Other Titles in the Peaceworks Series

Coercive Prevention: Normative, Political, and Policy Dilemmas, by Bruce W. Jentleson (No. 35, October 2000)

Women in War and Peace: Grassroots Peacebuilding, by Donna Ramsey Marshall (No. 34, August 2000)

Grappling with Peace Education in Serbia, by Ruzica Rosandic (No. 33, April 2000)

Three Dimensions of Peacebuilding in Bosnia: Findings from USIP-Sponsored Research and Field Projects, edited by Steven M. Riskin (No. 32, December 1999)

Building Security in Post–Cold War Eurasia: The OSCE and U.S. Foreign Policy, by P. Terrence Hopmann (No. 31, September 1999)

New Approaches to International Negotiation and Mediation: Findings from USIP-Sponsored Research, edited by Timothy D. Sisk (No. 30, August 1999)

Training to Promote Conflict Management: USIP-Assisted Training Projects, edited by David Smock (No. 29, July 1999)

The Challenge of Regional Cooperation in Central Asia: Preventing Conflict in the Ferghana Valley, by Anara Tabyshalieva (No. 28, June 1999)

Territorial Conflicts and Their Resolution: The Case of Ecuador and Peru, by Beth A. Simmons (No. 27, April 1999)

The Quest for Democratic Security: The Role of the Council of Europe and U.S. Foreign Policy, by Heinrich Klebes (No. 26, January 1999)

Nagorno-Karabakh: Searching for a Solution, by Patricia Carley (No. 25, December 1998)

Removing Barricades in Somalia: Options for Peace and Rehabilitation, by Hussein Adam and Richard Ford, with Ali Jimale Ahmed, Abdinasir Osman Isse, Nur Weheliye, and David Smock (No. 24, October 1998)

Muddling toward Democracy: Political Change in Grassroots China, by Anne F. Thurston (No. 23, August 1998)

Preventing Genocide in Burundi: Lessons from International Diplomacy, by Stephen R. Weissman (No. 22, July 1998)

The China Challenge in the Twenty-First Century: Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy, by Chen Jian (No. 21, June 1998)

Private Peacemaking: USIP-Assisted Peacemaking Projects of Nonprofit Organizations, edited by David R. Smock (No. 20, June 1998)

Sovereignty after Empire: Self-Determination Movements in the Former Soviet Union, by Galina Starovoitova (No. 19, October 1997)

Keynote Addresses from the "Virtual Diplomacy" Conference, by Richard H. Solomon, Walter B. Wriston, and George P. Shultz (No. 18, September 1997)

Greek-Turkish Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy: Cyprus, the Aegean, and Regional Stability, by Tozun Bahcheli, Theodore A. Couloumbis, and Patricia Carley (No. 17, August 1997)

U.S. Responses to Self-Determination Movements: Strategies for Nonviolent Outcomes and Alternatives to Secession, by Patricia Carley (No. 16, July 1997)

Creative Approaches to Managing Conflict in Africa: Findings from USIP-Funded Projects, edited by David R. Smock (No. 15, April 1997)

Conflict Management Training

Advancing Best Practices

Robert M. Schoenhaus

Contents

Introduction

On June 27–28, 2000, the United States Institute of Peace conducted a symposium designed to explore the best training practices, current and future, in selected areas of critical importance to the growing conflict management community. The meeting brought together more than fifty funders, providers, and consumers of training to examine, affirm, and, in many instances, question the effectiveness of today's training practices and the systems that support them. Eight topics were selected and eight papers were commissioned to frame the discussion for this event. Comments were taken in both plenary and breakout sessions on both days. It was evident throughout the course of the symposium that the group also wanted to explore potential problems and alternative solutions, as well as to recognize some things that have current and lasting value. This report, prepared by the Institute's Training Program staff, summarizes those papers and discussions and offers some insights into the core concerns of the conflict management community and the ability of training practitioners to be successful in the complex environment in which they operate today. The papers, as submitted to the symposium, are available through the Institute's Training Program.

The complexities of conflict management training and practice, as evidenced in this symposium, reflect an emerging, dynamic, and somewhat fractured community that is moving toward consensus and, eventually, a holistic approach to dealing with group conflict and failed states. This movement was certainly evident in the papers and discussion, and is captured to some extent in this report, where consensus on key issues suggests a clear path ahead. The main convergence in thinking occurred in the following areas:

▶ There was general acknowledgment within the group that all training is intervention to some extent, in terms of both the conflict itself and the society in which that conflict exists. As such, we as formulators and executors of training are faced with ethical considerations and challenges related both to the "who and why" of a particular training and to our responsibility for the outcome of the skills and information we impart.

▶ The question of what approaches to training in contemporary conflict management are currently needed should be based on the nature of contemporary conflicts and the role of the international community in them, for this reveals what types of skills are currently required and in demand. Viewed in this light, it would appear that the skills most commonly taught in the field are no longer adequate to cover the burgeoning responsibilities that are being undertaken in current international conflict engagements.

▶ Successful training and practice must focus on clearly defined and obtainable objectives or goals, both internal to the training event and external with regard to the

effect of the training or intervention, as translated to the broader society. These goals should be practical enough to be attainable.

▶ Successful training and practice also require an excellent understanding of the participants in the training and the individuals, groups, or societies that the training or intervention is intended to influence. This understanding requires research into who they are, how they learn, where they stand currently (attitudes and behavior), and what other influences are likely to support or interfere with our training efforts.

▶ With these understandings, a program of influence (instruction, nonviolent intervention, or political, economic, or military action) can be designed and implemented to help the participants get from where they are now to where they need to be in order to have their goals satisfied (presumably everyone shares a common goal).

▶ We cannot train individuals without training the structures in which they operate, so that the structure recognizes and supports their efforts. This finding suggests a new direction for awareness training and a much greater effort at synergistically coordinating the efforts of the structures so that their individual "pieces of the peace process" can be melded into a holistic and effective effort.

▶ Societal conflicts are complex and often deeply rooted in trauma, oral history, and ethnic, religious, and cultural identification. These problems are not easily or quickly resolved, and our interventions, whether in the form of training or something more direct, need to be sustained and evaluated over the long term.

The purpose of this Peaceworks is not only to capture these convergent lines of thought, but also to represent, in small measure, the richness of the discussion and interaction that helped these points of consensus to emerge and be recognized. Each of our nine authors, operating independently and focusing on a specific aspect of conflict resolution training, struck chords that were common to all and resonated with the audience as a whole.

In Part I, we look at the front end of the training process, focusing on analysis and cross-cultural communication skills. Michael Lund undertook the difficult task of looking at the precursor to all effective training—the analysis of the conflict, the parties, and the type of training that is best suited to achieving the objectives of the parties. Using his unique ability to step back from a topic and truly observe it, he suggests that the nature of current conflicts and the depth of the international community's engagement in them have changed, and that the training that we have been providing on the "micro" level needs to expand and be complemented by training at the "macro" level. Doing so entails recognizing the structures that are already in place and that could be put in place to facilitate early conflict identification and warning, and mutually training the actors within those structures to recognize and effectively communicate indicators and warnings that are "heard" by responsive governments.

Christopher Moore looked at the universally recognized problems associated with training negotiators and others to work across cultural lines. Culture matters when parties from different cultures approach conflict resolution from different, sometimes incompati-

ble perspectives. Moore noted that in a training context it is important to analyze and understand the cultural issues attached to all the participants—including the instructors—in order to settle on a training methodology that works for everyone, and there was universal agreement among other presenters and many of the practitioners in attendance on Moore's salient points and lessons learned.

We could have easily included a discussion of evaluation in this part, because planning for a successful evaluation should be built into the early analysis and planning process for any training. Before the training commences, for example, it is necessary to have established not only clear objectives, but also a current baseline that suggests where the participants in the training are in relation to the objectives. Movement toward the objective, measured after the training is given, indicates success; movement away indicates a need to re-analyze the training design components for the future. Though we have chosen to discuss evaluation only in Part III, it really pervades the entire process.

In Part II, we explore some of the training practices that form the core of today's conflict management training. The paper and presentation on training negotiators offered by Robert Ricigliano picked up these themes and highlighted the fact that negotiation training, like other forms of training, is a means to an end, not an end in itself. It is critical to effective training to understand the goals of the participants, the context in which those goals are set, and the ways in which the participants receive and process information (cultural predisposition) that may lead to personal and organizational change. To effectively use new skills and insights, some change is inevitable, and negotiation training is a change process. Keeping this in mind, an interesting problem is posed: If negotiation training is part of a process of individual and group change, is it not, therefore, also an intervention in the overall conflict resolution process, to the extent that the training participants play a role in that process?

