Studies in Communication Sciences 1 (2001) 291-300

BARBARA A. EMMEL*

REPORT ON "PRAGMATICS AND NEGOTIATION" AND "NEGOTIATION AS A DIALOGIC CONCEPT"

(University of Tel Aviv and The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, June 13-16, 1999)

1. Pragma99 - IADA

Pragma 99 was a successful example of its own theme of negotiation, bringing together as it did a number of institutions, organizations and individuals who worked effectively together to put on a well-focused but far-reaching conference under the general rubric of Pragma 99. In the works for several years now, the conference was ultimately conceived and carried out as a joint working conference under the auspices of the University of Tel Aviv and The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, in Israel, and the International Association for Dialogue Analysis (IADA, see *http://zsf5.uni-muenster.de/zsf/iada/iada.htm*), the IASC (International Association for the Study of Controversies), and the IATL (Israel Association of Theoretical Linguistics) (but not the International Pragmatics Association, as was originally planned).

Within the umbrella framework of Pragma 99, the IADA part of the conference was titled "Negotiation as a Dialogic Concept." Edda Weigand (Vice President, IADA) was in charge

* B. A. Emmel, Fachbereich 9: Philologie (Sprachwissenschaft) Universität Münster (Germany).

of the IADA sessions, which sponsored about 30 contributions by members from America, Austria, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Romania, Singapore, Switzerland, and Taiwan, as well as a plenary address. The IADA sessions were fully integrated into the framework of the overall conference; thus its sessions ran concurrently with broader conference sessions and even with its own, such was the richness and range of offerings over the course of the four conference days.

In addition to drawing participants from over 30 nations, the choice of the conference's location in Israel made it possible to include a special dimension of the pragmatics of negotiation, by bringing in representatives from the Israeli, Jordanian, and Palestinian governments and private organizations who had been part of the negotiations for peace in the Middle East in Oslo in 1993. By including participants who could speak to hands-on experience in the life-or-death negotiations for peace, the conference achieved an unusual and especially meaningful depth of inquiry into negotiation as a pragmatic activity, the language and shape of which was continuously being defined by virtue of its success--or failure. The meeting of many cultures that Israel provided, as a location for the conference, contributed to its success both as an instantiation of negotiation on a pragmatic level and as a working conference for the examination of the pragmatics of negotiation.

2. Negotiating Negotiation: The Plenary Sessions

Throughout the conference, the concept of "negotiation" was itself continuously being negotiated. In fact, the work of the conference seemed to be the work of identifying and defining the different meanings of, practices in, and methodologies for examining "negotiation". Thus a negotiation of the concepts and practices of negotiation took place through presentations that examined: 1) the negotiation of meaning as a methodological

concept, in which meaning and understanding are negotiated at every point in language use; or negotiation as one type of communication, and consequently as a defined activity often called "mediation" or "negotiation"; or as both. Thus negotiation was determined to be both an integral aspect of language use, as well as an activity which depends on language and meta-language for its very existence and definition. This basic paradigm provided a rich field of play for both the plenary sessions and the concurrent sessions.

On the first day of the conference (Sunday), the Vice Rector of Tel Aviv University Shimon Yankielowicz observed in his welcoming address that we "negotiate opportunities throughout all our lives" and that negotiation required one to "behave wisely after exhausting all other possibilities", a comment that helped to establish the interplay between negotiation as behavior and negotiation as language use throughout the conference. Following Yankielowicz, Marcelo Dascal (Dean of Humanities, Tel Aviv University, and Conference Director) addressed the issue of "Reputation and Refutation: The Negotiation of Merit" and the ways in which reputations are negotiated pragmatically, first through the accomplishment of scholarship and then through reactions to the scholarly accomplishment, which can become a powerful pragmatic and rhetorical construct that can make or break reputations and thus affect future accomplishments. This approach to negotiation helped to link linguistic activity (the negotiation of meaning) to the idea of negotiation as power, decision-making, and control (or lack of control), themes that would be examined from multiple perspectives throughout the conference.

