

Understanding, Modeling & Evaluating Conflict Resolution Techniques¹

Norman Frohlich

I. H. Asper School of Business

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2

(204) 474 - 6385; e-mail: norman_frohlich@umanitoba.ca

Edy Kaufman

Truman Institute

Hebrew University

Jerusalem, Israel

972 288 2327; e-mail: msek@msec.huji.ac.il

&

Joe Oppenheimer

Department of Government & Politics

University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742

(301) 405 - 4136; e-mail: joppenheimer@gvpt.umd.edu

Victor Assal

Although for a time, perhaps centered in the 1960's, techniques and theories of conflict resolution were deeply rooted in economics and game theory, time has led to a peaceful separation of the parties. The near absence of theoretical attention at this level over the last 20 years, has occurred while both the use of, and the practical payoffs from, the techniques of conflict resolution have increased. The purposes of this paper are both to renew the theoretical dialogue by focusing in on the operational structure of a 'typical' "Track II Diplomacy" mode of collaborative problem solving to develop an understanding by modeling its basic workings and to propose a more rigorous evaluative technique for measuring its success. In this article we do not take as yet the next step: the actual testing of process evaluation, nor to develop a 'single model' via which all the pieces can be understood – as in the form of a complex multi - stage non-cooperative game. Our main aim, at this stage is to generate a discussion about the benefits of such approach about the benefits of this approach and appropriate ways to further explore it. We will attempt to show that some insight may be gained from an evaluation and a possibly subsequent modeling exercise.

JEL Classification:

Keywords: Conflict-resolution modeling evaluation

Table of Contents

Introduction

Why a Pluralistic Analysis is Needed

Developing an Evaluation Tool

A Discussion of the Methods

Evaluating the Essential Ingredients of a Conflict Resolution Intervention

Stage 1: Setting up the Process

Stage 2: Experiential learning of conflict transformation

Stage 3: Framing and re-framing the Partners own conflict in search of common ground

Stage 4: Postscripts Preparation for re-entry

Concluding remark (*Joe, Norm, Vic, do we need this, I would think so, I could try one to include summing up main points, overall conclusion, suggesting avenues for further research*)

List of Figures and Tables

Understanding, Modeling & Evaluating Conflict Resolution Techniques

By Norman Frohlich, Edy Kaufman and Joe Oppenheimer

Introduction

This paper focuses on developing an evaluative technique for Track II Diplomacy collaborative problem solving and will try to sketch a theoretical understanding of such processes.

Around the 1960's, techniques and theories of conflict resolution were deeply rooted in economics and game theory, but time has led to a peaceful separation of the parties.¹ This is somewhat unfortunate since the divorce has meant that there has been little attention paid to understanding the theoretical² underpinnings of the techniques, why they work, or how they might be improved.

Several factors generated this gap. Firstly, the inability of theoreticians to manipulate the political decision-makers has meant that the scholars were often reduced ex-post facto testing of reported behavior or they modeled the state as a unitary actor. This led to other ways of studying the problems of conflict resolution.³ 'Track I' negotiations continued to a large extent to be driven by the traditional rules of the game, since diplomats and politicians reluctant to experiment with new techniques of conflict resolution. However, in the last decades, and particularly in the post-Cold War Era, a "citizens' diplomacy" has emerged.⁴ On the one hand, we find that most conflicts are currently of "nations versus states," namely intra-state when one of the parties to the dispute is not a state actor. Furthermore, the citizens' concern has raised given that the number of non-military casualties of violent conflict has increased from 5% in

1/ One can note the time honored place of the Journal of Conflict Resolution as the child of the earlier marriage. But the field of economics and game theory had a number of partners in this work, from Nash to Boulding.

2/ The word 'theory' is being used as "a set of interrelated constructs (concepts), definitions and propositions that presents a systematic view of phenomena by specifying relations among variables, with the purpose of explaining and predicting the phenomena (Kerlinger, 1972, p. 11).

³ We are using generically the term "conflict resolution" to determine the overall area in which alternatives to the "power politics" or "litigation" approach have developed. The particular Track II techniques to be discussed are focusing on the more defined area of "conflict transformation" which aims at affecting a lasting attitudinal change of the parties to the conflict, to assist in problem solving at present and future circumstances.

4/ This wave was preceded by a US/USSR Track II of scientists and experts that were able to function as an "epistemic community" (Adler, 1993)

World War I to 50% in World War II to a soaring figure of 80% in the 1990's⁵ With globalization and instant communication the exploration of new ways of reaching consensus between the parties to a conflict through Track II involving "influentials" and other groups has substantially grown. These exercises open the possibility of collecting observations and formulating 'low-level' contextually based hypothesis to be tested with experimentation. Although a literature mostly based in political and social psychology emerged, but was not were rarely tied to formal theoretical understanding.

While much of the literature dealing with second track diplomacy is phrased in the language of practical application, there are several theoretical assumptions that, whether explicit or implicit, many of the authors share. The prescriptive recommendation to apply the second track workshop approach stems from an understanding of conflict that looks beyond interests and material resources to find some of the strongest and virulent causes of conflict. As defined by Azar these deeper roots can be defined as basic human needs which cannot be bargained away but need to be met in some fashion if the conflict they generate are to be solved in any long lasting fashion. " We assume that individuals strive to fill their developmental human needs through the formation of identity groups. The most basic needs are individual and communal physical survival and well being. In the world of physical scarcity, these basic needs are seldom evenly or justly met (Azar 1990, 7). " The desire to achieve these basic human needs finds expression in the creation of communal identities that often serve as foci for the protracted conflicts that are created when needs are not met. Rothman identifies the recognition and legitimization of these communal identities as the main stake in protracted conflict and the main area where second track diplomacy can make a substantive difference. Because they are based on fundamental needs conflicts based on communal identities are often intense destructive and the sides tend to be intransigent when it comes to recognizing the other sides rights and viewpoints. (Rothman 1997)

Rothman and Montville point out that identity conflict is made more complicated because basic human needs include needs that go beyond the material to the psychological. Simply dividing a particular resource cannot solve a protracted conflict founded in clashing identities or establishing a certain border because, unless psychological and cultural needs are addressed as well, the root causes of the conflict will not have been completely addressed. (Rothman 1997, Montville 1993) Lederach feels that conflict is created in the quest for shared meaning and can be resolved when a new and mutually beneficial shared meaning is created. (Lederach 1996) Both Lederach and Montville stress the need to focus on achieving justice to find a long-term solution to protracted conflict. (Lederach 1996, Montville 1993) Montville argues that the process must also include a component of apology and healing for the wounds inflicted upon each other. (Montville 1993)

The track two workshop approach is designed to make these conflicts more tractable by moving the parties into productive dialogue with each other. Since conflict is a learned behavior, it can be modified through learning and experience that will allow such productive behavior

⁵ SIPRI Yearbook 1997, as mentioned in International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, Unadbook Series 3 (Stockholm, International IDEA, 1998) pg.14

(Azar 1990). The key to resolution needs to be found in facilitated face to face interaction where the sides can build up an understanding of each others position and the tools and desire to develop a mixed sum solution to the problem that faces them (Fisher in Davies and Kaufman Manuscript). The unofficial contacts that take place in conflict resolution workshops are supposed to help modify this behavior by improving communication and understanding and lowering anger and fear by humanizing the other side (Diamond and Macdonald 1996).

