

President's corner

By Martin C. Euwema, IACM President, martin.euwema@psy.kuleuven.be



Working on conflict?

Why are you working on conflict? This question has been asked to me often, and I guess so has already happened to you. Why am I working on conflict? On negotiation, on mediation, on power or emotions? I find for myself different answers to that question. As a student, I am mostly fascinated by conflicts, as it brings both the worst and the best in people to the surface. Every conflict is a crossroad, where people make choices that matter, for their personal lives and those involved. Fascination is the scientist perspective. Working on conflict is also driven by an activist perspective. What can I do to prevent or solve conflicts, including my personal conflicts? Yes, I admit some idealistic motivation or a helper's complex, for that matter. How can we help each other in making choices in conflict situations, and find solutions that work for all? What interventions work?

Our personal biography colors the choices we make. Professionally, as well as personally, as scientist and as interventionist. Many IACM members work on conflict in different roles, developing and applying knowledge, volunteering, mediating and/or coaching. Working to prevent conflicts, empower people, building on peace.

At IACM 2012 working on conflict is present in many different faces. We present our academic work and learn from experiences from practitioners in many fields. Our Rubin Award Winner, Ellen Giebels, clearly shows the combination of academic work in the field and applying this knowledge by giving advice to particularly hostage negotiators. See her interview in this Signal.

Our coming to South Africa for the 25th annual IACM conference has also been inspired by the long history of conflict, negotiation, mediation and peace-building in this continent. As such, we decided to have throughout the whole conference a special track on mediation, provided by academics as well as outstanding mediators. Also peace-building will be a central and recurrent theme during the conference.

Besides this, I hope also that the IACM-participants who will be doing some community work in South Africa, will be able to contribute to knowledge and/or practices that prevent conflicts or constructive ways to deal with conflicts and as such contributing to the society as a whole.

With IACM coming to South Africa, we have the honor to work on conflict with two highly inspirational people: Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Leymah Gbowee. Both have experienced the down sides of conflict personally and have transferred these experiences in a strong motivation to work for sustainable peace. Both have achieved greatly, and their work is worth studying for sure, as well as it is worth practical support. Regarding the latter issue, IACM has engaged itself to work with Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Leymah Gbowee.

Archbishop Tutu is patron of the Africa Centre for Dispute Settlement, our conference host this year. The Tutu Foundation is present in many different countries around the world, promoting sustainable peace and working with youth. There will also be a workshop at the IACM conference by the Tutu Foundation UK, which will be led by Reverend Ms Mpho Tutu. I would highly encourage all members to financially support the great work by the Tutu Foundation. The Tutu Peace Centre's details for donations can be found at: <http://www.tutu.org/donate.php>

Leymah Gbowee, our key note speaker this year, launched in February 2012 The African Girls Leadership Initiative (AGLI) (see below).

AGLI is inspired by the personal experience of Leymah Gbowee. Her focus is to prioritize girls from post conflict communities on the continent where structures that promote the rights of young girls have eroded. (See below for more info, including account info)

AGLI and IACM cooperate in providing full scholarships to qualified girls to colleges and universities within and outside of Africa. This can be done by direct donations to AGLI for sponsorship or by arranging scholarships at your university. For example the Universities of Seville and Leuven will be offering scholarships to African young women to do Masters in Leadership and Conflict Management in cooperation with AGLI. We have also found corporate sponsors for these scholarships. The cost to send a Liberian girl to a local college or university for a complete bachelor program is only US\$ 5000. The costs for master programs are in our hands at our own universities. In case you want more info, don't hesitate to contact me or AGLI.

As IACM, we work on conflict, and education is the key to do so. Therefore, I hope that many of us are able to work with the Tutu Foundation and with AGLI providing young people with, access to education, who are highly motivated to transfer their experiences in conflict, into future leadership. We will for sure need good leadership to work on conflict and sustainable peace.

Martin C Euwema

President IACM

GBOWEE Peace Foundation Africa African Girls Leadership Initiative

Background

The African Girls Leadership Initiative (AGLI) is the flagship program of the newly established Gbowee Peace Foundation Africa (GPFA). The mission of the GPFA is to enhance the leadership potential for young women across the African continent. The GPFA is inspired by the personal experience of Nobel Laureate Leymah Gbowee. Her focus is to prioritize girls from post conflict communities on the continent where structures that promotes the rights of young girls have eroded.

The aspect of AGLI that we collaborate with the International Association for Conflict Management is in providing full scholarships to qualified girls to colleges and universities within and outside of Africa. GPFA will select program participants from conflict-ridden in Liberia, Ghana, Sierra Leone and Nigeria. Leymah Gbowee's personal and professional experiences attest to the significant role education plays in the advancement of girls and women. She is acutely aware that in order to preserve peace and ensure equitable allocation of economic, social and political development in regions of conflict, women need to be in key decision-making positions. The AGLI will secure the financial support girls need to develop as leaders within the classroom and beyond.

Program Goals

The program consists of three prongs:

- Program A: Enable Liberian girls to attend in-country colleges and universities with or close to their home communities with tuition and fees fully paid for their entire matriculation.
- Program B: Enable girls from Liberia, Ghana, Nigeria and/or Sierra Leone to attend top colleges and universities outside of west Africa with all tuition, fees, boarding and roundtrip international travel expenses covered.
- Program C: Provide West African girls 2-4 week summer internships with top firms in technology, media and retail provided with roundtrip international travel, accommodations, and modest clothing allowance.

Liberia faces an epidemic of teen pregnancy, teen prostitution, and one of the world's highest infant mortality rates. It sorely needs capable Liberians to tackle the many challenges the country faces. The full funding of scholarships allows girls from afflicted to directly combat the aforementioned issues while advancing development. Many aid organizations use a top-down approach to development and are not indigenous to the regions they serve. The goal of the AGLI is to help communities identify potential leaders, support their schooling, and instill a sense of responsibility among scholarship recipients to return and develop their communities.

