lionheart is in the holy land. And he wants to go to Jerusalem, but he's on the coast in Haifa. He wants to go to Jerusalem, but he doesn't know how to do that. And Jerusalem is in the hands of the Kurdish guy, Saladin. Saladin is there with his army and Richard the Lionheart thinks, "Well, you know what I'm going to do? I'm going to offer negotiations to Sala." And those were an agreement with Sala. "But I want to find out what is the strategic situation is. Where is the Muslim army? And I want to try to bribe the brother of Saladin to come over to us. And I want to give him some land and things like that."

So, he was negotiating, not for having a deal, he was negotiating for getting intelligence, for any way like Adolf Hitler in Munich in 1938. Not everybody's negotiating for a deal. There is also negotiating in order to create a smokescreen of course, all about that or negotiating with you to keep you busy, right? So, I always ask, is it in the interest of the Israelis to have a deal now with the Palestinians? The longer the Israelis wait the worse the situation for the Palestinians could be.

So, they're not going for a deal. You wait and wait until you think that you might have the better deal. Well, you never know what happens in the future. If you look beyond that, to instability, that might be even worse. But anyway, Saladin understood this. Saladin send a message to Richard the Lionheart. And the message read, "Kings don't negotiate unless an agreement has been made in advance. The message will have to reach you then the kings can. And this draft is the final."

Now, we had the conference at the PIN Group, I will write down the website for those who don't know about PIN. The Process of International Negotiation Program started 30 years ago in Austria. It was a confidence-building institute there between the Americans, along with the Soviets on the other hand who wanted to bring academicians together. And IIASA, the International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis, as a kind of way of building trust, and maybe coming to some truth.

And then, the first director Howard Raiffa, who wrote the book, The Art and Science of Negotiation. Howard Raiffa said, "But we have to know how to take our findings that we report to the political level, we need negotiation to do that. If we don't understand negotiation, we should do some research on that." And started doing some research on that.
Now, a few months ago we had a conference, and this was on the Middle East, and new ways to deal with conflicts in the Middle East. The problem, to me, in the Middle East is that you don't have an overarching structure. In Europe, we have the European Union, but we also have NATO, that connects European Union with United States.

And NATO is not just about security. NATO's not just about American dominance or whatever it is, well, also, but not only. But, it is also a very structural relationship between the two. That if things go wrong, that at least you have an overarching structure, a multilateral structure to discuss things. To me, it's always a little bit my worry. I hope you ... I can be forgiven for saying that, but in East Asia, there's no real overarching structure, multilateral organization overarching situation.
Kind of movement, so much-

That is a problem. Because you can stabilize negotiation processes if you're protective of the negotiation. Trust. Yes, we need trust. But can you trust countries? Do they trust each other? Why should countries trust each other? People can trust each other. Right? Mr. Mitterrand trusted Chancellor Kohl. But Mr. Chirac didn’t trust Berlusconi, and this had a lot of consequences. Alright? So trust between countries, no I don't think that works. What works is control. If you can control each other in a way that you can see to it that what the other promises, you can force them more or less to do. Both sides can do that through control. Then you create an alternative to trusting. Then you might protect negotiation processes and then they might move forward and then negotiation can be used as an alternative to warfare. So these multilateral organizations are very important. But the problem we face today is that there is an erosion of the multilateral organizations. It is not only because of Donald Trump. It's also in the European Union, populism. People are distrustful of the European Union. It's eroding the multilateral system and that is a problem for negotiation because negotiation processes are no longer protected.

It has to do also with the fact that, let's say that's the downside of multilateral organizations, I feel, that the moment you have such an organization it has its own interests. It wants to maintain itself. It doesn't want to wither away. And sometimes it acts against its member states. And that's what a lot of people in Europe feel and they see this as a negative aspect of the European Union. This is one of the reasons why countries choose weak secretary generals of the United Nations. Why did they elect Waldheim? Because they knew about his past in the Balkans as a Nazi. So the Russians said and the Americans said that let’s have Waldheim as Secretary General because if he does certain things against our will we can blackmail him. So normally the Secretary Generals of these organizations are not the best ones. But you hope for the organizations to be effective. So there's another paradox in these kind of situations. So how are we going to move forward? It's so difficult for democracies. Because I think for negotiators in democracies, their main problem are not the other negotiators. They can understand each other probably normally. They have common interest in solving certain problems. And these bureaucratic systems negotiations are, you might say, decision making systems for bureaucracy.

So, you know, they start to understand each other, they negotiate for months, they negotiate for years, they put a lot of energy into it, and then they don't want to lose the deal anymore. And so at a certain moment there might be an outcome. Even an outcome they never expected before. That's the positive side of negotiation. That if they work together, that positive emotion helps you to go somewhere. And also negative emotions. And if they are around it's very difficult to get them off the table and out of the room. Or they so harden people that they harm a negotiation project and so on by not paying attention to the emotional side. With the Chechens and Russians it was the whole negotiation that went down in flame because the Chechens could not get rid of what happened in the past. The shadow of the past, a shadow's presence is something that we cannot always resolve and must leave for future negotiation.

So how are we going to deal with this erosion of multilateral systems? It will be very difficult. And I don't have the answers. But negotiation is uncertain. It cannot be as optimistic as in the past. But it will go better because we will always feel that negotiation will be always a good alternative to warfare. But if negotiation cannot be effective then again there is the danger of a war. And how to deal with that. And I don't know. I don't think it's a very resolvable issue just now.

Training of course will help us to train the people we need. It has been said of course training is extremely important. I'm a trainer, I believe in training. I think it's not only about the issue itself, it's also about the context you are working in. Trying to get to that, the standard context, but that's my latest experience in training the Romanians for the presidency of the European Union. We have been many weeks in Bucharest, we have been training the civil servants because Romania now has the presidency of the European Union. And so the Romanian civil servants should understand the procedures and the processes in Brussels. So we trained the people. And I knew beforehand that 95% of the people we were going to train would not be sent to Brussels and would not be used in Brussels because the ministers would find their own clique to do that because of the money available in Brussels. But you still hope that these Romanian civil servants stay behind the Bucharest. That they will still at least learn something maybe in the future. We might have a little bit more fair policy. With Romania also considering their outcomes.

Training is nice but in some areas ... it takes a long time before it finally gets put to use. But one drop in the ocean is enough. In 2011 on behalf of the Dutch embassy I trained the diplomats of Assad in Damascus because they were not proficient in negotiation. One month later the fighting started.

Audience: Was there a causality?

P. Meerts: There is a little bit, but I don't dare to say this. But okay let me be un-Dutch and ... well let me be blunt so be Dutch, or un-Dutch in saying what I'm going to say. Half of the group of 30 diplomats went over to the Syrian opposition and later on was trained at Clingendael to prepare them for the negotiations with the regime in Geneva. And the Lavros said that the Syrian opposition negotiators were more effective than those of the regime. That was my fault.

P. Meerts: Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.

Session 5: Negotiation education and understanding characteristics of skilled negotiators, Cristian-Dragos Vasilescu (Technical University, Vienna)

Dragos-Cristian Vasilescu currently holds an associate position as lecturer and researcher at the Institute of Management Science at Vienna University of Technology. His main research topics are in the fields of machine innovation, machine learning, entrepreneurship and negotiations. Following an academic path, he received the title of University Expert in Innovation Management and Business Planning in 2011 after finishing a joint multi-year program organized by the Royal Institute of Technology Stockholm, Vienna University of Technology and University of Seville. Afterwards he started coaching and mentoring entrepreneurial-minded students at Vienna University of Technology. Dragos-Cristian's first encounter with the field of negotiations in 2011 quickly expanded into a passion for negotiations. In 2015 he started teaching international negotiations focussing on intercultural business negotiations. He is currently a member of the International Negotiations Teaching and Research Association, serving as a judge in the (Global) Negotiation Challenge as well as a reviewer for two negotiation journals. Advocating for an increased awareness for the benefits of negotiations, he took the role of academic coordinator in the Business Negotiation Club, a division of the Academic Forum for Foreign Affairs and United Nations Youth and Student Association of Austria.

D.C. Vasilescu: Hi. So I have to start by saying that what I did hear is something that's smart in 2016 at INTRA in Vienna. So I started by thinking, okay, we have this idea that we want to improve our negotiation skills right? And to do that we need to train new generations to be better at it. How to do that? Well we have three main ways of doing that. So you can teach them the competencies for it. Teach them concepts and they have different building blocks and you hope that they will get the better picture. And this is a big hope that we have. Then we can have negotiation trainings and we can do that based on cases, multi roles, or single roles, or whatever combination you want. And then you have self reflection. Fantastic. Now the problem with this is the further down you go the more the students are working because they're appropriating their own skills. They're understanding better what you're doing. However, from our perspective as the trainers, well you have less and less influence. Because once you get to self reflection it's self reflection. Yeah? I can't go inside their brain and change anything.

Now the problem with that is, of course, no influence, you have no clue what they're learning. So how should they learn? Well that's actually a quite well researched … well, it's not researched, it's a question that has been asked a lot of times. Is what we teach the right thing? This question is extremely general. So basically what do you do with it? Nothing. We have to be a bit more concise and do something else. So let me rephrase it into something else. I rephrased it into, do the skills that you're learning change from the beginning before you have any training to after you do the training? Do you see what is important in a different way or not? So with that in mind, I applied that in my negotiation course.

So a bit about my course. It happens every semester, it's a graduate level course, it is not mandatory for any student so the students that are going there will be motivated by the interest and desire to learn rather than getting grades and passing their curricula. And it's about 50/50 between conceptual training and experiential building. The course itself is focused on long lasting partnerships and having appropriate responses to appropriate scenarios. And trying to be, well, friendly and let's say we're all here together on the same platform.

Right. There are different tasks and different activities happening in this course. From lectures to negotiations in class that were happening at every single part of the lecture. To multi role, multi part, the multi face negotiations. But also online negotiations. So remote negotiations with other parts of the world. Two right think cases and two reflection cases. So basically everything that you can possibly fit into 75 hour of work. Right. So with that in mind I collected data last year from two sets of students in two semesters. In total from 53 students, 99 responses, from 18 countries. These people are mostly European but also there are a few from other regions. Mostly they are master's students because it is a graduate course. But other levels are there and also a few exchange students. The collection of the data happened twice. Once in the beginning before I said anything, even my name. I didn't say anything. And also I was very careful not to put too much information into the course catalog. Because then people will have a better understanding and that's not what I wanted.

And then once at the end, once everything happened, and after the final exam. So basically after they went through everything. The question asked was, literally what Remi said. What is a great negotiator? That was the question asked. It is pretty nondescript, but I like that. Because then the people are free to just say whatever comes to their mind. They had enough time to write whatever they want. Typically within five minutes everyone was done writing. Right, so then we analyzed the results. We used qualitative content analysis in order to generate the content behind this. We used ... I was very lucky to have two students that did not take my negotiations class, but had negotiations knowledge. Which was really helpful because then they were not biased by what I was teaching in the class when they were generating this. I was of course there from beginning to end and we had two coding runs, and it was pretty reliable between the two coders that did the whole process so it went pretty well.