The most developed theoretical explanation of how conflict resolution workshops change the perceptions (and hopefully the actions) of parties in conflict is found in Rothman's book *Resolving Identity-Based Conflict* (1997). Conflict resolution workshops achieve results that regular negotiation does not because, instead of focusing on dividing the pie, the workshops are designed to change how the sides think about and deal with each other. Creating a realization that the two sides are interdependent in their search to meet their basic human needs for security and legitimization brings about this change. According to Rothman, second track diplomacy workshops work because the facilitator/s help move the participants to a clearer view of their own positions and needs, the other sides positions and needs and the realization that the needs may be met by an agreement reached in consensus. Besides creating an atmosphere and a space where the sides can feel safe to interact and express themselves, the facilitators also provide training and a framework where the parties to the conflict are encouraged to think differently and creatively about the conflict that binds them. The adversarial phase Rothman advocates is supposed to clarify the conflict for both sides and point out the futility of continued unilateral approaches. The reflexive phase conducted in small groups after training in reflexive articulation is designed to build empathy and understanding across the conflict line. After problem solving training, the inventing phase allows them to explore a consensual problem solving method that illustrates the possibility of mixed sum solutions that meet the needs if not the positions of both sides (Rothman 1997).

In order to build a bridge between theory and practice and in order to construct a more formal theory of second track diplomacy evaluation of workshops is key. "Action-research" is well suited to combine simultaneous evaluation and intervention throughout the workshop and enables the researcher to correct and advise the facilitator as well as sharing the findings with the participants during the process itself. Despite this, many facilitators that have conducted workshops have been more interested in ~~short term~~ concrete results with the participants than with making a contribution to enrich the scientific research⁶ in the field of conflict resolution. It has become something of a cottage industry and practitioners were only rarely open to sharing their methods and skills with other potential "competitors." Most of the conflict resolution 'shops' use proprietary techniques, and are loath to share them for fear that common knowledge will increase their competition and decrease their market value. Hence, until recently and with the exceptions noted below, no attempt to develop standard evaluative tools has taken place, (*v-I am in the process of getting the new rothman and saunders book which should address this*

6/ Scientific research as systematic, controlled, empirical and critical investigation of hypothetical propositions about the presumed relations among natural phenomena (Kerlinger, F.N, op.cit, pg 13) as developed by Dewey, J, *How We Think*, 1922, p. 106-118H.

the parties. Then one might say that 'preferences haven't changed' but rather their projection into the outcome space is altered by the new information. But this approach may 'save the hypothesis' of stable preferences only by making it substantially less falsifiable. At the same, the zero-sum finite nature of the scarcity of water as a common pool resource can be transformed into a win-win by agreeing to include sea-water desalinization and setting a joint mechanism to deal with the new subject of contention, now transformed to the issue of pricing and profit-sharing.

The goal of changing individual's preferences is in contrast to the premise held in economics and game theory that individuals have fixed and unique preferences which motivate their choices (Mueller, 1989; Arrow, 1963; Sen 1970). The problem with the economic view is that it is one-dimensional. Psychologists have shown that individuals have a far more complex preference structures which are subject to a variety of 'framing' and other effects (see Frohlich and Oppenheimer, 2000; Kahneman and Tversky, 1979; Rabin, 1998; Quattrone and Tversky, 1988; Grether and Plott, 1979; Simon, 1986; Tversky and Kahneman, 1986; as well as Shafir and Tversky, 1994). As all spin doctors, advertising agency executives and facilitators will agree, the setting of the frame for a decision can make a great deal of difference. With the goal of re-framing the participants' preferences, Track II facilitators hope that the conflict's resolution can be facilitated by "expanding the cake" before cutting it¹⁰ (Fisher and Ury, *Getting to Yes*). Or, by disaggregating the overall preference into smaller packages revealing that both sides preferences on each of them are different, and that the overall summation does not necessarily amount to the previously expected "zero-sum total"¹¹. The point here is that there are two processes, one which introduces introspection into the real needs behind the established position (realizing that there are also non-tangible/psychological aspects to conflict that help determine behavior); and one that builds on the possibility that the tangible asset at stake can be enlarged by introducing added values, such as a foreign aid incentives for successful completion of a treaty.

The strong possibility of multiple preferences means that one might be able to elicit some preferences which may be better, both practically and normatively, for the purposes of managing the conflict. One such set of preferences may be evoked when individuals adopt a "moral point of view": preferences which are based on a consideration of more universal consequences rather than only the consequences for one's self. Such a view has been strongly related to concepts of legitimacy by numerous philosophers (see especially Baier, 1981 and Frankena, 1983; but also note the related perspectives of Buchanan, et.al. 1999; Habermas, 1996; Nagel, 1991; or Nozick, 1981; finally, the reader may be interested in Frohlich and Oppenheimer, 2000b). These universalistic concerns are often seen as desirable properties of any political settlement. As will be seen in the analysis of the techniques themselves, conflict resolution facilitators often try to construct a part of the framing of the conflict which encourages impartial reasoning, and

¹⁰ Roger Fisher and William Ury (1991), *Getting to Yes*, Penguin Books, New York and (*Coexistence Handbook*

¹¹ To use again the river dispute example, when asked "why do we need the river" we may find that the needs of the parties are different (individual consumption, irrigation, environmental preservation, fishing, navigation, tourist attraction, religious symbolism, etc.), and the preferences given to each vary in a high degree from one to the other.

measuring its success. At this stage rather than taking the next steps of developing and applying a 'single model', we suggest to confine ourselves to generate a more structured discussion via which all the pieces can be better understood.⁹ On the other hand, we do attempt to show that some insight is possible into how these techniques can be understood in the light of a number of the current theoretical structures in micro-economics and cognitive psychology. Re-establishing this connection could energize the theoretical field as well as provide practitioners with a more systematic framework to point out loopholes and inconsistencies, and highlighting better organizing principles to help in their search for common ground. These links may provide suggestions for how the techniques can be brought into play both more transparently more effectively, highlighting inconsistencies and loopholes.

Why a Pluralistic Analysis is Needed

The interactions inherent in a protracted and deep-rooted identity driven conflict dispute are complex, indeed. While simple and elegant models may be possible, with our current knowledge we do not aspire to a swift cutting of the Gordian knot and the presentation of a parsimonious and simple model. Beyond the apparent complexity of the problem, there are a few reasons why the analysis we propose will be multidimensional (and interdisciplinary), even pluralistic. First, an analysis would likely utilize some of the insights and techniques of micro-economics and game theory. Yet many of the techniques used in conflict resolution workshops challenge the foundational assumptions of these disciplines. This tension is supported by new findings in cognitive psychology -such as the variability of preference under framing and reframing- which also call into question some of those fundamental behavioral assumptions. Since we would recommend an integration of these two separate perspectives, our analysis would be neither theoretically homogeneous, nor 'straight-forward.' Finally, most conflict resolution techniques try to get participants of each side to understand and place new value on the points of view of their opposite numbers. Those activities would seem to depend on the mutability of preferences and, so, go beyond the traditional concerns of economics. To be more specific about the need for a theoretical heterogeneity on these points: they stem from the very goals of conflict transformation processes which attempt both to change individuals' preferences and to encourage solutions that are moving away from zero-sum outcomes to 'win-win alternatives.' . Thus, for example, two sides may have a water dispute, and think only about the division of water rights. They may express strong preferences over the options on the table. They may even escalate up to 'going to war' over disputes over the outcomes. But the parties to the conflict can come to think about the water dispute in terms of their overall welfare, the welfare of their progeny, etc. This may lead them to see new avenues of cooperation, and new options. It can lead to different preferences over the outcomes. Of course, such a changing of preferences can be framed as a problem of information. New information can be given which causes one to reconsider one's preferences over the outcomes in a game. In game theory terms the new information 'updates' the estimations regarding the likely consequences of choices by