On Monday, participants were welcomed by Chair Edda Weigand (Vice President of the IADA, University of Muenster), who extended an especial welcome to the IADA-sponsored plenary speaker Bruce Fraser (Boston University). Bringing his many years of experience as an official mediator/negotiator (especially in the arena of labor disputes) to his talk titled "The

Power of Mediation and the Mediation of Power", Fraser illustrated his presentation with numerous examples from real-life negotiations, observing that "negotiation is the process by which disputing parties voluntarily engage in verbal interchange for the purposes of securing agreement on a conflict [and] trying, through language, to resolve their differences". This approach, enabled Fraser to examine "the work done by language used rather than the form of the language used to do the work", thus establishing negotiation as a distinctive activity aimed at achieving a defined end.

In her presentation titled "Recontextualization and the Transformation of Meanings - Discursive Processes of Decision", Ruth Wodak (University of Vienna) examined the nature of organizational discourse and the ways in which the "decision making [that] itself constitutes the life of an organization" becomes recontextualized as texts that define both past dialogues and future dialogues. A critical ethnographic approach thus reveals that organizations depend not only on negotiation as an activity essential to their definition, but also on the linguistic meanings that they achieve therein (through such activities as meetings, memos, texts, further meetings, decision-making, and so on) as part of the process of definition as well. Through examples, she illustrated how this kind of behavioral/linguistic activity is currently being carried out as some European economic and political organizations attempt to define themselves more broadly through initiatives of globalization.

On Tuesday, the conference shifted to Hebrew University of Jerusalem, where Shoshana Blum-Kulka (The Hebrew University) introduced Menahem Ben-Sasson (Rector of The Hebrew University), who welcomed us. Emanuel Schegloff (UCLA) then addressed the issues of topic negotiation and shape in real-life conversations in his presentation titled "Case Studies in Negotiation in Conversation" (which he illuminated by tape-recorded examples collected over the last 30 years) and closely examined his examples for their contribution to our under-

standing of the processes of negotiation innate to language use: turn-taking in conversations, for example, strategies for inserting oneself into conversations or competing with others for conversational position, or influencing the direction of a conversation. By such close attention to conversational snippets, Schegloff could examine the simultaneous involvement by speakers in negotiating meaning and negotiating behavioral actions.

On the last day of the conference (Wednesday, in Tel Aviv again), Jacob Mey (Editor of the Journal of Pragmatics) welcomed plenary speakers Thomas Schelling (University of Maryland) and Deborah Tannen (Georgetown University). In his presentation titled "Rational Choice and Some of Its Alternatives", Schelling described a number of "varieties of departure of rationality" that we use in everyday discourse, and the conditions under which non-rationality is negotiated as a heuristic for apparent rationality, a talk which he illuminated with many lively examples from real-life speech and behavior. These examples were both humorous and sobering in their reminder of how humans use language (often through internalized voices) to negotiate their perceptions of reality and their consequential behavioral choices, through their understanding of how meaning shapes reality and reality in turn shapes meaning.

In her presentation titled "Academic Discourse as Discourse: Agonism in the Academy", Deborah Tannen challenged current trends in academic discourse towards an increasingly agonistic and overly-critical paradigm, one that "calls for the wrongness in others" and in which the complex views of others are reduced to an essentialist simplicity; she argues for a more supportive model that will encourage, rather than reject, scholarship and its findings. Through a communication of negativity, language becomes the means by which one positions the self (a negotiation) in an ascendence over others (a behavioral decision) - rather than serves as the medium by which we

negotiate knowledge and achieve understanding of others' points of view, as well as our own. As we seek to assert our own words over those of others, rather than in concord with others, the negotiation of meaning becomes a negative and destructive act, rather than a positive one helping to construct a shared knowledge.

