

CRPLAN 6750: Resolving Social Conflict

Instructor name:	Mattijs van Maasakkers	Telephone/E-mail:	(614) 292-0949 / vanmaasakkers.1@osu.edu
Year and term:	2021 Spring	Office location:	233 Knowlton Hall
Meeting time:	Wednesday and Friday, 02:20 – 03:40	Office hours:	By Appointment, via Zoom
Meeting location:	195 Knowlton Hall and Canvas Zoom		

COURSE INFORMATION

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.

GOALS & 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

FORMAT

The students are required to attend all class-sessions, either in person or via Zoom; 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.

Pace of online activities:

This course includes scheduled lectures, negotiation simulations and debriefs, as well as scenario presentations. All negotiation simulations will take place via Zoom (synchronously), but most other sessions are scheduled to take place in person, with the possibility of livestreaming via Zoom in case necessary or preferable.

COURSE MATERIALS

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.

- Fisher, R. and Ury, W. *Getting to Yes. Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. Random House, New York, NY.
- Susskind, L. and J. Cruikshank, *Breaking the Impasse: Consensual Approaches to Resolving Public Disputes*. Basic Books.

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

- Avruch, K. *Culture and Conflict Resolution*. United States Institute of Peace Press. 2006.
- Rogers, N., Bordone, R., Sander, E. and McEwen, C. *Designing Systems and Processes for Managing Disputes*. Wolters-Kluwer Law and Business. 2013
- 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.

ASSIGNMENTS

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. Reflection memos are evaluated based on 1) answering specific question, 2) effective use of relevant theory and 3) application of key lessons outside of the classroom.
- Scenario memos (30 points) Scenarios will be posted to Carmen a week before class. Students will be selected to facilitate small group discussion about the scenario. All students are expected to act as scenario leaders twice during the semester.
- Final Memo 30 points (maximum 10 points for presentation, maximum length is 10 minutes and 20 points for Dispute System Design memo, no more than 10 pages)
- Participation and Attendance (10 points)

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OR GRADING

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. Students are allowed to use visual aides like handouts or slides, but this is not required. These presentations will be evaluated based on clarity of argument, appropriate use of required readings and overall style.

Letter grades are assigned based on a standard scheme:

A	93-100
A-	90-92.9
B+	87-89.9
B	83-86.9
B-	80-82.9
C+	77-79.9
C	73-76.9
C-	70-72.9
D+	67-69.9
D	60-66.9
E	<60

OVERVIEW

DATE	TOPIC & ASSIGNMENTS	FOCUS	READINGS
1/13	The Nature of Social Conflict	Introduction to Negotiation Theory	Carpenter and Kennedy (1991) <i>Managing Public Disputes</i> , Chapter 1: Understanding Public Disputes: The Spiral of Unmanaged Conflict. p. 3-17
1/15	<i>Negotiation Simulation #1: Appleton v. Baker</i>		Lewicki et al. (2007) <i>Essentials of Negotiation</i> , Ch. 3: Strategy and Tactics of Distributive Bargaining, p. 48-79.
1/20	Principles of Conflict and Negotiation Scenario A		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
1/22	Avoiding Negotiation Pitfalls Scenario B Due: Reflection Memo #1		Bazerman and Neale (1994) <i>Negotiating Rationally</i> , Chapters 1-4, p. 1-30
1/27	<i>Negotiation Simulation #2: Redstone</i>		Fisher and Ury (1981) <i>Getting to Yes</i> , Chapters 1-5, p. 3-98
1/29	Integrative Negotiation <i>Debrief of Redstone</i>		Fisher and Ury (1981) <i>Getting to Yes</i> , Chapters 6-8, p. 99-120
2/3	Conflict Framing Scenario C	Making Sense of Conflicts	Bazerman and Neale (1994) <i>Negotiating Rationally</i> , Ch. 5: Framing Negotiations, p. 31-41. <i>Optional:</i> Tversky and Kahneman (1981) The Framing of Decisions and the Psychology of Choice, Science , p. 453-458
2/5	From Conflict to System Due: Reflection Memo #2		Rogers, N., Bordone, B., Sander, F. and McEwen, C. (2013) Chapters 2 and 5 from <i>Designing Systems and Processes for Managing Disputes</i> . <i>Optional:</i> Constantino, C. and C. Sickles-Merchant (1995) Chapters 1-4 from <i>Designing Conflict Management Systems: A Guide to Creating Productive and Healthy Organizations</i> .