9/ Our suggestion would be that such a model would take the form of an explicit complex multi - stage non-cooperative game.

consideration of the above mentioned moral point of view. Often equated with “enlightened self-interest”¹², (joe/norm: *I hope that you agree with the use of the term as explained in the footnote. I fear that leaving it only as a “morally inspired choice can put off some of the pragmatist, when we have already a hard time in trying to show the real-politik nature of IPSW participants are then more likely to make decisions favoring ‘morally privileged’ outcomes.*

What are the specific theoretical structures and arguments from economics that we would use in our analysis of a typical conflict resolution mechanism? We would rely on the traditional assumption that individuals are sensitive to the costs and benefits associated with alternatives and attempt to choose the alternative that maximizes the net benefit. All decisions must be made in a structured environment. Individuals (implicitly) rely on decision structures that resemble the formal structures of extensive form games to try to cast light on the decision processes. Individuals are cognizant of collective action problems. The economic analysis of public goods problems, including free-rider effects would also, therefore, play a role in the analysis

But we would not be orthodox in our assumptions about the structure of individual preferences which underlies the specification of costs and benefits. As noted above, we believe that the preferences are not as fixed as economists would have us believe. Framing and other effects can lead subjects to change their choices and decisions. Moreover, unlike traditional economists, we believe that empathy is possible. We do not construe preferences as being strictly self-interested, unless we include in the term the psychological preference of avoiding cognitive dissonance, an understanding of the social costs of pathologic and anomic behavior, and other non-tangible needs.

In addition, the results from both the theoretical and experimental philosophical literature are relevant. Impartial reasoning has a long pedigree in philosophy as a means of identifying fair outcomes. We assess the role such reasoning plays in conflict resolution mechanisms. We also use findings on the sensitivity of subjects to distributive justice questions when confronted from an impartial point of view. In particular, we identify the importance and legitimacy attached to what John Rawl (1971) referred to as “primary goods” and fundamental rights, often related in the conflict resolution literature as “human needs”¹³.

This diverse set of theoretical bits hopefully should help to explain our choice of the term “pluralistic” to describe our analysis, and we can now move into its instrumentalization.

Developing an Evaluation Tool

¹² “the “upper-dog” takes into account the volatile nature of states coalition can eventually find him in the future on a weaker standing, or that the military superiority does not necessarily determines outcomes of confrontation with a civilian-based revolt. Or, that the ability to ensure national security in the countries’ borders does not necessarily preclude the threats to personal security by minority-inspired terrorism, a serious handicap for governance in democratic states.

¹³ See the compilation of Edward Azar’s writings in J.Davies and E. Kaufman (eds.) “Track II Diplomacy and Conflict Transformation” (forthcoming)

In evaluating any process one must consider the degree to which it achieves its goals, and the efficiency of the process.¹⁴ Zartman suggests that the first element that needs to be analyzed in conflict resolution workshops is the "extent to which they contributed to a change of attitudes among the participants themselves ..." (2000). Any evaluation tool needs to evaluate something in comparison with something else. Broadly speaking, there are only two possibilities: First, one can do the comparison using a 'theoretical benchmark' and second, it can be done in comparison with a control group. The first option can be analyzed, as suggested by Rouhana¹⁵ through set short term micro-objectives (i.e.: personal transformation, intra-group and inter-group cooperation) as well as longer-term macro-goals (i.e.: generation of policy-relevant solutions, multiplying effect within both parties civil societies, affecting public opinion through mass media and direct grass-root activity). We incorporate the notion of a control group in the technique, with an in-depth checking of preferences, attitudes, and perspectives of the individuals participating in the two distinct processes: one in workshops with a collaborative problem solving type of intervention and the second through normal chairing of a discussion group framework. Given that all of the micro goals operate on the level of the participants themselves, it is necessary to measure the participants' attitudes and orientations as they proceed through the conflict resolution process. The most straight forward of all measuring devices for such situations are surveys: asking the participants themselves. But there are limitations to such techniques.

A Discussion of the Methods

We propose that the goals and essential elements of the conflict resolution process be identified and that iterative measures of these be taken via survey in an actual workshop. For illustrative processes, we outline how this might be carried out with the "Partners in Conflict" model (referring to participants selected from contending parties while owing a shared professional, gender, age, locality, or other attribute across the divide), as developed by Kaufman in the "Innovative Problem Solving Workshop" (IPSW)¹⁶. Two groups of participants: randomly assigned into control and treatment groups would constitute the basis of the study.

Control group: In the case of conflict resolution processes, a control group would be made up of individuals who are of similar background, etc. to the participants in the collaborative problem solving process. To be a control, they need to be put in what we might think of as a placebo condition: one which mirrors their participation in a process, but does not subject the individuals to the specific procedures. This would enable us to examine whether the changes in the IPSW group is a result of the conflict resolution process used by the facilitators or is a byproduct of simple consistent human contact in a neutral area. In addition the survey

14/ In some cases one also must worry about the side-effects of the process. Typically, this is a major concern in medical interventions. Before one can test for such side-effects, one must know what one is looking for. Since there is no literature pointing to negative side-effects, in the examining of conflict resolution processes we will assume that negative side-effects are not a problem.

¹⁵ Rouhana,

¹⁶ E.Kaufman: "Innovative Problem Solving Workshops" in J.Davies and E.Kaufman (eds.), op.cit. pp ?

instruments used at the beginning and end of the process should be administered to a third group surveyed at the beginning and end of the same week long period to see if the changes observed in either of the control groups is simply a byproduct of the current events of the week. This is especially important given the often volatile nature of events in areas of protracted social conflict.

Validity Concerns: A second major concern in the evaluative process are the limitations of survey techniques. Specifically, the sponsors of the conflict resolution process have at least two very salient aspects to their relations with the participants: First, the participants know the values and preferences of the sponsors of the conflict resolution program. Second, they have sponsored the event, and as will be clear, this is often a very pleasant 'junket' type experience: one the participants will not want to jeopardize by responding in a manner which alienates the sponsor.¹⁷ Thirdly, introduction of surveys into an ongoing process may be reactive: it may affect the process it is trying to measure. While noting these possible limitations, we believe that careful design and implementation may be able to limit these effects, but in any event, there is a need to evaluate the techniques, and the problems come with the territory.

Evaluating the Essential Ingredients of a Conflict Resolution Intervention

To understand conflict resolution one must first have a clear understanding of what constitutes an identity-driven conflict.¹⁸ For our purposes we will define a conflict as a situation involving two or more parties who have been engaged with one another over time and who at least one of them finds the status quo of their relationship unacceptable. As often shown in pass behavior, each party has potential and credible action which could harm the other, and there is no agreement on which can improve their joint and separate situations. While those are the dry and bare bones of a definition, many more vivid and human attributes attach to situations with these characteristics. Individuals in conflict have feelings of hate, fear, mistrust, and desire for revenge, all of which tend to obstruct the possibility of reaching any amicable accord to resolve the conflict. It is in this sort of charged atmosphere that conflict resolution is often attempted. Indeed, in the situations which conflict resolution is introduced some level of violence is often ongoing.

