brought to you by CORE
provided by Research Papers in Economics

DR 07017

The Classroom as a Potential Space-Teaching Negotiation through Paradox

Laurence De Carlo

June 2007

ESSEC
Centre de Recherche

The Classroom as a Potential Space-teaching Negotiation through Paradox

Laurence de CARLO

Abstract:

In this article, we describe and analyze a way of teaching negotiation which recognizes and accepts paradoxes, such as caring and frustrating the students at the same time and helping them being more autonomous while manipulating them. In this analysis, the classroom is considered tantamount to a transitional space (Winnicott). This way of teaching is not the easiest one for the professor and for the students, as it is shown. But it helps the students to really listen to others, to sincerely try to understand the rational of others, and finally be more creative in the options they propose, all skills and capacities necessary to better negotiate.

Keywords: Creativity - Negotiation - Paradox - Teaching - Transitional Space - Winnicott

Résumé :

Dans cet article, nous décrivons et analysons une manière d'enseigner la négociation qui reconnaît et accepte les paradoxes, comme en même temps prendre soin et frustrer les étudiants et les aider à devenir plus autonomes tout en les manipulant. Dans cette analyse, la classe est considérée comme un espace transitionnel au sens de Winnicott. Cette manière d'enseigner n'est pas la plus facile, ni pour le professeur ni pour les étudiants, comme il est montré. Mais elle aide les étudiants à réellement écouter autrui, à sincèrement essayer de comprendre sa rationalité, et finalement à être plus créatifs dans les options qu'ils proposent, toutes compétences nécessaires pour mieux négocier.

Mots-clés : Créativité - Enseignement - Espace transitionnel - Négociation - Paradoxe - Winnicott

JEL Classification: I 20, I 29

« The Classroom as a Potential Space - Teaching Negotiation Through Paradox»[1]

Laurence de Carlo, ESSEC Business School, Paris

The title of this chapter defines a way of teaching deliberation[2] in public decision processes, a method I have developed at ESSEC Business School, Paris.

This teaching method has been progressively put into practice over the years, evolving from my own participant observation in the classroom, without being formally conceptualized. Sharing ideas, between 2001 and 2003, with experts in negotiation and psychoanalysts[3], I have found that psychoanalytical theories based on Winnicott's approach are illuminating in their capacity to explain this teaching method. It recognizes and accepts paradoxes such as caring and frustrating the students at the same time, and helping them be more autonomous while manipulating them. Indeed, for Winnicott, « what we feel and what can be observed to be true can not be reconciled. Paradoxes are not meant to be resolved; they are meant to be observed. » (Winnicott, 1986, p.148).

This teaching method could have been named "dialectical teaching" as a dialectic process recognizes the contradictory sides of reality. But it would have meant that these sides could be reconciled in a global approach. The teaching method described here acknowledges two contradictory visions of teaching, but doesn't presuppose that they can blend into a global approach. They will, however, be balanced and linked together as far as possible, in the aim of providing a constructive and self-reflective learning experience for the students.

---

[1] This research has received the financial support of the ESSEC Research Center

[2] Deliberations are roughly negotiations occurring in public decision processes in France. In deliberations, the State makes the final decision taking into account the proposal made at the end of a dialogue between the parties. Negotiation and mediation approaches and techniques are appropriate and useful in dealing with deliberations.

[3] Many thanks to the members of the "Psychoanalysis and Negotiation" workshop organized by the Program On Negotiation at Harvard law School and chaired by Kim Leary.

One of these visions of teaching is a strategic and common vision of teaching, the desire to pass on knowledge or “putting something into the students” (i.e. teaching student concepts, methods and techniques). The other is a more authentic way of teaching, wanting students to make the very most out of the experience or “pulling something out of the students” (i.e. helping them to be more sensitive, self-confident and creative in their interactions with others).

When conceived as a space of creation and analysis, the classroom may be considered tantamount to a transitional space. Students in this space are encouraged to find their autonomy with the help of the professor playing the role of a “good- enough mother”.

I practice this method of teaching through paradox in the field of negotiation. It can equally be practiced in other management fields such as team building and project management for example, presenting the two before-mentioned dimensions, strategic and authentic. And it will perhaps be more easily put into practice in these other fields, as they are not centered on conflict management. There is inherently more tension in teaching negotiation, as conflict arises from the subject of the course itself. As a result the paradoxes described are truly visible.

At the end of the course, many students in the classroom learn to better listen to others, i.e. they sincerely try to understand the rational of others, that which differs from their own. Afterwards these students are more creative in the options they propose to reach an agreement. Such results are important in negotiation and can not be attained by all types of negotiation courses. Indeed, after a negotiation course students often try to apply the formula of listening to one another without truly respecting the other, i.e. not really listening. This leads them to propose poor options in order to reach an agreement, i.e. options that satisfy their own interest at the expense of others’ interests or others interests at the expense of their own.

In the following pages I will first argue the pertinence of teaching negotiation in its two dimensions, strategic and authentic. Second, the course on which the teaching experience is based will be described. Third, the class setting will be analyzed as a transitional space, as defined by Winnicott. In this space, students, aided by the professor's authority, can develop their learning process and creativity. Fourth, we will recognize that the professor simultaneously cares and frustrates the students. Fifth, we will see that encouraging verbal interactions with and among the students is not the correct formula to help them learn. Finally, I will discuss the manipulative dimension of the negotiation course, the evolution that takes place from the students' vulnerability to the students' creativity, and the distance adopted between the professor and the students.

1- To be taught techniques and to experience a self-reflective process

There are at least two levels of learning negotiation. Negotiation can be learned as a group of techniques to be experimented and analyzed in class, then reproduced in real settings. These techniques are « put into the students ». Or, negotiation can be learned as a change process in students' behavior which involves a deep evolution: from convincing the other to listening, from defending one's positions to being conscious of one's interests (in Fisher, Ury and Patton' s negotiation theory (1982), interests designate an individual's values and desire), from reproducing norms to inventing new options, from being aggressive or/and shy to being confident, from being locked into one type of reasoning to imagining and accepting a lot of others, etc. These deep changes occur when something is « pulled out from the students ».

These two levels seem important to me and linked together, even though opposed to each other.

Negotiation methods and concepts constitute knowledge that represents a reference for all the students. These concepts and methods are numerous: we can think about the seven elements

(Fisher, Ury and Patton, 1982), the tension between cooperation and competition (Lax and Sebenius, 1995), the one-text procedure (PIL Negotiation Workshop, 1997), the role of a mediator (Salzer and Stimec, 1995-96; Six, 1990), etc. They have been experimented in real settings by their authors and by others and they allow negotiators to find an easier way in reaching an agreement, if possible and desirable. At the end of a course, they can be considered as (i.e. having the status of) references for the students, which will be used in their own negotiations. But students can not use them as external tools, universal means that could be applied by everyone in the same way. It is not enough to apply them in a few short role plays in the classroom to be able to reach agreement in complex real settings afterwards. Students have to be able to be open to themselves and to others in order to feel the negotiation situations which they are experiencing. Their feelings will give them the capacity to choose the pertinent conceptual and methodological reference that will allow them to succeed. It is the recognition of the major role of emotions in negotiations (Shapiro, 2001; Fisher and Shapiro, 2005) and in management in general (Kisfalvi, 1993).

