

**Researching Practitioner Skills
In Conflict Resolution:
Micro Decision-Making and
Neuro-Linguistic Programming**

Andrew Floyer Acland

Working Paper 12

**Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution
George Mason University
August 1996**

**Introduction to
Micro-Decision-Making
in Conflict Resolution Practice
a working paper by
Andrew Acland**

**Introduction by Michelle LeBaron
Assistant Professor
ICAR**

As a member of an institution concerned with exploring, developing and evaluating processes for resolving conflict, it is a privilege to write an introduction to Professor Acland's paper. As a colleague who has seen his sensitivity and facility in practice, it is an honour. It is one thing to develop and present a set of ideas; it is quite another to apply them in a way that illuminates your own practice and that of others with whom you are associated. This is Andrew Acland's gift.

When Professor Acland came from the United Kingdom as a visiting fellow in 1994, he brought us a wide range of experience in diverse conflicts and a thoughtful analysis of how we are inventing ourselves as a field. His interest in the broad implications for conflict resolution practice of minute-to-minute behaviours stimulated and augmented our thinking. Professor Acland's experience as a developer of the field, an author, and a prominent practitioner contributed significantly to our pedagogy and practice.

In an effort to continue and to extend the dialogues we began, we asked him to write about his experience with Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP). NLP, a study of the relationships between cognition, language and behaviour, poses important questions for our development as practitioners, theorists and researchers.

Questions about the evolution of conflict resolution practice and theory are not new. At the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, we have developed an interdisciplinary synthesis of theory from many areas including political science, sociology, international relations, social psychology and law. Much of this work has emphasized the dynamics of large systems and how stakeholders can devise and apply processes to prevent and address conflict.

At the same time, we have long recognized that these deep-rooted conflicts involve people; conflict can neither arise nor be resolved except through individual as well as action. As intervenors in conflict, we know that the complexities of issues, communication and human dynamics make our roles challenging. In analyzing conflict and the intervention role, we have focused on a continuum of processes, not delving deeply into the dynamics of intrapsychic or even the interpersonal dimensions of these processes. We saw Professor Acland's work as important for its contribution to these areas, complementing the work of Joseph Montville, Vamik Volkan, Oscar Nudler and

Chris Mitchell on the interaction of personal conflict processing and large-scale conflict resolution.

As he acknowledges in this paper, NLP has not been widely applied to the study or practice of conflict resolution although the two studies have evolved simultaneously. NLP is only about twenty years old, an outgrowth of the combination of cognitive and behavioural psychology. It seeks to tease apart the complexity of verbal and nonverbal communication in a way that can provide cognitive and behavioural maps of the dynamics involved. To the extent that its principles provide insights into these dynamics, they have far-reaching implications for the analysis and resolution of conflict.

An example used by Professor Acland in his paper contains both the promise and the challenge of this material. He writes of the importance of analyzing language with a full awareness of the context from which the language arises. In personal conversation this means attending to sensory references (body position, breathing rate, tone of voice, etc.) when dealing with a person in a state of conflict. To do otherwise may be unconsciously interpreted as a denial of legitimate emotion. He asserts that we incorporate information and know that we are heard when our senses are engaged. And, the corollary to this proposition is, that if language is used that does not connect to the senses, people are likely to lose the feeling that they know what is being said. The seeds of truth in this statement are intuitive; poets and storytellers have known it for generations. Its implications for training and practice are significant if it helps practitioners and scholars become more effective in dialogue with each other and with those they serve.

The challenges of Neuro-Linguistic Programming for an academic community are several. Controversies continue beyond the bounds of our Institute about its empirical defensibility. Our academic lexicon is full of constructions that are far removed from sensory allusions, challenging us to examine not only our practice, but the way that we write and dialogue about conflict. Even if we take the information on a purely pragmatic level, questions of how to construct appropriate sensory references remain unanswered. Is the use of these devices so central that it should be one of the things balanced by those learning intervention skills along with all of the other process and substance concerns they are mentally holding? Given that this is only one example of many that Neuro-Linguistic Programming offers, how do scholar-practitioners know which of these are most pivotal in improving their practice?

There are many unanswered questions, as Professor Acland acknowledges. At the same time, we thought it important to add this to our Working Paper series because of the questions it poses about information sought and used in analyzing and resolving conflict. This paper reminds us that the stratification of conflict resolution practice into categories (interpersonal, intergroup, international, etc.) is artificial as is the separation of micro- and macro-interventions. The Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution was founded on the premise that it is valuable to test ideas in different domains and to let the light of each inform the other.

We print this working paper as an invitation to dialogue and to further work in the important area of raising awareness about the micro-decisions we all make in our roles as scholars and practitioners in conflict resolution.

Michelle LeBaron
August 1996

About the Author

Andrew Floyer Acland is a citizen of the United Kingdom who is an independent author, lecturer and consultant in conflict resolution. His work is wide-ranging, from developing inner city leadership teams to international conciliation in South Africa. He has authored two books and several articles and manuals on conflict resolution. He is a Master practitioner in Neuro-Linguistic Programming.