The problems become even more complex when we address training for mediators. Linda Singer pointed out that, as most effective mediation is conducted in private, few role models are available for those who aspire to be conflict managers. There are, however, certain skill sets that can be identified and taught. Training for mediators, like mediation itself, is designed to change behavior. For this reason, as with negotiation training, the focus should be on providing participants with an opportunity for hands-on experience with immediate and supportive feedback. The consensus among international mediation trainers is that effective mediation trainers should possess the following qualities (note: many, if not most, of these qualities are needed by practitioners of effective mediation as well):

- ◗ a sense of perspective;
- ◗ knowledge of effective teaching concepts and skills;
- ◗ training in adult learning;
- ◗ a thorough knowledge of mediation gained through practice and continuous training;
- ◗ an ability to move from the abstract to the concrete and back again;

◗ knowledge of the current state of the mediation field and the trends determining its future;

◗ an ability to adapt successful concepts and methodology to new cultures and the particular needs of the trainees in the room;

◗ a background in curriculum development and an ability to put material into meaningful contexts;

◗ a desire and skill to coach others;

◗ a willingness to share control, to be flexible, and to collaborate with trainees and co-trainers;

◗ an ability to assemble necessary learning tools and resources and to know where they are and how to use them;

◗ the talent to hold a group's attention and to inspire; and

◗ an ability to model the mediation—to "walk the walk."

George Lakey delved into the difficult subject of what constitutes third-party nonviolent intervention (TPNI) and what can be done to understand and train for this form of conflict intervention. Clearly, TPNI involves risk both to the persons who undertake it and to the conflict resolution process and framework in which the action is undertaken. To mitigate this risk, adequate analysis of the situation and the goals of the intervention is critical, as are thorough training and commitment on the part of those who would be actors. There have been some well-publicized instances of individuals who have, without training, successfully used their official stature and position to establish credibility in TPNI. For example, Congressman Thomas Foglietta was able to accompany Korean politician Kim Dae Jung on his return to Korea in 1985, possibly saving his life so that he could become president of that country today. Training appears more likely to be sought by unofficial parties, however, who do not feel protected by their political or professional role.

In Part III, we look at issues that are critical to well-designed and effective training. In the discussion of how to compel an ethical response in a conflict situation through nonviolent intervention, Wallace Warfield reveals the ethical dilemmas in conflict management training. In a training environment, an ethical dilemma may be posed when practitioners doubt whether their personal and professional perspectives and intentions are in line with their individual actions (internal ethics). In addition, ethical considerations arise when considering what the training means for the relationship between the trainers and the participants, as well as among the participants themselves (external ethics). If this is not enough to think about, Wallace suggested, we also have to deal with the ethical implications of the training process—the ends/means paradox and the issue of neutrality—as well as the very serious question of whether we have an ethical responsibility for the outcome of the training and how it affects the structure of the conflict to which the participants will be returning. Reflexive practice, defined as the process of exploring a pattern of action, making adjustments during the action, or thinking about past action, is, in the view of the author, the generic skill that enables a trainer to anticipate and respond to ethical dilemmas.

Barbara Wien and Pete Swanson combined their efforts to produce a rich and challenging cornucopia of training practices and design considerations. Recognizing that their efforts were not all-inclusive, the presenters were nonetheless able to focus on some core principles, including their belief that hands-on training that draws upon the experiences of the participants (elicitive) is more likely to have a lasting effect. Key to successful training design is answering three questions: Who is the audience? What is the intended outcome? How much time will be devoted to the training? Wien and Swanson revisited some of the symposium's earlier topics, presenting their insights into training designs for negotiation, mediation, and cross-cultural communication, while discussing some creative applications and exercise techniques that transcend specific training disciplines (that is, role playing, videotaping, storytelling, and the "Ah Hah!" method of learning). In actually designing an exercise or role play, it is important to identify the objectives to be achieved, to choose the right "landscape," and to create vivid and balanced characterizations. It is also important during the actual conduct of the exercise to control the tempo and flow by selective releases of information and, where appropriate, by the creative use of the exercise "media" pool.

After all else is said and done, we need, more critically today than at any other time, a methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of whatever training has been conducted. Marc Howard Ross took on this challenging task and pointed out that evaluation is not just about whether projects achieve their goals, but is also about making explicit the underlying premises upon which the goals are based. The immediate job of evaluation is to decide what worked and what did not; the more compelling role is to make sense of why successes or failures occur and, thereby, to recommend alternative courses of action for the future. Trainers have a natural fear of being taken to task, and possibly denied funding, for failing to achieve fixed results in the complex world of conflict resolution. But measuring positive movement is possible, and the seeds are planted early in the process of training design and audience analysis. If you are clear in your objectives and you can accurately determine where the training participants are in relation to that objective, you have a good chance of designing a program that will incorporate the right content and exercises to produce the result (movement) desired.

Each of the presentations that follow is divided into three parts: (1) a summary of the original paper; (2) an encapsulated discussion of the paper, which included remarks by selected commentators and general discussion in breakout groups; and (3) comments by the author of this Peaceworks on the substance of the presentation and the relationships among topics.

This symposium was an exceptional event that we hope will be repeated in the future.

Part I: Preparing for Training

One

Training for Conflict Analysis and Strategy Development

paper by
Michael Lund

The question of what approaches to training in contemporary conflict management are currently needed must be based on a consideration of the nature of contemporary conflicts and the scope of international involvement in them, for this reveals what types of skills are currently required and in demand. Viewed in a global–historical perspective, all recent violent conflicts are essentially *transition* conflicts, reflecting the inability of many societies to cope with the political and economic stresses and strains that occur when a would-be new world order comes into contention with an existing autocratic, patrimonial, one-party, or statist arrangement.

The lively fiction known as the "international community" has, in response, trended toward becoming more engaged in mitigating, terminating, and, increasingly, preventing a variety of differing conflict situations, exercising wider, deeper, and longer involvement in these war-torn national societies. Conflict prevention, whether in respect to past or prospective conflict, in many ways involves nation building. By definition, conflict prevention may include any structural or interactive means to keep intrastate or interstate tensions and disputes from escalating into significant violence, to strengthen the capabilities to resolve such disputes peacefully, and to alleviate the underlying problems that produce them. The skills currently being taught no longer cover the burgeoning responsibilities that are being undertaken.

Involvement in conflict resolution is costly, however, and actors are increasingly being held accountable for getting tangible results in attaining the ultimate goal of establishing a sustainable peace. There is a growing realization that the problem in conflict prevention is not merely taking some action, but implementing *effective* action. Consequently, these actors are starting to develop analytical tools that will enable them to identify more systematically effective responses to incipient conflicts in particular countries. As a consequence of this development, the need for additional and expanded training is growing.

The range of professional skills that are needed includes the ability (1) to analyze and monitor the context, nature, sources, and dynamics of potential, actual, and waning conflict situations; (2) to identify the range and mixes of *appropriate* diplomatic and other approaches and instruments that fit given situations and that might be used to avoid, limit, end, or transcend the conflict; (3) to formulate various strategies for dealing with the con-

flicts; (4) to gain political support and funding for these strategies; and (5) to implement and manage the resulting programs.

Conflict management training to date is woefully incomplete, focusing on skills that comprise only a small fraction of those that are in demand. While the locus of the existing conflict resolution skills being taught is micro (designed for use by individuals or small groups at varying levels), the scope of the challenge being undertaken by the international community is macro. This is not to suggest that current training is not important or should not continue; rather, it should be linked to training at the macro level that focuses on contextual relevance.

Six essential steps need to be addressed in order to link an initial awareness of a possible conflict in a particular place and time to consequent actions that are effective in dealing with it: (1) conflict analysis—drawing on the wealth of existing early warning data and synthesizing them into a format that is useful for practitioners; (2) identifying possible actions, entry points, angles of attack—considering a range of means and avoiding universal (grand) objectives that disregard the phase of conflict and the existing balance of power; (3) prospective evaluation—determining whether the selected instruments will work in this context (this is the greatest current need in the field); (4) implementation and coordination among other actors; (5) monitoring and evaluating; and (6) strategy modification or termination. The problem at hand is how best to impart an understanding of this process.

A policy-relevant training seminar provides an excellent opportunity to increase practitioners' understanding of the relationships among the wide variety of international actors and their corresponding roles associated with conflict prevention, management, and resolution. Such a seminar would foster better understanding of the dynamics of conflict, specific causal patterns, recognizable triggers and accelerators, and the operational capabilities of various actors. The understanding gained needs to be a *common understanding* among all actors engaged in the problem environment.

The seminar should not seek to provide answers; rather, it should attempt to help participants understand better the nature of the complexity, identify the different pieces of the puzzle, and learn to ask the right questions. It should introduce participants to new ways of thinking and acting by creating an environment in which experiences shared among a wide range of actors contribute to the formation of new and/or modified rules appropriate to the conflict.

