

**IT UNFOLDED QUITE WONDERFULLY: A HISTORY OF
THE CERTIFICATE IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION AT
THE JUSTICE INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
1983–1993**

by

Nym Hughes
M.Ed., Simon Fraser University, 2001

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

In the
Faculty of Education

© Nym Hughes 2009

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Summer 2009

All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

Name: Nym Hughes
Degree: Doctor of Education

Title of Dissertation: IT UNFOLDED QUITE WONDERFULLY:
A HISTORY OF THE CERTIFICATE IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION
AT THE JUSTICE INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA 1983–1993

Examining Committee:

Chair: Lee Southern, Adjunct Professor, Faculty of Education

Geoff Madoc-Jones,
Limited Term Senior Lecturer
Senior Supervisor

Tom Nesbit,
Associate Dean, Continuing Studies, SFU

Michelle LeBaron,
Professor, Law, UBC

Wanda Cassidy,
Associate Professor, Faculty of Education
Internal/External Examiner

Paul Emond,
Associate Professor of Law, Osgoode Hall Law
School, York University
External Examiner

Date Defended/Approved: April 29, 2009



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Declaration of Partial Copyright Licence

The author, whose copyright is declared on the title page of this work, has granted to Simon Fraser University the right to lend this thesis, project or extended essay to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users.

The author has further granted permission to Simon Fraser University to keep or make a digital copy for use in its circulating collection (currently available to the public at the Branches & Collections' "Institutional Repository" link of the SFU Library website www.lib.sfu.ca), and, without changing the content, to translate the thesis/project or extended essays, if technically possible, to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation of the digital work.

The author has further agreed that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by either the author or the Dean of Graduate Studies.

It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without the author's written permission.

Permission for public performance, or limited permission for private scholarly use, of any multimedia materials forming part of this work, may have been granted by the author. This information may be found on the separately catalogued multimedia material and in the signed Partial Copyright Licence.

While licensing SFU to permit the above uses, the author retains copyright in the thesis, project or extended essays, including the right to change the work for subsequent purposes, including editing and publishing the work in whole or in part, and licensing other parties, as the author may desire.

The original Partial Copyright Licence attesting to these terms, and signed by this author, may be found in the original bound copy of this work, retained in the Simon Fraser University Archive.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, BC, Canada



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
THINKING OF THE WORLD

STATEMENT OF ETHICS APPROVAL

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

(a) Human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics,

or

(b) Advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University;

or has conducted the research

(c) as a co-investigator, in a research project approved in advance,

or

(d) as a member of a course approved in advance for minimal risk human research, by the Office of Research Ethics.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed at the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Bennett Library
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC, Canada

ABSTRACT

The Certificate in Conflict Resolution based at the Justice Institute of British Columbia was a manifestation of a North American conflict resolution movement of the 1970s and 1980s. Its location in a justice and public safety training institution facilitated its emergence and its first decade was marked by exponential growth.

This study makes visible the theoretical and contextual bases of this first Canadian post-secondary conflict resolution educational program. A narrative research approach was used to gather stories from trainers and administrators; archival documents and the relevant literature were examined. The text was created using hermeneutic and dialogical interpretive strategies.

The Certificate's practical content, short course format and highly interactive teaching methodologies contributed to its popularity. Creating enough trainers to teach all the courses and the self-creation of identity as conflict resolution practitioners were major projects. Course content was based on ideas in circulation coming from disciplines of communication, psychology, game theory and organizational relations. By 1991 a JIBC conflict resolution model had coalesced: a perceptual definition of conflict paired with a four-stage resolution process—setting a co-operative atmosphere, defining concrete issues, identifying interests, and brainstorming mutual agreements. Additional contributions to the teaching of conflict resolution were an emphasis on defusing anger in self and others, and active listening and assertive speaking skills. The experiential pedagogy emphasized coached role-play but contradictory adult education philosophies led to some inconsistencies, particularly in the end-of-program performance assessments.

The early years are remembered as a time of excitement, collegiality and creativity. In the early 90s a new generation of trainers was hired, competition for training days and mediation cases fuelled escalating conflict, and collegiality eroded. Core course content, teaching practices and conflictual relationship patterns solidified and this dissertation recommends as a corrective the adoption of a self-critical stance and the integration of newer, more contextual theory and practice developments.

This study makes contributions to the documentation of the history of the mediation field in Canada, and to the construction of conflict resolution training practice. It also advances discussions of curriculum development, mediator professionalization, and adult education orientation applications.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My ability to undertake and complete this research project is due to the help and the kindness of many, many people. My Supervisory Committee – Michelle LeBaron, Tom Nesbit and Geoff Madoc-Jones - provided excellent advice from the first glimmerings of the idea to the oral examination. Michelle LeBaron, conflict scholar and practitioner extraordinaire, helped me to locate the research within the contours of conflict resolution scholarship. Tom Nesbit, adult education guru, not only was always ready with the perfect book, but offered emotional support just when I needed it most. Geoff Madoc-Jones was my Senior Supervisor and pushed me to the finish, insisting eloquently all the while that I stay connected to questions of educational philosophy and historical context, to the meaning of the research.

My Ed.D. cohort has been a constant circle of encouragement and Simon Fraser University itself has been an institutional supporter of this research. I am grateful for the use of an office at SFU's Great Northern Way Campus and for financial support in the form of an Ed. D. Fellowship.