In addition to the evaluation of components of the process that will be discussed below, we suggest the use of a computerized survey to see if the goal of conflict resolution workshops, changing the views of the participants about the other side and the conflict itself, has been achieved. The survey would be framed as a preparation for a negotiation on the topic to be discussed in the workshop and would ask the participants to value the issues involved on a numerical scale which would allow them to set BATNAs on specific issues and compare

¹⁷ Note that the control group will have less incentive to respond in a manner mirroring the values of the sponsors. This is in part because the control group will be in a procedure which will be less obvious in its goals.

¹⁸ "When people's essential identities, as expressed and maintained by their primary group affiliations, are threatened or frustrated, intransigent conflict almost inevitably follows", Rothman, Jay, Resolving Identity-Based Conflict (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997), pg. 5

3 surter
3 objects
3 low
3 per
2
internal
external

prioritize their interests. They would be asked to do the same for the other side as well in a playacting role. This survey would be conducted both before and immediately after the workshop and six months later. The underlying assumption is that those who participate in the workshop will show the greatest change towards a more win-win oriented valuation of the issues and possible outcomes as well as a change in the outcomes that they register as possibilities. In addition, if workshops have the effect expected, then the participants' valuation of the other side should be much closer to what participants on the other side actually register.

Any conflict resolution intervention involves a number of analytically distinct phases. We list these and identify how each might be evaluated for its contribution to achieving the goals of the process and hence its contribution to the potential success of the intervention.

1. *Setting up the process.* This concerns the selections of the facilitators, the site, the participants and the sponsors.

2. *Experiential learning of conflict transformation.* This involves warm up exercises and skills development.

3. *Re-Framing the "Partners' own conflict in search of common ground.* This involves airing adversarial attitudes, reflecting on the needs of the "Other" and creating new options, evaluating and classifying it as well as searching for consensus on preferred alternatives.

4. *Ending of the conflict resolution session* which involves the preparing of the participants for re-entry into the environment of conflict which is often hostile to the participants' personal transformation and shared outcomes.

Stage 1: Setting up the Process

The sponsors

Track II workshops do not, generally, self-organize. Someone must take an initiative to organize a session and someone must pay. Clearly, the identity of the sponsor is an important factor. To see this, consider the difference between a conflict resolution session over a long standing conflict such as the Northern Irish 'troubles' with Sarah Williams (an individual with no special status) and the U.S. State Department as possible sponsors. The latter would be taken far more seriously by potential participants. Higher status individuals would be likely to show up, while at the same time the official nature of the sponsor may deter the true opening up of the "Partners" to share concerns and invent solutions. The compromised positions which the participants would be willing to bring back to their communities would be altered (say because the weight of the sponsor would legitimate the compromises, etc.). In other words, the sponsor's identity helps to determine the cost and benefits of the procedure for the participants, and the community. Moreover, the nature of the sponsoring party can determine, to some extent, the

'attractiveness of the club' to which the individuals are invited. The sponsor can change the structure of costs and benefits by selecting an attractive location, offering to pay the individuals for their participation, etc.

One might get insight into the role played by the sponsor by including, in an evaluation, questions regarding the participants' attitudes towards the sponsor. Questions on trust, respect, perceived impartiality, power, etc. might be included.

The Facilitators

Collaborative problem solving facilitation, as compared with the better known mediator, is a less formal but more interactive level of intervention by a third party into a dyadic or multi-party conflict. As such, the facilitators are supplying a frame and an institutional setting within which the attitudinal conflict transformation of the "Partners" can be best achieved. Part of the difficulty inherent in an identity driven dispute is that each of the parties assigns unacceptably low valuations to the known courses of action which might ameliorate the condition of their opposite numbers. Moreover, there is likely to be a rigidity and mistrust which hampers the introduction of novel alternatives. Facilitators, to resolve the conflict, must either change the parties' valuations of known alternatives or facilitate the introduction of new parameters with acceptable perceived outcomes. Both tasks require that the facilitators' interventions be credible, and that requires a modicum of trust.¹⁹

Given our characterization of a conflict, it is essential that the facilitators be able to elicit the good will of the participants to open up to new experiences. In the absence of that their actions are not likely to be effective. Possible impediments are perceptions of bias and perceived lack of expertise (either substantive or methodological). Hence care must be taken that the facilitators be viewed in a positive light by the participants. An evaluation should ask participants, at the outset, and perhaps periodically, about their attitudes towards the facilitator(s). Relevant aspects to be evaluated are, as with the sponsor, trust, respect, perceived impartiality, power, expertise, and effectiveness.

The participants

Participants are selected not only because they are reliable representative of the disputants' positions. They are preferably "influentials" selected with an eye to communication both to the others in the process and to the communities (or the leaders of their communities) in the dispute. These Track II characteristics are necessary both for the process to proceed smoothly within the context of the intervention as well as to facilitate the credible diffusion of

19/ We will argue below that preferences are subject to framing effects. That implies that a variety of valuations may be placed on a given alternative depending on the way in which it is presented. Arguably, alternatives presented by credible, trusted individuals will have, *ceteris paribus*, higher valuations placed on them and contribute towards the re-framing of the issues at stake.

any agreement within the participants' home community. Hence, the participants from each side of the conflict must have both credibility within their community and the potential to trust their opposite numbers. In addition, they should also have personality attributes compatible with the nature of the exercise. The selection process recruits individuals who have information regarding the conflict, stature in their home community, and an expressed willingness to address the conflict with their opposite numbers. It would be useful for an initial evaluation to elicit participants self-perceptions regarding a number of these aspects: their stature in the home community, their initial trust level in their opposite numbers, as well as their perceptions of those same characteristics in their partners.

The facilitators are able to decide (to some degree) whether to choose as participants those more interested in a solution or more powerful as leaders of the involved communities; those more willing and able to discuss (see Habermas, 1996) or communicate together, or whether selection is to be based on other criteria. Clearly there is a trade-off between the wider scope of views in each camp, the attitudinal gap between the parties and the likelihood of finding common ground, But such selection criteria can be manipulated, not only on the individual level, but also for group dynamics, trying to maximize both the margin of intra and inter-group contention and the outcome expectations .

As already briefly mentioned, one unique attribute of the "Partners in Conflict" of this recruitment process is the attempt to select parties from each side who share some commonalties across the divide such as profession, age, gender, location etc. This can help the facilitator bridge the gaps between individual participants of contending groups. For instance, parties in a given profession (such as journalists, or physicians) are more likely to have some shared values and experiences which can be used as a basis for re-establishing some trust, along a dimension other than those of the explicit dispute between the parties. That may facilitate the exchange, particularly at the early stages.

The process of conflict transformation requires, as intermediary steps that certain personal dispositions and attitudes of the participants change. In addition to inculcating more trust, the process is designed to induce participants to become more willing to work and cooperate, more prone to empathize with their partner, more trusting in their partner's attitude towards themselves, and more willing to examine new possible solutions, Effective tools to test for the effects of various components of the process, these characteristics should be monitored, both initially and throughout the process can be developed. Participants expectations, of possible success (or failure) are also likely to affect some of these variables, and so it too should be monitored periodically.