Discussion

In introducing his paper in plenary, Michael Lund reiterated that the context in which we train today is changing. The international community is becoming more interventionist and is, despite denials, dealing in nation building and the various processes subsumed in that term more often. The training we have been providing at the micro level needs to be complemented by training at the macro level in terms of both collaborative analysis and cooperative intervention. We need to move from doing something to doing the right things and evaluating their effectiveness.

Commentator Tom Beck from the U.S. Agency for International Development picked up this theme, stating that the problem in dealing with conflict is not merely a lack of

early warning or political will, but the difficulty of generating the political will to do something effective. There is a need in the field for a common methodology for evaluating conflicts, with commonly understood terms, within a common frame of reference.

Other points emerged from the general discussion: No single person can provide the comprehensive analysis that is needed for any particular emerging conflict; a collective analysis is required that involves different perspectives and various disciplines. There should be horizontal coordination in this effort, using a systemic framework (yet to be developed) that sets priorities and evaluation norms. Actors within this framework would require training on how to observe, record, communicate, and be heard, and the framework itself would have to be prepared to listen and respond to their early warnings. You cannot train the individual without training the system in which that individual operates. What we need is a global network of networks, combining local adaptation and expertise with international monitoring and reaction capability.

Various actors in the field of conflict prevention are beginning to develop a "culture of peace," a widespread system whereby people are trained to see and recognize early warning signs, within a system that recognizes and responds to those signs. This type of training needs to spread, for nation-building interventions can involve many nontraditional players (religious leaders, businesspersons, and so forth), and they need to be able to recognize and communicate significant indicators and warnings to the same extent (or close to it) as seasoned practitioners.

Comment

Clearly, there is a need for a worldwide "early warning" framework, linking local observers and organizations with international response mechanisms in a way that fosters a common (but not rigid) approach to identifying emerging conflicts and adequately alerting and engaging the international community. Common training would be critical. Local observers and organizations would be trained on how to see problems using internationally approved norms. They would also require training in horizontal coordination and in how to voice their concerns in a way that would be "heard." The support structure in which they operate, on the other hand, would require training on how to listen and react appropriately.

The response to an emerging crisis should be more than just doing something—it should be doing the right thing. This requires a far greater understanding of the measures available and far more analysis of what the results, both ethical and practical, of applying those measures might be. Many well-meant interventions in the past have prolonged or worsened the situation on the ground. There is a great need for training and evaluation in this area, for both those requesting aid and providing it.

An understanding of concerns at the macro level is critical for those being trained to operate at the micro level. It would be good to know, for example, that installing a well in village A (peace-promoting in its own right and a boon to the village) is likely to generate conflict with adjacent village B, which has no such access to a water supply. Incorporating a class on situational awareness into all interdisciplinary training programs would be a means to this end.

Analyzing conflict is both a science and an art.Occasionally, we see the rare expert—
and artist—at work via the television or newspaper interview, but what the world desper-
ately needs is the "*science*"—a trained and integrated network that sees,*warns*, and reacts
appropriately in a timely and cost-effective way to emerging crises.

Training Negotiators to Work Effectively Across Cultures

paper by
Christopher
Moore

T he paper drafted by Christopher Moore explored the ways that culture influences intercultural problem solving and bargaining, with a focus on the use of training to help prepare negotiators, mediators, and facilitators to build relationships and to reach agreements with people from other cultures. To set the background, the author defines culture as a "system of shared mental constructs, knowledge, or principles—both conscious and unconscious—that help define the reality of an individual belonging to a specific society or group. . . . Culture defines competencies, procedures, and responses that are appropriate for members of a given collectivity, in both general and specific situations, and guides interpersonal interactions between members."

Negotiation is a process for establishing and building relationships, through which participants jointly try to reach agreement on issues of individual or mutual concern. In the negotiating process, participants commonly—

- establish contact with each other directly, by written words or symbols, or through an intermediary;

- create at least a minimally positive professional relationship;

- identify topics to be addressed and determine how discussions will be conducted;

- transmit both substantive information and messages about the type and strength of feelings;

- communicate about their desires, positions, or demands and possible needs and interests;

- generate options and assess their viability;

- seek to influence each other to obtain advantage or satisfaction;

- create procedures and rituals for gaining final approval for agreements; and

- develop ways to implement, monitor, and ensure compliance with understandings that have been reached.

While people from most cultures engage in bargaining behavior that tracks this process, how people perform these steps (sequence, style, timing, and so forth) differs greatly across cultures.

Intercultural negotiation training refers to formal efforts to prepare people for more effective interpersonal and group negotiations. The training community is split on the impact that culture has on negotiations. One school holds that negotiation is a universal process with predictable approaches, stages, and tactics, regardless of the culture in which

it is practiced. Adherents of the other point of view argue that people from diverse cultures differ profoundly in how they see the world in which they live, and that these differing views influence the approach, processes, and outcomes of their negotiations.

Another variable entered the training process in the 1990s, in the form of a dialogue over the "best" way to train—by use of the prescriptive or elicitive approach. The prescriptive approach is the more traditional. It assumes that there is a body of knowledge that can be organized and transferred to others through a structured educational process. It also assumes that the holders of this knowledge—educators, instructors, and mentors—are experts who know best how to transfer knowledge to their students. Prescriptive training programs, however, are often developed within the context of a particular culture and may carry a bias toward that culture. Prescriptive teaching fails to draw upon the students' knowledge.

The elicitive approach emphasizes helping individuals and groups uncover their conscious or unconscious knowledge gained from practical experience. The trainer acts as a facilitator or catalyst to help group members uncover knowledge they already have. There are five sequential elements in an elicitive training process: (1) discovery; (2) naming and categorizing; (3) evaluation; (4) adaptation and recreation; and (5) practical application. Both approaches have their strengths and weaknesses and, in fact, most effective training programs incorporate elements of each.

Intercultural negotiation training programs (whether prescriptive or elicitive) take either a "culture-general" focus, which prepares participants to understand and negotiate effectively in a wide range of cultures, or a "culture-specific" focus, which enables people to work in a specific culture. There are four common variations on these content areas:

◗ Culture-general/negotiation-general training programs seek to expand trainees' general knowledge about cultural difference and different approaches to negotiations.

◗ Culture-specific/negotiation culture–specific training programs address either one specific culture or several cultures and negotiations among them.

◗ Training programs that focus on situations, issues, or problems that are specific to particular cultures help to prepare people from two or more cultures to enter actual bicultural or multicultural negotiations.

◗ Interaction-specific joint training programs bring together actual negotiators from two or more cultures.

Most intercultural negotiation training programs devote significant time to culturally based processes, such as making contact, articulating issues to be discussed, exploring patterns of talk and dialogue, developing settlement options, and making decisions. Frequently, programs will structure opportunities for participants to practice skills learned, usually in the form of role-plays or simulation exercises. Because negotiations are commonly influenced by broad intellectual, social, political, economic, and environmental structures, it is good practice to expose participants to these factors during their training.

The following represent some lessons learned with regard to intercultural negotiation training:

◗ Trainers should develop a firm understanding of their own culture and biases.

◗ Trainers should design training programs that promote a safe, supportive, and non-judgmental environment for discussing cultural differences and their impacts on negotiations.

◗ Trainers and participants must be prepared to be challenged.

◗ Whenever possible, trainers should consult with prospective trainees on the design of the proposed intercultural negotiation training seminars.

◗ Trainers should develop a balance between prescriptive and elicitive approaches and should communicate with trainees about the approach being used.

◗ Trainers should explore the trainees' own culture of negotiation and dispute resolution early in the program, using elicitive approaches, before exploring other cultures.

◗ Trainers should utilize a range of interactive exercises that provide opportunities for trainees to experience negotiating with people from different cultures.

◗ Trainers should remain open to diverse ways of conceptualizing and practicing negotiations.

◗ Trainers should avoid the extremes of "we are all alike" and "we are all completely different" when discussing cultural differences.

◗ Trainers should help trainees develop general "cultural maps" in the form of analytical frameworks and guidelines that can be used to interpret and develop creative responses to unforeseen situations and circumstances.

◗ Trainers should present open-ended models or frameworks that allow trainees to develop a range of possible culturally influenced negotiation responses.

◗ Trainers should develop culture-specific simulations and role-plays or elicit real problems directly from trainees.

◗ Trainers should allow plenty of time to practice intercultural negotiation skills and practices.

Discussion

Christoper Moore launched his presentation by reminding the forum that conflict resolution has been practiced effectively around the world in a variety of ways. In looking at differences in culture, he suggested three areas of consideration: When does culture matter? How does it matter? What lessons can be learned along the way?

Culture matters when parties from different cultures approach negotiation differently. For example, parties may have a relationship-building versus a task-orientation approach. Do they deal with things directly or indirectly, through third parties or obscured references? How are emotions handled? How do they look at the negotiation process itself? How is it conceptualized?