More information: gboweeassistant@gmail.com All contributions will go only to scholarships.

Correspondent Bank: Citi Bank London

Swift code: CITIUS33

Address: London

For credit of: Guaranty Trust Bank (Liberia) Limited

Swift code: GTBILRLM

A/C No.: 12310872

IBAN: GB97CITI18500812310872

Former Chief Justice of South Africa, Justice Arthur Chaskalson keynote speaker at IACM 2012 conference

By Barney Jordaan and Lindy Greer



At the upcoming 25th Annual IACM Conference, the welcoming dinner will be a special moment. We hope for the presence of Archbishop Desmond Tutu, and our key note speaker that evening will be Justice Arthur Chaskalson, former Chief Justice of South Africa, the first President of South Africa's new Constitutional Court, and described by president Mbeki as "giant among the architects of our democracy". The impressive CV is worth reading, and shows a wonderful example of bridging between academy and practice, across boundaries. We are most honored to have Justice Chaskalson as our guest, and look forward to learn from his wisdom.

Arthur Chaskalson was appointed by President Nelson Mandela in June 1994 to be the first President of South Africa's new Constitutional Court and was the Chief Justice of South Africa from November 2001 until his retirement in 2005. In December 2002 he received the award of Supreme Counsellor of the Baobab [gold], a national honour, for his service to the nation in respect of constitutionalism, human rights and democracy. On his retirement in 2005 he was described by President Mbeki as a "giant among the architects of our democracy".

He was born in Johannesburg on 24 November 1931 and is married to Dr Lorraine Chaskalson; they have two children, Matthew, born 12 August 1963 and Jerome, born 1 August 1967.

He is a graduate of the University of the Witwatersrand, B Com (1952), LLB, Cum Laude (1954), was a member of the University's soccer team and was selected for the Combined South African Universities soccer team in 1952. He was admitted to the Johannesburg Bar in May 1956 and took silk in July 1971. During his career at the Bar he appeared as counsel on behalf of members of the liberation movements in several major political trials between 1960 and 1994, including the Rivonia Trial in 1963/1964 at which Mr. Nelson Mandela and other leaders of the African National Congress were convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment. He also appeared as counsel in major commercial disputes. In 1978 he helped establish the Legal Resources Centre, a non-profit organisation, which sought to use law to pursue justice and human rights in South Africa, and was its director from November 1978 until September 1993. During that period he was leading counsel in several cases in which challenges were launched by the Legal Resources Centre against the implementation of apartheid laws.

He was a member of the Johannesburg Bar Council from 1967 to 1971 and from 1973 to 1984, the Chairman of the Johannesburg Bar in 1976 and again in 1982, a member and later Convenor of the

National Bar Examination Board (1979-1991), and the Vice Chairman of the General Council of the Bar of South Africa (1982-1987).

He has been a member of the Board of the Faculty of Law of the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg [1979 – 1999], was an Honorary Professor of Law at that University from 1981 to 1995, a member of its board for the Centre for Applied Legal Studies from 1979 to 1994, a member of the National Council of Lawyers for Human Rights (1980-1991), was Vice Chairman of the International Legal Aid Division of the International Bar Association (1983-1993) and Chairman of the Rhodes Scholarship Selection Committee for South Africa (1988-1993).

He was a member of the Judicial Service Commission from 1994 until 2005, and its chairperson from 21 November 2001 until his retirement on 31 May 2005. He was elected as an honorary member of the Bar Association of the City of New York in 1985 of the Boston Bar Association in 1991 and of the Johannesburg Bar in 2002. He was a visiting professor at Columbia University in New York, 1987 - 1988, and again in 2004, was a Distinguished Global Fellow at New York University School of Law and a visiting professor at American University's Washington College of Law in 2010.

He was a consultant to the Namibian Constituent Assembly in connection with the drafting of the Constitution of Namibia (December 1989-March 1990), a Consultant to the African National Congress on constitutional issues (April 1990-April 1994), and served as a member of the Technical Committee on Constitutional Issues, appointed by the Multi Party Negotiating Forum in May 1993 to give advice on constitutional matters to the Forum (which negotiated the transition to democracy in South Africa), and to draft on its behalf the transitional constitution, which was finalised and adopted in December 1993.

He was the President of the International Commission of Jurists from 2004 to 2008, was the Chairperson of a committee of senior judges appointed by the United Nations Environmental Programme to promote and develop judicial education on environmental law in all parts of the world, was the first chairperson of the Southern African Judges Commission, an association of the Chief Justices of Southern Africa, and chaired the Eminent Jurists Panel (2007 – 2009) appointed by the International Commission of Jurists to enquire into the impact of terrorism and counter-terrorism on the rule of law, human rights law, and where relevant, international humanitarian law. He is an elected member of the South African Academy of Science, a Foreign Honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Science, is a trustee of the Legal Resources Trust, the Constitutional Court Trust, the Constitution Hill Trust, and is a member of the board of the South African Institute for Advanced Constitutional Law.