The site

Where the intervention takes place is important in at least two senses. After all, one of the most important things supplied by the conflict resolution intervention is the institution of the meeting of the disputants. Conflicts are often accompanied by a breakdown in communication either explicit, by the overt lack of communication, or implicit, by the reduction of exchanges to

the re-statement of pat, unacceptable and inflexible positions. Of course, without the proper setting, there is no reason to believe that any change would occur in the conflict by giving the parties yet one more forum to hear each other's propagandistic denouncements.²⁰

In contrast to the every day continuation of politics as usual, a facilitated peace seeking environment supplies an institutional forum for the solving of the conflict (or at least a part of it).²¹ As such, the facilitator is supplying a public good which the parties may not have been able to provide for themselves:²² it is available for the use of all who are invited (i.e. the club members) to help the problem move to a different stage. This both decreases the costs of helping to solve the problem and increases the efficacy of any action an individual takes to help solve the problem. As such, the facilitators have taken an implicit step to gain the trust of the parties. The mere effort involved in organizing a facilitation is, ipso facto, a demonstration of good faith (or can be viewed as such by the parties).²³ The forum gives the individuals an opportunity to make a contribution toward the public good of solving the conflict.

Typically, the setting for the conflict resolution exercise is an attractive, safe, and neutral spot. It cannot be overemphasized, that it is usually an extremely high cost, and often risky, enterprise for members of one side of a conflict to attempt to organize a forum for discussion of the dispute by themselves. Even in a facilitated and sponsored environment safety usually implies confidentiality, and perhaps even secrecy. But of course, there can be difficulties in insuring confidentiality after individuals return to their home context.²⁴ Nevertheless, questions about perceived risk involved in participating, the safety at the site, the extent to which confidentiality is assured, and the conduciveness of the site to the task should also be included.

Stage 2: Experiential learning of conflict transformation

20/ Putting it this way makes one realize that there are both 'timing issues', and 'sponsoring issues' involved in when conflict resolution is likely to be useful. Some would say that parties have 'something to gain' from violent conflict at its outbreak. (See Bueno de Mesquita, 1981.) Only after the costs are fully appreciated by all is intervention of any sort given a chance to succeed. We will, however, not deal with the timing issue here. Sponsoring issues are another matter, which are important to consider (see above, page 3).

21/ Of course, the conflict resolution exercise may be only to establish the possibility of a settlement as in second track efforts.

22/ Or at least a club good: a public good supplied to a closed group of individuals, members of the club. (See Buchanan, 1965, and Sandler and Tschirhart, 1980.

23/ It is, of course, always possible for the parties to view themselves as the targets of manipulation, and hence to mistrust the intentions of the facilitators. From that perspective, the provision of the locus would not be viewed as a boon - but a trap. This underlines the importance attached to the appropriate selection of the facilitators.

24/ Obviously, this shows exactly why selection of the participants needs to be carefully thought about.

All conflict resolution techniques utilize an introduction, which includes a series of 'warm up exercises.' The details of both the warm up exercises (and the methods of the subsequent conflict resolution stages) vary from shop to shop, and it is precisely these details which are at the heart of what facilitators often choose to keep proprietary) are following the already mentioned IPSW model. We are mentioning here only some of the exercises to provide a general picture.

Warm up Exercises

Trust building

One of the questions, which stands out is the function of warm-up exercises. How and why do they work? After all, if the facilitators have done a good job of selecting participants, we might think that facilitation should be quite easy, and should move directly to addressing the conflict. Even if all the participants are keen to resolve their conflict, many difficulties remain. One of the difficulties is that, due to mistrust, they each may see their opposite numbers as intransigent, uncooperative and untrustworthy. They each are likely to hear the others launch into propaganda-like characterizations and to resort to stereo - typed responses. The first exercises try to address these expectation head on.

One of the primary functions of the warm-up exercises (sometimes referred to as ice breakers) is for the participants to get to know each other as individuals, establishing a mode of informality and exploration of new personal and often shared dimensions. Even more difficult is the task of breaking down the expectations of prejudice. As we saw above, the selection process, is designed to highlight the fact that there are many common attributes among participants while not necessary negating the importance of their differences. The exercises are designed to communicate and reinforce these commonalties. Identifying commonalities is a way of allaying suspicion, building a base for identification and breaking down stereotypes. It opens participants to future communications inasmuch as it allows them to see the others not simply as representatives of a hostile party-line, but as real individuals with shared characteristics, among, them, possibly, shared values. This also helps build the empathic base upon which one might be able to develop the reasoning, which is important in later stages of the process.

At the end of the day in which the icebreakers are conducted, questions paralleling those initially asked regarding trust, affect towards their opposite numbers, perceptions the others' attitudes towards themselves, their sense of commonalities, and their perceived expectations regarding success should be put to the participants.

Skills development

Participants are assumed to be interested in resolving the conflict but are also presumed to be relatively unacquainted with a variety of conflict resolution methods. Hence, it will be important to systematically put forward the ground-rules to be followed by all during the workshop. Moving ahead, the tasks of the sessions at this stage is to orient the participants firmly

in the direction of conflict transformation and to provide them with skills with which to address their conflict.

The initial presentation of the program is a way of framing the task facing participants so that they are more open to receiving and using new techniques. Since participants are likely to be somewhat skeptical about the ultimate success of the sessions, facilitators begin by lowering the bar. Initial emphasis is not on solving the conflict but on developing personal skills, gaining experience, all of which is to be conducted in a learning environment. This is important as a way of reducing anxiety, and opening participants up to new ideas. It also decouples the techniques from the substantive issues. Emphasis is placed on the notion that the techniques of conflict resolution must be mastered prior to attempting to apply them to the difficult conflict, which they face. This facilitates the learning of the techniques, and provides for additional time together for participants to get to know one another better and share experience prior to broaching the issues facing them. The effects of this phase on the factors noted above should also be monitored via a questionnaire at the end of the day.

Transformation from zero sum. The role of the facilitator is explained, an introduction to the field of conflict resolution is provided and a daily feedback mechanism is introduced to insure that the facilitators are in touch with the orientation and learning levels of the participants. Emphasis is placed on the unfairness and instability of unilateral solutions and on recent progress in resolving international and other disputes via conflict resolution mechanisms. This both increases the perceived need for, and potential efficacy of, the techniques to be introduced. The constructive side of conflict and conflict resolution may be introduced along with the notion of the transformation of a situation from a zero sum game to a non zero sum game. Let us consider a simple example of an exercise designed to do this.

The participants are divided into pairs and asked to take part in an arm wrestling contest where the two participants with the highest number of wins within a space of time win a monetary award. While most participants assume a zero-sum attitude to the exercise, creative thinkers may realize that a pair may collaborate to let each other 'win' repeatedly and thus both can win the monetary award. At the end of the exercise, this win/win strategy is pointed out to the participants.

Focusing on Underlying Needs & Humanization of the "Partner" Next, subjects are introduced to the process of looking beyond the positions and alternatives and focusing on the underlying needs of the individuals in a conflict as opposed to the "interests" as implicit in their positions. This latter insight has important implications for how participants may ultimately relate to their own conflict. Later, participants will be asked to dig below the surface of their opposing positions to try to uncover the underlying needs which have generated the demands and positions. Uncovering those basic needs and motives will help to legitimate demands and open the way for innovative alternatives, which address underlying needs as opposed to stereotyped and entrenched positions. As we discuss below, the identification of needs also opens the prospect of identifying minimally acceptable levels of needs satisfaction for some of the parties which can be agreed upon from an impartial point of view.