3. The Closing General Session: Negotiating for Peace

At the last meeting at the end of the conference, participants gathered together once more in a general session to hear Uri Savir, the Director of the Peres Center for Peace (Israel), speak about his role in the peace negotiations in Oslo in 1993, in a presentation titled "The Pragmatics of Palestinian-Israeli Negotiations". The speaker and conference participants alike were disappointed that he was not joined by Nabil Shaath (Minister of Planning and International Cooperation, Palestinian National Authority) as planned, but Moderator Michael Keren (Head, Institute for the Study of Jewish Press and Communications) explained that Mr. Shaath had just that morning been called into governmental meetings. Mr. Savir carried on admirably alone, speaking eloquently about the private relationship of trust that he and Mr. Shaath had developed as they sought to move beyond conflict and negotiate a new shared ground of mutual peace. Although not everyone agreed with Mr. Savir's conclusions about the defined goals of such negotiations, or even the steps necessary to make such negotiations successful, Mr. Savir held the participants enthralled with his stories of how behind-the-scenes negotiations require a combination of determination and luck, of intentional speech and unintentional speech, of discovering and finding a way toward peace at the moment of dialogue, in addition to planning carefully for it. Remarking that "you can never negotiate the past, only the future", he urged those in the

audience to embrace a pragmatics of negotiation as the only way forward and out of conflict, even if trust (and thus vulnerability) in the desired end was one of the essential components of making such negotiations work.

Mr. Savir's presentation was not the only one to address the question of how real-life negotiations for peace proceed in the Middle East. In an earlier session, General Mohammad Shmaisani (of the Department for Disarmament and Security Studies in Jordan) spoke, attesting to both the fine details of negotiation and its larger implications: "communicating does not guarantee understanding [...] but its absence does". At the same session, we heard Gabriel Ben-Dor talk about the role of cultural differences in negotiation; Raymond Cohen (Hebrew University) about the ways in which negotiating is its own teacher of how to negotiate; and Emily Landau (Tel Aviv University) about the cooperative processes of diplomatic dialogues. And throughout the conference, a number of participants presented papers which examined the particular circumstances of the Israeli-Palestinian efforts at coexistence and looked at the ways in which those efforts require constant negotiation by those who live there, both on a daily basis and through the more formalized activities of negotiating politically for peace. For example, in one panel titled "Negotiating Identities through Narratives", the presenters examined the ways in which Israelis use narratives, gossip, and media reportage to negotiate their images of not only themselves, but also their public figures. Thus negotiation as a political process was well-represented at the conference, by virtue of the opportunity that holding the conference in Israel provided.

4. The IADA Sessions: "Negotiation as a Dialogic Concept"

In addition to the foregoing, over 300 papers were presented in the parallel sessions over the course of 4 days (approximately

30-36 papers in 12 parallel sessions at any given time). Although their titles (and abstracts) suggest that every paper touched on the conference themes of negotiation and pragmatics, the scope and depth of the papers was impressive. Topics ranged from politeness to translation theory to dialogic practices to human/computer interaction, and from expressions of embarrassment to telephone talk to Heidegger and Perelman (among many others) to literary gossip to courtroom dialogues. Virtually every topic within general and specialized linguistic study was available. Sessions were often organized according to themes, such as narrative, gender, literal meaning, politics, therapy/pathology, argumentation, dialectics, scientific argumentation, literature, work/business, philosophy, varieties of discourse, the media, irony, methodologies and so on. Deciding which session to attend was not easy, and of course it is impossible to report here on all sessions.

Within the framework of the larger conference, the IADA participants focused on "Negotiation as a Dialogic Concept". Thus, while the IADA and other concurrent sessions were organized thematically (e.g. "The Methodological Issue" or "Types of Negotiation" or "Dynamics of Negotiation"), they always emphasized some particular aspect of dialogue as a negotiative activity.