He was awarded the degrees of Doctor of Laws Honoris Causa by the University of Natal in 1986, the University of the Witwatersrand in 1990, Rhodes University in 1997, the University of Amsterdam in 2002, Port Elizabeth University in 2002, the University of South Africa in 2004, the University of the Western Cape in 2006, the University of Pretoria in 2006, and Stellenbosch University in 2008. He received the Premier Group Award for prestigious service by a member of the Faculty of Law at the University of the Witwatersrand in 1983, the Claude Harris Leon Foundation award for community service and the Wits

Alumni Honour Award for exceptional service to the community, both in 1984, was the joint recipient of the Human Rights Award for 1990 of the Foundation for Freedom and Human Rights, Berne, Switzerland, and has received awards for his work in the promotion of human rights and constitutionalism from the General Council of the Bar of South Africa (the Sydney and Felicia Kentridge award), from the Jewish Board of Deputies, from Rotary (the Paul Harris Award), from Lawyers for Human Rights in South Africa, and from the Constitutional Hill Trust. In 2004 he was the co-recipient with Chief Justice Langa of the Peter Gruber Justice Prize; in 2007 he was the co-recipient with Ms Wangari Maathai of the 2007 Nelson Mandela Award for Human Rights and Health. He received the American Bar Association's Rule of Law Award for 2010 and the World Justice Forum's rule of Law Award in 2011.

He has participated in conferences and delivered lectures concerned with constitutional issues, human rights and legal services, in South Africa, Australia, Austria, Bosnia, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Mauritius, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Tanzania, Uganda, United States of America, United Kingdom, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Member Spotlight: Q and A with Ellen Giebels

By Meriem Kalter



Prof. Ellen Giebels of the University of Twente, the Netherlands, received the Jeffrey Z. Rubin Theory-to-Practice award this year. She received the award because she conducts first-rate research and excels in bridging the science-to-practice gap. Ellen's research, teaching and consulting centres on managing issues related to social safety, and forms an intersection between social psychology, behavioural interventions and technology. One particularly noteworthy contribution she has made to the field of crisis negotiation is her development of a theoretical framework ("the Table of Ten") that defines how communication behaviour can be used to deal with police interviews, informants, and hostage negotiations. Ellen is the first recipient of the Rubin Award outside North America and will receive the award officially this summer during the IACM-conference in South Africa, where she will also be a keynote speaker.

Congratulations on your Rubin Award! What does it mean to you to win this award?

I feel very honoured. I was particularly moved by the letters of recommendation from my direct colleagues and the people in the field. Organizations like the Danish army, the Dutch and German police force and the Dutch Public Prosecution service expressed their gratitude for the research I have done for them. It was wonderful to read that they appreciate the work I have done, and that it is still very useful to them.

What do you think of the development that practice-oriented academic research is more widespread nowadays?

Although I think pure fundamental research remains important, it is a positive development that practice-oriented scientific research is also getting more attention and acknowledgement. Scientific research nowadays doesn't always have to be only fundamental or only applied, it can be both. Psychological scientific research that is both fundamental and applied is about things you encounter in daily life, but with a critical look. The advice you give as a researcher to your client consists of more than 'best practices'.

What do you like about practice-oriented research?

What I like about doing this kind of research is the interaction you have with people in the field. I particularly enjoy helping people to see things "differently" and to crucially challenge their initial ideas. At the same time, interaction with practice also teaches us, as researchers, that it is important to sell our ideas and to clearly show what the benefits are for daily practice. All in all, it is about trying to solve problems. Every project I do also teaches me something, both as a researcher as well as personally.

Do you think you have a specific role yourself in promoting practice-oriented research?

I don't see myself as a figurehead for promoting practice-oriented research if that is what you mean. I believe in my research and hope people are inspired by it.

Your research projects consist of a wide range of topics in the field of conflict: crisis negotiation, neighbourhood mediation, and bullying behaviour within organizations, to name a few. Why does conflict interest you?

Conflicts interest me because of their duality and dynamic character. We all know that conflicts can have a huge negative impact on people and society. At the same time they are also opportunities for innovation and development. The key question is how conflicts can be effectively managed.

What kind of research would you like to do in the future?

One of the avenues for further research I would like to pursue is to put the UT slogan "high tech, human touch" more in practice. I think there are exciting new techniques that we could incorporate into our conflict research, particularly when we want to examine real life conflict dynamics. I am hoping to do that more in the future, together with our research team and –of course – partners from practice.

SEE THE FULL IACM 2012
CONFERENCE PROGRAM ONLINE
AT THE CONFERENCE WEBSITE

Some Recent Publications by Members

Bendersky, C., & Hays, N. A. 2012. Status conflict in groups. *Organization Science*, 23(2): 323-340.

Bere, M. 2011. Managing Intra-state conflicts: promises and failures of peace agreements in Cote d'Ivoire", in *Africa Peace and Conflict Journal*, 4:2 (2011), 17-28.

Chasek, P. S., & Wagner L.M. (eds). 2012. *The Roads from Rio: Lessons Learned from Twenty Years of Multilateral Environmental Negotiations*. Abingdon: Routledge/Resources for the Future.

Druckman, D. & Ebner, N. (2012). "Simulation: Learning through Role Playing and Design". In D. J. Christie (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology*. NY: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dunaetz, D. R. (2012). *The early religious history of France: An introduction for church planters and missionaries*. Claremont, CA: Martel Press.

Dunaetz, D. R. (2011). *Personality and conflict style: Effects on membership duration in voluntary associations*. Saarbrücken, Germany: Lambert Academic Press.

Dunaetz, D. R. (2011). Understanding the effects of diversity in mission from a social science perspective. In A. S. Moreau & B. Snodderly (Eds.), *Reflecting God's glory together: Diversity in evangelical mission* (pp. 335-353). Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.

Ebner, N. (2011). "Negotiating via email". In M. Benoliel (Ed.) *Negotiation Excellence: Successful Deal Making*. World Scientific Publishing: Singapore.

Khatab, S. (2011). *Understanding Islamic Fundamentalism: The Theological and Ideological Basis of al-Qaida's Political Tactics*. The American University in Cairo Press.