To be able to feel their emotions without being afraid of them, and to be able to use their emotions to understand and act in better ways in negotiations, students have to be welcomed in a class setting as individuals, with their own reasoning and emotions. They have also to engage themselves in a reflective process about the experiences they live in the classroom. The classroom will then be the place where they could appropriate negotiation concepts and methods. In Winnicott's paradoxical view, the classroom will be the place where students could experiment the process of creation of their negotiation concepts and methods, which were « there waiting to be created » (Winnicott, 2001, p. 89).

The idea of creativity in the class setting will be developed in a next paragraph, as, for me, it is a major element of negotiation teaching. In deliberations in public decision processes, which are long and complex, including a lot of actors with a wide range of rational and

emotions, coping with a lot of constraints, creativity is indispensable. It is indispensable for the parties in order to recognize their own interests (motivations, desire, etc) and those of the other parties, in order to imagine new ways of dealing with the others, with the constraints, new options to reach an agreement. So there is a correspondence between the learning process proposed in teaching through paradox, which encourages creativity from the students in their understanding of negotiation concepts and methods, and the pedagogic aim of teaching through paradox, which emphasizes creativity in negotiation settings.

This correspondence can be found again in the place given to conflicts at the same time in the teaching approach and in negotiation concepts proposed. Conflicts are recognized in teaching through paradox. They are also recognized in the concepts discussed with the students. In particular, Simmel's (1992) theory of conflict is explained. He sees conflicts as parts of social interactions. As such, they are preferable to indifference. Therefore, it is important to accept and understand conflicts in order to try to solve them through negotiation, if desirable and possible.

2- Course description

The core of the course "Deliberation and Local Democracy" is the particular deliberation on the CD-ROM *La Francilienne*. It simulates a deliberation on a highway project that, in real life, lasted six years, from 1990 to 1995. In this deliberation, various actors take part in the decision-making process. The goal is to provide advice to the Ministry of Equipment concerning the layout of a highway connecting two cities northwest of Paris 20 km from each other. It is neither pure negotiation nor mediation but rather a complex decision-making process.

The course comprises ten class sessions lasting three hours each. The course sections have 20 to 30 students (it is an MBA elective and is required for all candidates for the masters degree

in urban management, environment, and services.) There are no teaching assistants. I follow the students in their learning process during the entire course. The students usually work in groups of two at the same computer, with each pair sharing one role.

The simulation has four phases. In the first three phases, students review the information provided on the CD-ROM, meet and debrief, and record their experiences in individual journals. In the fourth phase there is a press conference organized by the students. In each phase there are six roles. Students change roles two or three times during the simulation.

The CD-ROM itself is used in seven class sessions, after three sessions examining the history of public-decision processes in regional and urban planning in France since the 1960s, and includes a comparison to the Quebec deliberation processes[4]. Two paper cases are used during these sessions.

During the first session, I present the pedagogic and administrative framework of the course. I introduce such key-concepts as limited rationality (Simon 1974) and double-loop learning (Argyris and Schön 1978). I tell the students that they will work in a context of limited rationality as in a real setting: they won't have all the information or time they would like to have to make their decisions.

I also discuss the concept of double-loop learning as defined by Chris Argyris and Donald Schön (1978). In single-loop learning, actors deepen their knowledge by basing their learning process on a well-known framework of reflection (arguing, being rational, defending their position, etc.). In double-loop learning, the complexity of the situation requires them to change their behaviors and their framework of reflection in order to solve problems by listening to others, being empathetic, and recognizing their own motivations and those of the others. Developing the students' capacity to adopt double-loop learning is one of the

[4] The Quebec procedure of deliberation in public decision processes in environment and planning served as a model for the current French one.

pedagogic aims of the course. Students seldom understand the concept initially because it is too abstract, but they do come to understand it as the course goes on.

Structure of the CD-ROM

On the first CD-ROM screen, there is a link to videos, a link to the logbook each student is expected to write, links to text, maps and photos, and, across the top of the screen, ten icons that link to archives, role, role summary, context, context summary, instructions, parties, information support for the debate, logbook, and methodological forms.

Some information is confidential, some is not. Students are given a code at the beginning of each phase that provides them with access to their given role's information. At that moment, they are informed by the computer of the State's decisions concerning the last phase. These decisions depend on the success of the previous phase but not on its precise results, as we will see.

After each debriefing, students have access to the corresponding methodological forms. The methodological forms are summaries of theories and methods included in the CD-ROM (they are accessible through an icon). Students also have access to all the information concerning a phase while working on the next one. These two points encourage the students to actively engage in reflective thinking while writing their logbooks. They can use the concepts and methods to analyze their past experience, and they are informed of its whole context.

Freedom and Constraint

At all phases, students are restricted by their given roles and by the information they receive through the CD-ROM. More information is provided on the CD-ROM than in paper simulations, and students must organize and rank this information themselves. Consequently,

they must take more initiative, are less restricted, and, I believe, participate more as actors than in paper simulations.

The CD-ROM does not recommend one “best way” of finishing the simulation as role plays or paper cases sometimes do. There are good reasons to use simulations that propose a “best solution” because that solution often allows a joint agreement that satisfies all the parties. But knowing that the professor might indeed favor one particular solution according to his or her negotiation model or frameworks could prevent the students from inventing new options and from searching for new ways of understanding and resolving a complex problem. These class frameworks push them to perform and satisfy the professor, to be “good students.” But reaching a satisfying agreement in class does not mean they will be able to find one in real settings, where the context and motivations will be different and where they may not have the capacity to recognize these differences.

In addition, there are many more concepts and methods offered in the CD-ROM than can be discussed in the debriefings. So, the students can choose to learn some that haven’t been discussed, depending on their own experiences, and the professor can adapt herself to the students’ learning processes in choosing to highlight corresponding concepts and methods. She could also choose to privilege her preferred concepts and methods, depending on her way of teaching. I usually do both, basing the debriefing on emerging concepts and methods and, at the same time or afterwards, introducing some concepts and methods that seem especially relevant to me and helpful for the students.

3- The classroom as a transitional space?

In teaching through paradox, the classroom can be considered tantamount to a transitional space.

Winnicott defines the transitional object as “the first object in object-relationships […] [[situated] in the intermediate area between the subjective and that which is objectively perceived” (Winnicott, 1989; 2001). For Kaës (in Amado and Ambrose, 2001, p.64), transitional thinking concerns « the passage from a state of union with the environment to a state in which the subject relates to it as something external and separate ». Mannoni (1979, p.105) highlights that the potential space is not only the discovering of the difference between one’s self and the world. The separation between the baby and his/her mother permitted by the transitional space also allows creation. This space will be the one of analysis, of playing and of dreaming. More specifically, Winnicott writes that “in order to give a place to playing […] [I] postulated a potential space between the baby and the mother” (2001, p.41).