The humanization of the "partner" can be facilitated by the use of an exercise based on a film which demonstrates the use of dehumanization techniques by both sides in the Cold War or by other means such as collecting newspapers' caricatures of the "Other" in a conflict situation. The pernicious effects of dehumanization reinforce the need to see and understand one's opposite number as a human being, with some characteristics which are different, but with others which are shared.

Over the course of these preliminary exercises some form of concrete confidence building measures may be taken. This might involve some sort of reward for admirable behavior such as the exchange of flowers or complements. This can develop further empathy and mutual confidence so that subsequent exchanges will be more open and less subject to suspicious misinterpretation.

These exercises should affect participants' perceptions of available alternatives and, through understanding needs increase empathy with their opposite numbers. Measures of these factors after the exercises could be used as indicators of the efficacy of these steps in the process.

Participants must ultimately confront, head-on some of the implicit impediments to finding a solution to the conflict. As noted above, negative stereotypes of one another and of one another's positions are barriers to free examination and evaluation of options. A variety of skills building exercises can be used to overcome these barriers. Explicit exercises which call for participants to identify their views of the other and their perceptions of the other's view of them can be instructive in showing that each share stereotypic thinking. This is particularly effective, given their experience with the historic stereotyping they were exposed to in the "Cold War" exercise. Followed by an exercise in which both sides reveal personal experiences with discrimination, this can further help humanize the participants to each other and, potentially establish some feelings of shared experiences. Participants may be shown that failure to deal, adequately, with instances of discrimination can result in deep-seated resentment and anger.

An additional de-escalation exercise is introduced through the joint reading of a powerful children's book describing how two neighboring nations arguing about a trivial issue eventually prepare for nuclear war. At the last page, the outcome of the crisis remains unknown and participants are asked to write and then discuss their suggested "happy ends".

Participants are also exposed to a number of exercises involving the development of skills in "non-violent communication", focusing on conflict situations through the way people talk (and their body language) and listen to each other as well the impact of cultural differences in distorting the message. The use of certain expressions become "hot buttons" to the adversary and need to be identified. The objective of these exercises is to teach them how to state positions in a sufficiently non-aggressive fashion, that the recipient will not, immediately, react reflexively, but remain open to the content of the communication. At the same time, active listening requires expressions of understanding, empathy and even eliciting more readiness for the messenger to open up. This is essential if the problem-solving phases to follow are to be fruitful rather than exercises in rhetoric.

The final phase of skills development involves introducing participants to various forms of dispute settling mechanisms, such as principled negotiation and mediation. The stage has, by then, hopefully, been set for the introduction of their own conflict. Questions about the appreciation of the perceived usefulness of each of the skills learned might be used as a surrogate measure of their effectiveness.

Stage 3: Framing and re-framing the Partners own conflict and the search for common ground

Introducing the conflict

At this stage, participants are getting ready to seek solutions to the issues at stake. Tversky and Kahneman, the foremost proponents of the importance of framing decisions note, at the very end of their paper in *Science*: “When framing influences the experience of consequences, the adoption of a decision frame is an ethically significant act.”(1981, p. 458). The manner in which the conflict to be resolved is introduced to the group is of critical importance. The framing of the situation can have a major impact on the trajectory of discussion and on the ultimate outcome. In framing the conflict, the facilitators at Maryland rely on a major insight of Tversky and Kahneman (ibid). Namely, that individuals experience losses more acutely than they do gains of the same size.

Shared Vision

To make use of this effect facilitators ask participants to develop a “Shared Vision.” This consists of their view of the best possible outcome of their conflict 20 years in the future. This device has a number of useful properties. Putting the timeline far into the future frees the participants mentally from the immediate constraints of the current mired-down status quo. It allows them to see the potentially real gains from an agreement, without having to worry about how they can get there from here. This framing implicitly raises the stakes of finding some accommodation because it points to the potential gains, which may have been lost sight of in the short run.

This phase is followed by an exercise which asks participants to maintain the 20 year horizon, but this time to paint a worst case scenario. Although often unwilling to visualize a harsher picture than the current sad realities, Inevitably that scene will be grim. Subjects experience a virtual sense of loss, having gone from their previous rosy scenario to the blackest of views. This explicitly invokes the loss phenomenon and further emphasizes that the stakes in finding a resolution are huge. The distance from the worst to the best are what are at stake, not just incremental gains from the status quo. Having canvassed the best case first makes the worst case look like a bigger loss (rather than from the status quo and, as we have noted, losses look bigger than gains.

In game theoretic terms this expands the negotiation space and changes the valuations placed on possible outcomes. It increases the perceived stakes in getting progress and therefore facilitates participants' investment of time and effort in seeking an agreement. It also changes expectations about how much the others have at stake and create a negotiation space which is potentially non zero sum. That is because when negotiations are focused on the status quo, in a deadlocked conflict movement is almost always viewed as involving concessions (losses) by one side or the other. When the negotiation space is expanded, the possibility of joint gains is more apparent.

The next phase of the presentation of the conflict involves backcasting, or projections backwards at 10 and 5 year intervals, to try to identify what might have happened to get to the 20 year best and worst outcomes. This parallels the game theoretic tool of backward induction. Subjects are implicitly trying to identify branches of an extensive form game tree (moves-actions) that might have got them from the status quo to their best and worst outcomes. This fills in the alternatives available in the conflict in a fresh fashion, since it does not start at the status quo, from which participants would be free to rely on the stereotyped positions. Ultimately the hope is that agreement might be reached on a course of action (strategy) which would amount to a group choice which would get to a subgame perfect equilibrium

It might be possible to value the effectiveness of this particular technique in affecting subjective evaluations of alternative solutions. Participants may be asked, early on in the process to identify possible outcomes and to rank them on two continua. One would rank an outcome on a 100 point scale in terms of its desirability. The other scale would be a subjective probability scale which would be the participant's expectation of the likelihood of that outcome's actually occurring. Changes in values at the end of the exercise would help identify its effectiveness. If this were repeated a few times, it would have the added advantage of identifying the emergence of new outcomes and their desirability - one of the main goals of the process.

Developing alternatives and shared solutions

At this stage, the Partners are getting ready to work constructively in the search for common ground on issues identified more precisely on an agenda determined by themselves in the previous days. Participants are then given practice in finding consensus via a variety of consensus games which prepares them for addressing possible resolutions of their own conflict. Several methods of searching for common ground have evolved, but the one that has reached the highest and most effective level is the groundbreaking ARIA (Adversarial, Reflexive, Integrative framework) originated by Jay Rothman (1992, 1997) and since then brought to a more rigorous application in Kaufman's IPSW.

The Adversarial Stage

The Adversarial portion of the process is designed to identify the existing stereotyped positions, point out the futility but at the same time the necessity of an adversarial preliminary stage, putting individuals in the first round to represent their own positions and in a second round then those of their opposite numbers. It allows both the venting of their own grievances and truths as well as a minimal understanding of at least the intensity of feeling inherent in the other's position and so to invoke a limited form of impartial reasoning. It establishes the baseline for the Reflexive stage.

