

Instructor: Mattijs Van Maasakkers  
Office Hours: Tuesday 5-6pm; and by appointment  
Office: 233 Knowlton Hall  
Email: vanmaasakkers.1@osu.edu

## **Resolving Social Conflict**

(CRPLAN 7500)

**Autumn 2014**

Tuesday, 2:20-5pm, Location: 175 Knowlton Hall

### **COURSE DESCRIPTION**

Conflict is a fact of social life. Whether we want to or not, most of us are likely to encounter a variety of conflicts, in our personal lives, in our workplaces, and in the communities in which we live. But how do we deal with conflict? What are the (most) appropriate strategies to analyze and intervene in conflicts, in order to achieve outcomes that are fair, stable, efficient, and wise? This course helps students answer some of those questions by investigating the theory and practice of social conflict transformation, with an emphasis on negotiation and consensus building. Theoretical frameworks like interest-based negotiation, conflict (re-)framing and the mutual gains approach are introduced. The course entails a significant practical component, in which students can develop their negotiation, facilitation and mediation skills. The course includes a wide range of disputes, with an emphasis on conflicts in the public sphere. The examples of conflicts discussed in class range from organizational disputes to international crisis negotiations.

*Learning Objectives: -Upon finishing the course, students will be able to:*

- Prepare and implement a clear negotiation strategy when entering into a conflict resolution process
- Analyze social conflicts by identifying and describing (latent) stakeholders and their interests, i.e. conduct a conflict- or stakeholder assessment
- Recognize and classify different conflict resolution techniques and processes

**GRADING:** There are 100 points possible in the class. Grading is assessed based on the following maximum points allocation:

- Reflection memos: 30 points (You are required to write a reflection memo of 1-2 pages after every negotiation simulation. There are six negotiation simulations and students can receive up to 5 points per memo.)
- Scenario Presentations: 20 points (Scenarios will be posted to Carmen a week before class. Students will be randomly selected to present for no longer than 6 minutes. The maximum score for a presentation is 10 points.)
- Midterm: 20 points (the midterm will be held in class on October 21)
- Final Assessment: 30 points (maximum 10 points for presentation, maximum length is 10 minutes and 20 points for written assessment, no more than 15 pages)

**ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT:** Submitting plagiarized work to meet academic requirements including the representation of another's works or ideas as one's own; the unacknowledged work for work use and/or paraphrasing of another person's work; and/or the inappropriate unacknowledged use of another person's ideas; and/or the falsification, fabrication, or dishonesty in reporting research results shall be grounds for charges of academic misconduct.

**DISABILITY STATEMENT:** All students with disabilities who need accommodation should see Dr. Mattijs van Maasakkers privately to make arrangements.

## COURSE OVERVIEW

DATE	TOPIC	FOCUS
September 2	The Nature of Social Conflict <i>Negotiation Simulation #1: Appleton v. Baker</i>	Introduction
9	Principles of Conflict and Negotiation <i>Scenario A</i>	Negotiation Theory
16	Integrative Negotiation <i>Negotiation Simulation #2: Redstone</i>	
23	Conflict Framing <i>Scenario B</i>	Conflict Assessment
30	Stakeholder Analysis <i>Negotiation Simulation #3: Three-party Coalition</i>	
October 7	Coalition Analysis <i>Groups Assigned for Final Assessment</i>	
14	Multi-Party Disputes <i>Negotiation Simulation #4: Harborco</i>	
21	<b>Midterm</b>	Exam
28	Facilitation <i>Scenario C</i>	Conflict Resolution
November 4	Introduction to Mediation <i>Negotiation Simulation #5: Redstone</i>	
11	Mediation in Practice <i>Guest lecture</i>	
18	Identity- and Value-based Disputes <i>Negotiation Simulation #6: Springfield Outfest</i>	Identity and Social Conflict
25	Gender and Negotiation <i>Scenario D</i>	
December 2	Culture and Conflict Resolution <i>Scenario E</i>	
9	<b>Final Assessment Due at 2pm (1 hardcopy and online)</b>	Final Presentations

## COURSE READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS

All readings are either available through Carmen or on reserve in the Knowlton library. The following books are recommended for purchase. When deciding whether or not to purchase these, keep in mind that older editions of these texts can be used. Second-hand copies are easily and cheaply found online.

- Lewicki, L., Barry, B. and Saunders, D. *Essentials of Negotiation*. McGraw-Hill, London, UK.
- Fisher, R. and Ury, W. *Getting to Yes. Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. Random House, New York, NY.
- Susskind, L. and J. Cuikshank, *Breaking the Impasse: Consensual Approaches to Resolving Public Disputes*. Basic Books.