It is hard to imagine that there could be only one model for teaching effective negotiation. When working in a cross-cultural environment, it may be better to present three or four frameworks from different cultures and ask the attendees which framework(s) they

think would be more culturally appropriate and effective. This elicitive approach could break down resistance.

Commentator Sofia Clark pointed out that it was rare for an organization to run only a conflict management program. It is usually coupled with something else related to the organization or the individual's organizational growth. Organizations going into a conflict area frequently have difficulty rationalizing their programs to a population that was not involved in the program's design. Training is critical, given the generally high turnover rate; local recruits want the models and prefer the prescriptive approach.

Other points emerged from the discussion: It is important to remember that there is as much diversity within a culture as between cultures. A state-of-the-art intercultural negotiation training focuses on (1) building increased individual and group awareness of cultural similarities and differences; (2) expanding general and specific cultural knowledge; (3) deepening understanding of how relationships across cultures are established and built; (4) learning various negotiation procedures and appropriate skills; and (5) appreciating structural impacts on the negotiating process. The Internet was viewed as a resource for preparation.

Comment

Communicating across cultures is difficult; conducting effective training across cultures presents unique challenges for both trainers and participants. Yet a common thread across presentations is that in order to reach your training objective you have to understand where the participants are with respect to that objective and how they best process information. For the trainer, the challenge is to find a suitable framework for the training, one that is culturally acceptable to the participants, and then to avoid inserting his or her own cultural bias into the process. For the participants, it is important that they be comfortable with the training framework and be willing to suggest changes if they are not. It is much better to develop this comfort level before the training starts. Collaborative training across cultures is being conducted successfully every day; unfortunately, the same can be said for ineffective and harmful cross-cultural training. The difference lies in sensitivity to the important issues involved and sufficient advance preparation to ensure that the needs of all parties are being met.

Part II: Training Practices in Current Popular Disciplines

Three

Best Practices in Training Negotiators

paper by
Robert
Ricigliano

Negotiation training is a means to an end, not an end in itself. The process therefore must remain amorphous, taking its shape from the end that it supports—what the sponsor wants it to be. It generally involves a group of people who desire to sharpen skills and learn concepts that will help them to get better results through a process of negotiation. Frequently, they are asked during the process to make changes in deep-seated behaviors in order to reach their objectives.

An effective training process involves four basic premises: (1) good training is done in pursuit of clear and generally understood purposes; (2) pre-workshop preparation is essential to clarify the purposes of the session and to design the session and its follow-up so as to support the application of classroom learning; (3) in the classroom, a trainer's job is to structure a process for helping participants meet their goal; and (4) postworkshop follow-up is necessary to support participants in continuing the learning process and applying what they have learned.

The first stage in the process involves defining goals. In order to do this successfully, the first question that should be asked of someone seeking training in negotiation skills is "Why do you want the training?" Knowing the purpose of the training with some specificity will allow the trainer to design the session with the end state in mind.

Once the purpose is articulated, it needs to be fleshed out in three areas: (1) what skills would be consistent with achieving the sponsor's purpose; (2) what assumptions or cultural norms would be needed to produce the desired behavior, and what factors might impede it; and (3) what structures would be needed to promote the new behavior and assumptions, and what existing structures might impede them. Any best practice in negotiation training needs to address each of the skills, assumptions, and structures that are important to attaining the sponsor's purpose.

A key part of the up-front diagnostic process involves understanding what negotiation means in the context of the people or organization to be trained. Another critical variable involves understanding the learning style of the group. Some groups require more exposure to theory; others are experientially focused. Some groups welcome free-flowing discussion, while others prefer to deal indirectly. It is equally important in designing the training to understand what specific negotiation issues the group members are facing.

Designing the training almost always involves use of an experiential model; as a skill-based discipline, negotiation requires "doing," and the predominant method for doing is the case-based format, in which participants go through a cycle of practice and reflection.

It should be noted that, when using the case method, it is helpful to move from more generic cases that are outside the participants' current work context to more work-specific cases. Training design must also take into account the logistical needs of the participants and suggest a method for following up on the training provided.

In conducting the workshop, the role of the trainer working with an adult audience is less to teach than to structure a learning process for the participants. The choice of the prescriptive (or teaching) model or the elicitive (or learning) model should be based on a diagnosis of the needs and learning goals of the group. People tend to define their goals in terms of achieving better results, and their success is a function of their skills and behavior. How people behave is not randomly determined, it is a function of how they think.

Negotiation training attempts to help people to change their behavior in ways that improve their results. Helping them to think in ways that will produce the desired behavior and, in turn, the desired results, does this. To be successful, it may be necessary to help people recognize the assumptions that cause them to think and act in a certain way, and to introduce them to a new set of assumptions and a new way of thinking.

Learning is a process consisting of three basic stages: (1) awareness of existing and alternative assumptions, thinking, and behaviors; (2) understanding, defined as the ability to appreciate and articulate concepts and a sense of how it feels to use them; and (3) competence in applying the concepts without conscious effort and going beyond them to generate new ideas. Building a constructive training process involves being aware of how people learn and how they move from one stage of learning to the next. In general, there are five ways of helping people to learn:

- ▶ Hearing—explaining a concept (for example, active listening);
- ▶ Seeing—providing a demonstration of the concept in action (for example, modeling the techniques of good active learning);
- ▶ Doing—providing an opportunity for participants to try out the concept on their own (for example, an active listening exercise or negotiation role play);
- ▶ Feeling—providing an opportunity to experience the impact of certain behaviors (for example, what it feels like not to be listened to);
- ▶ Reflecting—providing an opportunity for participants to step back and analyze their behavior, the results it achieved, and the thinking and assumptions that led them to act as they did (for example, a review session after the role-play).

Building in a follow-up mechanism is essential to the success of any negotiation training. Successful follow-up begins in the preparation phase and is built around the sponsor's goals and the capabilities of the participants. As the instructor's ability to follow up is limited, the primary responsibility falls upon the organization that requested the training.

Negotiation training success depends, in large measure, on what takes place before and after the actual event. Negotiation training is a change process. The jobs of negotiation trainers are easier if they see themselves as involved in the same change process as the people they are training. There is no better way to help others learn and change than to be involved in learning yourself.

Discussion

Robert Ricigliano began the plenary discussion by suggesting that all training is intervention in some form. If our engagement relates to an ongoing process (for example, an international crisis, a labor negotiation), where we enter that process has a critical impact on the design of the training. What is more, the fact that we do enter the process makes us a part of it and a part of the change process that results from our doing the training. The sustainability of the training is largely determined by how supportive a structure the participants will have once they return to their society. We need to understand this and find ways to help the participants effect change in their societies. Negotiation training is not just adding tactics; it is about improving results.

Commentator Jaco Cilliers from Catholic Relief Services raised eight important questions in his commentary:

- How do we ensure that negotiation training takes into consideration the long-term nature of most conflicts?
- How do we develop a holistic approach to negotiation training?
- How do we ensure that conflict resolution methods are sensitive to and appreciate indigenous cultures?
- How do we build a "culture" of negotiation?
- How do we ensure that the benefits of negotiation training reach those who are actually making the important decisions (for example, it can be hardest to provide training to national leaders)?
- How do we meet, with short-term training, the need for long-term involvement?
- How do we as trainers integrate ourselves into the long-term peacebuilding process?
- How do we create opportunities for transformation?

Any one of these questions could serve as the basis for an additional symposium. The general discussion that followed was wide-ranging. Negotiation training was perceived to be both a training event and an intervention in whatever outside context or process from which the participants were drawn. Training design must be customized to the needs of the sponsor and the participants, and it may evolve during the training and between trainings, as the surrounding situation changes. The objective is not to produce a "perfect" negotiator but, rather, to facilitate the development of a more perceptive negotiator with a better toolbox.

By training in negotiation skills, are we trying to change the way people think? Or is that evolutionary change in the thinking process the result of exposure to new ideas and methodologies? To suggest the former may be culturally insensitive and manipulative. In actuality, however, we are all changed by our experiences to some extent.

Comment

The paper and the discussion raise several interesting points. If training in negotiation skills is an intervention in the surrounding process—as it surely is, at least to some

extent—professional and ethical responsibilities must be considered. These considerations are explored in the planning stage of training by developing a full understanding of why training is being requested, what the objectives are, and who will be trained. Armed with this information, it is possible to better forecast the outcome of the training and anticipate the sustaining structure that might be put in place to allow the benefits of the training to endure.

Negotiation and negotiation training are about process, enabling the participants to better understand the process and how to effect positive change through it. There are certain core capabilities that are beneficial for everyone to understand (for example, active listening, cultural sensitivity, getting to the issues behind the positions). However, the best trainings are those that take into account the cultural backgrounds of the participants, their preferred method of learning, and the difficulties they may face in trying to bring their newly acquired skills into their societal structure.