Mundate, L., Euwema, M.C., & Elgoibar, P. (Eds.). (2012) *Ten steps for empowering employee representatives in the new European Industrial Relations*. Madrid: McGraw Hill. ISBN: 978-84-481-8266-3

Rahim, M. A. (2011). *Managing Conflict in Organizations* (4th ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Rahim, M. A. (Ed.). (2011). *Current Topics in Management* (Vol. 15). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Rahim, M. A. (Ed.). (2012). *Management: Theory, Research, and Practice*. San Diego, CA: Cognella Academic Publishing.

IACM member contribution

To green, or not too green? The environmental impact of conflict management

By Noam Ebner

It's a safe guess that while most members of the conflict management community feel they are doing helpful and useful work, they don't view themselves as planet-saving superheroes (even those who actually are). A more humble approach of one-step-at-a-time – another aspect of conflict explained, another dispute mediated – might be more typical.

A similar description might be apt for those millions around the planet who take small steps at planet-saving in another sense – by separating their trash, recycling their plastic, or taking other environmentally-friendly measures in their day-to-day life.

Beyond this shared one-step-at-a-time approach, another connection between the worlds of conflict management and environment became apparent to me only recently. While not a planet-saver, whale-adopter or tree-hugger in any sense of the terms, my own personal conduct has gradually reflected rising awareness to environmental issues. Five years ago, recycling bottles was my only nod towards Mother Earth. Two years ago, however, the perfectly operational light fixtures in my home gave way to energy-efficient lighting; last year, when my growing brood of younglings necessitated transition to a mini-van, my choice of vehicle (in this particularly environmentally-adverse category of transport) was strongly affected by particular vehicles' lower environmental impact.

Yet, what of my professional activities? Only very recently did I consciously consider that environmental considerations might have a spot in these as well – at which point I discovered that, *absolutely* unintentionally, I have engaged in relatively environmentally-friendly forms of professional practice for the past few years. Alongside my 'traditional', site-based mediation practice, I've developed practice (and, I like to think, some theory), in Online Dispute Resolution (ODR). Additionally, four years ago I substantially reduced my teaching activities in traditional classrooms, and joined The Werner Institute at Creighton University's School of Law, where I helped develop and currently chair the graduate program in negotiation and dispute resolution offered via online learning. These shifts significantly reduced my professional carbon footprint - unintentionally. It seemed to me, that this issue deserved more attention and intentionality.

Uncovering the Green Giant

I was not alone in excluding environmental concern from my professional mattering-map. Searching ODR providers for mention of ODR's environmental advantages turned up a sole voice in the wilderness. The Distance Mediation Project conducted by Mediate BC in British Columbia had conducted an environmental savings analysis as part of the program's evaluation. Partnering with the program's evaluator, Colleen Getz, we set out to thoroughly examine the relationship between ODR and environmental issues, resulting in an article recently published in *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, entitled *ODR: The Next Green Giant* (Ebner

& Getz, 2012). We discovered that not only was the Distance Mediation Project's environmental objective the only example of considering the environment in conducting ODR, it constitutes the only mention of ODR's green nature in *all* of the field's discussion venues: the topic is absent from conference proceedings, articles, and service providers' websites. This, despite the dozens of articles published enumerating the field's advantages: time saved, flexibility, accessibility, expertise etc.; environmental advantages never made the list. The article recommends reasons the ODR field might do well to spotlight its environmental advantages.

The Environment and the Conflict Management Field

I suggest widening this self-examination of the environmental impact of professional practices. Just as the choice between delivering dispute resolution processes through traditional methods or through ODR involves an environmental consideration, so too does the application of *any* practice of the conflict management field. All our activities: training, peace-building, research, conferences, Track II meetings and so on, have some degree of environmental impact, worthy of consideration at the design and implementation stages. Yet - despite long-standing connections between the conflict management field and the environment (best demonstrated by work on environmental conflict resolution) - the environmental impact of our own activities seems not to hold a spot in the internal discourse of the conflict management field.

What's in it for us?

Why is reflecting on the environmental impact of the field's activities, and considering environmentally-friendly options for carrying them out, important?

Many reasons pertain, each of which might appeal to different people or organizations in the conflict management field:

- 1) Personal satisfaction for environmentally-minded conflict management professionals;
- 2) Gaining favor with, or buy-in from, environmentally-minded individuals, communities or cultures;
- 3) Discovering new partners, from fields either genuinely concerned with the environment, or from businesses for whom this concern is necessary or beneficial;
- 4) Complying with emerging standards of donor organizations and states as these begin to require environmental impact consideration in project proposals;
- 5) Allowing conflict management projects to tap into *new* sources of funding from sponsors with an environmental focus.

I am not suggesting the field take a stance on substantive environmental issues such as climate change, nuclear power or urban planning priorities. Adopting an environmentally-friendly stance certainly raises the

challenge of maintaining and presenting neutrality on any of these issues; I look forward to a conversation on these challenges developing in the field.

Convene in the machine for green: Incorporating online practices

How might the field go about considering and developing activities with low environmental impact? While any number of options might be proposed (yet another topic for discussion in the field), one stands out: The reduction of travel-related carbon emissions, through supplanting traditional convening methods with online activity.

In general, I expect the coming years to witness many calls for replacing or supplementing traditional with online methods. Currently cutting across fields and industries, this trend has been demonstrated by proponents of ODR in the dispute resolution field. Pre-empting the likelihood that these calls will focus primarily on cost-saving and flexibility to the exclusion of environmental considerations (as was the case with ODR) – I'll note that I believe this would be doing the field (to say nothing of the planet) a disservice.

It is certainly true that an across-the-board shift to online convening is neither practical nor desirable. Speaking for myself, I would certainly not like to be seen as proposing that we eliminate all face-to-face convening – particularly given how much I enjoyed our last conference in Istanbul, and how much I'm looking forward to Cape Town! However, as a field, we can certainly do more online than we currently do, resulting, *inter alia*, in environmental benefits. These might be marginal, or quite significant - depending on the activity and its scale.