So let's look at the results. In the beginning there were in total four categories. And this is how it looks. Well, negotiation skills that were the most important that the students mentioned. Negotiation skills: personal and some technical. Right? Technical skills, I'm going to get to that. Everything in these main categories is detailed into separate smaller categories as well. These are thought units, so basically snips of what is important for the people. Right. Here at the beginning one thing I want to mention, persuasion. So a lot of persuasion. Winning, deal making, goal achievement. So very goal driven. That was really in the beginning very noticeable. And you might think we're, most of us, very adept at negotiations. Preparation is important right? Well, preparation. That's where it fits. Yeah. In the beginning how many people thought preparation is important? Well it's in that three percent. Not much. Right.

So let me show you a bit about the categories. So from the four categories we had in the beginning different sub categories. What we noticed, when we started coding, or when they started coding the end results, we noticed there was a lot of stuff that would not fit in these categories and we needed new categories. All of a sudden complex thoughts appeared that were not present in the beginning before the course was studied. Things like invisibility. Right? Time and stress management. Conflict management. All of a sudden the awareness of other people, emotional control. All these things did not exist in the beginning before any training happened. Right. So now results are there. Negotiation skills, well still important. Technical skills by far more important until, well, the beginning. Communication and personal more or less remained the same. What's really changed is the amount of detail and the complex thoughts people had. And this was really dramatic of an improvement. Also persuasion is not really the most powerful thing. Now it's mutual problem solving. It's something else, it's better, right?

Yes of course personal skills went really really high. Human skills. They counted in here things like diplomacy, things like being a good friend, being ethical. These are all the human skills. Right. Also we'll talk about the other two categories, but then again we're going to get to that in a different picture. Now, comparison, beginning, end. Yeah? Biggest change, like I said, technical skills. Then you see the details. The nitty gritty part. Right. Beginning is in orange, end is in blue. Right? These are across all categories in a face. So first persuasion. OI jumped quite significantly. So it's not so much about pushing your deal, but actually doing something to create something else. Winning: not necessarily very important anymore for the students. Right. Communication: more or less it remained the same. You have to remember there is expected to be a drop in percentage because there are more subcategories they can mention. So all of a sudden it doesn't mean here that this is less important than this is, it's just a different division between them.

In terms of personal skills ... Well, not exactly sure what happened with them. It kind of sank there by quite a lot. Flexibility went up. Ethics. Not even one person mentioned ethics at the end of the course. I am sorry about this, it's not really necessarily the test issue.

Audience: But it is interesting.

D.C. Vasilescu: That was really a surprise for me too. Yeah, not sure exactly why.

Well I do teach ethics, but yes not sure exactly what happened. I am very happy to see this part with self awareness, awareness of others, emotional control, that gained a lot... well, up from zero actually. And very happy about preparation and planning. So this subcategory is by far the biggest category of everything else, yeah? This is by far the biggest one. Right, so conclusion. First off a lot more variety in thoughts between the beginning and end. Persuasion dropped. But at the same time the self reflection part and analysis came into play. And this brought with itself flexibility. And being able to be adaptable and changeable, well, in order to judge the situations better. Communication is largely the same, but I did say here either there was no change or people can approximate pretty well how much they need to communicate with the counterparts even before they learned about negotiation skills. Not sure exactly. Of course, my sample of 53 is pretty low. Right. And preparation went, well, up significantly. Which is good. Considering the whole course focused on, well, building long term relationships.

Right. I also have a little bit of self reflection. Yes, so I'm not really ... it's a head scratcher for me. I'm not sure exactly what happened there. It's something I can improve right? I can perhaps bring up the topic some more. The next two parts is colder negotiators with lower empathy, more emotional control and any and all achievement. They are not direct representations or things I said. Yeah? It's something they internalized and they came up with these, or they arrived at these conclusions by themselves. It was really interesting for me to see, although I never said these words during the lectures. And of course, importance of planning, I stressed this. Yes it went well. Now, and then, after all is said and done, I'm pretty happy to do this analysis. Because it allows me to improve something in my lecture as well. At least I have a better understanding of what's going on and perhaps what points I should stress out this specifically. And also seeing how well what I'm thinking I'm actually transmitting to other people.

So I also have a few things that I would like to discuss with you. So first is there a difference between, or are there other focus points for other lecturers here, on other points that I would stress or you stress during your lectures and your courses? What are the key activities or outcomes that interest the student the most? Is it the reflection part? Is it literally just having enough cases for them to experience this by themselves. I'm really interested in that part. And this, a lot of my tracking and feedback. So I learned in the US there's quite a lot of universities that keep track of their alumni. And this tracking process also helps with seeing how well they're doing based on what they did in their school. Yeah? We don't have anything in Europe like this because, well, we have GDPR which doesn't allow us to just blanket take all the students information and input it into a database. But it's also interesting what can you do in this respect regarding negotiations? I mean anyone can help with that.

D.C. Vasilescu: So yeah that's it. I hope you found this interesting and I'm opening the floor to any discussions. Thank you.

J. Pinto: I was intrigued by your puzzle about why the empathy went down. And my working hypothesis is perhaps in the exercises, because I don't know how many exercises you do, but if they've kind of lost in the exercises that they feel that, oh by showing empathy I was screwed over by the other guys. And that's what makes that ... well the ethics and the empathy will go down because they're just focused on whether they won or lost in those exercises that they did.

D.C. Vasilescu: Yeah.

Audience: That could be a factor. But I don't know how many exercises you have and how many of them are distributed with the win loss thing. And the second point in terms of the alumni tracking, London Business School and the American schools do this very well. They give them the same email which they have as a student that remains their email for life.

D.C. Vasilescu: Okay.

Audience: Right? So they will continue to be ... it will change to an alumni email or whatever. So they keep that email ID for the rest of their life and they're constantly on the community like ... a common. If you can spam the whole LBS campus community with one email and whether student or an alumnus you'll get the email. So that way if school can give them emails for life, than you can for instance send a survey and say, here, voluntarily, if you want to tell me. Did you take the scores, how did you find it, and that would be what we have voluntarily captured from them.

D.C. Vasilescu: Thank you for that.

A. Sigurdardottir: Yeah I was just ... it's really remarkable. Because it all depends on cases. I have no information on what cases you are using and for example it's really surprising to me about ethics and trust. Maybe you should revisit what cases you were using. Because that might be the reason why they didn't pick up all that.

D.C. Vasilescu: Yeah. I mean the cases are in the beginning extremely distributive and they get more integrative as the course goes along and to the end it's basically all integrated.

A. Sigurdardottir: Yeah. But still if you really find a good case that really is important for them to be ethical and to have success through ethics. Exactly, they can't succeed without it, then they will recognize that it is important.

D.C. Vasilescu: Oh something ... Thank you for that. Actually a very good point to this part, yeah? It's not that they're not important, but they're seeing the process as important and this is a consequence. If they do the process right, this comes as a consequence. This winning part. It's no longer the goal. The goal is to have a good process.

A. Sigurdardottir: Yes.

D.C. Vasilescu: And that's what they're saying about that point. Yeah. Yes?

P. Kesting: So thank you very much for the presentation. I think that's a really really useful topic for research and it's very hard for us to understand. I mean basically it's your ... your topic also of how do we train negotiators. So the only thing ... and I think also this question is very interesting. So what I see here is would be really interesting to have a drawn out database. And I mean I see another question here is the question of quantitative analysis. Because you now do a text analysis and coding. But you have always these two elements. What really matters and what comes to the mind. And I think both play in your result and you could eliminate one of those with a quantitative analysis where you give the different possibilities. But on the other hand you would take focus away from what goes around in your head. So what do you think?

D.C. Vasilescu: That's why the question was, in my opinion, so well formulated. Because it's a very generic question. And then people ... I'm not “streaming” people into telling the answer that I want.

P. Kesting: That's exactly the trade-off.

D.C. Vasilescu: Yep.

R. Smolinski: But maybe it would be interesting to modify the design slightly and do an open question in the beginning and a structured question at the end. Well at the beginning if you run it once it's hard to compare. But if you run it several times you get statistics on how many times different things are mentioned. So I would say use this to design a structured questionnaire in the end at some point. Because ultimately what it says is, what came to my mind at the beginning, what came to my mind at the end. It doesn't say anything about the efficiency of the training from the course's structure, it doesn't say anything about the attainment of the negotiator. It doesn't even say that the ethics is important or not. It's just not mentioned. That's all it says.

D.C. Vasilescu: Right, exactly.

R. Smolinski: And so what can we do with it? I mean there's always a big question in science, so what? If someone doesn't mention ethics, what can it mean?

A. Sigurdardottir: It doesn't mean that it isn't there.

R. Smolinski: Exactly. Maybe it's so obvious that I just don't mention it?

Audience: Exactly, yeah-

J. Vos: Yes but I think because your framework is, we're all together in this planet. And then maybe that brings it, makes it so obvious, that it doesn't need to be mentioned because other things crowd it out.

D.C. Vasilescu: It becomes a second sense. It's like-

J. Vos: But it can also be the other way around. That you start with a distributed negotiation and then if you let people lose the people will feel that negotiation is compromise and that have been tougher, the self assured people, and then they say, hey if there's not so much there together.

D.C. Vasilescu: Yes. Well. Thank you very much.

Session 6: Learning from Negotiation Simulations, Gro Alteren, Anne Eriksson (The Arctic University of Norway)

Gro Alteren, Dr Oecon, Associate Professor, School of Business and Economics in Tromsø. UiT, The Arctic University of Norway. Teaching areas include Negotiation and International Marketing. Her research interests include International marketing, export-import relationships, relational exchange, teaching and negotiations, as well as emerging markets.

Anne Ericksen, Associate Professor in Drama and Theatre, The Arctic University Museum and Academy of Arts, UiT, The Arctic University of Norway.
Teaching interests: Role-play, drama, theatre and communication, theatre production
Research interests: Drama as a learning activity, International collaboration in theatre studies, drama as action research.

G. Alteren: Okay, hello. I guess we'll now start to be tired everyone, and ... yeah I think actually but we'll do our best to try to engage you guys. I'm Gru, I work at the School of Business and Economics. Here it says that it's the University of the Arctic but actually UIT, Arctic University of Norway. I don't know if you're familiar with Tromsø. It's a city, it's north to the Arctic Circle. It's a very exotic place for a lot of tourists during the dark time of the year. Now it's start to be more and more light so there are less tourists. But when the midnight sun is coming we get more tourists. So this is my colleague.

A. Ericksen: Yes and I'm Anne Ericksen and I'm a associate professor in drama and theater. And I collaborate with Gru only in this subject, international negotiation. And normally I teach drama.