For example, in "Dynamics of Negotiation", Frank Liedtke (Heinrich Heine University), claimed that the dynamic of relevance might well be a negotiated aspect of dialogue, one in which we compete, either subtly or not so subtly (in the case of his talk-show example), for the relevance of our topics and perspectives. In the same session, Robert Maier (University of Utrecht) argued that we also negotiate our identities through dialogue, and that transformations of identity are determined by the phases of negotiation and their possible resolution that occur. In a session titled "The Methodological Issue", Edda Weigand (University of Muenster) argued that "negotiation is a dialogic action game which uses power and persuasion to some

degree throughout its process"; using an authentic example from on-line business negotiations, she illustrated the principles of the action game model. Franz Hundsnurscher (University of Muenster) presented an interactive model for a grammar of bargaining, a term that implies a distinctive activity within the larger framework of dialogic negotiation. Thomas Bearth (University of Zurich) examined the dialogue-centered and interaction-oriented nature of information structure (IS).

In a session titled "Constraints on Negotiation", Andra Serbanescu (Bucharest) looked at the culturally-defined norms of negotiation, as it occurs at the moment of speech. Giuseppe Mininni (University of Bari) presented an interlocutory model of active communication, in which all participants take part in shaping meaning, and Michela Cortini (University of Bari) talked about the use of silence as a way to negotiate meaning in trilogues and polylogues. In a session titled "Types of Negotiation", Ileana Vantu (Romanian Academy) talked about negotiation in political discourse; Marco Ruehl (St. Cloud, France) about interactive negotiations that shape the subjects of arguments; and Monika Dannerer (University of Salzburg) about the ways in which meaning is negotiated in the distinctive setting of the business meeting. The theme of "Objects of Negotiation" was treated by Andreea Ghita (Bucharest), who focused on negotiating irony in dialogue; by Annely Rothkegel (Fachhochschule/Polytechnic, Hannover), who focused on the social interactions involved in a negotiation of topics in professional e-mail communication; and by Martina Drescher (University of Bielefeld), who focused on the linguistic manifestation of emotion and the interactive nature of affect in dialogue.

In association with the IASC, the IADA also sponsored two sessions on "Controversies: A Historical Perspective", in which participants examined controversies in ancient texts (Han-Liang Chang, National Taiwan University) and involving historical figures (Thomas Gloning, University of Giessen), traditions of

written dialogue (Mirela Saim, McGill University), faith and reason in ancient texts (Marcelo Dascal), historical perspectives on communicative principles in controversy (Gerd Fritz, University of Giessen), and "a few lessons on rhetoric and methodology" from a well-known historical, economic controversy (Sergio Cremaschi, University of Amedeo Avogadro).

Literary aspects of negotiation were raised by Ernest Hess-Luettich (University of Bern) in his paper on "Fontane's Gossip", as well as by Barbara Emmel (University of Muenster) on the dialogic dynamic of the underlying assumption and by Rafael Jimenez Catano (University of Rome) on constructs of meaning negotiated by dictionaries. "Aspects of Sentence Meaning and Speech Acts" were addressed by Marina Sbisa (University of Trieste), who looked at apologies (e.g. the Italian "scusarsi") in speech; and by Mirka Maraldi (University of Bologna) and Anna Orlandini (University of Toulouse-Mirail), who looked at connections between concession and negotiation in dialogue.

As a wide range of dialogic dynamics, methodologies, and topics were examined throughout the IADA sessions, it became apparent that negotiation as a concept could be broadly interpreted indeed, but that a multiplicity of interpretations would contribute, in the end, to a much better understanding of the nature of dialogue. To this end, Marcelo Dascal and Edda Weigand have arranged for a selection of IADA papers that directly deal with the topic of "Negotiation: The Dialogic Question" to be published by Benjamins Press in their "Current Issues in Linguistic Theory" series. Hopefully, the many other exciting presentations that took place at the conference will be published as well, thus making it possible for all participants and readers to catch up with the current theory in the many fields represented by this truly global conference.