RESEARCHING PRACTITIONER SKILLS IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION: Micro Decision-Making and Neuro-Linguistic Programming

Andrew Floyer Acland

Who would do good to another must do it in minute particulars

William Blake, *Jerusalem*

Preface

The purpose of this paper is to present some informal observations and reflections around the subject of *micro decision-making* using as a vehicle the blend of cognitive and behavioural psychology which goes under the forbidding name of *Neuro-Linguistic Programming* (NLP). Micro decision-making describes the minutiae of interveners' behaviour: of what interveners actually *do* moment to moment. Under this broad umbrella can be clustered choice of language, of posture and movement, of analytical focus: how interveners use - consciously or more often unconsciously - their faculties and their physiology. NLP, whose origins and approach is described later, is an appropriate vehicle for exploring the subject because it is based on close attention to human behaviour and on the details of how people influence each other.

The purpose of this preface is to explain why I think micro decision-making should be taken more seriously. Before doing that, it might be useful to place it in context by reviewing some of the challenges which conflict resolution, as a field, is facing. (I use *conflict resolution* as a term to include mediation, facilitation, problem-solving workshops, consensus-building and

Copyright (c) Andrew Floyer Acland 1994. The author acknowledges with gratitude the support of the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University, and comments on an earlier draft from Frank Blechman, Lawrence Kershen QC, and Dr Raj Thamootheram. The choice of subject matter and the views expressed in this paper are mine alone.

generally all processes which use collaborative rather than adversarial processes, and *interveners* to describe those who endeavour to make such processes effective.)

The literature of conflict resolution reflects the hopes and frustrations experienced by those who seek to practise it. Both hopes and frustrations spill from the Holy Grail of conflict resolution: convincing others - politicians, lawyers, diplomats, police, the population at large - that conflict can be prevented, resolved or transformed without the current flood of blood and treasure. As the world turns, listening fitfully at best, the temptation is to concentrate on the big ideas and seek acceptance for them.

We have largely failed, however, to communicate with those who can most benefit from what we know. For example, the majority of mid-career diplomats who come on the negotiation courses I run for the British Foreign Office not only have little knowledge of the basic principles of conflict resolution: they seem unaware that such a field exists. I have found the same to be true of many of those who are involved, day to day, in neutral UN or CSCE roles. There is evidence for this in the somewhat peculiar conceptions the so-called mediators in former Yugoslavia have had of their role: calling for air strikes against one of the parties, for example, does not accord with my understanding of a mediator's role.

I believe there are two main reasons for the failure of communication between those in the conflict resolution field and those who should be in it. First, with rare exceptions we have failed to find language which dovetails with the experience of those who need the ideas, but which is at the same time sufficiently

distinctive to signal that we have fresh ideas and approaches to offer. This poses a tricky conundrum: we need to demonstrate that we speak the language of our 'clients', while at the same time speaking our own.

Secondly, the 'technology' of conflict resolution has sometimes been difficult to disentangle from the politics out of which it has been born. I believe that too often the technical aspects of the field have been obscured by the political agendas of its advocates. Now, it may be that it is in practice impossible to separate entirely the technology from the context in which it is used, or from the political beliefs of the users: but we should perhaps try harder.

For example, I am always uneasy when conflict resolution is mixed with human rights, partly because I share John Burton's reservations about the entire concept of 'human rights', and because I know from bitter experience that it is very difficult to work with, say, an authoritarian regime if one wants simultaneously to be an advocate for human rights. This is not to say that the concept of human rights is not important, nor that one should always be willing to sup with the devil: merely that the two do not mix. Nor is it to say that conflict resolution should not have a humanitarian or human rights thrust to it - clearly it has and rightly so - but for purely practical reasons it is useful to create some space between its moral and technical aspects. The uncomfortable reality is we have to start from where the 'clients' are rather than from where we are, otherwise the metaphorical baby is liable to be lost along with the political bath water they prefer not to share with us.

Another source of frustration stems from our failure to challenge effectively the adversarial assumption: the belief that the road to resolution must invariably lead first through the dark tunnel of dispute. There will always be situations where the realities of the world dictate adversarial approaches: what major social transformation, for example, has ever come without first some struggle for recognition and justice? But if we can dent the belief that the adversarial way is the only way, then we shall be halfway home, for it is the adversarial assumption which shapes the world to which we have to respond.

Fax: 703 993 1302

Further Reading

The following books provide some insight into the depth and complexity of NLP as a subject:

The Structure of Magic 1 & 2 Richard Bandler and John Grinder, Science and Behaviour Books, 1975 and 1976

Patterns of Hypnotic Techniques of Milton H. Erickson M.D. Volumes 1 and 2. Richard Bandler, John Grinder and Judith DeLozier, Meta Publications 1975 and 1977.

Neuro-Linguistic Programming: Volume 1, The Study of the Structure of Subjective Experience Richard Bandler, John Grinder, Robert Dilts, Judith DeLozier, Meta Publications, 1980.

Applications of Neuro-Linguistic Programming Robert Dilts, Meta Publications, 1983.

Time Line Therapy and the Basis of Personality Tad James and Wyatt Woodsmall, Meta Publications, 1988.

The following are more 'popular' transcripts of workshops:

Reframing: Neuro-Linguistic Programming and the Transformation of Meaning Richard Bandler and John Grinder, Real People Press, 1982.

Frogs into Princes Richard Bandler and John Grinder, Real People Press, 1979.

Turtles All The Way Down John Grinder and Judith DeLozier, Grinder DeLozier Associates, 1987. (This almost impenetrable transcript becomes fascinating on about the fifth reading.)

Two books providing accessible overviews:

Introducing NLP Joseph O'Connor and John Seymour, Crucible, 1990.

Influencing With Integrity Genie Laborde, Syntony Publishing Co., 1984.

For an example of criticism of NLP:

see *Enhancing Human Performance* Druckman and Swets, 1988.