G. Alteren: Yeah. So it's actually a very interesting cooperation. And I may say a little bit about how it happened to me. Because they actually asked us how come you started to talk to each other. So when I started to work at the university I was asked to give a course in negotiations. And I also have to do the pedagogical course. And it was there that I actually met Anna. And my ... since I started there I was thinking how to decide a course for teaching that engaged the students. And so to cooperate Anna has been very helpful for me to try to decide, especially the negotiations, for actually the students are actually asked to play roles in order to play out negotiations.

Just to start, this is actually a work in progress and actually Christian here, he has actually read through and most likely has a lot of comments to our work. But it's a work in progress. We have collected reflection assignments from our students who are six years. And it's based on one particular case. Because you were talking about it depends on the case that you use. What do they learn? So we actually had been using the MedLee case. I'm sure that quite a few of you know that case. But in this negotiation simulation the students are asked to play either to be a Thai, to actually represent the company with the particular organizational culture that is rooted in a family company in Thailand. And the other one is an American company that is rooted in the typical organizational culture that is characterized by the American culture.

So they are asked to play very different roles. And our concern has been to facilitate that they actually play as well as possible in order to ... learn something from being in someone else's shoes that is very different from their original culture. I say a little bit more about those preparations. But the theoretical framework for this is permissible. And that is what Anna has from the pedagogical background. Who defined the learning processes in terms of four distinct processes. The first two do not challenge your established assumptions about how to interpret new experiences. It either modifies knowledge that you have, or complements knowledge that you already have.

But the third and the fourth learning processes actually challenge your established assumptions about how to integrate a particular experience. And what we want with this role, or with the MedLee case is to facilitate a situation that actually initiates this formative learning process that actually challenged the mindset of the students. That they need to consider other views of how to integrate an experience that actually contrasts their action. Perhaps the expectations they have before they get into that role.

So the objectives of the studies are set in terms of three main topics. We actually make use of the software program NVIVO plus to comb the text from these assignments to actually learn what the students learn from taking part in this simulation. Second is the test of these categorizations. We want to discuss what it is that students learn who take part in cross cultural negotiations.

And transformative learning, actually teaching that doesn't challenge their established concepts. The third is that they actually use, let's say original transformative learning, and integrated with literature, cross-cultural negotiation literature, in order to enhance our knowledge of students' learning.

We know that, as you already have mentioned, the simulations teach the students skills. But, in our particular case, we want to challenge the mindset because we assume that the skills are not sufficient for students to actually negotiate effectively in situations that are very unfamiliar to them in the first place. We want to challenge the mindset and to learn how to deal with experiences that are unfamiliar.

These are some of the concerns that students have expressed in their notes. That it actually gave them some understanding or opened their eyes, or they have to become this case, challenging. What we want, so according to the transformative theory, if you want to initiate learning process that really challenges your established assumptions, how to interpret new experiences, you have to create a challenging situation, disorienting dilemma, or trigger events. They're all different ways of saying it.

So what we did in order to prepare, they both they had to prepare something at home. We asked them to research the role that they were going to play. The first thing was that they actually had to report to me what is your nationality, and then I put them into that role which contrasts their original culture. Then they were asked to research their role they were going to play, what are typical characteristics, for example, for a Thai, or what is typical for another place.

Then we had some preparations in the classroom. Actually, I was teaching the low and high context communication styles, become familiar more or less with these things, for imitating. Also, in order to be aware of your style, or to change aspects that challenge your behavior, you need to become also aware of what is my typical style. What am I trying to do when I encounter a conflict?

We have, as a preparation, we have this card came called Barnga where you're placed in the situation that someone is not playing according to your rules, and how to deal with that. Then it is tested. What were they trying to do when you were placed in this conflict? Did you accommodate? Let the others start organizing and finding out the truths to apply to, or did you engage in participation?

P. Meerts: People get angry.

G. Alteren: Yes. And then, would you say something Anne about taking part in it?

A. Erikson: As a part of preparation, they have to sit together and prepare a party, an imagined party, to get to know each other, and then they discussed what kind of food shall we eat, what kind of activities shall we do at this party just to get to know each other. Also, they sit together with people who are going to play the same role from the other teams, to discuss what is characteristic for my role, what kind of opinions and attitudes I have. Get to know the role.

G. Alteren: It is part taking, how to say, we must emphasize the importance of creating relations, starting to trust one another. Based on this, we tried to create this challenging situation where they actually are going into the actual negotiation and play out the part.

A. Erikson: So we can say a little bit about role play as a facilitator for perspective taking. Role playing doesn't demand acting skills, but participants have to be able to represent a point of view and to step into an imagined world, or to enter the shoes of the other, as we like to say. This means that it's a premise to accept the fiction, and to respect the role they're going to play. Role plays are often improvised drama. The players, they all have to know their character's motivation, which implies attitude of the character, both towards the subject of the role play but also towards the other players.

G. Alteren: We have to analyze the use, and be able to record the test. Of course they learn acquisition skills, but they also realize that they learn the wrong learning, because of misunderstanding of negotiation strategy concepts. That is something we need to be aware of. Some of the students emphasize the need for more practice, they realize they still have a way to go to learn.

Then we got some data were we actually had to make a new code, it's called disrupting interactions. There were quite a few teams that had big problems where emotions played out. Their personal characteristics played out. They used hardball tactics, persuasion tactics, and all the, how to say, negative behaviors that they in the first place we don't want to teach them. But this was also the result of these negotiations that they have to be aware of, that behaviors don't really necessarily go in that direction that we in the first place want them to go.

But then we have these students who reported that they did go into the direction of transformative learning, or at least started the process of transformative learning, but communicative learning, is very central. Where students record that they managed to take this perspective taking, which actually implies that they managed to get into someone else's shoes and to understand the differences of cultures and people, the partners.

A. Erikson: The students also reported things about how they managed to identify with their roles. First they ... It's about how they prepared for the role. Some of them read articles, some discussed with partners, and they also had a Thai classmate that they could interview. Then their experience this when it came to play a role, also even someone found it easy, and others found it very difficult. Also experienced that they got into their personal roles, private roles. And here you see some examples of interesting data; I will let you look through it yourself.

Sometimes it's better to come from students who actually were placed in very hard to pick up the situations where some people who actually have to prepare to get typed, but ended up with negotiating with students who actually played out their personal characteristics, and they actually had very conflicted negotiations with a lot of misunderstandings. There is a different experiences of students in order to play out their assigned role.

I just say that actually from this experience, at least two different main processes occurred, which is important for us as teachers to be aware that, because I find that myself at least, if I didn't study this reflection notes, or trying to observe the positive sides of the negotiations. What we don't really touch those processes where the negative or the difficult experiences happened.

This we have expressions for you, because negotiations is about playing a role, and we wonder how, to what extent, you as teachers compare students playing the role in order to ensure that the event, the descriptions, and the case that they actually are assigned for the classroom.
So, do you have any comments for us?

R. Smolinski: I'm happy to share some of the things I wrestled over the last couple of years. I think we need to differentiate between two aspects. One is the ability to identify oneself with certain interests and the ability to craft a negotiation strategy that draws upon those interests and come to a more or less desirable solution, and second thing, the ability to become a type. I'm a very big friend, I'm a huge friend of role simulations. Although they are not perfect, that's the best tool we have for negotiations, that energy. I'm not a very good friend in terms of using role plays for teaching cultural differences. The reason that is-

G. Alteren: But that is not the reason here-

R. Smolinski: I know. The reason is because we are putting the students in a situation which is completely awkward. We're asking Belorussians to become Thai. What does it teach me? Maybe if I'm to be an actor-

J. Kos: Hold on, don't ... There's so many misunderstandings about actors. Actors are the most truthful persons. They are just capable of being themselves in different situations.

R. Smolinski: Absolutely.

J. Kos: But really there is so much misunderstanding, I know the tendency, if the word "actor" falls through so many connotations with I think ... Let's not go there.

R. Smolinski: I'm sorry if it sounded disrespectful.

J. Kos: I think in this discussion, it's really important to not take away from the position of what an actor can learn and the skills and qualities which are there, and how that relates to students and which role and actor can be in preparing.

R. Smolinski: The tension here I would like to emphasize is the ability of becoming someone I'm not, and I will never be.

G. Alteren: That is not the problem. Then you missed a little bit what our purpose is.

A. Erikson: Because it's a difference also because between an actor and a role player, because an actor is working very deep with his role, and characterize a role, but the role player only has to define some attitudes.

R. Smolinski: I completely agree. I completely understand.

A. Erikson: But it's not supposed to be a Thai, but to understand how a Thai thinks.

G. Alteren: No, but at least be aware of the different approaches and that you really have to control yourself or how to be aware of the qualities of the others.

That is what we want to initiate.

R. Smolinski: What I wanted to say, to finish the sentence, what I wanted to say was that there's a huge difference between let's say putting myself in the shoes of the culture I'm not from, I'm not a part of, and the ability to negotiate as a person with a certain set of interests. These are completely two different skillsets. So what I believe for negotiation pedagogy that what is absolutely important is to teach the second, and it's not so important to teach the first.

G. Alteren: Yeah, but we do both here.

R. Smolinski: I trust you do, I think you are professional.

The purpose was to initiate a challenging situation, how is it you feel in a challenging situation, and from a different point of view.

R. Smolinski: I understand.

A. Erikson: And then we try to teach in order to initiate this process. That we try to represent.

W. Baber Sorry, maybe we will stop and discuss in the coffee break, and then we'll understand what everyone has to say.

P. Meerts: This is why I don't like to use fantasy games. Let's say we have an exercise about cyclists, everybody know what a cyclist is, what it is about, so they're automatically in their role.

R. Smolinski: Are you sure?

P. Meerts: Always.

P. Kesting: But how do I know what cyclists, I could confuse the needs of cyclists.

R. Smolinski: So what I know, Paul, is what you told me is how to be a cyclist, and not to be a cyclist-

Session 7: Multiple Negotiations Strategy, T. Higashikawa (Ritsumeikan University)

Tatsuzo Higashikawa holds a BS in Agricultural Science from Kinki University and an MBA from the University of Wales, and has also received 1-year academic training in Agricultural Science at the University of Kiel (CAU), Germany, in 1980. Mr. Higashikawa had worked for two Kyoto-based companies specializing in Japanese traditional handicrafts and was in charge of sales and new business development then, before joining Shinjyu Global IP in 1991 as the General Manager and a managing partner. Mr. Higashikawa has been involved in the establishment of all member firms of United GIPs, and he is currently in charge of management matters related to internal cooperation and coordination within United GIPs, as a managing partner of GIP Tokyo (Tokyo), GIP India (Delhi), and GIP ASEAN (Singapore), and as a supervising member of GIP China (Beijing), GIP Korea (Seoul), GIP Europe (Munich), and GIP Italy (Milano).

Outside of United GIPs, he is a member of the board of directors of Japan International Society of Negotiation from 2016. He also teaches negotiation classes at Ritsumeikan Graduate School of Business as an instructor.

He is native in Japanese, and speaks English and German.

