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1. NEGOTIATION – ARGUMENTATION – BARGAINING: A DOMAIN-INDEPENDENT COGNITIVE SKILL
Domain-Independent Cognitive Skills

(general / transferable meta-cognitive learning skills)

- problem solving and task management
- communication skills
- collaborative work skills
- metacognitive skills
- intercultural competence
- argumentation skills
- compensation-, negotiation-, and other strategies
General Scheme of Negotiation Procedure
An adaptation of the CI PP-model (Stufflebeam 1975, 2003)

CONTEXT: NEGOTIATIONS
Procedure aiming at reaching an agreement mutually acceptable to the interested parties

INPUT: to identify and assess policies, capabilities, strategies and
- Professional qualifications & experience
- Language proficiency
- Intercultural competence
- Specified aims & outcomes
- Limits of flexibility at reaching agreement

PROCESS: to identify the procedural designs
- Problem inventory
- Prepare proposal
- Exchange views & explore options
- Negotiate
- Agree & close

PRODUCT: to define measurable outcomes
- Resolved disputes
- Agreed upon courses of action
- Bargained for advantages
- Crafted outcomes serving mutual interests

IMPACT ESTIMATE
require & decide
decide & improve
resolve & agree & bargain & craft

prepare evaluate
require & evaluate
decide & evaluate
resolve & evaluate
2. TOULMIN MODEL (1958, 1984) APPLIED TO ARGUMENTATION
Toulmin Model for Analyzing and Constructing Arguments

- **DATA**
- **CLAIM**
- **WARRANT**
- **QUALIFIER**
- **BACKING**
- **REBUTTAL**

Connections:
- **DATA** supports **CLAIM**
- **CLAIM** is justified by **WARRANT**
- **WARRANT** supports **QUALIFIER**
- **QUALIFIER** specifies **REBUTTAL**
- **REBUTTAL** modifies **QUALIFIER**
A Model for Analyzing and Constructing Arguments in International Military Negotiation Contexts

Adaptation of Toulmin model in the current project

**DATA**

2. Operational English Proficiency of Finnish Commissioned Officers

**CLAIM**

For senior officers in international missions negotiation skills are the most important ones to achieve successful results and require the highest level of language proficiency

**WARRANT**

1. Level of Required English Language Proficiency (CEFR B2)
2. Importance of English Language Use Situations

**QUALIFIER**

Unless general approach of intercultural communication (e.g. critical incidents, non-verbal communication, manner of communicating) appropriate to various cultures is taught

**BACKING**

Interviews of top ranking officers with extensive experience in military operations abroad are to be carried out

**REBUTTAL**

Various cultural backgrounds of negotiators cause problems impeding them from achieving positive results or even end up in a complete deadlock
Warrant 1:
Understanding discussions in meetings. Taking the floor in meetings
Importance of English Language Use Situations
(Operational English Proficiency of Commissioned Officers, Aho 2006)

Warrant 2:
Understanding discussions in meetings.  Taking the floor in meetings
## A Model for Analyzing and Constructing Arguments: Data and Claim

(Goldman & Rojot 2003 adapted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>CLAIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding (recognising/being aware of)</td>
<td>It is possible to search for a structured way (to proceed in a systematic and principled manner) to understand the sources of conflict and discover and achieve desirable solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the situation, the environment, and the context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• divergent interests of the parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• relationships of the parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• legal constraints of bargaining activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Warrant

- Perception of the (legitimacy of) divergent needs
- Offer to Meet the Other’s Needs
- Best Alternative to the Proposed Agreement
- Costs of Impending Negotiations