Given these definitions, some classroom settings could be related to transitional spaces. In the case of teaching negotiation through paradox, it will be more pertinent to consider the class setting tantamount to a transitional space for people who have already experienced a transitional space with their mother, and afterwards in other situations. In particular, unlike the baby, students possess the capacity to use language, and to work through their experiences.

The classroom doesn’t reproduce the analytical frame using transference and counter-transference to work on past experiences. It takes into account an institutional environment with its own rules at the present time. Students deal with self-reflections on their present experience. But somehow, some aspects of the potential space are reproduced - the professor caring for the students so that they can more easily accept the frustration linked with the change process - with the aim of hopefully, being more creative in their future negotiations and in their lives in general.[5]

[5] For Winnicott (1989, p.165), the baby needs first a perfect adaptation to his/her needs, then the mother can prudently diminish it, introducing frustration, for the baby to enrich his/her experience. Thus, the frustrating process is linear. For students, it is impossible to offer a perfect adaptation. Also, they have had other experiences beforehand. However, it is important to enhance caring from the beginning of the course.

In the transitional space, the “good-enough mother” helps the baby to progressively accept his/her own vulnerability and the frustrations due to his/her openness to the environment. The classroom setting can be considered as a transitional space with a professor playing the role of the “good-enough mother.” As students are young adults, they have already experimented a transitional space experience with their own mothers. In this context, the professor does not enter into a process of openness but offers a setting including both from the beginning and simultaneously, caring and frustration. Thus the professor and the students experiment this paradox. In a general manner, the classroom setting can be defined by a series of paradoxes that will be discussed in the following chapters: caring and frustrating, encouraging students to talk and not encouraging them to talk, manipulating students and helping them be more autonomous, accepting their vulnerability and encouraging their creativity, and being distant and close with them.

Referring to Mendel (2002), the way authority is conceived in teaching negotiation through paradox is another dimension which allows one to consider the classroom tantamount to a transitional space. The type of authority assumed by the professor helps her play a containing function in the classroom.

For Mendel, there are different figures of authority but one unique source of it: the assumption of the basic feeling of abandonment. When one submits him/herself to authority, s/he will receive love and feel protected against abandonment. Depending on the content of a specific authority, the archaisms at stake in submission to it are different. The author defines three types of archaisms (2002, pp.204-205). The first comes from Melanie Klein: at the beginning of the baby’s life, s/he is in fusion with his/her mother and doesn’t have a representation of his/her mother. The baby feels her as absent or present. The feeling of abandonment (when the mother is absent) is at the basis of experience in the first archaism. The second archaism comes from Donald Winnicott: between the 6th and the 15th months,

while transitional phenomena occur, the baby who does not succeed in having the illusion of creating the world, will feel abandoned and will renounce creating him/herself. Creation is central in the second archaism. The third archaism comes from Sigmund Freud: after 15 months, the child will repress unbearable fantasies of fear and pleasure from his/her consciousness. In archaism three, the repression of an all-powerful mother figure is decisive. Mendel associates the first type of authority, limited, with archaism one and two. This type of authority allows protection against the feeling of abandonment without taking control of individuals. It is limited, « severe but just », and contractual. It refers to reciprocal and permanent rights and duties, precise and known rules. The second type of authority is unlimited, arbitrary, violent and excessive. Mendel points out the dangers of the second type of authority while claiming the necessity of the first type.

In teaching through paradox, the professor exerts a limited authority. The students, feeling protected against abandonment, can thus criticize and create during the course.

The second type of authority, unlimited, is linked with archaism three. Mendel denounces the regression at stake in companies where unlimited authority (rules which change very often requiring frequent evaluations and auto-evaluations, the fear of loosing one's job, the appeal for autonomy and initiative that in fact masks a lack of power over the work act, etc) actualizes archaism three, nowadays replacing the limited type of authority and its forms of regression. In those situations, the individual is confronted with an unlimited power and s/he is neither protected against the figure of an all-powerful mother, nor against anxiety and depression. Trying to escape the feeling of abandonment, without succeeding, individuals renounce criticism and creation.

Kaës (in Amado and Ambrose, 2001, p.64), also mentions the importance of a type of authority in his transitional analysis: « According to Kaës, this space must be created by the expression and the practice of a « paternal » law, which is the manifestation of an extra-

maternal horizon. Unless it exists, the working-through does not lead to moving beyond the crisis, only to the indefinite repair of the wounds inflicted by separation. ».

Authority as defined here is a fundamental dimension of a transitional space in general and a fundamental dimension of the classroom dynamic in teaching through paradox in particular. In teaching through paradox, the authority of the professor is bound by the institutional rules which are explained during the first session and repeated when necessary during the course. These rules frustrate the students and at the same time contain them and help them be creative.

But the reconciliation between caring and frustrating is not always a smooth process. As the Reality Principle can clash with the Pleasure Principle, sometimes there are clashes. For example when a student does not accept that another party has a very different point of view and becomes verbally violent against this party; or when a student does not accept the professor's proposal to understand the interests (i.e. needs, desire) of another party and only wants to convince him/her of his/her own interests.

Clashes are to be contained by the professor who plays the role of Winnicott's "good-enough mother". Kaës defines the containing function as the third characteristic of his transitional analysis. The container « must be capable of tolerating all sorts of projections and making them fruitful » (in Amado and Ambrose, 2001, p. 64). Amado and Amato (2001) define a « containing space » as the sense of safety provided in their transitional approach to change. This space « enables people to express any kind of idea or feeling » (p.88).

Students may adopt a defensive behavior, refusing to be self-reflective without overtly expressing a clash or expressing it overtly. For example, if a student becomes angry at another student over his/her role's instructions, the professor can give an interpretation of this anger. S/he can explain its legitimacy. This calms down both students (not just the angry one) helping them to accept and give meaning to their emotions.

Depending on the course, students either choose to participate or it is a required part of their program. But, even if they choose the course, at the beginning they don't realize the meaning of the method used. It is one of the reasons why the professor has to accept that learning processes may be very different among the students. Those who are not willing to or who cannot be self-reflective from the beginning of the course will have the opportunity to observe the others and discover another way of learning. Some will become interested in the process at a later stage in the coursework; others later on in their own development process, after the course, and some, never.

4- Caring and frustrating

One of the main paradoxes of this pedagogy is to care and frustrate the students at the same time. They are not pedagogic aims, but means used by the professor to offer the students a constructive learning experience.

The caring dimension will help students to go through the potentially difficult process of self-reflection. In a warm and secure environment, the students feel safe to accept their emotions and to be open to others' emotions. They don't need to defend themselves against their own and others emotions, especially rationalizing them and applying formulas. The caring for the students takes different forms, which depend on the professor's feeling of the class. It is first indicating that the grades will be given on the base of their individual learning process (assessed through their log-book, which serves as a basis for the final written exam) and not on their successes in negotiation exercises. In this way, their own personality is acknowledged[6]. It can be discussing with the students in their preparation of a negotiation exercise and encouraging them to ask themselves questions and helping them to use negotiation concepts and methods. It can be the professor's own presentation as possessing

more knowledge and experience than the students, so potentially helpful. And at the same time explaining that these experiences and knowledge come from similar training, so recognizing that they are real and reachable and perfectible. It can be adapting the pace of the course to the students learning process, staying more on one phase if necessary and less on another. Or, when an exercise seems to be especially difficult, to acknowledge the difficulty and then to take distance from it in order to learn[7]. It could be recognizing their anger (against one party or against the professor when they feel they don't succeed in an exercise) and giving meaning to their emotions. In this case, the professor plays the role of a container. So, containing can be seen as a part of the caring dimension.