Also on reserve at the Knowlton library (but not recommended for purchase) are:

- Susskind, L. and J. Cruikshank, *Breaking Robert's Rules: The New Way to Run Your Meeting, Build Consensus and Get Results*. Oxford University Press. 2006.
- Forester, J. *Dealing with Difference: Dramas of Mediating Public Disputes*. Oxford University Press. 2009.
- Avruch, K. *Culture and Conflict Resolution*. United States Institute of Peace Press. 2006.

The students are required to attend all class-sessions; complete the required readings listed below and be able to discuss them in class. In addition, every student is required to produce 7 written assignments (six reflection memos and the final assessment) and at least one presentation. The written assignments should be double-spaced, 12 point font. The due dates are noted on the syllabus. Unless otherwise noted, written assignments are due at the beginning of class and one point will be deducted for each day a paper is late. Papers more than a week late will not be accepted. Students will be graded on both intellectual content and clarity of writing. The presentation will be based on a scenario, available on Carmen at least one week in advance. Students will be selected at random, at the beginning of class, to present on that week's scenario. The presentation can be no longer than 6 minutes, and while students are allowed to use visual aides like handouts or slides, this is not required. These presentations will be evaluated based on clarity of argument, appropriate use of required readings and overall style.

### **Mud Cards:**

At the end of each class, 3x5 cards will be handed out to all students in the class, so they can write down what the "muddiest" part of that day's class was. This can be a conceptual problem, a practical issue, or a request for additional readings on a particular topic or conflict. After each class, these cards will be collected. If there are questions that can be answered briefly in writing, I will do so via the class website. Alternatively, or if a large part of the class brings up a very similar question, I will devote some time in the next session to the question. These "Mud Cards" can be filled out anonymously, and do not count towards a grade. If nothing is unclear, a student does not have to fill out a mud card.

## SCHEDULE OF READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS

<b>September 2</b>	The Nature of Social Conflict	<p>Carpenter and Kennedy (1991) <i>Managing Public Disputes</i>, Chapter 1: Understanding Public Disputes: The Spiral of Unmanaged Conflict. p. 3-17</p> <p>Susskind and Cruikshank (1987) <i>Breaking the Impasse: Consensual Approaches to Resolving Public Disputes</i>. Ch1: Introduction, Ch. 2: Theory and Practice of Dispute Resolution and Ch. 3: Sources of Difficulty, p. 3-79</p>
<b>9</b>	Principles of Conflict and Negotiation  <b>Due: Reflection Memo #1</b>	<p>Lewicki et al. (2007) <i>Essentials of Negotiation</i>, Ch. 1: The Nature of Negotiation and Ch. 2: Strategy and Tactics of Distributive Bargaining, p. 1-55</p> <p>Bazerman and Neale (1994) <i>Negotiating Rationally</i>, Chapters 1-4, p. 1-30</p>
<b>16</b>	Integrative Negotiation	<p>Lewicki et al. (2007) <i>Essentials of Negotiation</i>, Chapter 3: Strategy and Tactics of Integrative Negotiation. p. 58-82</p> <p>Fisher and Ury (1981) <i>Getting to Yes</i>, Chapters 1-5. p. 3-98</p>
<b>23</b>	Conflict Framing  <b>Due: Reflection Memo #2</b>	<p>Tversky and Kahneman (1981) The Framing of Decisions and the Psychology of Choice, <b>Science</b>, p. 453-458</p> <p>Bazerman and Neale (1994) <i>Negotiating Rationally</i>, Ch. 5: Framing Negotiations, p. 31-41.</p> <p>Davis and Lewicki (2003) Environmental Conflict Resolution: Framing and Intractability -- An Introduction, <b>Environmental Practice</b>, p. 200-206</p> <p>Maiese (2004) <i>Interests, Rights, Power and Needs Frames</i> from: <a href="http://www.beyondintractability.org">www.beyondintractability.org</a></p>
<b>30</b>	Stakeholder Analysis	<p>Susskind and Thomas-Larmer (1999) <i>The Consensus Building Handbook</i>, Ch. 2: Conducting a Conflict Assessment, p. 99-136</p> <p><i>Skim:</i> Rockloff and Lockie (2004) Participatory tools for coastal zone management: Use of stakeholder analysis and social mapping in Australia, <b>Journal of Coastal Conservation</b>, p. 81-92</p> <p><i>Skim:</i> Lindahl and Soderqvist (2004) Building a catchment based environmental programme: a stakeholder analysis of wetland creation in Scania, Sweden, <b>Regional Environmental Change</b>, p. 1-25</p> <p><i>Skim:</i> Snow (2001) <i>Across the Great Divide: Explorations In Collaborative Conservation And the American West</i>, Ch. 1: Coming Home: An Introduction to Collaborative Conservation, p. 1-12</p>
<b>October 7</b>	Coalition Analysis  <b>Due: Reflection Memo #3</b>	<p>Raiffa (1982) <i>The Art and Science of Negotiation</i> Ch. 17 Coalition Analysis. P. 257-274</p> <p>Zeckhauser, Keeney and Sebenius (1996) <i>Wise Choices: Decisions, Games and Negotiations</i>, Sebenius Ch. 18 Sequencing to Build Coalitions: With whom should I talk first? p. 324-348</p>