2/10	Stakeholder Analysis Scenario D		<p>Reed, M. et al. (2009) Who's in and why? A typology of stakeholder analysis methods for natural resource management, Journal of Environmental Management, p. 1933-1949</p> <p><i>Skim:</i> 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, Journal of Coastal Conservation, 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, Regional Environmental Change, p. 1-25</p>
2/12	<i>Negotiation Simulation #3: Three-party Coalition</i>		<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>
2/17	Multi-Party Disputes Scenario E <i>Preparation for Harborco Simulation</i>		<p>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.</p>
2/19	<i>Negotiation Simulation #4: Harborco</i> Due: Reflection Memo #3		<p>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.</p>
2/24	OSU Instructional Break - No Class	Conflict Resolution	Catch up on rest (and maybe reading?)
2/26	Introduction to Mediation <i>Harborco debrief</i>		<p>Moore (1986) <i>How Mediation Works</i>. Ch. 1 The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict. p. 13-43</p>
3/3	CRP Reading Day – No class Due: Reflection Memo #4		Catch up on rest (and maybe reading?)
3/5	Mediation and Planning Scenario F <i>Preparation for Northam simulation</i>		<p>Susskind and Ozawa (1984) Mediated Negotiation in the Public Sector: The Planner as Mediator, JPER p. 5-15.</p>

3/10	<i>Negotiation Simulation #5: Flooding in Northam</i>		Instructions for negotiation simulation
3/12	Consensus Building <i>Northam Debrief</i> <i>Film: Rebuilding the World Trade Center Site</i>		Innes, J. and Booher, D. (1999) Consensus Building and Complex Adaptive Systems: A Framework for Evaluating Collaborative Planning. JAPA , p. 412-425
3/17	Mediator Ethics <i>Film: Rebuilding the World Trade Center Site (ct'd)</i>		Mayer, Stulberg, Susskind and Lande (2012) Core Values of Dispute Resolution: Is Neutrality Necessary? Marquette Law Review , Vol. 95, Issue 3, p. 806-828.
3/19	Gender and Negotiation Scenario G Due: Reflection Memo #5		Kolb (2004) Staying in the Game or Changing It: An Analysis of Moves and Turns in Negotiation, Negotiation Journal , p. 253-268 <i>Optional:</i> Bowles and Babcock (2005) Constraints and Triggers: Situational Mechanics of Gender in Negotiation, in: Journal of Personality and Social Psychology , p. 951-965
3/24	Gender, Violence and Justice <i>Film: A Better Man</i>	Identity and Social Conflict	Cobb (1993) Empowerment and Mediation: A Narrative Perspective, in: Negotiation Journal Vol. 9, Issue 3, pp. 245-259. <i>Optional:</i> Kolb (2009) Too Bad for the Women or Does it Have to Be: Gender and Negotiation Research over the Past Twenty-Five Years, in: Negotiation Journal p. 515-531 <i>Optional:</i> St. Felix (2017) After Abuse, the Possibility of a "Better Man," The New Yorker .
3/26	Social Justice and Transformative Mediation Scenario H		Bush and Folger (2012) Mediation and Social Justice: Risks and Opportunities, Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution 27, p. 1-52
3/31	OSU Instructional Break – No Class		Catch up on rest (and maybe reading?)
4/2	Identity-related Disputes in the Public Sphere Scenario I <i>Preparation for Camp Seward Simulation</i>		Rothman (2006) Identity and Conflict: Collaboratively Addressing Police-Community Conflict in Cincinnati, Ohio, in: Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution 22, p. 105-132 Wondolleck, Gray, and Bryan (2003) Us versus Them: how identities and characterizations influence conflict Environmental Practice , Pp. 207-213.
4/7	<i>Negotiation Simulation #6: Camp Seward</i>		Instructions for negotiation simulation

4/9	<p>Confronting Identity in/and Conflict</p> <p><i>Debrief of Camp Seward Simulation</i></p>		<p>Laws and Forester (2015) On Radicalization and Social Cohesion: The City of Amsterdam's Responses to the murder of Theo van Gogh Seen through the eyes of Marian Visser and Joris Rijnbroek. Chapter 11 in: Conflict, Improvisation and Governance: Street Level Practices for Urban Democracy. Routledge, London, UK.</p>
4/14	<p>Culture and Conflict Resolution</p> <p>Scenario J</p> <p>Due: Reflection Memo #6</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: Negotiation Journal, p. 389-435</p>
4/16	<p>Working Session</p> <p><i>Dispute Systems Design</i></p>		<p>Q and A about final projects and presentations.</p>
4/21 & 4/23	<p>Dispute Systems Design Presentations</p>	<p>Student Presentations</p>	

GENERAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Academic integrity is essential to maintaining an environment that fosters excellence in teaching, research, and other educational and scholarly activities. Thus, The Ohio State University and the Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) expect that all students have read and understand the University's Code of Student Conduct, and that all students will complete all academic and scholarly assignments with fairness and honesty. Students must recognize that failure to follow the rules and guidelines established in the University's Code of Student Conduct and this syllabus may constitute "Academic Misconduct."

OSU's Code of Student Conduct (Section 3335-23-04) defines academic misconduct as: "Any activity that tends to compromise the academic integrity of the University, or subvert the educational process." Examples include (but are not limited to) plagiarism, collusion (unauthorized collaboration), copying the work of another student, and possession of unauthorized materials during an examination. Ignorance of the University's Code of Student Conduct is never considered an "excuse" for academic misconduct, so it is recommended that you review the Code of Student Conduct.

If a faculty member suspects that a student has committed academic misconduct in a course, they are obligated by University Rules to report suspicions to the Committee on Academic Misconduct. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Academic Misconduct to investigate or establish procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct. If COAM determines that a student has violated the University's Code of Student Conduct, the sanctions for the misconduct could include a failing grade in this course and suspension or dismissal from the University.

Resources you can refer to include:

The Committee on Academic Misconduct web page: oaa.osu.edu/coam.html

Ten Suggestions for Preserving Academic Integrity: oaa.osu.edu/coamtensuggestions.html

SEXUAL HARRASSMENT: Title IX

No forms of sexual harassment or intimidation will be tolerated. Sexual Harassment includes lewd remarks and inappropriate comments made in the studio environment, classroom, and computer labs as well as the "display of inappropriate sexually oriented materials in a location where others can see it." Sexual harassment includes inappropriate behavior among two or more students; between students and/or faculty and/or staff; and within those groups. The actions can take place in physical, verbal, or written forms.

Title IX makes it clear that violence and harassment based on sex and gender are Civil Rights offenses subject to the same kinds of accountability and the same kinds of support applied to offenses against other protected categories (e.g., race). If you or someone you know has been sexually harassed or assaulted, you may find the appropriate resources at <http://titleix.osu.edu> or by contacting the Ohio State Title IX Coordinator at titleix@osu.edu. Also, refer to University's Code of Student Conduct 3335-23-04 (C) for additional information.

SAFETY

To provide the best education, the Knowlton School must act as a community. As such, its members (faculty, students, and staff) must respect and watch out for each other. The studio is available for students 24/7. The University escort service provides safe transportation to and from Knowlton Hall 7:30AM-3:00AM. Call 292-3322.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

If you have a documented disability, please register with Student Life Disability Services. After registration, make arrangements to meet with instructors as soon as possible to discuss your accommodations, so they may be implemented in a timely fashion. If you have any questions about this process, please contact Disability Services at 614-292-3307.

PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

Students are expected to conduct themselves in a professional manner and to abide by the provisions in the Code of Student Conduct. Students should appreciate diversity, and they should conduct themselves professionally with members of the same or opposite gender and/or from different ethnicities and cultures.

Students should represent themselves in a professional manner in forums that have public access. This includes information posted on social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter. Information on these pages is often screened by potential employers, and unprofessional material can have a negative impact on job or graduate school prospects.

PROHIBITED ITEMS AND ACTIONS

The following items are prohibited: Non-Knowlton School furniture, alcohol, cigarettes, weapons, bicycles, skateboards, rollerblades, pets, spray paints, foam cutter wands, welding devices, heat guns and any flame or gaseous liquid device.

STUDENT RESOURCES

Knowlton Student Services

100 Knowlton Hall. Hours: 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. weekdays

Undergraduate Students: knowlton.osu.edu/students/undergraduate

Graduate Students: knowlton.osu.edu/students-current-students/graduate

Student Advocacy and the Dennis Learning Center

advocacy.osu.edu

dennislearningcenter.osu.edu

University Counseling and Consultation Services

ccs.ohio-state.edu

Ohio State Police Department

ps.ohio-state.edu

General non-emergency: (614) 292-2121

To report an emergency, dial 9-1-1