When caring for the students, the professor recognizes their needs and supports their ego, thanks to empathy, defined as a capacity to identify with the others (Winnicott, 1986). This caring dimension can be related to Winnicott's concept of holding. Winnicott links the holding concept to the issue of human reliability (1986, p.146). When a mother holds a baby, s/he could rely on her, his/her « good-enough » mother, and afterwards on his/her environment. This would give the baby the capacity to progressively accept the Reality Principle, presented by the mother, « which at first clashes with the Pleasure Principle » (Winnicott, 1986, p. 107). So, holding, progressively in the experience of the baby, includes the confrontation with the loss of the feeling of omnipotence, which creates a feeling of frustration. It appears that holding adolescents and adults includes in itself the frustrating and the caring dimension. In the classroom, the professor points out the powerful experiences of the students (their successes, their comprehension, and their ideas), caring for them, and

[6] As written before, there is a correspondence between the students' learning process and the pedagogic aims in terms of negotiation. So, evaluating their learning process also includes evaluating indirectly their capabilities to negotiate, as they will have to develop learning processes in real negotiations.

[7] For example, some students can realize in a debriefing that their partners lie to them in order to win. It is painful for them to understand that their confidence was betrayed. This pain is recognized as such. Distance can be given in relating a similar pain experienced by the professor in another negotiation situation, and the working through which she did. And, after that, it begins possible to think that we don't know from the beginning if the other will lie or not, because s/he is different from us. So, it is necessary to build confidence progressively in a negotiation setting.

accompanies them in the confrontation with the limits of their power. To go along this process, the professor assumes a level of authority in the classroom that can be felt as frustrating by the students in the short run, especially in France where rules don't have the same status as in Anglo-Saxon countries[8].

The professor defines from the beginning the pedagogic objectives, the requirements, the rules to be respected and the limits of the course. This will constitute the frame of the course in which the students may express themselves. Kaës defines the frame as one of the three elements of his transitional analysis applied in training groups. For him, the frame is made of unchanging elements, which constitute the bounds of the experience. Within these bounds, a change process can take place (Kaës in Amado and Ambrose, p. 64). Defining a frame seems to me honest, regarding the students, knowing that students and professor are engaged in an institutional learning experience. It recognizes the environment of this experience, in which the professor has a specific role of conducting the course and evaluating the work of the students.

Lapierre (1996) and Lapierre and Bourque (1999) mention that this appeal for authority is no longer fashionable nowadays in teaching and working environments. The illusion that participation processes could replace authority is widespread. Authority is reduced to authoritarianism.

Agreeing with these authors, I think that Mendel's first type of authority is legitimate, and the professor has to assume it, even if it sometimes seems frustrating to the students in the short run. Authority used to define the course framework participates in situating it in reality instead of fantasy.

[8] French people seem to experience authority as a more subjective phenomenon than Anglo-Saxon people do. French people live authority as a relationship between parent and child more than in the perspective of the common good for which it is objectively preferable to respect rules (Mendel, 2002, pp.30-33).

The type of authority at stake in teaching negotiation through paradox prevents the classroom from being a place of manipulation, or of too much manipulation, as will be developed later. And, as we have seen before, assuming authority (professor) is a condition for a process of personal development or personal change (students) to take place.

Another frustrating part of the student's experience can come from the non-answering position of the professor. Their questions are usually not answered directly. They are helped to pursue them, to conceptualize them, and answer them themselves or make them more complex, finding that there is no answer, at least now (before meeting the other parties for example). The aim is for them to be actors of their own experience, to use their feelings and reasoning to better understand the situations in which they are. Laing (1971) argues that very often groups are dominated by the fantasy that the therapist knows « the answer » and that if they knew it, they wouldn't suffer any more. So, according to him, the art of the therapy is the tact and lucidity with which the therapist draws attention to these phenomena of illusion based on collusion.

The choice of non-answering students' questions leads to situations in which some students cannot find any solution (agreement) in their negotiation experience; another reason for being frustrated. This experience can be rich for them regarding learning, being engaged in a reflective process, but difficult to live, painful at the time. Their pain is acknowledged, analyzed and worked through during debriefings or in private conversations, in order for the students to accept it , to work through it and transform it into knowledge.

Thus, caring is inseparable from frustrating. This link between caring and frustrating seems to save teachers from watering "the sparks of creativity" (Gardner, 1994, p.37). Gardner denounces this problem describing the Reynolds-Rilke controversy in teaching. The Reynolds followers put discipline, that is learning from the masters, first, and creativity second. The Rilke followers refrain themselves from judging students' work in order for them to find their

own way of working, that is in order for them to be truly creative. « But Reynolds followers say Rilke followers expect capacities for self-scrutiny and for do-it-yourself learning that few students possess » (1994, p.36). And Gardner ends writing that “today, knowing full well the folly of pitting discipline against creativity, the true teacher, with an educated blend of discipline and creativity, uses both Reynoldsian and Rilkean ways to water the sparks of creativity” (1994, p.37).

5- Talking or not talking

In these courses, I realized that the students can’t put their energy in many ways at the same time, i.e. they can’t intervene often in the classroom and at the same time evolve in their negotiation process. They often need time to evolve, and during that time, they remain silent. Some students want to talk, it is OK. And, depending on how I feel the others, I encourage them to talk or I leave them alone. Afterwards, I can go and see the silent ones in order to see if they want to share thoughts with me.

This is difficult to do, because the professor very often uses discussions to evaluate the work of his/her students. And, s/he prefers (to feel more confident) to have a class that seems alive than silent students.

But obliging students to talk would be contradictory with the importance given to their autonomy. They are encouraged to feel what they have experienced in a past negotiation setting, to analyze this experience and to change afterwards. They can refuse to talk about their emotions in front of the entire class. They are not obliged to talk in front of others, as « fear of failure or of looking foolish in front of their peers (…) [presents] a major threat to their self-esteem » (Kisfalvi, 1993, p. 17). Some come to talk during the break or after the course. And the professor can go and talk with them in small groups or individually. And they can write about their individual change process in their logbook.

This students'absence of oral communication can be named an « active non-communication » (Winnicott, 1970, p.152). For Winnicott, this is due to the fact that « communication is so easily associated with a certain degree of object-relations, false or based on compliance. A silent or secret communication with subjective objects, which have a sense of reality, must periodically take over to restore balance. (…) We can say that significant relationships and communication are silent. (…) It should be possible, to establish a sense of reality, to define in a positive manner a healthy use of non-communication »[9]. (1970, p.152).