Environmental impact can be measured by assessing carbon emissions per activity, multiplied by scale. A calculator such as that provided at www.calculator.carbonfootprint.com/calculator.aspx can easily (albeit somewhat roughly) calculate carbon emissions. Scale takes into account the number of travelers and the iterations of the activity. We demonstrated this issue of scale in our *Green Giant* article, by demonstrating the carbon emissions saved by a hypothetical mediator first taking a few of her cases online, then convincing her partners to take a larger chunk of their firm's practice online, and finally by consulting to the court system in whose jurisdiction she works on a program entailing referral of 10% of the cases normally referred to ADR processes to online ADR processes. As the scale rose, so too did the savings in carbon emissions.

To widen the scope to other activities of the conflict management field, let me give some examples originating in my own neck of the woods:

Consider three Israeli and three Palestinian peacemakers from East and West Jerusalem gathering in a coffee shop somewhere along the city's seam line; the environmental cost their travel to the meeting entails is negligible.

Next, suppose these practitioners decide to form groups including fifteen members from each side, ranging from all over Israel and the Palestinian Authority, and to utilize two facilitators. Unable to convene locally for bi-national meetings, they plan four three-day meetings of the group in Istanbul. The environmental cost of such a project now involves 128 short round-trip flights, in addition to ground transportation.

Finally, consider a 2-day peace convention held somewhere in the Middle East, attended by about 40,000 participants from 15 countries, mainly in the Middle East (including Egypt, the Palestinian Authority, Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Algeria, and Israel) but with thousands participating from farther afield: the USA, Russia, the Netherlands and Germany.

Of course, prohibitive costs, political constraints, and sheer magnitude of scale all combine to rule convening this conference fantastical. Online, however, such a conference is not only possible – it is reality. This past January, Yala-Young Leaders - a Facebook-based group over 60,000 members strong, dedicated to empowering young Middle Easterners to lead their generation to a better future – convened the online version of this conference. Conference organizer (and IACM member) Arik Segal of Segal Conflict Management, told me that this convention was held via Shaker - an online platform offering the visual impression of a virtual world such as Second Life, easily accessible to anyone with a Facebook account. Participants (in avatar form) could walk around, approach other participants and jointly participate in various activities: conversation, buying a virtual drink or jointly perusing documents. Participants discussed issues such as roles for young players in promoting Middle East peace and the potential inherent in social media for connection across geographic and stereotypical divides. Guest speakers (the roster of which included Hilary Clinton, Sharon Stone and NBA commissioner David Stern amongst many others) pre-recorded video addresses or participated live. Participants not only engaged with each other, they also committed to follow-on online projects such as Yala's "Online Academy" educational venture.

Obviously, the primary benefit of convening this conference online is that it never would have happened otherwise. However, this real-life case demonstrating practical advantages of online convening, also provides a good case illustrating its environmental benefits. Consider the costs to the environment which would be incurred by physically convening such a conference: The staggering amount of carbon emissions from thousands of round-trip flights (ranging from a few hundred to a few thousand miles long), and from thousands of drives to the airport and back on either end of the journey. This, of course, only takes into account carbon emissions related to participant travel. There are other environmental costs associated with hotel stay (unless the little notes that hotels place on my towel racks have been lying to me), conference facility operation (e.g., electricity for lighting and air conditioning), printing of agendas, and so on.

This case exemplifies the potential for the conflict management field to conduct its business – or more of it than is intuitive - online. As grassroots conventions can be conducted online, so can other activities of our field. Online practitioner conferences can follow in the footsteps of the ODR field's annual online Cyber week conference (see, <http://www.adrhub.com/forum/topics/cyberweek-2011>). Academic education as well

as training programs can be conducted effectively in online or hybrid form. ODR practice demonstrates that interpersonal and organizational disputes can be resolved online. Track II dialogue groups can convene online, or alternate online and in-person meetings. All of these will probably become ubiquitous in the years to come, and spotlighted for reasons such as cost and flexibility – environmental considerations should have their place in the discussion as well.

Conclusion

This note suggests that the environmental impact of our work is something that the conflict management field, like any other professional field, should take into account. Many of our activities allow for choosing between environmentally-friendly and environmentally-adverse practices. Whether focusing on environmental savings associated with online rather than face-to-face activity, or on other environmental considerations, intentional choice is not only possible, it is important – to the field, and to the planet.

IACM member contribution

How to negotiate with generation Y?

By Moty Christal

The senior VP (age 55) was angry. He asked, again, his secretary to call Andrea (age 31), his PR agent. Andrea did not bring him a copy of the report she was suppose to prepare for last week meeting. Andrea did not reply, but sent a text message to the VP saying: "call you later!!". Of course she did not call. Instead, she sent the VP another message saying: "report in your inbox since Saturday". Just before the VP will fire Andrea, I think he should read the following advice: "How to negotiate with Generation Y".

If you are a senior executive, probably your most talented employees belong to "Generation Y". "Generation Y" is the name given to those young people who were born in the 80's and 90's, and start to emerge as young managers in companies throughout the world. Important to note that "Generation Y" has their own culture, and exhibits same characteristics, whether they are in Hong-Kong, New York City, Moscow, Tokyo, Istanbul, London or Tel Aviv.

Assuming we can generalize the non-Ys, Generation Y is different than others and different than what we were used to be when we were in their age. First and for most, this is a generation which lives in a constant paradox, and feels good about it. Stability does not mean much for them, and uncertainty is their natural environment. They can be mature and childish at the same time, extreme individualistic and team players while conducting the same tasks in different settings. Living the paradox and contradictions in what

characterizes their attitude and behavior, and since they are the majority of the productive workforce today, and gain more and more managerial positions, it is imperative to understand the way they think and operate, and more important adjust the way we negotiate with them, if we want to succeed.