When we looked at training for conflict analysis, one of the things that became apparent was that, in order to have an effective conflict response system, you had to train both the analysts in what to see and how to report, and the organization in which they operated to hear what the analysts were saying and to devise appropriate and effective responses. The discussion of negotiation training suggests that there may be a parallel requirement in terms of the need to educate the structure in which the newly trained negotiators are going to operate.

Best Practices When Training Mediators

paper by
Linda Singer

Mediators must employ certain skill sets in order to be effective. Such skills, although they build on attributes found in greater abundance in some people than in others, are not wholly intuitive. The challenge in conducting mediation training is to determine what skills can be taught and how to develop most effectively the approaches to skill building necessary to create a larger pool of effective professional mediators.

Mediators must understand conceptually what the barriers are to resolving conflict through unassisted negotiations if they are to work toward overcoming them. Once they have that understanding, they must also acquire the skills needed for overcoming those barriers and for assisting the parties to a conflict in reaching an agreement that meets their interests and, ideally, creates joint gains. In this regard, the best training combines the teaching of "action strategies" with theories of knowledge and action in order to increase students' flexibility in responding to various situations.

While the public has limited access to positive mediation role models, certain core skills and attributes of successful mediators have been identified:

- ◗ Conflict analysis and situational awareness;
- ◗ Persuasion;
- ◗ Listening actively;
- ◗ Gathering information through open-ended questions;
- ◗ Emphasizing without patronizing;
- ◗ Providing effective feedback;
- ◗ Dealing with emotional issues and difficult people; and
- ◗ Analyzing alternatives, creating multiple options, and maintaining momentum.

The fact that there is a common core of skills does not obviate the need to pay attention to context. The best mediators are sensitive to differences in types of disputes, in the culture and sophistication of the parties, and in the organizational and historical setting in which the dispute arose. The best trainers will combine teaching with regular practice to keep their skills fresh.

Mediators agree that skills can be taught, and attributes enhanced, only through interactive experiences. Aspiring mediators must be given the opportunity to experiment with and practice techniques repeatedly in a controlled setting. It is also important to have the experience of acting as a party to a simulated mediation in order to experience the effect of various mediative techniques. For this to occur, class size should be kept small and multiple instructors should conduct the training so that the participants may observe differ-

ent styles and benefit from the interaction. If possible, students should have the experience of mediating a single dispute from start to finish.

Good mediation training is not cheap. Despite growing technological advances, it still requires face-to-face participation to be most effective. As with good negotiation training, it is important for those designing mediation training to ascertain the needs of the organization sponsoring the training and to tailor the instruction, as much as possible, to meet those needs. This can generally be done by advance interviews, during which the parties also may attempt to establish some method for evaluating the effect of the training.

Good trainers are facilitators as well as teachers. Training seminars should blend knowledge-based and skill-based education, providing a balance between analytical and behavioral skills development. Training seminars provide a safe environment in which to test assumptions, theories, approaches, and techniques.

Discussion

Linda Singer initiated discussion in the plenary forum by pointing out that it is far easier to talk about the challenges connected with mediation training than to talk about the best practices. There is, after all, no exportable TV show called *L.A. Mediators* to model good mediation practice to the world. Most good mediation occurs as a series of private processes that are generally invisible to those who might want to learn the skills involved.

It is important to understand that mediation becomes necessary because negotiation has failed. Our view should never be that of a mediator seeking a dispute to resolve but, rather, that the parties in dispute are seeking a way beyond their roadblocks in negotiation. The group defines the role of the mediator. Consequently, a successful mediator must understand the parties in context—who they are, where they are in their history and relationships, and what they are trying to achieve. Beyond that, attempts have been made to map mediation "styles" into four squares: narrowly focused on the dispute at hand versus broadly focused on the dispute in a historical context; facilitative in terms of trying to find what will work versus evaluative in pointing out what will not work. Mediation style and practice flow, amorphously, among these squares.

More people today are seeking mediation training than ever before. Some are seeking to become professionals and are interested in a credential; others seek to enhance their skills in working in another discipline (for example, law, psychology). While each mediation is unique, conforming to the circumstances and the culture of the parties in dispute, some core skills transcend most situations and can be taught. Those core skills are highlighted in the paper. The mediator's focus should be on overcoming barriers, not just identifying them. Most people who seek mediation training do not realize how difficult the process can be.

Commentator Rosemary Fennell from the U.S. Department of Education addressed the difficulties inherent in mediating community problems. She pointed out that the benefits of effective mediation can be long-lasting; but to be effective, time has to be spent identifying the true community leaders and building trust with them. Building that trust is a process that involves respecting the cultures involved. Many community activists have the *will* but not the *skill* to be effective. Providing skill training within the community can have a long-range, positive effect.

Further discussion reinforced some points and developed others. The value of small, culturally diversified training programs was reiterated, as was the value of modeling good mediation behavior to the participants. Mediation training must help the participants to get better at stepping back from a conflict in order to analyze their purpose, goals, and, through that, their role in the mediation. A good mediator must be able to choose from more than one strategy and set of techniques. Training design should try to help participants build their tolerance for ambiguity.

Interestingly, the discussion raised the issue of mediation training for the military in light of the increased presence of the military in peace support operations. The inherent problems here include identifying the right people to train (those who will actually use the skills), overcoming the resistance that will no doubt arise, and convincing the leadership that this skill has value. Recent military engagements in Bosnia and Kosovo have gone a long way toward building recognition in the defense community that additional training in negotiation, mediation, and communication may be beneficial.

Comment

The problems faced in training mediators differ from those faced in training negotiators, but they are closely linked. Mediation becomes necessary because negotiation has failed. The challenge in training potential mediators is to develop in them the skills necessary to truly understand the process that has broken down, the parties involved and their cultural context, and the problems (roadblocks) that the parties *or* the process have interposed between themselves (internal) or between themselves and a solution (external). These skills can be taught; applying the skills successfully is a function of having the will and the artist's ability to deal with ambiguity while envisioning a positive end-state.

To be understood in its entirety, the discussion of mediation training must be interlaced with the other discussions that took place in the symposium. Mediation trainers and practitioners must be ethically and culturally attuned in order to understand their role. This includes being aware that as trainers and practitioners they are undertaking an intervention that has challenging ethical and political ramifications. To learn and practice the needed skills, and to understand those ramifications, they must experience the process from all perspectives, making maximum use of modeling, simulations, and role-play exercises during their training. Mediation is both science and art, and the most effective mediators, as scientists and artists, deal in a world of constant challenge.

Training in Nonviolent Intervention

Third-party nonviolent intervention (TPNI) is the intervention of a third party into the arena of conflict with the intention of reducing the level of violence through the use of nonviolent methods. Four types of TPNI have been identified thus far: (1) protective accompaniment; (2) interposition between two forces preparing for combat; (3) observation/monitoring of the situation by written, audio, and visual recording means; and (4) modeling, whereby individuals enter a conflict situation and, through body language, acts of service, and words, assist people to choose nonviolent behavior.

As an organized and planned behavior in conflict situations, TPNI is of recent origin, and the concept itself is new. It should be distinguished from other forms of third-party intervention, such as arbitration and mediation. TPNI—

- assists unilaterally—the combatants may not ask for it and one or both sides may object to it;

- assists the struggle to continue—the intervenor's success is not in an agreement being reached, but in the conflict continuing on a less violent basis; and

- uses the techniques of nonviolent action to affect directly the field of physical conflict.

The two other major applications of nonviolent intervention—social change and social defense—involve specific goals that the parties are trying to achieve through partisan nonviolent struggle. TPNI is different in its nonpartisan character.

The training for TPNI needs to take into account the following assumptions for teams in the field:

- The more clearly nonpartisan the intervenors, the safer they are and the more options they have for expanding the range of safety for others.

- Strategic moves in the field, therefore, must be guided not only by the team's intentions, but also by the *perceptions of the combatants.*

- Team participants must accept the nonpartisan public stance, however much they may privately be more sympathetic to one side.

- Intervention teams can do good work in the field so long as the projects enhance their credibility as outside, nonpartisan intervenors.

Teams in the field need sustained support from a center that continually builds its nonpartisan credibility. TPNI is a new and relatively high-risk form of intervention. The trend in TPNI training has been to take this risk into account by increasing the length of the

paper by
George Lakey

training time and its rigor, attempting to instill discipline and greater understanding in those being trained.

As to who gets trained, the leading organizations that field peace teams have compiled what they believe to be the primary traits to be sought in new volunteers, including concern about human rights; being committed to working in a team; being affiliated with an organization; being literate; displaying openness to growth and change; having an ability to go beyond prejudices; personal maturity (age twenty-three or older); having language skills appropriate to the country and the team; having some international experience; and displaying a willingness to take responsibility for continuing self-education.