This « active non-communication » can be related to Winnicott's concepts of true and false self. As he writes, communication is very often associated with compliance. We can add: especially in the classroom setting, which constitutes a demanding environment in which the students can consider that their only aim is to fit in. In this type of communication, the person communicates his/her false-self, that is the organization s/he needed to build to cope with the world, « this false front being a defence designed to protect the true self » (1986, p.33). The true self develops in a normal way, which means that parts of it can be expressed, when the mother gradually helps her infant to give up its belief in omnipotence, and at the same time, allows her/him « to enjoy the illusion of omnipotence, knowing it as such, and 'joining up with the world's events' in play, imagination and the use of symbols » (Winnicott, 2001)

So, to avoid a communication based on the students'false self, I don't oblige them to talk in front of the others. But I engage them to try to express their feelings, their true self, in specific situations.

This vision has implications on debriefings, method largely employed in negotiation classes. In debriefings, the professor counting and listening to their interventions often evaluates students' participation. Here, assertiveness is evaluated at another level: seeing if the students are able to create new ideas and ways of understanding and solving problems.

[9] Translated by the author

Perhaps this vision is more adapted to a French audience because French students are often reluctant to talk in class about their experiences. They are used to talk about abstract knowledge. So, before searching for a method to make them talk more (costing me efforts and time…), I asked myself if talking was so important as an aim for the students. And my answer was not always.

6- Autonomy and manipulation

How can the two concepts of autonomy and manipulation coexist in the activity of teaching?

It seems that all of us, as professors, want to offer learning experiences in which students could be autonomous and not manipulated, at the same time. That is part of our conscious desire.

In reality, the classroom setting can be considered as one of manipulation in itself. The professor has his/her own learning objectives. S/he wants the students to attain them. In order to succeed, she can use manipulation, consciously or not.

Kaës (1997, p.43) explains the teacher's fantasies in teaching situations. One of them is the fantasy of omnipotence in which the teacher sees the student as an object to be taught, forbidding him/her the possibility of being a subject. Kaës adds (p. 44) that the myth of Pygmalion, the sculptor whose sculpture has been metamorphosed into a woman, has become the symbol of the teaching project.

Manipulation is especially of concern when working in role plays and simulations, very often used in negotiation courses, in which students have to enter into personalities which are different from their own.

So, the recognition of some sort of manipulation in the course is important if we hope to give space for student's autonomy. They will be less manipulated if they are aware of the context in which they study. This subject can be discussed with the students, answering their

questions. Often, in France, they ask questions about being in roles, which is not usual for them and can appear to them as a manipulative practice. And one can feel that the tension is released in the classroom after talking about manipulation and defining the one used in the classroom and its limits. But not all of the tension is released. Other means than discussion can be used to limit manipulation, in particular the course structure and dynamics. Assuming authority, as we have seen, limits manipulation (Lapierre, 1996). The tools used also, even simulations, can be more or less manipulative, as we have seen.

Moreover, considering the course as a sort of transitional space, students can at the same time enter into roles, and be conscious that they are not these roles. They can succeed in doing this by playing, in Winnicott's meaning. They can enter into roles in an imaginary process, having the illusion of being a role and at the same time knowing that it is an illusion. Winnicott defines the healthy individual as one who has « the ability (…) to enter imaginatively and yet accurately into the thoughts and feelings and hopes and fears of another person; also to allow the other person to do the same to us. » (1986, p.117). There is no recipe for this process to happen. But if the professor him/herself plays during the course, entering into different roles, imagining similar situations, using humor, not taking him/herself too seriously but seriously enough, students can more easily allow themselves to do the same thing.

In other words, students, relying on the professor (i.e. being non autonomous) can succeed in being more autonomous, playing with their own imagination and creating their own ways of dealing with their environment.

7- Vulnerability and creativity

Often, negotiators feel anxiety when thinking about being confronted with their counterparts (Wheeler, 2002). They feel vulnerable, impotent while the other party is seen as omnipotent. We can translate these reflections in the context of the classroom.

Students sometimes see their environment in terms of impotence/omnipotence, i.e. they feel impotent or omnipotent, depending on the moments. So they experience vulnerability, because impotence appears as a perpetual threat for them. This vulnerability appears at two different levels in the classroom. The first one is when entering into their roles, as being in role changes their potentialities. The second one is when being confronted with the other party, as in real negotiations.

And it is difficult for students who are reluctant to enter into their roles to recognize and exploit the roles' specificities in the aim of negotiating with another party. It is also difficult for students who entered into their roles, but are reluctant to be in relation with another party, to listen, to create options together and reach an agreement. In the first case, students can say that the definition of the role is not realist, or that it is almost impossible for them to play a role so different from their own interests. In the second case, they try to imagine very precisely what the other party's discourse will be during the preparation phase, while during the encounter, they don't listen to the other but make efforts to convince him/her. They try to dominate the situation and the other party.

In the two cases, a learning process is engaged when students succeed in creating, by playing.

I have observed that, in the simulation I use, the students who manage to play more and more, usually find a new option at a specific phase.

Those who, at the beginning, were reluctant to enter into their role are less prone to invent a new option at this phase. Their progress in terms of creativity (so in negotiation too, for which creativity is an important stake) is marked by their capacity, at the end of the simulation, to play their roles. It is this learning process that is evaluated at the end of the course. The final exams I give are made of questions about the student's logbook. The grades don't depend on the students' succeeding in one phase or another of the simulation. This appears to take into account each student personality and past history and at the same time his/her efforts to learn.

Winnicott (2001, p.88) distinguishes two different types of object-relations. The first one, being in relation with the object, is typical of a subject who is isolated, considering the object as a subject of his/her projections. The subject remains in his/her world of omnipotence. The second one, using the object, implies that the object is not considered as a result of projections but as an object in itself, whose existence is real in the environment of the subject, outside the area of the subject potency. For Winnicott, the capacity to use an object depends on the subject capacity of creation. And this capacity of creation can be developed in a transitional area, by playing. The link between considering an object as part of the subject environment and creating the object comes from the paradox which is at the basis of Winnicott's way of thinking: « I should like to put in a reminder here that the essential feature in the concept of transitional objects and phenomena (according to my presentation of the subject) is *the paradox, and the acceptance of the paradox*: the baby creates the object, but the object was there waiting to be created » (Winnicott, 2001, p. 89). This creation of the object can be developed by playing, which is allowed in a transitional area, the transitional area being this of precisely play, and also dream and transfer (Mannoni, 1979, p. 101).

For Winnicott, playing is central: « It is in playing and only in playing that the individual child or adult is able to be creative and to use the whole personality, and it is only in being creative that the individual discovers the self » (Winnicott, 2001, p. 54). Playing, for the child (and here for the students), or, for adults, the existence of an intermediate space of experience (like religion or arts) is seen by Winnicott as releasing the tension which results from the fact of putting in relation our inner reality and the reality outside us (Winnicott, 1989, p. 183). And, in the course, students experience this tension, as teaching through paradox aims to « pull something out from the students ». So, the release of this tension can explain the fact

that those who succeed in playing more early during the course learn more. The others have to release this tension first, helped by the professor's caring[10].