In preparing for negotiating with Generation Y, we would sort their exhibited features¹ into three groups relevant for designing our negotiation strategies.

Communication wise:

- (1) Generation Y are tech-savvy. They grew up with technology and rely on it to communicate and to perform their jobs better. Ys are plugged-in 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and as they prefer to communicate through e-mail, facebook status and IMS messaging rather than face-to-face contact. That said, we should execute conduct some elements in our negotiations through electronic means, carefully overcoming their disadvantages², in order to speak the language and use the vocabulary of Generation Ys.

(Think, for example, of improving your BATNA through tweeting while negotiating with a Y'nik to buy his start-up company: "Currently interested in expanding my investment portfolio. Please contact me for interesting offers".)

- (2) Generation Y are Attention-Craving and impatient: Generation Y craves attention in the forms of feedback and guidance. They appreciate being kept in the loop and seek frequent praise and reassurance. On the same time they are individualistic, demand their space to take decisions and are impatient. They need feedbacks, comments and reactions fast. Translating this paradox into the negotiation process will require a brief communication, short sessions, and clear offer to be put on the table. Leading the process through a set of short and brief interactions will guarantee you their attention, and their process engagement.

Values and preferences (sometimes could be called: "interests"): Generation Y exhibits a significant awareness for social justice, civic responsibilities and public discourse. This, along of being driven by financial motivation and "quick-rich" mindset. Therefore an appropriate balance, both in terms of the process and in terms of the outcome, should be kept between the individual offer/gains out of the deal, and the public/collective outcome or at least the collective perception of the negotiated outcome.

- (1) Achievement-Oriented: Nurtured and pampered by their parents, Generation Y is confident, ambitious and achievement-oriented. They have high expectations of their employers, seek out

¹ Please refer to the full articles by Sally Kane, at <http://legalcareers.about.com/od/practicetips/a/GenerationY.htm>, and <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1640395,00.html>.

² Reference to Noam Eibner work..

new challenges and are not afraid to question authority. Generation Y wants meaningful work and a solid learning curve. In negotiation it means that long-term agreement will not appeal to them, and they will feel much more challenged and satisfied with a financially rewarded incentive scheme while performing their part of the agreement. Like every human being, their compensation package has to include tangible and non-tangible rewards, with the slight modification that the non-tangible reward ought to be presented to the world on the company's facebook page.

- (2) **Better life-work balance:** As Generation Y get bored relatively fast, the work promotion fast-track has lost much of its appeal for them. Generation Y is willing to trade high pay for fewer billable hours, flexible schedules and a better work/life balance. This, again, should be incorporated into the offer that an employer put forward to a Y'nik.

Moreover, negotiation setting matters. If you will negotiate with a Y'nik his personal benefit in a new workplace, it will be different than negotiating an industrial deal with a young physician or head of R&D team who decided to unionize the work in the company because it is the "right thing to do" from his perspective of social values. The latter will require a more comprehensive understanding of the stakeholders map, and applying some negotiating techniques that emanating from the world of system thinking and network science. This, however, could be discussed and presented in a different article. Now, to our Generation Y readers, (or, a quick operational list of do's and don'ts while negotiating with Generation Y. Remember, Generation Y does not ask why...).

Generation Y is full of paradoxes. Therefore the following seven golden rules³ should apply when negotiating with Generation Y:

1. **From ventilation to operation:** Allow them to speak. It is very important for them to talk. They will feel extremely frustrated if you will shut them off. If you have an hour meeting, let them talk and share their perspectives for 45 minutes. You are here to negotiate the best terms for you, not to exercise authority.
2. **..then talk slow and clear.** You don't have to follow their communication codes. You just have to be familiar with them. At the last ten minutes, put forward your offer: clear and brief. It is crucial that it will be short. Don't explain your offer. They don't need it, and consider it "waste of twitter space". Be short, and send them home to think and reply. Don't try to persuade them.
3. **Make a short term offer.** Generation Y don't see and don't care about long term. Offer them a comprehensive proposal (clear give and take) for the next year. Not more. If both parties are happy – both of you will renew it at the end of the term.

³ Based on my article published at the Russian edition of Forbes magazine:
<http://www.forbes.ru/forbes-woman-column/psihologiya/79247-sem-pravil-obshcheniya-s-pokoleniem-y>

4. **Measure their performance, not "time in work".** Generation Y is motivated more by performance than by relationships. If and when possible – give them performance based financial incentives, rather than compensation for time spent in the workplace.
5. **Negotiation process has to be short.** One or two exchanges of proposals. Chewing the process works in their favor, not in yours. Generation Y lives much better than their bosses with uncertainties, therefore they will feel fine with "no decision".
6. **Use smart leverages.** Generation Y knows how to live with deadlines. Give them genuine deadline and real leverage, and they will comply. If in work they pass an agreed deadline – make them pay for it. Again, they care more about money than about relationships.
7. **Last, but not least.** They are full of contradictions, which they can't explain. Don't ask them to. Give up the "why", you will control through their actions.

..and if these advises, or this article, were too short... get use to it. It's Generation Y.!

Announcements

2012 Conflict Management Division Professional Development Workshops, Academy of Management, Michael Gross, Colorado State University, Program Chair-Elect (PDW Chair)

Friday, August 3rd 2012

Sponsor(s): **(CM, OB)**

Scheduled: **Friday, Aug 3 2012 8:00AM - 10:00AM** at **Boston Park Plaza** in **Stuart Room**

Backlash and Beyond: Strategies for Improving Women's Organizational Outcomes

Organizer: **Mara Olekalns**; U. of Melbourne

Organizer: **Carol T. Kulik**; U. of South Australia

Presenter: **Deborah M Kolb**; Simmons College

Presenter: **Hannah Riley Bowles**; Harvard U.