W. Baber: So we would like to restart our program with Prof. Higashikawa, who is with Ritsumeikan University, and his pursues own work in patent administration, and also is a member of the Japan International Society for Negotiation and director of the Western Japan, Kansai, branch.

T. Higashikawa: Yes. Thank you, yeah. I think I would express my appreciation to have a presentation here. And special thanks to the organizer, Dr. Baber, thank you very much. I think it is good timing for you to sleep - but never mind if you fall asleep now, you will lose nothing. But please bear with my presentation.

Okay. I would like to explain the main word used for confidence, but it means, for activity, in Japanese, we use this word, "shinrai", just one word, maybe our history is shorter than yours.

I have been researching this relationship based on negotiation and confidence. And today, I will explain to you the ... I'll say, my oldest thesis. And, please permit me to use my scenario, because of English is my “foreign country”, and in order to compress my words, I'm going to have to use this. Thank you.

And, I'm a lecturer of negotiation class, at Ritsumeikan University business school. And, I'm a general manager of a patent services office in Osaka. And, I have established eight offices outside of Japan, for example in Korea, India, Italy, and Brazil.

And, I'm also a managing director of Japan International Society for Negotiation. This association has over 30 years history. And, we are the oldest academic association in Japan in negotiation science.

Mr. Nakasako, the chairman of our association, has came to us from Tokyo. And, you know ORCID where you register your research, and now, I searched this yesterday, now 6.2 million researchers are registered on this site, and almost 2600 researchers are researching negotiation. So, I am very appreciative to have this meeting with you, because all of us are researching and teaching negotiation together.

I don't know, when you search “negotiation”, I am missing the top, I don't know why. Last August, I don't know completely, but I'd like to ask you to enter your data more and gain a much higher place than me. I hope you will.

Okay. These are the four things that I wrote for journal, and today I choose the oldest one. This is the first article that I wrote in my life. This article is same concept as the negotiation lifecycle from Dr. Baber. Thus Dr. Baber proposed to me to choose this theme to do the presentation. But actually, this theory is very new, this is the mathematical way of setting up a strategy of negotiation. This is the new one, the Relational Negotiator Model.

For example, the equilibrium theory of perpendicular bisectoral analysis. This is very fine tuned to set up a strategy of negotiation. If you are interested in this, let me explain it to you later. And this is a new one, this is the Relational Negotiator Model. It is necessary for us to make negotiation as a science from my point of view, same as economics. Let us start today's presentation.

Okay. May I sit down? The people have a short history of the word "negotiation", or people would like to easily use the word "negotiation." However, even though the word negotiation has a theme, their meanings are different depending on the scene. Negotiation, historically was related to human life and death. Negotiations between countries by politicians, or by lawyers, those are in fact special negotiations from the daily perspective of business persons like me. This is because many of these negotiation are by parties who are hostile to the other from the start. However, in business, it is very rare to start negotiations in hostile situations from the beginning.

In addition, the negotiation strategy differs greatly depending on the information of the other party. Today we are a highly information oriented society. The amount and quality of information has dramatically improved to high quality. Third, the information has changed significantly toward using information asymmetry.

Today is almost impossible negotiate forgiveness, and it is surely considered impossible for negotiations in which only one party wins big in business. Information manipulation in such situations is even more difficult. Information is enhancing convenience and transparency.

The abstract of the Multiple Negotiations Strategy. In mainstream theoretical constructs of negotiation strategy, it is common to focus on single negotiations. However, this study indicates a business activity which gains at efficient allocation of resources through continuous persistent negotiations with the same counterparty. It appears that business persons are focusing on the total amount of allocated resources acquired through continuous serial negotiations with a counterparty who is expected to bring benefits in other ways or through the resources of one or another parties in the negotiation.

In my own business experience, I do *not* consider single shot negotiations as temporary transactions. Instead I emphasize the long term perspective. I think it is important to see it as a chance to build trust with a counterparty through the process of negotiation. When evaluating the outcome of negotiation, it is often considered a failure if no agreement was reached. However, I think it was a good negotiation of I felt that I could build a good relationship with the other party. This study investigates the effect of accumulation of confidence between the two parties on their motivation and outcome of negotiation.

Distributive and integrative: Typical styles of negotiation technique are, you know already, distributive negotiation theory, and integrative negotiation theory. For myself, I have strong concerns about distributive negotiation theory which only is the other party increasing the amount of the pie; that the counterparty earns. In my own business experience it is not easy to increase the amount of pie shared during the negotiation in business situations. As a matter of fact, increasing the number of conservation factors during negotiations may complicate negotiations and may extend the duration of negotiations.

This book was published the year after I published this paper and describes the theoretical meanings of the win/win method proposed by Harvard negotiation, as I did. What I want to clarify from questionnaires and interviews ... Just a moment. You have this small booklet in the transparent folders that you were given in the entrance. This is the complete article. I'm following this article now, okay?

What I want to clarify from questionnaires and interviews, there is a concept of good negotiation derived from my experience. There are two important keywords. One, the accumulation of confidence jointly acquired from the other sides through the process of negotiation. Two, the total accumulation of reserves gained from the results of multiple negotiations. In my 30 years of business experience, I thought that the idea of increasing the total amount of distributive gains as a result of successive negotiations with intervals is the mainstream. In fact, this concept is not only my personal opinion, it is also a concept that my business customers in the world share, I believe, in common.

Like integrative negotiation theory, the idea is to increase the amount of the pie. But my way is a little different from the Harvard concept. That is not to force the number of pies at one negotiation opportunity, by increasing the number of negotiations. Give, over the passage of time, an increase in the amount of pie for later negotiation opportunities. In other words, it is a negotiation strategy that seeks to increase the accumulated amount of pies to be distributed by repeating the negotiations.

In general, businesspersons are considered to have a long term view from the first negotiation. Rather than speak to one of the hurdles of negotiation, he emphasized making the link between winning negotiations and losing negotiations with similar resource allocations.
Hypothesis: I have chosen four hypotheses, and I made four questionnaires to make it clear. It is considered easy and wise as a business to continue negotiations many times while considering the total distribution amount accumulated in each negotiation. I clarified it in these questionnaires.

The discussion was based mainly on surveys with these questionnaires with volunteer students of University of Wales business school where I graduated. I interviewed with my business partners around the world, China, Korea, India, Malaysia, US, Germany and Italy.

The following four hypotheses have been confirmed. The accumulative effect of confidence was confirmed. Just track the movement of the mind of person who is negotiating. Let's assume that both sides, just two groups, both sides have agreed many times in the past with Pareto optimal area, you already know the ZOPA. If there is trust in the relationship that allows them to repeat negotiations in the future, through these negotiations. It is expected that they will continue negotiations thereafter. Every time you negotiate, confidence builds up, and negotiation chain will continue.

In the situation in which the negotiations are repeated, it is assumed that the distribution by the first negotiation is distributed unequally to one party. The second negotiation is mutually coordinated to be distributive more to the other one. This will continue to make adjustment like swinging the pendulum.

In the process, it is assumed that both sides are aware of the adjustment of the total distributed sum. Total sum means this, both teams are always watching the result to make it half and half. I think that it is confidence higher up of a type of each negotiation. Confidence has piled, one, after the second negotiation, and third. The confidence accumulated between negotiation is a function of the next negotiation. According to the questionnaire, it is considered that the expectation value for the confidence is large when negotiating. On the other hand, hypothesis 2, in the case that even if confidence is accumulated, the probability that the chain will break is nearly 50% if the previous average is bad. Confidence works by accumulating, but it is important to be careful, because it is easy to lose.

Conclusion. Negotiations are an opportunity for the distribution of human sources. Due to the small number of responses, the interview and the questionnaire results cannot be fully relied upon, however, in and around the few responses, it seems that the best answers contains suggestions. In these negotiations, this paper has considered how trust works, I think that the theory underlines the effective functioning of trust.

Lies, even good intentions, and the availability that human beings seek. You may know Dr. R. Cialdini who wrote about interests, and Dr. Cialdini says, this mode is pervasive in human society. It pervades all type of exchange situations. It has been argued that such a system which has evolved from the rule of reciprocity. He wrote that reciprocal systems that return the benefits received may be a fundamental feature of human culture. We expect that healthy negotiations will expand in the business world. How is Multiple Negotiation Strategy as a concept to investigate? Thank you. That's all.

W. Baber: Thank you very much. Since we're short on time, let's keep our conversation for after, I'm sure we'll have some questions and comments to Professor Higashikawa. Dr. Vanenkova can you please come?

Session 8: International Negotiation Initiative, Irina Vanenkova

Irena Vanenkova is a CEDR-Accredited mediator (1998) as well as holder of the MATA advanced mediation certificate. She was Executive Director of International Mediation Institute from ___ until 2018. Irena holds the English Tutor Diploma of The Linguistic University in Moscow (1983), a Bachelor of Economics at the Moscow Institute of Business Studies (1997), and a Diploma in Public Relations Management at the Moscow State University (2001). Irena's prior career included positions as Commercial Projects Manager – Russia of International Distillers & Vintners Limited (1992-97), Deputy Chief Representative – Russia of CDR International (1997-98), Public Relations Manager of IKEA Russia (1999-2006), Executive Director of International Mediation Institute (2007-2018).

I. Vanenkova: So while I am getting ready, I'd like to start with thanking you very much for inviting me here to share with you some views about the organization which is being formed right now, the international negotiation initiative, and on behalf of the leadership group, I would like to invite you to see how we can join forces as we discussed yesterday, I hope you all agree that the negotiation is science, and some of us also consider it art. But the art and science of negotiation is in great need to be raised the level of a science and art that other science and art subjects are experiencing.

For the last year, the leadership group of the International Negotiation Initiative (INI) were thinking about we can really do that. What should be done? How can we get to the level where the virtuous circle of feeding science into practice and knowledge, and getting the knowledge feeding the science, can become something which will level up the science and I'm stressing on science here, because you're all interested. It's not a very fortunate spot to speak at the end of the conference when everyone is so tired. I will sit down a bit.

That was something which we thought should be considered, that INTRA could be the leader of this process of gaining on what we discussed today really showed that a lot could be done, and we can do that together.

This is what we created as the research, and the question is why? Why should the beginning be established? One of the things that is we made research, and it seems like nothing the like INI is existing right now, and it's a multi-state group which is focused on developing a credible body of negotiation science based on the field data, as well as lab data. That's what we thought could be in the organization, which could deliver many intangible benefits.

And who are the stakeholders? We can group them in three main sections like negotiators themselves, scholars, teachers, researchers, and trainers. I don't think you can stick it in the materials but we will send it to you so you can get more details. So the three core objectives of the INI is simply stated to be first of all, form a negotiator leadership internationally, one other objective is to plug the field research gap, and to promote negotiation confidence and excellence and that's what you expressed at the beginning of today.

