

---

# *Editor's Note*

This issue marks the beginning of the thirtieth year of *Negotiation Journal*. For more than a decade, the *Journal* was energetically and creatively led by its founding editor, Jeff Rubin, and its managing editor, Bill Breslin. When Jeff died hiking in northern New England in 1995, Debbie Kolb and I served as coeditors for several years.

More recently, I have had the pleasure of working with an able team of colleagues: our managing editor, Nancy Waters, and our associate editors, Bob Bordone, Dan Druckman, Melissa Manwaring, and Carrie Menkel-Meadow. As we mark another milestone, I salute and thank them for all they do to keep the *Journal* fresh and relevant, while our understanding of the theory and practice of negotiation continues to expand and deepen.

In presenting the contents of this issue, it seems right to begin with a column by Uri Savir, "Oslo: Twenty Years After," in which he reflects on the past in order to support peacemaking efforts going forward. Savir speaks from considerable experience, having been Israel's chief negotiator for several years in the early 1990s. In spite of subsequent setbacks and disappointments, he describes himself as still an "incorrigible optimist."

It is also fitting that I introduce three reports as a group, as together they illustrate the scope and quality of current research in our field. Each explores a different aspect of the negotiation process and employs a variety of methodologies to test their ideas.

For example, "The Influence of Emotional Intelligence on Negotiation Outcomes and the Mediating Effect of Rapport" by Kihwan Kim, Nicole Cundiff, and Suk Bong Choi describes a laboratory experiment that the authors conducted to investigate the possible relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and negotiation performance, both relationally and substantively. The researchers found that participants with higher EI were more likely to win their counterparts' trust and be seen as someone with whom they wished to work again. Perhaps surprisingly, however, there was no correlation between EI and substantive outcomes. Drawing on other studies in this realm, the researchers speculate that empathy sometimes may invite exploitation.

"Neutralizing Unethical Negotiating Tactics" presents the results of a study by Denise Fleck, Roger Volkema, Sergio Pereira, Barbara Levy, and Lara Vaccari. They analyzed transcripts from more than a hundred pairs of subjects who conducted an e-mail negotiation. Coders identified different moves that people used that might plausibly deter others from employing unethical tactics. They then cataloged what counterparts said and did as offers and demands were exchanged. Some potential preventative tactics

---

were rarely used. Of the more commonly employed tactics, ones that entailed immediate action seemed more influential than others that focused on long-term impacts on relationships.

Rounding out the trio of research reports is Brian Urlacher's "Groups, Decision Rules, and Negotiation Outcomes." He constructed a computer simulation to identify how internal procedural rules can complicate, even degrade, intergroup decision making in a prisoner's dilemma game. Urlacher notes that learning becomes more complex when agents are reasoning differently to make strategic choices. He adds that lab experiments with human subjects and case studies may shed further light on how internal decision making bears on group-to-group interaction.

Thania Paffenholz's theory piece, "Civil Society and Peace Negotiations," addresses that issue, at least by implication. Peace negotiations typically involve direct talks among representatives of contending groups that may well have differing norms for formulating and implementing strategy. With civil society in particular, those norms may be fluid and ambiguous. Paffenholz argues that rather than debate *whether* civil society should be included in peace talks (in order to promote durable agreements) or excluded from them (to simplify the process), we should address *how* civil society can justly and effectively participate. Drawing on case studies of conflict in various parts of the world, she offers nine models of inclusion that reflect cultural and contextual differences.

Jennifer Parlamis and Lorianne Mitchell tackle contextual differences in classroom settings, real and virtual. Although many negotiation teachers committed to experiential learning may be skeptical about the potential of online instruction, Parlamis and Mitchell show how in certain respects a computer-based course can support more student participation more successfully than a conventional offering can. They also provide careful analysis of survey data comparing two courses — one in-person, the other online — that show online students are at least as satisfied with their learning on a variety of measures, sometimes decidedly more so.

Ten years ago (let alone thirty years ago, when *Negotiation Journal* was launched), no one I knew was talking about MOOCs (massive open online courses), although a few pioneers, including our own Melissa Manwaring, were starting to explore how to teach negotiation to students several time zones and thousands of miles away from one another. Now, an increasing number of colleagues are doing it successfully. There is still much to be learned, of course, about what and how to teach in this environment. As the pace of innovation accelerates, I look forward to seeing best practices shared in these pages.

*Michael Wheeler*