### Backing

- Reflecting on the relationships between each side’s needs: common, compatible, conflicting, incompatible needs
- Considering options of integrative, distributive, and mixed transactions
- Offering to meet needs
- Being aware of basic needs – functional, emotional (Security, Love, Amusement, Personal achievement, Social status) conscious, subconscious
A Model for Analyzing and Constructing Arguments: Rebuttal and Qualification
(Goldman & Rojot 2003 adapted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REBUTTAL</th>
<th>QUALIFIER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Acquiescence</td>
<td>Most conflict resolution systems incorporate negotiation as an adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Governmental fiat</td>
<td>to the selected method for settling the dispute either in selecting,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alliance discipline</td>
<td>advancing or modifying the procedure. Thus negotiation and conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adjudication</td>
<td>cannot be separated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Voting</td>
<td>Negotiation is a tool to resolve conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chance</td>
<td>Thus: if negotiations are not even initiated, no solution can be achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prestigious exhortation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most conflict resolution systems incorporate negotiation as an adjunct to the selected method for settling the dispute either in selecting, advancing or modifying the procedure. Thus negotiation and conflict cannot be separated. Negotiation is a tool to resolve conflict. Thus: if negotiations are not even initiated, no solution can be achieved.
3. DRAFT OUTLINE FOR A CBLT MODULE ON NEGOTIATION
Outline of Study Module Structure

Theories on negotiation/argumentation (lessons and reading 4h+3h)

Example on argumentation demonstrated (2 h)

Further tasks on argumentation (6 h)

0,5 credits (15 h in total)
2x2h lessons a week
Theories on Negotiation/Argumentation

Negotiation; Theory and Practice (Goldman & Rojot 2003)

- Defining negotiations
- Understanding conflict
- The structure of negotiation
- The nature of bargaining power
- Choosing the most effective strategy
- A foundation for making tactical decisions
- The effect of cultural variables upon negotiated outcomes
Finland’s NATO membership is feasible and desirable
### Design Brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner and context related</th>
<th>Task related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td><strong>Target function</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 25</td>
<td><strong>Target language</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadets</td>
<td>Warrants, Backings, Rebuttals, Qualifiers, Opening gambits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td><strong>Skill area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td><strong>Activity type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution type</td>
<td>Time available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Academy</td>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course type</td>
<td>Model of argumentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>List of opening gambits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language knowledge</td>
<td>Natural real world behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue</td>
<td>Model of argumentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish, Swedish</td>
<td>List of opening gambits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brief 1 (Keith Johnson 2003; Jane Willis 2003)

- **Overview.** The task involves (a) a debate on the advantages and disadvantages of Finland’s membership in NATO, (b) building warrants and backings for their argumentations as well as rebuttals and qualifiers, and (c) practising relevant opening gambits to get the floor.

- **Situation.** Integration to art of war and Finland’s security policy focusing on students being able to justify their opinions on national defence.

- **Imaginary venue.** Nordic Cadet Meeting, after dinner get together party.

- **Preparation.** The platoon is divided into two opposing groups, for and against NATO.
  
  Students are asked to prepare their views (either pro or con) as homework for the debate.
  
  Students have access to an electronic dictionary with special military vocabulary.
  
  Students are given a list of opening gambits for revision (how to agree/disagree politely or interrupt the opponent etc.) which they should practise while debating.
**Brief 2** (Keith Johnson 2003; Jane Willis 2003)

- **Stage 1.** Students work first in pairs agreeing on how to present their prepared points of view (10 min).

- **Stage 2.** Students work in groups of four (2 pros & 2 cons) arguing, justifying, backing, presenting rebuttals and qualifiers. (10 min)

- **Stage 3.** Finally two opposing pairs are randomly chosen to take the floor in front of the platoon where tables and chairs are placed. One side starts introducing their stand. The opponents present their rebuttals and qualifiers. (duration depends on the number of relevant arguments)

- **Stage 4.** The platoon/class joins the debate asking either party questions and presenting further arguments etc. (20 min) The teacher may act as a chair person.

- **Stage 5.** The original groups of four students summarize the main points of the debate in writing. This is the end product of the task cycle.

The nature/essence of crisis management has changed so that Finland can participate in full in crisis management within NATO’s Partnership for Peace (PfP) operations.

EU is developing Rapid Reaction Force in which also Finland will participate. The actions of the troops are similar to those of NATO.