The key objective is to get the best brains, and most experienced negotiators and to enable them to inspire and to develop leadership. I think that INTRA is on this level. Where to start? We were thinking about several ways. I would like your contribution tonight, whether there are some other ways to make first, second and third steps. One was to identify economic benefits of negotiation confidence. What we see in the world, is a lack of negotiation confidence. We know it is happening right now and confident negotiators can really bring people, and countries and companies to something on this side.

Then another thing is a canon of good negotiations strategies and an international and global, non-partisan negotiation and international sociability also for negotiating. Another key objective was to generate observational field data in negotiation. Because we usually don't like observers in negotiation to be present because negotiation has confidentiality, and the cost issues. A strong international effort is needed to overcome this reluctance. For example, training internal observers in companies, government, and advising firms like financial, accounting, and law, is observers. These can help solve also confidentiality concerns in negotiations as well.

Coordinated efforts to secure private funding and public funding for that, and do a comparative field research program, could be done, if we join forces. This is why we probably know this article by three Swedish professors who reviewed almost 500 articles, which were published from 1995 to 2015, and I just go straight to the conclusions. I have a printout of that. So the conclusion they came to was that most studies in negotiation field rely primarily on the students as research subjects. While the rationale for using students is ease of access, critical discussions question, whether the negotiation behavior of students accurately reflects negotiation behavior of real negotiators. In fact, the governing behavior of students has been shown to differ significantly from professionals.

There was another article in 2018 also done in the long term negotiation in one company, and the conclusion was also that what negotiators were taught in the course of …they took preparation and planning, most of the things they were taught were not used. And there were several other similar articles too.

The third objective is that from maybe, from the negotiation field, it's missing the consistent global type standards of training knowledge and skills. I hope you agree with this. Developing this more coherently and more extensively, they can form the basis of looking at professional learning. These are the three main objectives I advise. This is what I want to show to you and how to join forces and I'd like to invite you for comments and suggestions, and I think that we can cooperate to make negotiating that feels like, which is acknowledged not only in academia but also in business and government. Thank you.

W. Baber: Would you like to take questions for just a couple of minutes?

I. Vanenkova: We can take questions now, or we can do ... Because it's time for the panel discussion, and I tried to shorten my presentation, so just not to overuse the time. Also, we have your piece.

W. Baber: Yes, I will keep my presentation very short.

I. Vanenkova: Of course it's very intriguing name. I'm sure that everyone would love to hear that.

W. Baber: Then let's come back to it in the panel discussion, because this is very important I agree. We're very fortunate in this group to have the cooperation of the Gap partnership, which is aware of how important it is for industry to work with students and professional teachers in these subjects. Okay, thank you, I will very quickly move along.

Session 9: Negotiation schemata, Will Baber (Kyoto University)

Will Baber has combined education with business throughout his career. Currently he is teaching and researching negotiation and business models as an Associate Professor in the Graduate School of Management, Kyoto University. He also teaches as a visiting professor at University of Vienna and University of Jyväskylä. Additional experience includes economic development in the State of Maryland and supporting business starters in Japan. He is lead author of the textbook Practical Business Negotiation, (Taylor and Francis 2015). Recent articles include *Team Positions in Negotiation,* (Proceedings, 18th International Conference on Group Decision and Negotiation) and *Identifying Macro Phases Across the Negotiation Lifecycle,* (Group Decision and Negotiation, 2018). Negotiation simulations include *Mukashi Games and Pixie* and *Electro Car Merger*, both available through TheCaseCentre.org.

W. Baber: My topic is about cognitive schemata in negotiation. Schemata mean your group of ideas around the thing for a concept or something very simple, or very difficult. Your ideas around a microphone are probably all very similar. It's long and you talk into it, and you have nowadays little ones that go around your ear or something.

Your concept about the city of London, not simple. Very complicated. Your concept around the idea of ordering a meal in a nice restaurant is relatively simple. This is a social interaction, which can also be a schematic concept. And negotiation then is quite a bundle of different schemata about interacting and how you're going to do it.

This idea came out of the idea of mind maps that you're all familiar with. Key authors here include Nishida, who writes about schemata of social interaction, including procedures and strategies and so on and so forth. These are the key literature behind this.

Negotiation, when we talk about strategy is we know these big five as explained connecting relationship to substance. Schemata are going down a level below this to ways of thinking that might impact your preparation, your initial interaction, your later interaction after the relationship develops, and these are in level of complexity or granularity, somewhere in between the strategies that are very broad and tactics that are very specific and might be quite targeted and temporary. However, there will be some overlap here.

Searching the literature and interviews and so on, I came to about a dozen of these. They include some that we all know: win/lose, getting alliances, and some we might not think about so quickly like negotiating *if* there's an empathic fit. You may have experienced a situation that you do like the other person, and you don’t bother or you might have happened to be that somebody just brushed you off, possibly because they just didn't feel a connection.

We have some others. End to end business logic, for example this is sometimes culturally inflected. You generally cannot get New Yorkers to think about multiple long term relationships. I'll pick on New Yorkers since part if my family is from there. So the idea of strategic relationships and multiple interactions might not happen so much. In Japan, this is very common from my interviews so far, it seems to be quite normal here.

We want to, when we're thinking about your conversation, we want to see about that context, and what the mutual expectations are. Anyway, came down to about a dozen, which was much a smaller group than I expected. I thought it might be infinite. And compacted this a little bit to about 10 questions for the survey. The survey includes currently a small number of Japanese and Finns, and a larger number of Indians.

We're looking at four different situations. First one is negotiating with those that are more powerful, and then the survey takers ranked the kind of schema that they would use or reject. Either rank the ones they use or reject if not applicable. So far, I can show graphically data that suggest that schemata play a role. More people for example were learning towards some of these schemata, like these three were relatively popular among the Indian survey takers. "We need to gather and share information to solve a problem," this is very process oriented. This is the kind of thing I typically encourage in my classrooms. "Making proposals to convince management," that means speaking past the person at your table and really working on what their constituents want. Even delivering the precise phrase that you want them to take to the back table.

Long term outcomes, some that they reject, leaning away from, including "Quick finish up and move on," well finishing up quickly and moving on is something that is near and dear to my heart being from the North East part of the US, we tend like to get finished and move on. Very opposite. "Empathic fit," very much rejected this one. Some of them were not so clear, like the hard competing for win and lose situations. Almost the same numbers accept as reject this.

I asked the same set in four different situations, more powerful, less powerful, high stakes, low stakes. And interestingly, we did get a little bit different patterns for each one. The patterns were different with the different groups. Three groups that I have so far. You can see here, the Indian group for question one looks like that. And you can see the difference. Finnish group is a little similar. But the ones they reject are similar.

Again, here with the second situation, a little bit different, so it's quite interesting that some of the groups are accepting some of these more and rejecting some of these more. I'm very cautious about connecting broad culture to a set of typical behaviors, but some of this may come from what we've learned quite early on the playground, grade school, at home. Some are more or less sharing process approaches to negotiation. I'm cautiously optimistic about finding some results here.

With the Indian group, my first data that I presented a couple of months ago had only 50 people in it. This data set now has 75 responses, yet no change in the patterns. Consistent so far is the medium sized group, medium sized piece of data. That is so far where I am pursuing this, there seem to be differences that we can identify. Later I will do a factorial analysis depending on the size of the groups. I am most interested to see if there are individual characteristics that tell us that there are different flavors of negotiator inside any one cultural group. There might be a bunch of people who like this and not this, but they do like this. And you have might have chocolate, strawberry and vanilla in one group, and chocolate, strawberry and banana in the other group.

With that I will stop and we will assemble our panel. Thank you.

Panel Discussion: Remigiusz Smolinski, Steve Gates, Margarita Canal, Aldis Sigardurdottir, Robert Orr, Irina Vanenkova

Margarita Canal is currently an Assistant Professor at the School of Management of the Universidad de los Andes in Bogotá, Colombia, where she is also the academic coordinator of a one year graduate program in Negotiation. She teaches courses in both the graduate and undergraduate programs, including The Negotiation Profile, Organizational Behavior, and Negotiation Strategies. She holds a PhD from Aalborg University and is a psychologist specialized in conflict resolution from Universidad Javeriana. She is also a psychoanalyst, Colombian Psychoanalytical Society, affiliated with the International Psychoanalytical Association.
Her research interests lie in negotiation and management education. With regard to the former, she studies the psychology of collaborative negotiators, as well as how to identify and take advantage of negotiation profiles. With regard to the latter, she researches self-reflection as a mental capacity and as a means for providing students with meaningful and personalized assessments aligned with a student-centered approach.
She is an active member of INTRA (International Negotiation Teaching and Research Association) and regularly participates in The Negotiation Challenge (TNC) as a judge or as a team coach of this competition.

Founder and Chairman of The Gap Partnership, Steve has built the company over the past 21 years to become the world's leading negotiation consultancy. His understanding of negotiation process, strategy, tactics, behaviour and psychology has enabled his team to shape and mould effective commercial negotiation solutions for over 500 global organisations. Steve is the author of 'The Negotiation Book' and has written numerous articles on the subject of negotiation.

W. Baber: Panel members I'd like you to come forward and Remi Smolinski will be your moderator.

R. Smolinski: Thank you very much. So we have five angry men and women here. I cannot resist. Can you guys look at my direction please? All right.

All right, thank you very much for joining the panel. I have a couple of questions prepared for you based on what we've discussed, and what we haven't, and who knows what the first question is going to be? It's been repeated several times today.

Please answer, what do you think, what makes a great negotiator, what are the characteristics of good negotiators?

M. Canal: Maybe in 10 years we will know.

R. Smolinski: But how we can teach it if we don't know?

M. Canal: I don't know. Of course we know, but today I had a flavor of complexity, and of challenge. We are trying to find an answer in that complexity, and I don't know, it's a mix of many things we have mentioned and that you brought in the format that you are preparing for journalists to use in the next couple of days. But what I was thinking is that we have different kinds of great negotiators. Maybe we have some principles that we have tried to teach, but for every negotiation we need different kinds of skills. I don't know if we really have the formula for that. I agree on the things we have been discussing about the characteristics. I have some that I didn't think about this morning, maybe 20% of the parameters we discussed, and I was talking to Dragos about that when he finished his presentation. Well, we need to think whether negotiators are strategic. We need to have the characteristics to read problem, the context, the stakeholders, and then decide what the best strategy to formulate will be.

R. Smolinski: Okay, thank you very much, so we know that it's complex, right? We know that we're on the right track, we need it, but it's very hard to crack. We also talked a little bit about the fact that ice skating, the governing federation, managed somehow to come up with criteria for judging skating on ice. Apparently, Aldis, you had a very good in terms of picking the teams, because your teams always do well. So what is your take on great negotiators?

A. Sigardurdottir: For me, personally, emotional intelligence. Basically from the beginning to figure out what can help them go where they want to be. And so that they realize themselves how they do it because they need to know what they want.

R. Smolinski: So, apparently, as a summary, it is possible to make great negotiators.

A. Sigurdardottir: It is, yes.

R. Smolinski: It's possible to make them. So Steve, what are the companies paying you guys for? How do you make the great negotiator? Have you made the great negotiator?