Presenter: **Robin Ely**; Harvard U.

Presenter: **Alice F Stuhlmacher**; DePaul U.

Presenter: **Victoria L Brescoll**; Yale U.

Presenter: **Corinne Alison Moss-Racusin**; Rutgers U.

Presenter: **Kathleen L. McGinn**; Harvard U.

Although the social and economic backlash that women incur when they behave agentically is well documented, there continue to be gaps in our understanding of this phenomenon. Research has yet to

systematically explore how women and organizations can offset or eliminate backlash, and researchers are yet to consider how this effect might vary across contexts. The focus of this PDW is on how women can improve their organizational outcomes through negotiation. By outcomes, we mean tangible outcomes such as obtaining the necessary resources for effective job performance and career progression and intangible social outcomes such as likability, trustworthiness and reputation. We define negotiation broadly to include the behaviors that women use to influence other people, shape organizational roles, impact organizational decisions, and gain access to organizational resources. Our central question is: how can women enact these negotiations so that they preserve or enhance their social outcomes? We anticipate that the answers are different depending on the negotiating context, because localized norms will define what behaviors are normative for women. Contextual norms may reflect national societal values, be reinforced by organizational value systems, and be embedded in organizational policies and practices.

Pre-registration is required for this workshop. To register online, please visit <https://secure.aonline.org/PDWReg>. The deadline to register online is August 1, 2012.

Sponsor(s): **(CM)**

Scheduled: **Friday, Aug 3 2012 10:15AM - 12:45PM** at **Boston Park Plaza** in **Berkeley & Clarendon Room**

Restorative Justice: Integrating Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Research and Practice

Organizer: **David Lewin**; U. of California, Los Angeles

Organizer: **Lindred L. Greer**; U. of Amsterdam

Presenter: **Karl Aquino**; U. of British Columbia

Presenter: **Robert Bies**; Georgetown U.

Presenter: **Alexander Colvin**; Cornell U.

Presenter: **Ryan Fehr**; U. of Washington, Seattle

Presenter: **Deborah Kidder**; U. of Hartford

Presenter: **Thomas A Kochan**; Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Presenter: **Lukas B. Neville**; Queen's School of Business, Canada

Presenter: **Christine L. Porath**; Georgetown U.

Pre-registration is required for this workshop. To register online, please visit <https://secure.aonline.org/PDWReg>. The deadline to register online is August 1, 2012.

Studies of restorative justice reflect a variety of disciplinary backgrounds and research streams. One research stream focuses on how individuals respond to perceived injustice. As organizational behavior

specialists have shown, some individuals seek revenge as a means to justice while others seek forgiveness. Another research stream focuses on the effectiveness of re-instatement following employee suspension or termination. This research, conducted by industrial relations scholars in the U.S. and Canada, highlights the difficulties that reinstated employees encounter from peers and superiors following reinstatement. Yet another research stream focuses on grievance procedures in unionized settings and alternative dispute resolution systems (ADR) in non-union settings as justice-restoring mechanisms. This research, often done by human resource management scholars, distinguishes availability from actual use of grievance and ADR systems and analyzes the effects of availability and use on organizational performance. Given these research streams, this PDW focuses on two main questions: 1) Can justice in organizational and workplace relationships be restored once it has been violated or broken? 2) How, if at all, do conflict management perspectives on restorative justice differ from HR perspectives on restorative justice? We invite scholars from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds to participate in an interactive dialogue about and provide answers to these questions. We also encourage participants to identify particular research issues and opportunities in the area of restorative justice, especially as they bear upon the potential integration of multidisciplinary perspectives on restorative justice.

Sponsor(s): (CM, MED)

Scheduled: **Friday, Aug 3, 2012 1:30pm-3:30pm at Boston Park Plaza in Franklin Room**

Faithful or Fanciful? Transforming the negotiation classroom to facilitate critical learning

Presenter: **Magid Mazen**, Suffolk U.

Presenter: **Suzanne C. de Janasz**, IMD

"I win." For some, that's all that seems to matter in negotiations. This distributive view of negotiation, wherein the successful negotiator is the one who leaves the table with the biggest slice of the pie, is for some, the only way. This approach to winning, whether through questionable tactics or ruthless determination, leads to success in the short term but may damage a relationship, reputation or alliance. The integrative view of negotiation, focused on the relationship and characterized by longer-term, pie expanding (v. dividing), collaborative efforts, is the view extolled by best-selling authors Fisher and Ury and taught in various academic and commercial programs. However, since "nice guys finish last" is it realistic to think that students and executives can actually change their negotiating behaviors once the class ends? Can learners in a negotiation class get past their own conscious and unconscious behaviors that preclude learning new and different ways of negotiating while participating in a sterile and safe

classroom environment...especially when the act of learning produces a defensive reaction to the loss of comfortable beliefs and habits? Does our negotiation instruction and approach encourage—and enable us to witness—real learning and behavior change, as oppose to surface changes or none at all? In this workshop, we provide a space for those who teach negotiation to discuss these dilemmas and how they impact the teaching and learning of negotiation. We will share our experiences and approaches in the classroom, and solicit the experiences and approaches from workshop participants.

Saturday, August 4th 2012

Sponsor(s): **(CM)**

Scheduled: **Saturday, Aug 4 2012 9:00AM - 5:00PM** at **Boston Park Plaza** in **White Hill Room**

Fast forward: Research Strategies to Accelerate Tenure and Foster a Successful Career

Organizer: **Michael A. Gross**; Colorado State U.