Training goals that are held in common by groups fielding peace teams include the following:

◗ Learning the mission of the team, including the political/economic/cultural situation in the area and the history of the intervention;

◗ Building team/group dynamic skills, including consensus decision making, gender issues, trust, feedback, and processing conflict;

◗ Developing attitudes that support cultural diversity, including storytelling, self-disclosure, and affinity groups;

◗ Building emotional (especially fear and grief) skills, including guided visualization, street speaking, and intense role playing; and

◗ Strengthening nonviolent responses and discipline through role plays, lifestyle adaptation, stories, and case studies.

Additional goals not held in common by groups fielding peace teams include training to select members for the teams, training to become more forceful and determined in taking a stand, and training to strengthen spiritual discipline.

Training is generally done in two segments, the first being devoted to core information and skills that all volunteers should possess. The second segment provides information specific to the assignment, the country, and the conflict. The advantages to two-segment training include financial and personal resource apportionment, an opportunity to screen out inappropriate candidates, and the ability to maintain the pool of volunteers.

As might be expected in a relatively new field, evaluation is unsystematic. Outcomes are not stated in measurable terms, cross-training is not practiced, and independent observers are rarely invited in for assessments. This situation will have to change if the impact of training is to be maximized.

Discussion

George Lakey began the discussion in plenary by inviting the participants to identify the characteristics of nonviolent action. The following are several suggestions, some of which contradict others:

◗ No consent required;

◗ Has to make a point;

- ◗ Limits violence but promotes struggle;
- ◗ Widely distributed throughout society;
- ◗ Means determine the end;
- ◗ "Takes guts";
- ◗ No threats;
- ◗ Appeals to conscience;
- ◗ Does not necessarily address issues;
- ◗ Creative;
- ◗ Takes time to understand; and
- ◗ Respects others' beliefs.

TPNI is *third party* because people see themselves that way. It is *intervention* because that is the way others see them. And it is *nonviolent*, although it takes place in the midst of violence. Many conflict resolution professionals are uncomfortable with violence and want to cool things down quickly. We train people to be all right with conflict, chaos, and mystery, and that is a difficult adjustment.

Commentator Nadine Bloch, a long-time peace activist, pointed out in her commentary that people need a framework for nonviolent intervention. When you enter another culture, you are no longer in control, and you have to be comfortable with that.

Further discussion raised the issue of whether an intervention could ever really be nonpartisan, because lowering the level of violence could be perceived as favoring one side over another. Training should help to make intervenors aware that their actions and intentions may be perceived differently by another culture. Storytelling on the part of intervenors who have been in the country is a valuable training tool. Another useful training technique is extended-analysis training designed to make participants aware of the country they will be visiting, what the various interests are, and how to get things done within that country's culture. Intervenors should draw up a will during the training as a reminder that nonviolent intervention can have serious consequences. Finally, they should be taught to network with other nongovernmental organizations, understand their objectives, and work with them.

Comment

Those who espouse nonviolent intervention do not suffer the same ethical confusion as other trainers within the conflict resolution community with regard to taking responsibility for change. They want change and they embrace the process that brings it about. In the case of TPNI, the change that is sought is a general lowering of hostilities that will create a breathing space for further change to occur safely. For TPNI to be undertaken safely, however, it is absolutely critical that the conflict be thoroughly analyzed and that the intervenors be well trained and disciplined. The best results will be achieved in situations where the decision makers whom the intervenors are trying to influence are susceptible to the type of pressure, both public and private, that the nonviolent action can bring to bear. If they are not, pursuing the intervention is both risky and of limited utility. Properly re-

searched and executed, however, nonviolent intervention can have a profound positive effect on the process of resolving a conflict.

Those who choose to intervene nonviolently face the same ethical responsibility as others to understand their objective and how it translates to the wider society, and to know that the actions they undertake have some chance of achieving their goals.

Part III: Issues Critical to Effective Training

Six

Ethical Dilemmas in Conflict Resolution Training

paper by
Wallace
Warfield

Because training seeks to have a discernible effect on practice, it is recognized that trainers, whether they intervene in conflicts or relegate themselves to equipping others with the requisite skills to intervene, share ethical responsibility for best practice and, to some degree, for the outcomes that may be traceable to practice. Ethics can be defined simply as professional conduct, the rightness or wrongness of a practitioner's actions. In conflict resolution training, ethical considerations are posed by decisions the trainer must make in determining how to approach the training and by the actual conduct of the training event. If asked to provide training for a specific conflict situation, trainers may, under some circumstances, be unclear as to whether they will be engaging purely in an act of training or whether the training is being used as a substitute for another form of intervention.

Should trainers conduct training if they are unsure about its application? Are you responsible solely for the process, or does responsibility extend to include all possible outcomes? (Having deflected the bullet, am I responsible for where it lands? What is my responsibility, on the other hand, if I don't deflect it?) An ethical dilemma is a situation in which the practitioner is faced with some doubt about how to act in relation to personal and professional values, norms, and obligations, and in which the choice of action has consequences for relationships between the trainer and the participants, and between participants and the objectives to which the training is being applied.

The main problem that we face is separating the ethics of training from the intervention it is designed to influence. An ethical dilemma can be triggered by a proactive decision on the part of the trainer who wants to use the training as a vehicle for getting into the perceived conflict situation, or by those being trained who want to use the event to manipulate the conflict from the inside. If the dilemma emerges during the training, the question of whether to continue arises. The ethical dilemma embedded in the ends/means paradox extends to the issue of who is selected for training and how that choice might advance the agenda of the selecting sponsor.

Initially, deference was paid to the concept of neutrality in mediation and training generally—a very process-oriented approach to training. When we began to question whether true neutrality was possible, a body of literature emerged that questioned the fea-

sibility and, implicitly, the ethics of concentrating on the process (means) to the exclusion of having some responsibility for the outcome (ends).

A greater need exists to understand the political culture of groups and individuals being trained and the implications it holds for the training objectives we select or accept. Decisions about the content and structure of training often fail to take into account the cultural distinctions nuanced in speech and behavior of the trainees. Trainers need to resist selecting out participants only on the basis of the trainer's approach to communication.

As trainers, it is important that we reconcile our beliefs and our practices. Establishing best practices begins with understanding that a dichotomy between beliefs and practices frequently exists. From this point, the trainer or training team should reflect on the objectives of the project and how these objectives will be met by the training's components. We must also take into consideration when planning our training how the identity of the participants should affect the design, process, and outcome of the training. This consideration, for example, may determine the techniques used to convey information (lecture, role plays, joint problem solving), the language used by the trainers, and the development of training modalities. The elicitive approach to training seems appropriate for most training events, and it reduces the risk that an instructor's predisposition and bias will be overlaid on the participants. Site selection has inescapable ramifications that go beyond the physical framework of the training environment. In some cases, it can help bring the parties together; in others, it can drive them apart.

Reflective practice is the process of exploring a pattern of action, making adjustments during the action, or thinking about past action. It brings knowledge to action in a way that assists individuals in making more informed decisions and is often portrayed as a loop involving theory, research, practice, and reflection. In conflict resolution, the reflection generally begins at the points of either practice or theory and is operationalized in three stages:

◗ Reflecting on who you are as an individual and what you bring to the intervention: the attitudes, values, and fears that affect your work;

◗ Thinking about situations you are likely to encounter and what theories, models, and concepts might apply; and

◗ Encountering surprises and being able to reflect in the moment (from a theoretical perspective) on what the trainer thinks is happening and developing a contingent response to deal with it.

Reflective practice, whether conceptualized as above or in some other way, is the generic skill that enables a trainer to anticipate and respond to ethical dilemmas.

Discussion

Wallace Warfield began the discussion in plenary by reminding everyone, once again, that training is not an end in and of itself. Thus in dealing with the ends/means dichotomy, we must internalize the issue of ethics. In this process, we must consider both internal ethics, involving a trainer's relationship with the participants (What is the purpose of training?

Why is it sought? Is the training in line with the trainer's own personal and professional ethics?), and external ethics, involving the participants' relationships with each other (taking responsibility for the results of the training). The distinctions between Track One and Track Two diplomacy are dissolving, and much of our training these days is at the crisis level, blurring the separation between ends and means.

Commentator Karen AbuZayd pointed out in her commentary the changing humanitarian environment, in which civilians are frequently the targets of military action. Working in a political environment, can we choose to be apolitical? If training is intervention, can the trainer at least be impartial, if not neutral, remembering that trainees, or their opponents, may not share our perception of our own intentions?

Further discussion suggested that best practices in training from an ethics perspective start with an awareness of the internal/external, process/outcome, and content/delivery aspects of ethics in general, and a sensitivity toward the following points:

- ▶ We should seek transparency with regard to values, intentions, and goals, for both trainers and training participants.