The Finnish Defence Forces (FDF) have already been developed for several years to be compatible with NATO.

Nato has the best readiness to carry out military crisis management tasks.

Both NATO members and the partnership countries have the opportunity to decide themselves, case by case, in which operation they will participate. Military operations based on UN charter 51 article are not applied to Finland.

In operations led by UN, EU and NATO, regulations to employ force have been similar content wise.
The significance of NATO is highlighted particularly in the fact that from 27 NATO members 21 countries have joined NATO.

EU is an important medium for crisis management in civil areas but it does not guarantee military security.

As a country outside NATO, Finland is not allowed to participate in planning nor decision making. Neither does she get the intelligence information obtained by NATO.

The primary military significance of NATO lies in its superior force. The existence of adequate force is the best guarantee against having to resort to force.

NATO membership is not a financial problem to Finland.
According to experts NATO membership impedes enemy from launching an attack on Finland because the aggressor must deliberate whether it is worth attacking a member county of a powerful military alliance.

NATO’s communications systems (e.g. satellites) support our own military communications systems, which is necessary if Finland becomes a target of electronic warfare.

In a critical situation NATO’s AWACS (Airborne Warning and Control System) airplanes assist in controlling the air space and in leading air defence.

Ordnance is expensive and gets fast out of date. As a NATO member Finland is able to obtain state-of-the-art technology at a reasonable price.

There is not enough money for independent defence, international crisis management and for modernizing weapons whose prices are ever-increasing, unless the defence spending is not increased considerably.

NATO Navy can in a crisis keep Finland’s sea routes clear.
According to surveys over 50% of Finns are against NATO, because people associate the low support for the Bush administration and the NATO.

NATO will not be able to provide adequate number of land troops to defend Finland.

A small country has a limited power to influence NATO decision making.

According to President Putin Finland’s joining NATO would not advance the mutual relationships between Finland and Russia.

Finland must not join NATO because the membership would connect Finland to possible conflicts between Russia and the Western world.

Willingness to defend the fatherland is high in Finland. It is partly due to the last wars in order to maintain independence. Thus NATO does not afford any extra value.
The case would be the opposite if people understood better the changed nature of NATO.

Unless NATO drops a plan to proceed to still fewer troops of professional soldiers.

Unless, by means of correct decisions and efficient actions, it is possible to achieve a standing which is much more important than the status based on the size of the country.

Finland has the right to make her own decisions on her foreign and security policies.

Finland must not forget that Russia has recognized NATO as an international security organization, which by no means threatens Russia.

Finland stood all alone at the end of the year 1939 and tried to keep aside. It did not succeed. Finland must acknowledge the reality and admit that NATO has changed.
## Task Prototype

### Rebuttals and Qualifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
<th>Warrant</th>
<th>Qualifier</th>
<th>Backing</th>
<th>Rebuttal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **R:** According to surveys over 50% of Finns are against Nato, because people associate the low support for the Bush administration and the Nato. *(Q: The case would be the opposite if people understood better the changed nature of Nato.)*

- **R:** Nato will not be able to provide adequate number of land troops to defend Finland. *(Q: Unless Nato drops a plan to proceed to still fewer troops of professional soldiers.)*

- **R:** A small country has a limited power to influence Nato decision making. *(Q: Unless, by means of correct decisions and efficient actions, it is possible to achieve a standing which is much more important than the status based on the size of the country.)*

- **R:** According to president Putin Finland’s joining Nato would not advance the mutual relationships between Finland and Russia. *(Q: Finland has the right to make her own decisions on her foreign and security policies.)*

- **R:** Finland must not join Nato because the membership would connect Finland to possible conflicts between Russia and the Western world. *(Q: Finland must not forget that Russia has recognized Nato as an international security organization which by no means threatens Russia.)*