S. Gates: Most people think that they're pretty good negotiators. Our first task is to show them, in fact, where they fall short in their abilities. So in other words, to expose them. The first attribute of effective negotiating is being a conscious, competent negotiator. Nothing happens by accident. Everything happens for a reason. And therefore be conscious around your approach, your planning, your engagement, and your understanding of the dynamics that you're involved in is fundamentally critical to who people are because us human beings are emotional characters. Therefore, we allow things like egos to get in the way of charisma. That the necessary relationship building blocks that take place in the early interactions.

So, among the programs that we run, the very first exercises they are supposed to demonstrate as much that can be learned through becoming a conscious, competent negotiator, while driving the self-awareness, and by understanding who you are, how you engage, and what that has. You know, of course, you can't teach people negotiation, but what you can do is you can teach them to learn about themselves as negotiators. So, a lot of the power or I should differentiates the way we go about doing it is by heightened facilitation by exposing people to this thing called the "mirror." Looking at yourself, and not just asking yourself questions, but having the people you have just negotiated with describe and talk you through how that made them feel, how it made them behave, how engaged they were in that negotiation, and every single step through the negotiation.

So, to teach people negotiation is not to run a case study. A case study is simply an activity. The learning comes from reviewing, reflecting, "What happened during that activity?" That is where the power of learning comes from. It doesn't come from you or I commentating on what happened, it's about the individuals you facilitated. Between the individuals, have someone screen as you video the case study to talk about the impact, the effect that it had on the process as it unfolded, whether it was consistent with the strategy and the planning that they set out in the first place, and whether the behaviors which they employed were strong enough to be effective. Their questioning, their listening, their trading, their creative thinking, their exploring of options, their collaboration, and their ability to bring the negotiations to a close, and importantly, the level of satisfaction they were able to provide the other party with as a result of taking the path that they had taken.

So, whatever I talk about in terms of what may take place on the learning journey, it's more about the vehicle that you used to help people become, and remain, motivated to change. People will not change if you tell them something, they have to experience it and feel it and understand from those around them as to what they might decide to change, as part of their character make-up.

There's much of it, the power of facilitation, as I said, in our business, is the level of facilitation that differentiates the impact in the change that we're facilitating.

R. Smolinski: So it seems that the road towards becoming a great negotiator needs to run daily, right? Discovering all deficiencies.

S. Gates: Failure, success, whatever it is that enables you to arrive at the way you arrive at, but understanding that we are all imperfect and the more conscious you are of those things you are less strong at, the more you're able to, perhaps, compensate for them, be aware of them, or build the team around you that supports those things that may not be your strengths, for example, if math or analytical skills are not a strength of yours, then have someone strong in that thing around you-

R. Smolinski: Right.

S. Gates: ... who is going to be support in that respect. Or it may be other aspects that you know, "It isn't my strength, therefore what do I need as a team?"

A. Sigurdardottir: Yeah, I have a little bit. It's not only your failures, it's also what makes you really good, able to reflect on what happened, what did you do to get a success. So that's also to ...

R. Smolinski: To enforce those behaviors.

A. Sigurdardottir: Exactly.

R. Smolinski: Thank you. Irena, anything to add on great negotiators?

I. Vanenkova: I have a question actually. What do you mean by great negotiation? It's like music; everyone is playing different things, different tunes, and then and perhaps you do not know that music. But as soon as you go to concert hall, even if you don't know anything about music, when the person starts playing, you know that it's obvious, it's a great musician or it's not. So, you can't measure it, to your last point, but you can define it, and that's the concept, right?

R. Smolinski: If I may jump in-

I. Vanenkova: Yeah.

R. Smolinski: ... very quickly, we do have competitions in music. There is the Chopin competition-

I. Vanenkova: Yes!

R. Smolinski: ... there are competitions in piano playing, in violin playing ... so apparently even those guys-

I. Vanenkova: Exactly.

R. Smolinski: ... those who judge those competitions at some point had to sit down and come up with a list of criteria that differentiates this guy playing better and this guy playing maybe not so good or excellently. So apparently anything that we can classify as a skill can and should be measured and if so, then we can compare.

I. Vanenkova: And to that notion of competence I would add skills, knowledge, and experience, as you said. So you go through the experience and that makes you good. So you have knowledge, you have skills, you train and you have experience with reflection, so then though ... but I also would not say that it's not best or most perfect, it's the suitable solution, this particular flow. Like, you wouldn't go to the principal's course here ... you wouldn’t see it. So you need to have suitable attitude, you need to have this kind of intense dance with, I would say, with your negotiating knowledge.

R. Smolinski: Right, yes.

I. Vanenkova: And situations are different. You're right, you have competitions, but each competition changes. You have the criteria, but they have to be able to judge the music.

R. Smolinski: Right.

I. Vanenkova: So go to business negotiation, then we have civil negotiation, you have legal negotiation, and so on that's more like it.

R. Smolinski: Okay. All right. Thank you very much. Skip, you've been in lots of different negotiation contexts, right? So you've done diplomatic negotiations numerous times and you were in many business negotiations. Would you share the statement that negotiation skills are context-specific or are there any universal level competencies that are important regardless of the context?

R. Orr: Well, I think ... to a certain extent there's the idea of suitability to all that ... when I think about, I'm going to fall back on Steve's statement, when I think about the United States, when we look at the people who are involved with high-ranking positions, often elected positions in the United States government, many of them came from the business world. So they were engaged in negotiations in the business world that transferred into the political world. Now, sometimes it doesn't work out too well. Let's face it. Sometimes there are those who boast about their great political or business negotiation skills that...

R. Smolinski: We know.

R. Orr: Yeah. So I guess if I were going to briefly paint it into a box I would say that when your situation, a lead negotiator, put a specialization involved, the lead negotiator can be briefed on what that specialization is. But it is important, I think, and valuable to have someone who is a specialist, who's very knowledgeable, you're then able to turn to them to consult, and that happened both times. I mean, certainly in my cases, when I was negotiating a cellular phone agreement, I was the authority on the technology, so it was important for me to have someone like that specialist to keep me up to speed.

I think the other thing that I want to come back to the concept of emotional intelligence because I think that's really important, and that's where I reject the full concept of empathy. Emotional intelligence to me is almost like we see, we feel, and the extent to which you have that in the room would be very valuable. I think that's important for that. And then I come back to what you're saying, self-awareness, and this is my translation of your comments, and how to change that. Sometimes you run into negotiators who are so full of their own ego that they're not capable of making those changes. Sometimes you have to almost reverse course. But be aware of some of those fallibilities, just be able to address them. I mean, goodness gracious, I have more fallibilities than I can count on one hand, but hopefully you're able to address those as a negotiator.

R. Smolinski: Thank you very much, Skip. We've spent about six, seven hours together talking about something that we're all very passionate about, learning about negotiation. When we leave this room, what will be one, two, three things that you will take with you? Is there anything that convinces you or that has convinced you that this day was worthwhile? You always a difficult role. Shall we start maybe with someone else-

A. Sigurdardottir: Yeah!

R. Smolinski: Maybe not to put you in a very difficult situation. But is there anybody else who would like to start?
So let me make a start. I have a notebook - it doesn't happen very often, but I took very concise notes. I took a lot of the over the course of the day, and so thanks to your kind feedback during the breaks, I learned a lot about how you guys perceive greatness or greatness defined maybe as, let's say, desire for suitable or appropriate traits, and measuring and negotiating. And I will incorporate your feedback into our measurement scheme, and I do hope to get more feedback once we've gone over the evaluation rounds tomorrow morning.

If there's something that comes to your mind, please share, please criticize, and our intention is to have a measurement system that is not perfect. That is not possible. Peter is absolutely right. Deciding on a measurement system cuts off certain things and that's a practical necessity. But, the discussion that we are starting is aimed at creating a standard that we all live with, and I do hope for your feedback and thank you for what you've shared so far, that's one of my key takeaways from our day.

S. Gates: But it still should be fun! There something that appears to be a common frustration, I don't know exactly what it means, and it's something which I worked hard on about two years ago regarding negotiating, and started with a behavioral framework, each behavior had entailing exist, and recognizing that the subject of this style or type of negotiation, the stage of negotiation even, will require certain of those behaviors to be used. In other words, if you were involved in a collaborative long-term negotiation, the concepts of battery thinking, creative thinking, problem-solving are very valued. If you towards the end of that same negotiation and you're nearly getting to the last one or two issues, and the climate has cooled and become more challenging, then certainly your ability to open up the questions or to hang tough may become more appropriate. I use the word appropriate because there's no good, bad, right, or wrong, there's the appropriateness given the situation that you face. But what it allowed me to do was to recognize that through certain types of negotiations, there were behaviors that would normally be relevant, there'd certainly be skill sets that you'd be looking for when assessing the delicate aspects of a program, or even assessing the right negotiation.

So, subjective as that may sound, the behavior indicated or any apparent behavior. If I see these things taking place, and regard that potentially as a strength, if they're not evident then maybe you have an opportunity there to impress. If indeed it is appropriate for that style of negotiation. There are frameworks that we use, both as strategic, behavioral, tactical, levels. Be it by self-assessment, profiling, observation, from tutors and from my managers who assess their own teams around that view of negotiations, they're always ... That seems to be a common frustration for them or certainly a line of inquiry.

R. Smolinski: Thank you very much for sharing this. Anyone else? Anything else?

A. Sigurdardottir: Yeah, I would agree with measurement, well, it's a debate as to how we measure it. That is one point that I would take home. But also I think that training is very important. It matters how you train negotiators and understand their world. So, the reflection and the feedback, I think that that's really important. Not only that I provide my feedback, or the training provides me feedback, but also that they have perhaps professional, peers, you know, not only from me but from how the others see it. So I think this is very important and I will look into this from now.

R. Smolinski: Thank you, Aldis. Anyone else?

M. Canal: I have enjoyed the day very much. I was studying and it seems we started with INTRA, we had that in mind doing more things as a group, not just meeting once a year and share our research, our experiences. Sometimes we do some things, I am writing or improving a couple of cases with people right now. But today, I have so many things that overlap like your question about the great negotiator, with for instance, my necessity in Los Andes University about, well now they have created a center for assurance of learning that these now or next because we are supposed to measure some learning of the groups and some competences. If we collaborate in better or more efficient ways, I think we can do it better. Peter always tells me, "Someone needs to take initiative." And I always tell him, or sometimes not always, "Maybe we need to do something other than that. Maybe we can create efficient ways of working together because we cannot just give responsibility of someone doing these and the others contributing."

Well, I was thinking I enjoyed the day, but I was thinking maybe next year we can leave more space for discussions, workshops. I'm trying to see if we can, say, combine of our resources, experiences, knowledge. Every time I hear what partnership means, I think, "Oh my god, I would like to contribute to that, or to try that thing at university, or to collaborate," but then we disappear and we see each other the next year and it's a pity! It's super nice, but it's a pity that we are not taking advantage of these experiences to do something more. This is one of the things.