- ▶ Reflection is required in a trainer's perceptions of both content and delivery: Is it ethical to intervene at all and, if so, what form should the intervention take and what level of responsibility for the outcome can I accept?

- ▶ We need to be aware of and engaged in the process of selecting the participants and determining the site and timing of the training to best accomplish the sponsor's objectives. Inherent in this process is dealing with the ethical dilemmas of providing training to those who may use it for the wrong purposes.

- ▶ We need to track knowledge, skills, and abilities imparted in training to understand which are the most effective in promoting the conflict resolution process and which are less than useful or are being used for improper purposes.

There is not much of a market for ethics training in a field that is dominated by requests for negotiation and mediation support. But ethical considerations permeate the choices we make and are often a determining factor in the long-range success or failure of our efforts.

Comment

Ethical considerations are at the heart of some of the thorniest problems in the field of conflict management. They force us to open our eyes and see the world as it is, and to make our choices in the context of an existing reality and in light of the range of possible results. Denied the ability to totally separate the training process from the political and historical environment in which it takes place, we must become more sensitive to the issues and consciously choose to become more or less engaged in determining the who, where, and when of a particular training, along with the how. This duty pervades the field, affecting how we approach conflict analysis, negotiation training, mediation training, and training for nonviolent intervention. The questions raised cross-ethnic and gender boundaries, as well as cultural divides.

Designing Training Materials: A Few Best Practices

paper by
Barbara Wien
and
Pete Swanson

The diversity, richness, and sheer volume of relevant training designs and approaches preclude any comprehensive discussion of best practices. However, some commonalities and core premises do exist. There is ample evidence that doing, in addition to reading and discussing, is the best way to enhance learning. Alternative pedagogical philosophies and practices should be embraced, and training materials and simulations should be participant/student centered, rather than teacher centered. Since training participants generally bring with them tremendous strengths and insights, the best trainers/instructors draw out and build on their participants' experience in an elicitive manner.

We all have more intelligence than we are trained to use. Different people learn differently, and training programs should incorporate the diversity inherent in the following multiple intelligences (ways of learning):

- Linguistic intelligence ("word smart")—language ability and auditory skill;
- Logical-mathematical intelligence ("logic smart")—the ability to think logically, sequentially, and numerically;
- Spatial intelligence ("picture smart")—the ability to visualize and manipulate images mentally;
- Musical intelligence ("music smart")—the ability to hear, appreciate, and play music, and sensitivity to nonverbal sounds;
- Bodily kinesthetic intelligence ("body smart")—physical ability, athletic or fine motor coordination, the ability to process information through body movement and "gut feelings";
- Interpersonal intelligence ("people smart")—the ability to get along with people; and
- Intrapersonal intelligence ("self smart")—the ability to be self-motivated and inner directed.

The best training programs recognize that participant strengths lie in diverse areas and incorporate training designs and materials that include all styles of learning.

Trainers should ask three key questions: Who is in the audience? What is the intended outcome? How much time will be devoted to instruction? The answer to the first question provides insight into how to structure the material in light of where the individuals are now in relation to the objective. One size does not fit all when it comes to training design.

Knowing the desired outcome or objective is equally important. All training is done for a purpose, and it is safe to assume that the end state is expected to be different from the beginning state. Knowing the expected end state and the relative beginning state of the participants enables us to design a training package that will move all or at least a majority of the participants from beginning to end state, preferably incorporating a little fun along the way.

The training agenda should balance minimal-information presentations with maximal-experiential and learning opportunities. The intent is to reach each student on an individual level. The practice of conflict resolution is a highly personal art form, and each student will bring a unique style and approach to dealing with conflict. Training adds tools, creative applications, and default options to a participant's existing skill set and provides a safe and interactive environment in which to practice alternative approaches.

Successful training design will incorporate necessary skills, such as conflict analysis, problem solving, cross-cultural communication, negotiation, mediation, and facilitation. It will also attempt, within the confines of time and resources available, to incorporate creative applications and exercises. Some leading examples of these might be the "Ah Hah!" method of learning, role plays and simulations, videotaping, storytelling, and case studies, as well as "fishbowl" demonstrations of techniques.

Writing simulation exercises is both an art and a science. To be relevant, a simulation must support the objectives of the training, and the landscape chosen must allow the participants to extract the maximum value from the time invested. Debriefing a simulation is done in three phases: (1) the description phase, in which the participants describe what happened to them in the game world; (2) the analogy/analysis phase, in which the participants systematically examine the objectives of the game; and (3) the reality phase, in which the participants focus on the understandings they have gained and how those understandings can be absorbed into their future activities.

Discussion

Wien and Swanson jointly began the discussion in plenary by asking the audience to describe some of the best and worst training practices they had experienced. Among the elements that were considered vital to good training were

- The adaptability of the trainers to the needs of the trainees;
- An environment in which people felt comfortable making mistakes and being vulnerable;
- The integration of different mechanisms for learning; and
- Allowing sufficient time to accomplish what was needed.

Among the elements that were considered bad training practices were

- Lacking goals or having unclear goals;
- Trainers who were unable to deal with deep emotions as they arose; and
- Unsuccessful role plays and simulations.

Flexibility and comfort with ambiguity are essential qualities for good trainers. Additional considerations emerged in general discussion. The issue of including participants in the training design process was generally accepted as a good idea, as long as they are able to add relevance to the process. The group also agreed that evaluation methods needed to be built into the training design. Finally, the group felt that the timing and rhythm of training sessions was an important consideration. If time is limited, providing less in the way of content is better than trying to do too much.

Comment

The considerations that emerge from a discussion of training design track with those that were enunciated by the speakers on negotiation and mediation training. The best training design is not determined by the skill of the designer. Rather, it takes its shape naturally from the objectives to be achieved and from a thorough analysis of the trainees—who they are, how they learn, and how they will translate the training into future practice. The same ethical considerations that apply to trainers also apply to those who design training. If all training is, in fact, intervention, then designers have an obligation to consider the ripple effects of their work.

Evaluation in Conflict Resolution Training and Practice

Popular expectations and diminishing resources in the context of conflict resolution endeavors are increasingly being seen as questions in search of a common answer—how effective is our intervention and are we, in fact, helping to resolve anything? More and more, donors and the public are looking for some form of evaluation. But evaluation is not just about achieving goals; it is also about understanding the underlying premises on which those goals are based. For example, the popular goal of holding free and fair elections may be achievable, but when evaluated against the objective of resolving a deeply rooted conflict, it may be seen as having a more divisive than inclusive effect.

The role of evaluation is to determine what works and what does not in terms of the goals of those undertaking a specific action. However, most conflict resolution training and practice involves multiple goals, diverse participants, and shifting time frames, and seeks to change behaviors, perceptions, and institutional practices. Defining success in this context must often go beyond the individual training event and should be understood in terms of multiple (often continuous) dimensions—what has been termed "pieces of peace."

Ultimate success in conflict management training (and practice) produces an improvement in the relationship between opposing communities and builds a capacity for disputing parties to manage future problems when they arise. There is no single best way to produce this result or best approach (or instrument) for evaluating the extent to which conflict resolution training or practice has been successful, but there are some guidelines that can be offered:

paper by
Marc
Howard
Ross

◗ Good evaluation requires a conscious effort to articulate the most significant goals of different groups of participants and to track goal evolution in the course of a project.

◗ Good evaluation spells out operational criteria of success linked to specific project activities.

◗ Good evaluation addresses the question of transfer—the ways in which direct work with only a small number of project participants is expected to have more extensive, indirect effects on the course of the wider conflict.

◗ Good evaluation leads to the development of multiple criteria of success and helps practitioners realize degrees of success and failure or partial successes and failures.

◗ Good evaluation helps practitioners define future activities that build on what has been successful or modifies activities in light of what has not.

◗ Good evaluation helps intervenors and funders of intervention in imaging "good enough" conflict management, asking not whether they have fully resolved a complicated conflict but whether they have improved conditions sufficiently that the parties in the conflict are more likely to develop the capacity to manage a conflict constructively in the future.

Having described some guidelines for good evaluations, it is important to stress that goal identification is critical to goal evaluation. If the immediate goal is to hold free and fair elections, regardless of the outcome, success or failure of that effort should not be benchmarked against whether the results of the election produced a more democratic and responsible society—that would constitute, in essence, evaluating an orange in terms of its being an apple. We need to evaluate conflict resolution projects in terms of what they accomplish themselves and in terms of what they accomplish in terms of working with other projects toward a common, larger goal.