14	Multi-Party Disputes	Burningham (2010) Using the Language of NIMBY: A topic for research, not an activity for researchers, in: <b>Local Environment</b> p. 55-67  Godschalk (1992) Negotiating Intergovernmental Development Policy Conflicts, in: <b>JAPA</b> p. 368-384 Spain (1993) Been-Heres Versus Come-Heres, in: <b>JAPA</b> p. 156-172
21	Midterm Exam	<i>All readings, lectures and materials covered</i>
28	Facilitation  <b>Due: Reflection Memo #4</b>	Schwarz (1994) <i>The Skilled Facilitator: Practical Wisdom for Developing Effective Groups</i> , Ch. 1: Group Facilitation and the Role of the Facilitator and Ch. 2: What Makes Work Groups Effective, p. 3-41  Susskind and Cruikshank (2006) <i>Breaking Robert's Rules</i> Ch. 5 The Importance of Facilitation, p. 83-100 and Appendix C: Being a Good Facilitator.
November 4	Introduction to Mediation	Lewicki (2007) <i>Essentials of Negotiation</i> , Ch. 10: Multiple Parties and Teams, p. 208-228  Susskind and Ozawa (1984) Mediated Negotiation in the Public Sector: The Planner as Mediator, <b>JPER</b> p. 5-15.  Cobb (1993) Empowerment and Mediation: A Narrative Perspective, in: <b>Negotiation Journal</b> , p. 245-259
11	Mediation in Practice  <b>Due: Reflection Memo #5</b>	Moore (1986) <i>How Mediation Works</i> . Ch. 1 The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict. p. 13-43  Amy (1987) <i>The Politics of Environmental Mediation</i> Ch. 5 Mediation and Inequalities of Power and Ch. 6 Distorting the Nature of Environmental Conflict, p. 129-198
18	Identity and Value-based Disputes	Rothman (1997) <i>Resolving Identity-Based Conflicts in Nations, Organizations and Communities</i> , Chapter 1: The ARIA Framework p.5-20.  Rothman (2006) Identity and Conflict: Collaboratively Addressing Police-Community Conflict in Cincinnati, Ohio, in: <b>Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution</b> 22, p. 105-132  Wondolleck, Gray, and Bryan (2003) Us versus Them: how identities and characterizations influence conflict <b>Environmental Practice</b> , Pp. 207-213.  Forester (2009) <i>Dealing with Differences: Dramas of Mediating Public Disputes</i> Ch. 4 Dealing with Deep Value Differences in Participatory Processes and Ch. 5 Practical Consensus Building in the Face of Deep Value Differences: Negotiating HIV/AIDS Prevention, p. 77-110
25	Gender and Negotiation  <b>Due: Reflection Memo #6</b>	Kolb (2009) Too Bad for the Women or Does it Have to Be: Gender and Negotiation Research over the Past Twenty-Five Years, in: <b>Negotiation Journal</b> p. 515-531  Kolb (2004) Staying in the Game or Changing It: An Analysis of Moves and Turns in Negotiation, <b>Negotiation Journal</b> , p. 253-268  Bowles and Babcock (2005) Constraints and Triggers: Situational Mechanics of Gender in Negotiation, in: <b>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</b> , p. 951-965

<p><b>December 2</b></p>	<p>Culture and Conflict Resolution</p>	<p>Avruch (1998) <i>Culture and Conflict Resolution</i>. Part 3: Frames for Culture and Conflict Resolution and Part 4: Discourses of Culture in Conflict Resolution, p. 57-108</p> <p>Movius et al. (2006) Tailoring the Mutual Gains Approach for Negotiations in Japan, China and South Korea, in: <b>Negotiation Journal</b>, p. 389-435</p>
<p><b>9</b></p>	<p>Final Presentations</p> <p><b>Due: Final Assessments</b></p>	<p>Present the stakeholder assessment, including the key stakeholders, their interests and the issues. Visual aides (like slides or handouts) are strongly encouraged.</p>