And about self-awareness and reflection, this is one of the focus in which I research and I like it very much. But I have a question that I would like to pose, because for me there is a difference between reflecting and changing. There is a gap between the two. So, what is necessary between these two? For me, change and learning is one of the more challenging questions, and I have seen some of my students reflecting a certain way and they come to some conclusions and to some changes, this is why I am studying the psychology of traits that make people who reflect change as compared to other change. And a small thing, I haven't thought about why asking my students to, when we are doing cross-cultural role-playing and we ask them to put on the role of another culture or to take the role of another culture, why that could be a waste of time? I don't see it that way. But I haven't thought about that before, so now I have something else to think about.

R. Smolinski: Thank you very much, Margarita. You mentioned cooperation, right? And this is something that Irena also mentioned in her presentation, encourage us to think, "What can we do together?" We have a very unique set-up because here at this table we have diplomats, business professionals, and academics on top of it, right? So are there any ideas, right now I'm asking the panelists, but also I'm opening this discussion to all of you. Are any ideas that come to your minds in terms of the things that we could do together in terms of joining forces, combining our assets? Is there anything that jumps to your mind immediately? Is there anything that academia can do to support the business? Is there anything that business can do to support academia? Is there anything that INTRA can do to support any idea, now?

I. Vanenkova: Is there anything that INI can do?

R. Smolinski: Exactly, right? Is there anything that comes to your mind?

P. Kesting: Once any idea comes, and we have lots of faces, I'm happy to share them. So if you need a role-play, like our simulations in INTRA, just drop me an email. So there's a thought, these role-plays are there and I'm happy to share.

P. Meerts: Well, this is something we want to develop at the moment with our program on special negotiation training. To create platform for those who are interested to take away simulations, exercises, and at the same time, develop them. I am coming up with exactly the same idea, so I would suggest that we talk it over and then we create one platform instead of a hundred. This is moving in the same direction.

R. Smolinski: All right, so we have a database of cases, all right. What else? Is there anything else that comes to your mind?

A. Sigardurdottir: Yeah, I was just wondering because ... a couple of us at least are teaching negotiation and what you were doing, I think we might create a measurement. Go over to see what they are teaching using the same places and do this research on more than one operation so we can collect all the data and we can use it.

J. Pinto: So I was wondering because we have so many people all committed to negotiations, publish stuff and make a book which like “the greatest negotiators as validated by this cross-functional expert panel like Talleyrand and Lyndon Johnson, and whoever else people might want to nominate. But then we not only tell a story but we also use a consistent framework of assessing why we think they're great negotiators, so we have this aspect or another aspect, so that could be anyone who wants to know what a great negotiator is, and what the characteristics that a bunch of world wide experts have come together to say, "This is what we're aiming for," as opposed to the characteristics of the U.S. and this idea of what a great negotiator is. I think that would have the intensity and hopefully the expiration of a sort of a guideline for people to know what to shoot for.

R. Smolinski: Maybe a short note on this, this is already a work in progress.

J. Pinto: I'm worried that Peter has come up with something that's already started!

R. Smolinski: But Peter and I have started working on a book like this.

J. Pinto: Okay, cool.

R. Smolinski: And you guys have good connections to great negotiators around the world, just let us know. We have already done interviews to find out and are planning to collate the data this year and publish next year.

J. Pinto: No, I was thinking of each person writing different chapter as opposed to you and Peter writing ...

R. Smolinski: Sure.

J. Pinto: Because then that way it could be any or INTRA or- so then it'll look like a more collaborative effort and different perspectives can come in, but we all singing from the same hymnal.

R. Smolinski: Right.

J. Pinto: And that's what I have.

A. Sigardurdottir: But are you looking for, just, whatever negotiators, political negotiators or business negotiators-

R. Smolinski: Correct.

We have several sections of the findings to have great negotiators in the world of politics and the second group is the world of business, and academics.

We'll have to include leaders of negotiation and obviously people who maybe stretch across several functions, right? For example, like Skipp, who has business person reputation, right? And international cross-cultural background. But we're looking at only at contemporary, so if someone would like to have a look or lead a project on a historical character, please be my guest. We're not going to touch historical.

P. Meerts: Yes, but we should not forget about literature that has been written about the practice of negotiators, written by de Callieres in 1716. The Art of Negotiating with Sovereign Princes remains appropriate. He said what he thought at that time, that moment, what an effective negotiator was and should do. I mean, we also need to have some kind of background or political context.

P. Kesting: Another thing you could consider is doing something about teaching in some book or special journal, because I think that there's a lot of experience here and a lot of research on teaching and this is where possibility publishing some of our ideas and data. Perhaps it's a special issue.

I. Vanenkova: And maybe that could be something, I hate this word, standards, but to have some kind of high level or teacher which can help with for- you have assurance, assurance. So if you need some kind of outline, you mentioned, an international association and we can take as an example, the International Air Transport Association because they have these levels for airlines, for pilots, for airports, for all kinds of important things around that, so they have standards. But I'm talking about not rules and regulations, I'm talking about aspiring standards so each professor and university can say, "This is the international level," so this is what we need to at least meet ... so it could be high minimal standards, so if you don't reach that then the teaching program should not count, something like this. And I think this is the great possibility and opportunity for all the depths of knowledge and experience and teaching that could be put up for everyone to see this star, so they would know where to go, like they see a lighthouse, to show the way.

P. Kesting: And actually, you didn't ask me, and now I can say it! My biggest takeaway was how little we know what we are actually teaching to our students, I mean, effectively.

And I found your perspective really enlightening. I see the feedback and the students are happy, they love this topic, and get a good evaluation, but I don't know what they learn. I don't know it.

A. Costelloe: Or how effective that is when they apply it to real life.

P. Kesting: Yeah. Exactly. I have some sense but I have no knowledge of, not at all.

J. Pinto: So that’s the thing- I got some messages… I taught in Brazil three days in January and the students are submitting their assignments and one of them has written, "I really like the course and I've been applying it to my daily life ever since." I don't know. Is that person just being nice or if they've been applying it in their daily life, then at least one student has learned something. Or at least thinks he has learned something.

P. Kesting: I get this often this feedback, but I don't know what-

I. Vanenkova: Or exactly.

D. Vasilescu: Are they finding the right thing?

S. Gates: We have a system we've been utilizing, basically it's based on our internal investment for our clients, and you might attend these programs for a period of three months to six months after being on the program to enter data about the negotiation which they had been involved in. Part of that data involves the variables that they were introduced as part of building value. The incremental value they accumulated during those negotiations, but importantly, the two or three behaviors which they believe they have employed that help them to negotiate that difference.

Now, over the period of three to six months those behaviors are then correlated with their own profile, in other words if their strengths happen to be around three or four, five specific behaviors, and they correlated with those behaviors that they claimed they would use to attract incremental benefit, you can start to see, or it might be the other way around, you can start to see if there is a correlation between behaviors they're employing and the benefits they claim to have attracted. Important for us, we go back to that client and we can highlight and talk through each of the negotiations those attendees have concluded and whether or not there has been an increment in benefits achieved. So the correlation between what you conceive to be your strengths, but are you employing them in the tight ways?

D. Vasilescu: I might have another possibility, we all have a very similar, let's say, teaching style on this topic at least. But we also have differences and it's something that we're actively doing at the university and we have a collaboration in the field of entrepreneurship, to do a summer school where we bring students together and we teach what we normally teach but from different cultural perspectives with the same people in the same room but by different trainers from different areas of the world. And this is something that perhaps could be done for negotiation as well.

R. Smolinski: INTRA-INI summer school?

D. Vasilescu: Something that, I mean, it's quite successful.

R. Smolinski: Supported by the Gap?

W. Baber: May I ask a question? Today we've talked about some questions about how you evaluate people and we sometimes the idea came up that we need to evaluate based on the situation, based on the negotiation, so one of my many pet projects that I'm working and working on is on to understand what kinds of negotiation there are. And I see this as genre. So when we talk about literature, we have short stories, we have novels, and we have plays, and we have this and that, and it's very clear what the different genres are, so my question to the panel is what genres do you see in negotiation? So we talked about hostage crisis today, I see that as a clearly different genre. So, your answers, please.

R. Orr: I mean, that's really one of the thing- I just jotted a note down here before you spoke that almost encompassed the question that you asked. I think the thing that you have to realize that there are so many different levels of negotiations. I mean it is honestly rare that you have normal sitting at the table with the other guy sitting over there and, I mean, this is a rare day. They usually that's at the end game, but the steps that you go through to get to that level are voluminous. So I think that to really understand international business or certainly a government negotiation, boy, you need to understand that process or otherwise you're sort of scraping the icing off a cake. And it doesn't really address the issue. Obviously it's important, but a lot of the groundwork has already been negotiated before you get there, and if it hasn't then chances are this one's not going to make it.

J. Voos: I have one role play where I give them time and there are five parties. They get the information and we pretend that everybody’s at an airport and have a conference room available to meet face-to-face, a half-hour, 45 minutes, and then they should, the parties normally they go to the room, but they don't have to. I look whether they make alliances, if they call each other, if they use What's App, if they have phone numbers and stuff like this. So if that's the only groundwork they have, and it's very limited, then at least I can mention it. I can say afterwards, "Hey, how did you create extra force and did you understand the idea, did you have to do such and such?"

R. Orr: I had a question because I taught last fall in Florida, the first time I've done that in 25 years I taught history at my alma mater, to what extent do you have a pool of people like me? I mean, there's plenty of people like me. I'm hardly unique. There's business, there's government. Do you have pools that you can draw upon of people that come in and talk about these experiences?

P. Meerts: For example, at the PIN meeting, for every academic who wrote a chapter, there is a practitioner to comment on it. So the Dutch ambassador, the Persian-Arabic specialist commented the chapter on the Middle East that had been written by a clinician who actually had no clue about how these negotiations were done.

R. Orr: It strikes me that there can be lot cross-fertilization.

P. Kesting: We could do much more than this

I. Vanenkova: Exactly. I was thinking the same thing.

R. Orr: Really, there's a lot of folks in your own countries as well who have gone back and forth across the line. And it doesn't mean you take everything hook, line, and sink, but you bring them in and have these young folks interact with- by the way, when I taught history last year for Florida University, I did this. I taught a course called “U.S. Strategy and Policy in Asia since 1783”, covered the whole thing. Know what I did? When we came into Vietnam, I brought a couple of senior officers that had been in the Vietnam War, now was that an interesting discussion? Fantastic! And I didn't say a word! It was between those veterans and the students. They're the ones that didn't want it to die, they won the lottery. I just sat there. So, I mean, that kind of thing.

R. Smolinski: Will asked a question about different genre or something in negotiations. Is there anything that you guys would like to add?