Traditional evaluation measures are difficult to apply in conflict resolution work where there are more independent variables than cases, no random assignment of subjects to treatment groups, difficulties in gaining pre- and post-test measures, changing contexts in which interventions are implemented, shifting goals, uncertainty about what constitutes success, problems of instrumentation, selection bias, reactivity, limited resources, and poor design. But, though perfect evaluation may not be possible, "good enough" evaluation requires that we make the best judgments possible under difficult circumstances.

Projects may establish both internal and external criteria for success. Internal criteria indicate the extent to which a project achieved its immediate goals. Multiple indicators are necessary because exclusive reliance on one indicator will fail to measure the multidimensional nature of most interventions. Because most interventions are focused on behavioral change, behavioral change measures can be particularly good indicators of an intervention's effectiveness. When evaluating internal success, however, we must be careful to avoid using evaluation criteria that are self-serving, such as questionnaires worded to elicit a favorable response.

It is difficult to develop good external criteria of success, and yet it is particularly important that we do so in order to link the specific effects of an intervention to the wider conflict in which it occurs. While projects generally have a good sense of internal criteria of success, there is a great need for explicit articulation of the link between these goals and the impact that their achievement is expected to have on the wider societal conflict.

Three different tests might be helpful in evaluating a project's effects:

◗ Face validity: Is it plausible that the activities of the project are likely to contribute to an outcome (or a non-outcome)?

◗ Consistency with theory: Is an outcome consistent (or inconsistent) with one or more accepted social theories?

◗ Consensus among disputants: While face validity generally refers to reactions from implementers and outside observers, another useful perspective on a project's impact could come from the members of the disputing communities themselves. In this regard, it would be useful to collect community perceptions about why particu-

lar outcomes had or had not come about, and to get reactions from a more focused sample of community leaders to determine their views on whether particular interventions were effective in advancing their goals.

Good evaluation improves conflict management training and practice at three levels. At the level of the specific project, it provides rapid and effective feedback so that ineffective activities are dropped and effective ones are enhanced. For communities in which the evaluations are taking place, an evaluation can provide tangible evidence of desired change that may be crucial in a political climate where interventions (by insiders or outsiders) are viewed skeptically. Finally, sound and effective evaluations can help funders (both private and governmental) feel more confident about what they are getting for their money.

Discussion

Marc Ross introduced the discussion in plenary by recognizing that most trainers and practitioners are uncomfortable with the idea of being evaluated, equating it with being judged on their performance. But a well-designed evaluation can provide tremendous insights, make thinking about disputes more productive, and make practicing in the field much better. To evaluate a program, you have to be aware of its goals. The more important the problem (such as making peace), the less people feel compelled to spell out their goals. But dealing in grand designs makes day-to-day planning and evaluation almost impossible. The central feature of good evaluation is making explicit the underlying premises on which the stated goals are based and making sure the premises are warranted.

Commentator Michael Beer picked up on the importance of goal setting, merging the goals of the donors, practitioners, and participants in a conflict situation, and tracking goal evolution over time. He cautioned the audience against imposing a results-oriented, instant-gratification culture on conflict resolution problems. A further question to be asked, he suggested, is who within most small organizations with limited budgets is qualified and available to do the necessary evaluations.

In general discussion, the group agreed that it is both easier and less problematic to attempt to measure behavioral rather than attitudinal change. In planning a training or intervention, evaluation is made easier if the planners "think small" in terms of their objectives. A small, focused, and positive result is better than a grandiose, ill-defined failure. Project evaluators need to educate donors on the benefits of relationships of small projects and how to recognize exaggerated promises.

Comment

Without evaluation, all training and practice is relevant and success is always just a few more dollars away. In truth, real success in conflict resolution is hard to quantify and hard to come by in the short term. As it is commonly agreed that some form of evaluation is necessary, it seems logical that evaluation—as measurement—must have an object (a training, an intervention, an election, a society), a beginning and an end point, and a direction. The direction and end point emerge out of clear and obtainable objectives, without which all hope for accurate and insightful evaluation rapidly fades. Equally as

important as knowing where we are going is knowing where we are now. As difficult as it may be to establish the necessary baselines (through questionnaires, surveys, focus groups, and so forth), without them it is difficult to track progress or to plan the right kind of training or application of influence that will move our object toward our goal.

The issues of transfer and evaluation over time are important. The more we learn about conflict resolution, the more we understand that it is a process of incremental change over time. There are likely to be multiple interventions—pieces of peace—that can be evaluated internally but must also be evaluated externally in terms of how they advance the greater object toward the higher goal. Those interventions that are counterproductive at the higher level, even if locally successful, should be reviewed and, perhaps, mitigated for the greater good.

The need for credible and insightful evaluation applies to all areas of conflict resolution practice and training. The community as a whole must realize this and build a culture that is less resentful of outside evaluation. Building effective evaluation measures into a training or a planned intervention forces the planners to clarify their goals and to determine the start point and direction of their effort. It also helps them to foresee potential and collateral effects, and to make adjustments sooner rather than later.

About the Participants

Karen AbuZayd is with the office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and served as the commentator on the subject of "Ethical Dilemmas in Conflict Resolution Training."

Thomas Beck is with the U.S. Agency for International Development and served as the commentator on the subject of "Training for Conflict Analysis and Strategy Development."

Michael Beer is with Nonviolence International and served as the commentator on the subject of "Evaluation in Conflict Resolution Training and Practice."

Nadine Bloch is with Greenpeace and served as the commentator on the subject of "Training in Nonviolent Intervention."

Jaco Cilliers is with Catholic Relief Services and served as the commentator on the subject of "Best Practices in Training Negotiators."

Sofia Clark is with the Organization of American States and served as the commentator on the subject of "Training Negotiators to Work Effectively Across Cultures."

Rosemary Fennell is with the U.S. Department of Education and served as the commentator on the subject of "Best Practices When Training Mediators."

L. Erik Kjonnerod is with the National Defense University and served as the commentator on the subject of "Designing Training Materials: A Few Best Practices."

George Lakey is with Training for Peace in Philadelphia, and he wrote and presented the paper on "Training in Nonviolent Intervention."

Michael Lund is with Management Systems International in Washington, D.C., and wrote and presented the paper on "Training for Conflict Analysis and Strategy Development."

Christopher Moore is with CDR Associates in Boulder, Colorado, and wrote and presented the paper on "Training Negotiators to Work Effectively Across Cultures."

Robert Ricigliano is with the Conflict Management Group, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and wrote and presented the paper on "Best Practices in Training Negotiators."

Marc Howard Ross is a professor of political science at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania, and wrote and presented the paper on "Evaluation in Conflict Resolution Training and Practice."

Robert M. Schoenhaus is a former program officer in the Training Program at the United States Institute of Peace and is currently editor-in-chief of international publications for Tax Analysts in Arlington, Virginia.

Linda Singer is with the Center for Dispute Settlement, Washington, D.C. and wrote and presented the paper on "Best Practices When Training Mediators."

Pete Swanson is a commissioner with the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service in Washington, D.C., and co-authored and presented the paper on "Designing Training Materials: A Few Best Practices."

Wallace Warfield is with the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution in Fairfax, Virginia, and he wrote and presented the paper on "Ethical Dilemmas in Conflict Resolution Training."

Barbara Wien is a program officer in the Training Program at the United States Institute of Peace and co-authored and presented the paper on "Designing Training Materials: A Few Best Practices."

About the Institute

The **United States Institute of Peace** is an independent, nonpartisan federal institution created by Congress to promote research, education, and training on the peaceful management and resolution of international conflicts. Established in 1984, the Institute meets its congressional mandate through an array of programs, including research grants, fellowships, professional training, education programs from high school through graduate school, conferences and workshops, library services, and publications. The Institute's Board of Directors is appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate.

Chairman of the Board: Chester A. Crocker
Vice Chairman: Max M. Kampelman
President: Richard H. Solomon
Executive Vice President: Harriet Hentges

Board of Directors
January 15, 2001

Chester A. Crocker (Chairman), James R. Schlesinger Professor of Strategic Studies, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University

Max M. Kampelman, Esq. (Vice Chairman), Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver and Jacobson, Washington, D.C.

Dennis L. Bark, Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University

Stephen J. Hadley, Esq., Shea and Gardner, Washington, D.C.

Theodore M. Hesburgh, President Emeritus, University of Notre Dame

Zalmay Khalilzad, RAND Corporation, Washington, D.C.

Seymour Martin Lipset, Hazel Professor of Public Policy, George Mason University

W. Scott Thompson, Professor of International Politics, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

Allen Weinstein, President, Center for Democracy, Washington, D.C.

Harriet Zimmerman, Vice President, American Israel Public Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C.

Members ex officio

Madeleine Korbel Albright, Secretary of State

Paul G. Gaffney II, Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy; President, National Defense University

Walter B. Slocombe, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy

Richard H. Solomon, President, United States Institute of Peace (nonvoting)