The students' capacity to negotiate is related to their capacity to play, that is to be creative. Being creative allows them to experience the constraints of a specific situation in a new way; they rearrange them by playing. Afterwards, they can invent new options offering the possibility to reach an agreement. Creativity is a way to reach negotiated agreements at an interactive level, and, at a personal level, a way to be free, or autonomous. This type of creativity concerns everyone, as Winnicott points out, not only the artists: « I must make clear the distinction between creative living and being artistically creative. In creative living you or I find that everything we do strengthens the feeling that we are alive, that we are ourselves. One can look at a tree (not necessarily a picture) and look creatively. (…) Although allied to creative living, the active creations of letter writers, writers, poets, artists, sculptors, architects, musicians, are different. You will agree that if someone is engaged in artistic creation, we hope he or she can call on some special talent. But for creative living we need no special talent. » (Winnicott, 1986, pp. 43-44).

For Pitcher (1996), leaders, who have « visions », are artists. They have the capacity to be creative. She distinguishes in organizations three characters: the artist, the craftsman and the technocrat. The craftsman is reliable, respects the traditions and works with the artist to realize concretely her visions. The technocrat is a manager, who relies on her knowledge and analytical capacities to deal with problems. For the author, the three characters are needed in an organization, each one possessing different qualities and competencies. And, for her, like for Winnicott, it is impossible to form an artist. One is born an artist with her talent, expressed or not. Agreeing with these two authors, we can say it is impossible to form artists. Only obstacles to the artist innate talent can be suppressed (Pitcher, 1996, p. 55). As professors,

[10] This is not a students' typology . Caring helps everyone. But these considerations are given to show different learning processes, according to students'personalities.

perhaps we can help our artists-students to remove the obstacles to their talents. We can also, for all our students, allow them to develop the other type of creativity defined by Winnicott: the creative living.

8- Distant and close professor

Gardner (1994) found his way of teaching being a grandfather. He learned with his grandson the *grandparental principle*, which signifies: « teach as a grand-parent, not as a parent » (p.69). It means that, as a grandparent, he could follow the « learning agendas » of his grandson instead of being preoccupied only by his own « teaching agendas ». To attain this state, one must be preferably older, having the capacity of being « half asleep » that allow openness to the other's needs, and leave the « teaching agendas » to parents. In this « half-asleep » state, one can be open to students « hidden questions » (p. 82). Gardner thinks that it is possible, « from time to time », for a teacher, even if not in the age of being a grandparent, to act as a grandparent (p.70). His method consists in organizing very clearly his courses, and then, trying to forget this organization in order to be open to his students'needs (p.84). Gardner's description of his way of teaching has common points with the one described here, which can be named as a mixed of parenting and grandparenting teaching, willing to teach negotiation concepts and methods and at the same time being open to students'needs. In the same way, the method used here has similarities with that of Gardner, the course being very well organized, and at the same time adapted to the students learning processes during the classes. This openness to students'needs is not a recipe. It depends on the number of students in the class, on the dynamics of the students group, of the professor's mood, etc. but it seems to be possible from « time to time ». So, being close to the students, which is a condition to be open to them, appears to be important and possible from "time to time".

But the professor's institutional status creates a distance between him/her and the students; status which reassures the professor in front of students, and the students who already know these types of relationships. This distance appears reconciliable with the students'proximity. Kaës (1997, p.72) points out that to allow the learning process to happen and to avoid « the fusional illusion of perfect coincidence », it is necessary to maintain a distance between the student's demand and the professor's offer: « This distance can only be backed in reference to a third entity, who guarantees against the fusional illusion and destructiveness, and provides the necessary conditions for a genesis and a foundation. The presentation and application of the rules, which guide the training situation, represent the third entity: these rules are not immanent from the subjects because they are applied to them; they are organized, as instruments, for the achievement of the work objectives; they function as symbolic guarantors. The reference to a knowledge that is in the building process and available for hypothetical approach, accessible at the price of which truth is paid is also a third reference. Finally, the consideration for time and history, determination and finitude constitutes the common reference to the *other* reality, the one which fantasy ignores. »[11] (Kaës, 1997, p.72).

Kaës draws our attention on the danger of being too close to the students. They could have the illusion that all their needs would be satisfied by the professor, forgetting their own desire and autonomy to prefer the illusion of being totally understood.

Kaës also helps us to make links between several aspects of teaching through paradox developed earlier: the type of authority assumed by the professor, the role of theories and methods, the course pedagogic aims, the students'self-reflective learning process and the caring and frustrating dimensions of the course. Attaining the course pedagogic aims requires mediators, or "symbolic guarantors" in Kaës'words. Among these mediators are authority as defined here and the knowledge to acquire, i.e. theories and methods of negotiation. These

[11] Translated by the author

mediators guarantee the distance between professor and students. This distance could have disappeared considering the proximity between the professor and the students involved in the caring dimension of the course. And this caring dimension is necessary to help students to engage themselves in a self-reflective process, which is part of "the price of which truth is paid". So the professor's proximity can be conceived without conducting to a fusional illusion with these guarantees. This illusion could appear from the part of the students, being manipulated, but also from the part of the professor. In particular, s/he could enter in the illusion that students are all marvelous.

Dealing with this paradox of being close and distant from the students, I often use humor during the courses, playing different roles for example. Humor appears to me as a mean to be at the same time close and distant. It allows to keep the distance with the students' demands not answering them directly. And it also allows to be at their side, helping them in their learning efforts, playing a role with them.

Conclusion

Teaching in general, and teaching negotiation in particular, is not an easy job. How do we help a student's ability to negotiate in real-life settings and afterwards? If this is our aim as professors, we cannot only be focused on teaching negotiation concepts and methods. We also want to offer students the opportunity to appropriate these concepts and methods so that in this way they will be able to create satisfying agreements. This paper relates the experience of a specific course of deliberation designed with this objective in mind. Designing and experiencing such a course as a professor demonstrated the necessity of recognizing the paradoxical dimensions of the course. It also shows the necessity for the professor to situate him/herself in these paradoxes. The paradoxes are numerous: wanting to pass on knowledge or "putting something into the students" while helping them to make the most of their

experience or “pulling something out of the students”; to care and to frustrate the students, to encourage students to talk or leaving them to just listen, manipulating them while helping them be autonomous, accepting students’ vulnerability and helping them to be more creative; being distant and close to them. These paradoxes, as the experience shows, can be accepted by the students and the professor, when designing the class setting as a transitional space, as defined by Winnicott. The transitional space as it is proposed here, is situated between the illusion of omnipotence (“I understand everything and I will be the best negotiator”) and depressiveness (“I am not able to apply these concepts and I will not ever be able to negotiate well”). It also appears to be a realistic posture for future negotiators.

Moreover, it seems to be a posture adequate for future managers in general. Yet this posture seems difficult to teach. Very often, for reasons of facility, professors of management teach positivist notions although they do not necessarily believe in the paradigm’s validity. Professors would ultimately like students to question, self-reflect, and be constructivist in their thinking in order to understand the complexity of organizations and make adequate decisions. But how? Although, and admittedly, this teaching method is not one of facility, perhaps this experience will help to give management professors fresh ideas.