S. Gates: Yeah, I think every negotiation is unique. They are all unique. You have different personalities, different levels of power, different members of change taking place during those negotiations ... so, no two are identical, but what we have set out to do is identify different styles and types of negotiation, and how these are driven by things like power and complexity, relationship and dependency. So we have eight pre-defined styles, types if you like of negotiation. I will let everybody else read them, they're in the negotiation book that you got a copy of. They are based around a clock face, but we also had nine different types of strategies that cover just about most paths we’ve taken. Things like contingency plans and triggers and so on, because most strategies don't turn out the way we think they are going. As long as you put them through all contingencies and you can remain in control, then that's great.

We've also got 14 behaviors that you can highlight or identify through a signal, things that are more likely to make a negotiation stronger or more rounded. And then, of course, there are three characteristics around being a diplomat, being an architect, and being a trader, or an engineer. The architect is the person who will be red hot at the planning, the preparing, the researching, and understanding the make-up and the backdrop to this scenario. The diplomat will be the person who understands the nature of the requirement, the type of relationships that need to be in play and how to manage those through. And then the trader is the person who will have the creative nous to be able to adapt and change, create, and counsel for the problem solved to bring that deal home.

So, we have different ways of the effectiveness of the negotiation, I'd say most of them all are in the book there that I've written, to help us understand how do we provide feedback, how do we coach, and how do we help others to become more effective negotiators by examining themselves and growing as individuals?

R. Smolinski: Anyone else like to speak?

M. Canal: But I was thinking about an example of these difficult things, about a genre and complexity, and I was thinking about the Colombian peace process and when I have been studying more a little bit about that because of the cases that Peter and I are improving. They are about that. When we interview people from the guerrillas who were participating in the process, we found they were acting as a group more easily because they have been together for many years trying to accomplish what they wanted to accomplish. And the perspective of the government was the same. They were negotiating like a pilot group, so it was easier for them to make decisions and to address what they wanted to address. On the other side, the government team, the representatives in the peace process, they were there for the first time, so they were not a team, and it was more difficult for them to make decisions. And they were trying to acknowledge information for many, many groups so it was more difficult for them to process that and to participate in the peace process as a group. So, the same process with two different teams with different purposes, so that's a complex negotiation and you cannot teach them how to do it because they have their ways. Perhaps you come prepared, the government team. The other team, it's more difficult for them.

R. Smolinski: Okay. I think during one of the presentations I heard that, I think Irena mentioned this, that most of the research, one of the petitions sees that negotiation research is that, most of it is based on, there's even an acronym for this which I forgot right now ... young undergraduate students studying at American universities, do you think there would be a need to create a research platform or a resource database that somehow collects the knowledge that has non-U.S. participants and non-U.S. professors have gathered over the years that maybe would challenge the findings that are considered standard today? Or do you believe that everything that has been written applies also in the context of our prolonged negotiation?

S. Gates: There is a lot of common research available. There is a lot to understand. Yale, Harvard, Stanford, that you'll find work. Professors are renowned for sharing research and a lot of research comes out of the US. Perhaps commonly found wherever I go around the world, I find Harvard case studies. Schools utilize them, I know of a lot of them. It can become very one dimensional everywhere you go you get the same thing. That's part of the reason why we believe we can be successful as a business. We have something different that we feel is relevant to a particular market. Not only the interpretation of the old cases. There's a real challenge there. There's just a lack of output here in Asia.

P. Meerts: That is why we created the PIN Group 30 years ago. We had many people from the United States, Canada, France, Sweden, Germany, Moscow, Middle East, South Africa. Very different viewpoints of what negotiation is, but when you put all these people together and we published a book a year – there are 30 books now. It was very good. About hostage taking, multilateral negotiations and so on. So we really try to get rid of the solely American approach and try to feed in additional views.

R. Smolinski: My question was trying to get at the fact that, most of the textbooks we are using are US based. Is there a need for a non-US based textbook that we could all be using or teaching? Are we satisfied with Lewicki's Negotiation, and with Thompson's the Mind and the Heart? Is there a need for more? This is something that we've asked already. I think we are asking this question every year. So, let me repeat it also this year to make sure we create a small tradition here at INTRA. Do you think it would make sense to write a textbook, an INTRA and INI textbook, maybe, that looks beyond US based research results and helps us aggregate the findings that we've collected in China, in Iceland, in Denmark, Japan, and Philippines? What's your opinion on that?

P. Meerts: We already have that textbook.

A. Sigurdardottir: That is not a textbook.

R. Smolinski: I happened to read this one for my PhD. One cannot take this and use it in the classroom.

S. Zhang: Most times we do a lot of comparing of negotiation. But, then when researching, I found this very interesting point. Most times we have the same story but different culture. Different language. But we think in certain ways, like principled negotiation, like Tai chi negotiations or Harvard negotiations. It feels safe. What I realize is that, we should not use hard negotiation, soft negotiation, Harvard negotiation. Principled negotiation. Chinese persons also think soft and hard are not good. It is just a form of violence. So, most times we can think, most times, just like today, communication with each other is very important. The same situation, the same story. All the time, I think. So maybe, it is just different culture and different language; we make a big, big world, so we cannot understand each other. But when we talk about it and communicate, we can open a window and maybe we can determine whether it is hard or soft. That's my opinion.

R. Smolinski: Alright. Thank you.

R. Orr: Thank you. Well, I'm not an expert like you folks are in this area. I guess my only comment would be I'm absolutely shocked that there isn't an international textbook that is not written by people in the United States. I'm shocked. It strikes me that something of that nature would be extraordinarily valuable to Americans. To understand a little bit more about how negotiations are viewed on a more non-American context and way of thinking.

R. Smolinski: Yes, thank you. Now, would that book contain the same stories written in a different language or would there have to be major differences?

W. Baber: I would agree that there's a need for that kind of book, but I think it's useful to think about the target audiences. You know, "Who is going to read that?" There should be material for professors and trainers that is non-US oriented. That is localized, that makes sense of the context of different parts of the world and situations. For students and the kind of people we're usually training, I think there is also need for localized books and materials. So, when I created a textbook with Chavi Chen a couple of years ago, we looked for stories that were not American. And one reason is that you get these Harvard cases and so on, and they're about small-to-medium sized companies that nobody in Japan knows, and you demotivate the students. So, for that alone we need motivational, local, useful, appealing, pertinent, relevant textbooks. And, they have to be refreshed periodically.

R. Smolinski: So if I'm understanding this right, you would opt for specific textbooks for Chinese students? Specific textbook for Japanese students? Is that what it means when you're establishing that they are local?

W. Baber: Yes. They would be localized to be useful to those audiences, *accessible* is a better word. So, some of the negotiation content is pretty universal. Much of the content, background, and the way that we consume it is, or should be, localized.

R. Smolinski: But that would mean that we cannot write it as a common project. That means that a lot of single projects are individual and pretty small regions.

W. Baber: Well, if you are writing a textbook for the educators, that can be a lot more generalized because that group of people are more internationalized. And, more able to handle theory. The book that Chavi and I did is… first of all the language is simplified and the users appreciated this and gave positive feedback about that aspect. Lewicki is very hard to read if you are not a native speaker. So, our content was made easy and accessible. It was pitched as practical, so it is light on theory and long and practice. And, there certainly is a role for theory, I'm not throwing theory out, but that has made it more appealing and accessible. So, I think there should be something that's aimed at us educators. And, a different kind of product that is aimed at students in different places for different reasons.

P. Meerts: Well, it's not a textbook, but it might be good for reference to start with the famous book "How People Negotiate" by Faure. There are about 50 authors from all over the world. With Chinese stories and stories from the Arab world and so on from everywhere. And at every step he connects this negotiation theory. And that is the kind of example, not the textbook, where you have stories and contexts from all over the world and then he tries to generalize that little bit. And the book is sold out. It will cost you 300 dollars if you want to buy it on Amazon. I think it they should reprint it because it's a small book. But, that is an example of what this different way of looking at how people negotiate, by Guy Faure.

L. Tan: As Shogang Zhang said just now, as we have communication, can we set up a formal room for communication, for chat, where we can share our teaching experience, share our research results, or even have collaboration on research projects?

R. Smolinski: Sure we could. Yes. Absolutely.

L. Tan: In China, we used WeChat, an app.

R. Smolinski: Is there anyone who would like to take on this task?

I. Vanenkova: I'm not …....It was just for a means. It was supposed to start. Like a Blog and forum. We were talking about books. It's nice to have a book, but in this day and age with all this virtual technology. The idea was to get some kind of a portal for teachers, for researchers, for professors, for students. Also, that would link to the standards so that they have high class material, which teachers all over the world can begin teaching and are approved for use. With INI, we have this dedicated portal and then you have access. Students have access to their thought and the professors can have access to theirs. That could be something where teachers just say, this the link we're going to do this part, and they could be in Japan. They can make you wonder or an argument or something. But, teachers or students can add on. Which will enrich this portal. So, how can we align and also publish books? Do something which can help make this scientific portal for negotiation come together. That's what we should discuss.

A. Costelloe: Something just came back to me. I'm probably the only person in the room who is not a professional negotiator. Now I feel like I have lived and breathed that for four years. The one challenge, I guess, is it is only successful if there is a quality proctor. So, it cannot be open to everyone who wants to put everything on. That has to be it because the minute it gets populated by anyone that has ever touched the subject of negotiation, it becomes impossible to navigate.

I. Vanenkova: That's exactly what I am saying. And, standards are not the right word exactly, we need to pick another word. But, according to experience, that's really the stamp of quality. Then, you would have to be qualified to be a part of the community to use it. So, that will need to be a project in itself.

A. Costelloe: Absolutely. Then, who decides the standards?

I. Vanenkova: We don't want to have Wikipedia. That's totally out of the question. Otherwise, it's not reliable. But, here we have the core people who can really do it.

R. Smolinski: But isn't it.. I remember going through several quality assurance processes at the Program on Negotiation in Boston, and this costs money. Which means, if we do this, first of all we have to find the funding. And second, if we find the funding due to quality assurance, would we be giving out the things for free?

I. Vanenkova: It depends. That's what you need to decide. So, create a small group for looking at questions like Who is going to do Quality Assurance? Who is going to be interested to fund it? And, who would implement that? Because, it's not about money. It's about people. When you have the right people, in the right place, in the right setting, then the money comes. That's how it works, right?

<u>R. Orr:</u> My attitude is that academia has got plenty of money!

<u>R. Smolinski:</u> In which country?!

<u>R. Orr:</u> I'm just giving you a hard time, that's all!

<u>R. Smolinski:</u> Let's take a short comment, Margarita.

<u>M. Canal:</u> I would like to go back to the idea of what a great negotiator is. And I think we would need to work on that more systematically. Because, for instance, you have come up to 14 parameters and at my university now I have 9 competencies which I am going to use. And it would be nice to compare that. I don't know how to do it. I don't know if I want to volunteer or not.

<u>R. Smolinski:</u> We're already writing a paper on this so if you guys would like to share any insights, raise your hands and I will contact you.