Presenter: **Wendi L. Adair**; U. of Waterloo

Presenter: **Kurt T Dirks**; Washington U. in St. Louis

Presenter: **Martin C. Euwema**; Utrecht U.

Presenter: **Keith Murnighan**; Northwestern U.

Presenter: **Mara Olekalns**; U. of Melbourne

Presenter: **Randall S. Peterson**; London Business School

Presenter: **Madan M. Pillutla**; London Business School

Presenter: **Linda L. Putnam**; U. of California, Santa Barbara

Presenter: **Quinetta Roberson**; Villanova U.

Presenter: **Bennett J. Tepper**; Georgia State U.

At the consortium doctoral students will learn how to turn their dissertations into five-year research programs. The goal is to develop an area of expertise and recognition that makes a contribution to the field and sets the stage for making tenure. To achieve this goal, doctoral students will listen to presentations by leading scholars in CM, and then meet with these scholars and other students in small groups to discuss how to choose and advance students' research programs. Scholars present include: Wendi Adair, Kurt Dirks, Martin Euwema, Michael Gross, Keith Murnighan, Mara Olekalns, Randall Peterson, Madan Pillutia, Linda Putnam, Quinetta Roberson, and Bennett Tepper.

Pre-registration is required for this workshop. To register online, please visit

<https://secure.aomonline.org/PDWRReg>. Please contact the workshop organizer(s) to obtain the approval code. The deadline to register online is August 1, 2012.

Sponsor(s): (CM, OB, HR, CAR, GDO)

Scheduled: **Saturday, Aug 4 2012 2:30PM - 5:30PM** at **Boston Park Plaza** in **Plaza Ballroom**

How To Negotiate Your First Job Offer

Organizer: **Lindred L. Greer**; U. of Amsterdam

Organizer: **David Lewin**; U. of California, Los Angeles

Facilitator: **Laurie R. Weingart**; Carnegie Mellon U.

Participant: **Oluremi Ayoko**; U. of Queensland

Participant: **Donald E. Conlon**; Michigan State U.

Participant: **Deanna Geddes**; Temple U.

Participant: **Jana L. Raver**; Queen's U.

Participant: **Dean Tjosvold**; Lingnan U.

Distinguished Speaker: **Margaret A. Neale**; Stanford U.

In this lively and ever-popular PDW, experts will offer advice and training to students who are negotiating their (first) job. The session will consist of three parts. We will begin with a 30-minute negotiation briefing from an expert Conflict Management professor. Next, participants will be paired and will conduct a mock job negotiation, which will include cross-cultural components (about 45 minutes). The group will then reconvene and debrief the exercise (30 minutes) and have a short break. Finally, we have scheduled a 60-minute panel discussion of faculty who have been on the "other side" of the hiring decision discussing the factors they consider when negotiating job offers. The panel will include senior faculty from multiple divisions of Academy, as well as from diverse geographic locations around the globe, to provide a balanced perspective across fields as well as cultures. Topics might include: what to ask for (the dimensions of the offer), cultural differences in job negotiations (what can you negotiate for where, and how), how to negotiate for more time (handling exploding offers), solving the joint-location problem (spousal hires), etc. The session will conclude with question-and-answers for the panelists.

Pre-registration is required for this workshop. To register online, please visit <https://secure.aomonline.org/PDWReg>. Please contact the workshop organizer(s) to obtain the approval code. The deadline to register online is August 1, 2012.

Session #11227: Conflict Management Division Doctoral Consortium**Academy of Management****“Fast forward:****Research Strategies to Accelerate Tenure and Foster a Successful Career”****What is it?**

At the consortium doctoral students will learn how to turn their dissertations into five-year research programs. The goal is to develop an area of expertise and recognition that makes a contribution to the field and sets the stage for making tenure. To achieve this goal, doctoral students will listen to presentations by leading scholars in CM, and then meet with these scholars and other students in small groups to discuss how to choose and advance students' research programs. Scholars present include: Wendi Adair, Kurt Dirks, Martin Euwema, Michael Gross, Keith Murnighan, Mara Olekalns, Randall Peterson, Madan Pillutia, Linda Putnam, Quinetta Roberson, and Bennett Tepper.

When is it?

The consortium is Saturday, August 4th from 9am-5pm at the Boston Park Plaza, White Hill Room. We begin with presentations from scholars who will recount how they began their research programs and give advice to you. At 2pm we will break out into small group session consulting for research program development. Later in the afternoon, a panel of editors of major journals will lend their perspective. We will finish the consortium with a full group discussion and wrap-up.

Who Should Apply?

Any doctoral student who is a member of CM, or who is specializing in topics within the domain statement of CM can apply. You must not have attended a CM doctoral consortium before. Note that you do not have to have proposed your dissertation yet. You only have to have chosen your specialization within the domain statement of CM.

How to Apply?

Pre-registration is required by June 30th, 2012. Contact the CM Doctoral Consortium organizer, Michael Gross (CMD@business.colostate.edu), expressing your interest. Also, you will need to have a faculty member send a nomination (via email) on your behalf. There is no fee.

For more specific information on IACM, conferences, membership and latest news, please check our website <http://www.iacm-conflict.org>

IACM 2013



Mark your Calendars!!!

IACM June 30 - July 3 Tacoma, Washington

IACM Welcomes you to the stunning, scenic Northwest Coast of the U.S. Tacoma is located on the shores of Puget Sound, 20 minutes from the Seattle-Tacoma airport and 58 mi (93km) northwest of beautiful Mount Rainier.



Brought to you by
your 2013

Conference Team:

Wendi Adair, IACM President

Sonja Rispens, IACM 2013 Conference Program Chair

Zoe Barsness and Jill Purdy, IACM 2013 Conference

Local Arrangements Co-chairs