References

Gilles Amado and Anthony Ambrose (editors), The transitional approach to change, London and New York : Karnac Books, 2001

Shoshana Felman, “Psychoanalysis and Education: Teaching Terminable and Interminable”, Yale French Studies, no 63, 1982, pp. 21-44.

Roger Fisher, William Ury and Bruce Patton, Comment réussir une négociation, Paris : Seuil, 1982

M. Robert Gardner, On trying to teach – The mind in correspondence, Hillsdale, NJ : The Analytic Press, 1994

Jim Hansell, « The injured self and its contribution to stalemate », chapter outline for the Psychoanalysis and Negotiation book

Francine Harel-Giasson, « Apprendre à bien diriger : les leçons d’une expérience personnelle », Gestion « Habiletés de direction », coll. « Racines du savoir », 1996, pp. 221-231.

René Kaës, Didier Anzieu et alii, Fantasme et formation, Paris : Editions Dunod, 1997 (first edition : 1975 by Bordas)

Veronika Kisfalvi, « The creation of a « safe place » in the classroom : an essential requirement for case method teaching », *in* Hans E.Klein (ed.), Innovation through cooperation-with cases, simulations, games and other interactive methods, WACRA, Boston, MA, 1993

Ronald D. Laing, Soi et les autres, Paris :Gallimard, 1971 (first british edition : 1961)

Laurent Lapierre, « Diriger ou ne pas diriger : voilà la question », Gestion « Habiletés de direction », coll. « Racines du savoir », 1996, pp.6-9.

Laurent Lapierre et Jean-Jacques Bourque, « Dilemmes de direction et jugement clinique », in J.-J. ; Bourque et F. Lelord, L’âme de l’organisation, Montréal : Editions Québec Amérique, 1999, pp. 3-26.

David Lax and James Sebenius, Les gestionnaires et la négociation, Paris: Gaétan Morin, 1995

Maud Mannoni, La théorie comme fiction – Freud, Groddeck, Winnicott, Lacan, Paris : Editions du Seuil, collection Le champ freudien directed by Jacques Lacan, 1979

Gérard Mendel, Une histoire de l’autorité – Permanences et variations, Paris: Editions La Découverte, 2002

Veronika Kisfalvi, « The creation of a « safe place » in the classroom : an essential requirement for case method teaching », *in* Hans E.Klein (ed.), Innovation through cooperation-with cases, simulations, games and other interactive methods, WACRA, Boston, MA, 1993

Ronald D. Laing, Soi et les autres, Paris :Gallimard, 1971 (first british edition : 1961)

Laurent Lapierre, « Diriger ou ne pas diriger : voilà la question », Gestion « Habiletés de direction », coll. « Racines du savoir », 1996, pp.6-9.

Laurent Lapierre et Jean-Jacques Bourque, « Dilemmes de direction et jugement clinique », in J.-J. ; Bourque et F. Lelord, L'âme de l'organisation, Montréal : Editions Québec Amérique, 1999, pp. 3-26.

David Lax and James Sebenius, Les gestionnaires et la négociation, Paris: Gaétan Morin, 1995

Maud Mannoni, La théorie comme fiction – Freud, Groddeck, Winnicott, Lacan, Paris : Editions du Seuil, collection Le champ freudien directed by Jacques Lacan, 1979

Gérard Mendel, Une histoire de l'autorité – Permanences et variations, Paris: Editions La Découverte, 2002

Michael Wheeler, « Anxious Moments : Openings in Negotiation », Negotiation Journal, vol 20, n° 2, 2004, pp. 153-169.

Donald W. Winnicott, Processus de maturation chez l'enfant – Développement affectif et environnement, Paris : Editions Payot, 1970 (first publication in english : 1965).

Donald W. Winnicott, Home is where we start from, New York and London : W.W. Norton and Company, 1986

Donald W. Winnicott, De la pédiatrie à la psychanalyse, Paris: Sciences de l'homme, Payot, 1989 (first edition in english: 1958).

Donald W. Winnicott, Playing and reality, Hove, East Sussex and Philadelphia, PA : Brunner-Routledge, 2001 (first published in 1971 by Tavistock publications)

ESSEC

CENTRE
DE RECHERCHE

LISTE DES DOCUMENTS DE RECHERCHE DU CENTRE DE RECHERCHE DE L'ESSEC
(Pour se procurer ces documents, s'adresser au CENTRE DE RECHERCHE DE L'ESSEC)

LISTE OF ESSEC RESEARCH CENTER WORKING PAPERS
(Contact the ESSEC RESEARCH CENTER for information on how to obtain copies of these papers)

RESEARCH.CENTER@ESSEC.FR

2004

04001 ***BESANCENOT Damien, VRANCEANU Radu***
Excessive Liability Dollarization in a Simple Signaling Model

04002 ***ALFANDARI Laurent***
Choice Rules Size Constraints for Multiple Criteria Decision Making

04003 ***BOURGUIGNON Annick, JENKINS Alan***
Management Accounting Change and the Construction of Coherence in Organisations: a Case Study

04004 ***CHARLETY Patricia, FAGART Marie-Cécile, SOUAM Saïd***
Real Market Concentration through Partial Acquisitions

04005 ***CHOFFRAY Jean-Marie***
La révolution Internet

04006 ***BARONI Michel, BARTHELEMY Fabrice, MOKRANE Mahdi***
The Paris Residential Market: Driving Factors and Market Behaviour 1973-2001

04007 ***BARONI Michel, BARTHELEMY Fabrice, MOKRANE Mahdi***
Physical Real Estate: A Paris Repeat Sales Residential Index

04008 ***BESANCENOT Damien, VRANCEANU Radu***
The Information Limit to Honest Managerial Behavior

04009 ***BIZET Bernard***
Public Property Privatization in France

04010 ***BIZET Bernard***
Real Estate Taxation and Local Tax Policies in France

04011 ***CONTENSOU François***
Legal Profit-Sharing: Shifting the Tax Burden in a Dual Economy

04012 ***CHAU Minh, CONTENSOU François***
Profit-Sharing as Tax Saving and Incentive Device

04013 ***REZZOUK Med***
Cartels globaux, riposte américaine. L'ère Empagran ?

2005

05001 ***VRANCEANU Radu***
The Ethical Dimension of Economic Choices

05002 ***BARONI Michel, BARTHELEMY Fabrice, MOKRANE Mahdi***
A PCA Factor Repeat Sales Index (1973-2001) to Forecast Apartment Prices in Paris (France)

05003 ***ALFANDARI Laurent***
Improved Approximation of the General Soft-Capacitated Facility Location Problem

05004 ***JENKINS Alan***
Performance Appraisal Research: A Critical Review of Work on “the Social Context and Politics of Appraisal”

05005 ***BESANCENOT Damien, VRANCEANU Radu***
Socially Efficient Managerial Dishonesty

05006 ***BOARI Mircea***
Biology & Political Science. Foundational Issues of Political Biology

05007 ***BIBARD Laurent***
Biologie et politique

05008 ***BESANCENOT Damien, VRANCEANU Radu***
Le financement public du secteur de la défense, une source d'inefficacité ?