- **R:** Willingness to defend the fatherland is high in Finland. It is partly due to the last wars in order to maintain independence. Thus Nato does not afford any extra value. *(Q: Finland stood all alone at the end of the year 1939 and tried to keep aside. It did not succeed. Finland must acknowledge the reality and admit that Nato has changed.)*
Further Tasks

Argumentation in small groups on:

- The Finnish Rapid Reaction Force should participate in peace-enforcement operations
- Finland should abandon general conscription and establish professional army
- Weapons should be donated to the Afghanistan government
4. ASSESSMENT
Assessment

Assessment could be continuous including:

- self-assessment
- peer assessment
- teacher assessment
- feedback
Self-Assessment: CEFR-Descriptors Focusing on Negotiating Skills

- Overall spoken interaction
- Sustained monologue: Putting a case (e.g. in a debate)
- Goal-oriented co-operation
- Linguistic accuracy
- Strategic competence
- Formal discussion and meetings
- Information exchange
- Turntaking
- Sociolinguistic appropriateness
- Spoken fluency
Example of Self-Assessment on Sustained Monologue: Putting a case (e.g. in a debate)

CEFR B2

• I can develop a clear argument, expanding and supporting my points of view at some length with subsidiary points and relevant examples.

• I can construct a chain of reasoned argument: I can explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.

• I can develop an argument well enough to be followed without difficulty most of the time.
Example of Self-Assessment on Turntaking

CEFR B2

• I can intervene appropriately in discussion, exploiting appropriate language to do so.

• I can initiate, maintain and end discourse appropriately with effective turntaking.

• I can initiate discourse, take my turn when appropriate and end conversation when I need to, though I may not always do this elegantly.
Self-Assessment on Understanding Context
refers to the scale “Overall spoken interaction” in the CEFR (p. 74)

CEFR B1

• I am aware of the salient politeness conventions and can act appropriately.

• I am aware of, and look out for signs of, the most significant differences between the customs, usages, attitudes, values and beliefs prevalent in the community concerned and those of my own.
Self-Assessment on Understanding Conflict

(refers to the scale “Formal discussion and meetings” in the CEFR (p. 78)

CEFR C1

• I can easily keep up with the debate, even on abstract, complex unfamiliar topics.

• I can argue a formal position convincingly, responding to questions and comments and answering complex lines of counter argument fluently, spontaneously and appropriately.
Self-Assessment on Intercultural Competence

- Overview of competence
- Openness
- Knowledge
- Adaptability
## INCA Framework (Assessee version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Dimension</th>
<th>Level 1 Basic</th>
<th>Level 2 Intermediate</th>
<th>Level 3 Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview of competence</strong></td>
<td>I am already willing to interact successfully with people of other cultures. I tend to pick things up and learn from them as I go along, but I haven't yet the experience to work out any system of dealing with inter-cultural situations in general. I respond to events, rather than planning for them. At this stage I am reasonably tolerant of other values, customs and practices although I may find them odd or surprising and approve or disapprove.</td>
<td>As a result of experience and/or training, I am beginning to view more coherently some of the aspects of intercultural encounters I used to deal with in a ‘one-off’ way. I have a mental ‘map’ or ‘check-lists’ of the sort of situations I am likely to need to deal with and am developing my skills to cope with them. This means that I am more prepared for the need to respond and adapt to the demands of unfamiliar situations. I am quicker to see patterns in the various experiences I have and I am beginning to draw conclusions without having to seek advice. I find it easier to respond in a neutral way to difference, rather than approving or disapproving.</td>
<td>Many of the competences I developed consciously at level 2 have become intuitive. I am constantly ready for situations and encounters in which I will exercise my knowledge, judgement and skills and have a large repertoire of strategies for dealing with differences in values, customs and practices among members of the intercultural group. I not only accept that people can see things from widely varying perspectives and are entitled to do so, but am able to put myself in their place and avoid behaviour I sense would be hurtful or offensive. At this level of operation I am able to intercede when difficulties arise and tactfully support other members of the group in understanding each other. I am confident enough of my position to take a polite stand over issues despite my respect for the viewpoint of others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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