Perhaps of greatest centrality in this phase of the exercise is a confrontation which is carefully staged. In it the two parties each have teams who present the 'classic' positions of their sides. Other members of the side criticize the presentations, saying such things as "how come you didn't mention" This usually leads to considerable anger, and posturing. Next, the sides must switch: putting forward the arguments of each other. But this time, the other participants are to discuss the style of the presentations: were they angry, argumentative, etc.²⁵ Role reversal not only ensures a better understanding of the positions of the "Other" but also softens the transition to the introspective following stage

Measures of many of the subjective variables of concern such as trust, affect, empathy, estimation of success, willingness to work etc. might be obtained at the end of the day in which this step is undertaken to gauge its impact.

The Reflexive Stage

This stage is designed to uncover the underlying needs, fears and expectations that exist behind the participants' declared positions. These, although they form the conscientious or undiscovered motives to be found behind the positions taken, are seldom articulated, and may not be actively available to participants. Nevertheless, if a satisfactory solution is to be found will these basic needs and desires must form the basis for re-valuing alternatives and finding solutions later on. Thus they must be uncovered through a productive dialogue. To create that dialogue the participants first must be coached in active listening techniques. Participants move from the blaming "you" to the expression of what "I" need. These are designed, explicitly, to uncover underlying motivations and feelings. Once learned, they are applied to discussions of the conflict in question so that the real stakes of the parties are laid bare as the basis for the next stage of conflict resolution the integrative stage. Here again there is scope, as in the previous stage, to get measures of subjective indicators which would serve as indicators of the impact of this stage.

The Integrative Stage

25/ The feedback from the corrections in phase 1 of this exercise means that all the participants are able to get 'all' the major points in the arguments on the other side when they switch. Thus the criticism of this phase is able to move to aspects of the presentation other than substance.

This stage is designed to generate new possible alternative solutions and to bring the opposing parties to team work together facing the problems and striving to reach a consensus on acceptable movement towards resolution of the conflict for "us". The first step in this stage is brainstorming in a free-wheeling and accepting environment. Ideas are to be freely suggested and not commented upon. Much of the prior confidence building, humanization and skills development are instrumental in allowing a wide range of ideas to be placed on the agenda. Individuals must be trusting enough to offer suggestions which might have the appearance of offering concessions. Emphasis is placed on generating all sorts of ideas even if seemingly outlandish. The recent identification of motives and desires form a backdrop from which suggestion may be generated. Training in creativity (lateral thinking, expanding the cake, disaggregating the big problem, etc.) Backcasting from the best case scenario can also be used to fill in possible steps to get to an optimal outcome. Here there is an opportunity to record the emergence of new alternatives.

Searching for consensus on preferred alternatives

After a wide range of alternatives are gathered they are prioritized and divided into a variety of "baskets" or sub-themes such as economic, social, cultural, security, political, security and humanitarian. The group first prioritizes tackles the smaller and potentially more tractable issues in small groups, in which the issues are as closely matched to the skills and experiences of the partners as possible. They end their task by re-drafting the preferred ideas to be amenable to the participants and to those "outside the room" is The hope is that progress on smaller issues will increase the credibility of the process and induce participants to exert more effort and be more flexible as the more difficult problems are approached.

The small groups report to a plenary session and the active listening techniques learned earlier are used to try to identify the underlying needs of the parties in each of the sub-issues and how proposed solutions (or new solutions which emerge) might help to satisfy those needs. Consensus remains the primary decision making mechanism. To the extent that the emphasis in finding solutions focuses on needs and uses a consensus rule, it parallels in a few important aspects the impartial reasoning exercises on issues of distributive justice in Frohlich and Oppenheimer, (1992). Since there is no explicit element of impartiality at this phase however, it is not a very close fit. The important elements that the two exercises have in common is the fact that participants may be able to identify "a floor" or a minimally acceptable level of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights which all can agree are necessary for any fair solution. Indeed, this might have been emphasized in the earlier phase when the notion of identifying underlying needs was first introduced. Once these floors are acknowledged, we would argue that it is difficult, given our findings on distributive justice, for participants to argue against accommodations which are designed to secure these minimal rights. In that sense the previous abstract and impartial discussion of needs and rights can act as a powerful stimulus to movement and accommodation. Indeed, a number of the moves are likely to be tied to the backcasting which was done previously, since a best state can hardly be envisioned which deprives some parties of minimal rights.

Here the generation of agreement represents a milestone that can be utilized in the evaluations. But it is important to track the other factors which underlie the agreement, as stated in the micro-objectives. So it would be important to measure the values placed on the outcome by the participants on the 100 point scale as well as the attitudes towards both their opposite numbers and to the process. What happens in the micro-environment of the conflict transformation, if it is to be effective in the outside world, must be appealing to the participants. So their feelings about the process, the decision and their counterparts need to be sufficiently positive to motivate continued activity after they leave the IPSW arena.

Stage 4: Postscripts Preparation for re-entry

Healing

Participants need ways to deal with their past grievances and the task of re-entering their home environment, which may be hostile to their new ideas and orientations. The problem of healing is not only relevant for dealing with the past, but also for the reaction to the often painful or worrisome events occurring back home, concurrent to the conduct of the workshop that may have affected the relationship. There have been instances, when acts of terror or massacres have occurred in the Partners' communities during our workshops. In such cases, explicit ways of coping with the trauma are required and a discussion on healing should be undertaken immediately. Firstly, it is important for the participants not to sublimate their inner feelings but to the contrary, to be able to externalize them, in front and together with the other "Partners". Personal gestures can create meaningful impressions and limit the potential for damaging the rapport generated in the process. We can get the Partners to brainstorm on some specific ideas or doable projects that can be added to the list of personal commitments at the re-entry. It is often forgotten that this workshop is not only a question of the participants showing empathy toward the humanity of their respective peoples as a whole, but also toward each other as individuals.

This session may also be useful to introduce the expectations of "justice" by both sides, particularly relevant for the those that perceived themselves as the oppressed in the asymmetric dyadic relationship. Reference to human rights principles are useful and provide international standards that have been shared by most nations and their governments.²⁶ Ideas about a longer-term process of reconciliation should be encouraged and registered.

Training for Re-entry

Conducting the "Innovative Problem Solving Workshops" as an isolated event is not only economically unsound, but can be counter-productive as well by producing an anti-climax with possible negative backlash, if the Partners feel isolated and lost after re-entry. The re-entry

26/ For the development of the subject see Kaufman, Edy and Bisharat, Ibrahim, "Human Rights and Conflict Resolution: Searching for Common Ground Between Justice and Peace in the Israeli/Palestinian Conflict", *NIDR Forum*, (National Institute for Dispute Resolution, Washington DC, December 1998, Number 36), pp 16-23.

process has been described as a culture shock both for the separation from those who had undergone a similar experience, and for the exposure to a sort of inquisition from others in a still hostile environment.²⁷ Participants who wish to share new and moderate ideas from the

27/ Lippert and Brendan, "Re-entry, or, You CAN Go Home Again Appropriately,"

brainstorming session may be regarded by some as fools, naive, or (even worse), as traitors and victims of brainwashing. Within a Partner's family, tensions can be quite high when discussing how helpful the workshop was and how it has influenced their thinking. To avoid being perceived as proselytizing or preaching, the Partners need to offer detailed pictures of their lessons learned during the process rather than move straight to report on the agreed solutions, and to actively seek and receive feedback on these new perspectives.