2006

06001 ***CAZAVAN-JENY Anne, JEANJEAN Thomas***
Levels of Voluntary Disclosure in IPO prospectuses: An Empirical Analysis

06002 ***BARONI Michel, BARTHELEMY Fabrice, MOKRANE Mahdi***
Monte Carlo Simulations versus DCF in Real Estate Portfolio Valuation

06003 ***BESANCENOT Damien, VRANCEANU Radu***
Can Incentives for Research Harm Research? A Business Schools Tale

06004 ***FOURCANS André, VRANCEANU Radu***
Is the ECB so Special? A Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis

06005 ***NAIDITCH Claire, VRANCEANU Radu***
Transferts des migrants et offre de travail dans un modèle de signalisation

06006 ***MOTTIS Nicolas***
Bologna: Far from a Model, Just a Process for a While…

06007 ***LAMBERT Brice***
Ambiance Factors, Emotions and Web User Behavior: A Model Integrating and Affective and Symbolical Approach

06008 ***BATISTA Catia, POTIN Jacques***
Stages of Diversification and Capital Accumulation in an Heckscher-Ohlin World, 1975-1995

06009 ***TARONDEAU Jean-Claude***
Strategy and Organization Improving Organizational Learning

06010 ***TIXIER Daniel***
Teaching Management of Market Driven Business Units Using Internet Based Business Games

06011 ***COEURDACIER Nicolas***
Do Trade Costs in Goods Market Lead to Home Bias in Equities?

06012 ***AVIAT Antonin, COEURDACIER Nicolas***
The Geography of Trade in Goods and Asset Holdings

06013 ***COEURDACIER Nicolas, GUIBAUD Stéphane***
International Portfolio Diversification Is Better Than You Think

06014 ***COEURDACIER Nicolas, GUIBAUD Stéphane***
A Dynamic Equilibrium Model of Imperfectly Integrated Financial Markets

06015 ***DUAN Jin-Chuan, FULOP Andras***
Estimating the Structural Credit Risk Model When Equity Prices Are Contaminated by Trading Noises

06016 ***FULOP Andras***
Feedback Effects of Rating Downgrades

06017 ***LESCOURRET Laurence, ROBERT Christian Y.***
Preferencing, Internalization and Inventory Position

06018 ***BOURGUIGNON Annick, SAULPIC Olivier, ZARLOWSKI Philippe***
Management Accounting Change in the Public Sector: A French Case Study and a New Institutionalist Perspective

06019 ***de BEAUFORT Viviane***
One Share – One Vote, le nouveau Saint Graal ?

06020 ***COEURDACIER Nicolas, MARTIN Philippe***
The Geography of Asset Trade and the Euro: Insiders and Outsiders

06021 ***BESANCENOT Damien, HUYNH Kim, VRANCEANU Radu***
The "Read or Write" Dilemma in Academic Production: A European Perspective

2007

07001 ***NAIDITCH Claire, VRANCEANU Radu***
International Remittances and Residents' Labour Supply in a Signaling Model

07002 ***VIENS G., LEVESQUE K., CHAHWAKILIAN P., EL HASNAOUI A., GAUDILLAT A., NICOL G., CROUZIER C.***
Évolution comparée de la consommation de médicaments dans 5 pays européens entre 2000 et 2004 : analyse de 7 classes pharmaco-thérapeutiques

07003 ***de BEAUFORT Viviane***
La création d'entreprise au féminin dans le monde occidental

07004 ***BOARI Mircea***
Rationalizing the Irrational. The Principle of Relative Maximization from Sociobiology to Economics and Its Implications for Ethics

07005 ***BIBARD Laurent***
Sexualités et mondialisation

07006 ***VRANCEANU Radu***
The Moral Layer of Contemporary Economics: A Virtue Ethics Perspective

07007 ***LORINO Philippe***
Stylistic Creativity in the Utilization of Management Tools

07008 ***BARONI Michel, BARTHELEMY Fabrice, MOKRANE Mahdi***
Optimal Holding Period for a Real Estate Portfolio

07009 ***de BEAUFORT Viviane***
One Share - One Vote, the New Holy Graal?

07010 ***DEMEESTERE René***
L'analyse des coûts : public ou privé ?

07011 TIXIER Maud
Appreciation of the Sustainability of the Tourism Industry in Cyprus

07012 LORINO Philippe
Competence-based Competence Management: a Pragmatic and Interpretive Approach. The Case of a Telecommunications Company

07013 LORINO Philippe
Process Based Management and the Central Role of Dialogical Collective Activity in Organizational Learning. The Case of Work Safety in the Building Industry

07014 LORINO Philippe
The Instrumental Genesis of Collective Activity. The Case of an ERP Implementation in a Large Electricity Producer

07015 LORINO Philippe, GEHRKE Ingmar
Coupling Performance Measurement and Collective Activity: The Semiotic Function of Management Systems. A Case Study

07016 SALLEZ Alain
Urbaphobie et désir d'urbain, au péril de la ville

07017 de CARLO Laurence
The Classroom as a Potential Space - Teaching Negotiation through Paradox

07019 ESPOSITO VINZI Vincenzo
Capturing and Treating Unobserved Heterogeneity by Response Based Segmentation in PLS Path Modeling. A Comparison of Alternative Methods by Computational Experiments

07020 CHEVILLON Guillaume, Christine RIFFLART
Physical Market Determinants of the Price of Crude Oil and the Market Premium

07021 CHEVILLON Guillaume
Inference in the Presence of Stochastic and Deterministic Trends

07023 COLSON Aurélien
The Ambassador, between Light and Shade. The Emergence of Secrecy as the Norm of International Negotiation

07024 GOMEZ Marie-Léandre
A Bourdieusian Perspective on Strategizing

07025 BESANCENOT D., VRANCEANU R.
Multiple Equilibria in a Firing Game with Impartial Justice

Pour tous renseignements :

- **Centre de Recherche/Research Center**
  Tél. 33 (0)1 34 43 30 91
  research.center@essec.fr
- **Visitez notre site**
  www.essec.fr

GROUPE ESSEC
CENTRE DE RECHERCHE / RESEARCH CENTER
AVENUE BERNARD HIRSCH
BP 50105 CERGY
95021 CERGY PONTOISE CEDEX
FRANCE
TÉL. 33 (0)1 34 43 30 91
FAX 33 (0)1 34 43 30 01
research.center@essec.fr

ESSEC BUSINESS SCHOOL.
ÉTABLISSEMENTS PRIVÉS D'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR,
ASSOCIATION LOI 1901,
ACCRÉDITÉS AACSB INTERNATIONAL - THE ASSOCIATION
TO ADVANCE COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS,
ACCRÉDITÉS EQUIS - THE EUROPEAN QUALITY IMPROVEMENT SYSTEM,
AFFILIÉS À LA CHAMBRE DE COMMERCE ET D'INDUSTRIE
DE VERSAILLES VAL D'OISE - YVELINES.

© ESSEC / CTD - Centre de Recherche / 2506071631