In preparing for re-entry, it may be worthwhile to role-play among the Partners an interaction with a friend or colleague from their own community who is skeptical about the "Innovative Problem Solving Workshops" process. A Partner tells the story as the local "friend" increases his/her critical response. Other participants can evaluate the performance and suggest improvements in strategy. Another suggested exercise is to ask the participants to take a few minutes and write themselves a letter, to be mailed by the organizers about two weeks after their return. In the letters, the participants should express their current feeling and willingness to undertake some specific joint actions and projects in the near future.

Participants may wish to rely on one another for support when they re-enter their home environments. This can be done by team-building. One suggestion is that participants prepare themselves for joint presentations in front of a local or even mixed audience, to write an op-ed together, or to use some other form for joint expression. In general, the organizers should provide follow-up opportunities in one or two minimal ways to keep the momentum of the workshop going in the same location, and/or in their respective communities after they have returned.

Partners should be encouraged to write about the process in the local press or academic journals, or to give a lecture or interview, sharing both positive and negative experiences. Additionally, it may be worthwhile for the participant to organize an informal session at a university, NGO, or even at a friend's house or in his/her own home. The emphasis should be on process and content, avoiding buzzwords or phrases that were part of the internal language of the workshop. The experience should be shared with peers, even if it is not as well received as originally hoped: the stimulus for creative efforts to resolve the conflict will be transmitted to the larger community more by deeds than by words.

Keeping in touch with other participants inside and outside their own country or community is also extremely useful, so that no-one feels alone in the process of keeping alive the commitments undertaken to themselves and each other.

Developing and Action Plan

One way of ensuring the re-entry is actually to start the joint activity as an appendix to the workshop, on their way back home. It can take the form of presenting a joint statement in meetings with the ambassadors to both Partners' in capital cities such as Washington DC, a joint statement delivered to the media, or the publication of the text signed by all in the local and

international press. This is also the last opportunity before departure that the Partners can prepare together, if they wish, an Action Plan that can be facilitated by providing systematic guidance, to include steps, timeline, allocation of individual responsibility, coordination, budget and fundraising, etc.

Several activities before departure are important for team-building, including the de-briefing of the Partners about their experience. This can be used for evaluation purposes, through structured and unstructured discussions, including conducting a focused groups of each party separate or all the participants together, run by the evaluators without the facilitators' presence.

Follow up questionnaires which give longitudinal measures of the attitudes and dispositions of the part measured during the sessions should help identify potential decay (or strengthening) of the effects of the workshop. Inclusion of a list of activities conducted after the workshop along with the solicitation of further suggestions would help identify the possible impact of the workshop on the problem in question.

References

Arrow, Kenneth J. (1963). *Social Choice and Individual Values*, 2nd ed. Yale: New Haven.

Adler, Emanuel, "Cognitive Evolution: A Dynamic Approach for the Study of International Relations and Their Progress", in Adler, E., and Crawford B., (eds.), *Progress in International Relations*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1993.

Baier, Annette (1981). "Frankena and Hume on Points of View." *The Monist*, v. 64, no. 3 (July): 342-358.

Buchanan, James M. and Roger D. Congleton. Politics By Principle, Not Interest: Towards Nondiscriminatory Democracy. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999.

Buchanan, James. "An Economic Theory of Clubs," *Economica* 32 (2/65): 1-14.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce (1981). *The War Trap*, Yale: New Haven.

Davies, John and Edy Kaufman (eds.) *Second Track Diplomacy for Ethnic and Nationalist Conflicts: Applied Techniques of Conflict Transformation*. Lanham MD: Rowman and Littlefield Forthcoming

Diamond, Louise and John McDonald *Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace* (3rd ed) West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press, 1996

Fisher, Roger and Ury, William, (1991), Getting to Yes, Penguin Books, New York

Frankena, William K. (1983) "Moral - Point - of - View Theories." in Ethical theory in the Last Quarter of the Twentieth Century. (Eds. Charles L. Stevenson, William K. Frankena, R. B. Brandt, and A. I. Melden). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company: 39-80.

Frohlich, Norman and Joe Oppenheimer, 2000. Choosing. (Mimeo) Paper presented at the 16^{èmes} **Journées-économique Appliquée**, Lyon, France 3 & 4 | June 1999.

_____. (2000b). Choosing from a Moral Point of View (working paper)

Grether David M. and Charles R. Plott, (1979) "Economic Theory of Choice and the Preference Reversal Phenomenon," American Economic Review, 69 (September): 623 - 638.

Habermas, Jurgen (1996) The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory. Edited by Ciaran Cronin and Pablo De Greiff. Cambridge, MIT Press.

Kahneman Daniel and Amos Tversky. "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Under Risk," Econometrica. 47, No. 2, March, 1979 263-291.

Kaufman, Edward (Edy), forthcoming. "Innovative problem Solving Workshops: Sharing the Experience of Second Track Diplomacy with Partners in Conflict." in Davies and Kaufman.

Kerlinger, Fred R., FOUNDATIONS OF BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH(London, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972

Lederach , John Paul *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995

Montville, Joseph "The Healing Function in Political Conflict Resolution." In Dennis Sandole and Hugo van der Merwe (eds.) *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice: Integration and Application*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1993

Mueller, Dennis C. (1989). Public Choice II. Cambridge Univ Press, Cambridge, UK.

Nagel, Thomas (1991) Equality and Partiality. Oxford University Press. Oxford, England.

Nozick, Robert (1981). Philosophical Investigations. Belknap Press of Harvard University: Cambridge, Mass.

Quattrone George A. and Amos Tversky, (1988) "Contrasting Rational and Psychological Analyses of Political Choice." American Political Science Review. (82, No. 3 Sept.) 719-736.

Rabin, Matthew (1998). "Psychology and Economics," Journal of Economic Literature, vol 36 (March): 11 - 46

Rothman, Jay. *From Confrontation to Cooperation: Resolving Ethnic and Regional Conflict*. Newbury Park, California: Sage, 1992.

_____. *Resolving Identity-Based Conflicts*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997.

Sandler, Todd; and J. T. Tschirhart, 1980. The Economic Theory of Clubs: An Evaluation Survey, Journal of Economic Literature, 18, pp. 1481-1521.

Sandole, Dennis J.P. and Hugo van der Merwe, eds . *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice: Integration and Applications*. New York: NY Manchester University Press, 1993.

Sen, A.K. (1970) *Collective Choice and Social Welfare*. North Holland: New York.

Shafir Eldar and Amos Tversky (1995). "Decision Making," in Edward E. Smith and Daniel N. Osherson, eds. **An Invitation to Cognitive Science: Thinking** Volume 3, Second Edition, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. 77-100

Simon, Herbert A. (1986) "Rationality in Psychology & Economics," The Journal of Business. v. 59, no. 4, Part 2 (October): pp. S209-224.

Tversky, A. and D. Kahneman (1981) "The Framing of Decisions and the Psychology of Choice," Science 221 (Jan. 30): 453-458.

Zartman, I. William (2000) "conflict Management: The Long and the Short of It," SAIS Review 20.1: 227- 235

1. We are very grateful for the wonderful hospitality shown to this project at Hebrew University and the University of Maryland. We are of course also thankful for the financial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the National Science Foundation (grant #01523490), and the Universities of Maryland and Manitoba for their continued support.