The Justice Institute of British Columbia (JIBC) also supported this research in very material ways. Pam White, Director of the Community and Social Justice Division, responded graciously to my pleas to work part-time and to have extensive periods of educational leave. I am grateful to Pam and also to my former Centre for Conflict Resolution co-workers who not only picked up my work while I was away on leave but whose warmth and caring was a major support throughout. Kent Highnam deserves special mention for responding to a frantic last-minute request for bio info and for scanning the photo for the oral examination presentation.

All of the JIBC library staff were extremely helpful and I cannot thank them enough. In particular April Haddad deserves a great deal of credit for amassing an outstanding collection of historical conflict resolution field literature. April also stretched the JIBC library loan periods way, way past their limits to allow me to use that historical literature.

I could not have done this research without the historical documents kept by two longtime JIBC employees. Pat Ross made photocopies for me of her collection of JIBC Annual Reports going back to 1979. Kerry Gruber had kept copies of every Course Schedule of Centre for Conflict Resolution Training courses from 1985 onwards, all

neatly and chronologically arranged in binders. Their collections were essential, and I salute them both.

My past and present JIBC colleagues and other conflict resolution practitioners who shared their memories with me formed the heart of my research. I am indebted to all of the people who allowed me to interview them and also to the other members of the JIBC conflict resolution community who were interested in the themes that were emerging and quick to see links between my past focus and our present practice.

My family and friends have endured considerable neglect during the five years of my doctoral studies and still were kind enough to provide invaluable assistance. Bethan Lloyd encouraged me over the last writing and editing hurdles and was part of the final copy-editing and proofreading team along with Nancy Pollak, Dorothy Elias and Diana Smith.

Emotional support is the hardest to quantify but perhaps the most essential when engaged in the lengthy, tiring and sometimes frustrating journey of dissertation-writing. Many colleagues and friends offered me a listening ear when I needed one. I thank in particular Pat Hibbits, Wendy Carr, Pam White, Yvette Perreault, Wendy Burton, Cathy Bray, Dale Zaiser, Marilyn Fuchs and Marsha Arbour.

My Mother, Ruth Hughes, told me over and over that she knew I could do it. Her confidence in me was a source of enormous support. And finally, my partner Sarah Davidson took on far, far more than her share of our household responsibilities to allow me to write. As well, she served as my IT person, my initial reader, my reference list checker, my complaints listener and my bedrock source of comfort and love.

My deepest thanks to all of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Situating the researcher	7
Significance.....	8
Chapter 2: Research Approach	11
A narrative conceptual framework	13
A narrative inquiry process	15
Relationship between researcher and research subject.....	16
The creation of the text.....	19
The hermeneutic interpretation of the texts.....	24
Research challenges	28
Ethical considerations	30
But is it true?	38
Chapter 3: A Very Brief History of Conflict Resolution.....	41
Origins of the conflict resolution field	42
United States conflict resolution movement emergence	47
Conflict resolution movement emergence in Canada.....	55
Institutionalization and professionalization	59
Chapter 4: The Founding of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution.....	61
Origins of the Justice Institute of British Columbia.....	62
The founding of the JIBC.....	66
Development of the JIBC.....	69
Community programs.....	75
The development of the first public registration mediation course.....	80
The creation of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution	84
Influence of the institutional location.....	87
Chapter 5: The Early Years 1986–1990.....	98
Growth 98	
The creation of conflict resolution trainers	100
The core training group	104

The coach role	106
Trainer and coach training	108
Collegiality	110
Development of practitioner identities	111
Contributions to the development of the field of practice.....	115
Chapter 6: Pedagogy.....	123
The experiential banner	125
A progressive adult education orientation.....	128
A humanist adult education orientation.....	132
A behaviourist adult education orientation.....	139
End of program assessment	149
The JIBC conflict resolution pedagogy.....	155
Chapter 7: Curriculum.....	164
Creating curriculum.....	166
Mediation Content.....	172
Anger Content	183
Negotiation Content	196
The JIBC Conflict Resolution Model.....	208
Theoretical sources of conflict resolution content.....	211
Cutting Edge and Crystallization	220
Chapter 8: Consequences of Growth 1990–1993	229
Popularity and success	232
Conflict 237	
Ossification.....	241
Chapter 9: Themes and suggestions.....	249
Answering the research questions	249
The unanticipated story	260
Suggestions for the improvement of practice.....	272
Suggestions for further research.....	284
Closing 287	
Appendix: Biographies of people interviewed.....	289
Reference List.....	293

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

With the formation of a new Conflict Resolution Certificate Program, the first of its kind in Canada, the Justice Institute is responding to the demand for comprehensive training in conflict resolution, anger management, mediation and negotiation skills. The program consists of six core courses totalling 147 hours and elective courses totalling 63 classroom hours. Core and elective courses will be identified in each Extension Programs Course Calendar and may be applied toward the Certificate Program requirements at any time. (JIBC, 1986b, p. 3)

This announcement of the formation of the Conflict Resolution Certificate Program appeared in the January to March 1986 Extension Programs Calendar of the Justice Institute of British Columbia. It is, on the face of it, a straightforward announcement: a post-secondary educational institution introduces a new program. However, what appears straightforward is not always so. New programs do not just appear fully formed, but are the result of complex processes of conceptualization and design. Exploring the gestation of a new program can uncover the contextual sets of ideas, motives, opportunities, hindrances, and negotiations that allow new programs to emerge. For example, was there really a “demand” for a program in “comprehensive training in conflict resolution, anger management, mediation and negotiation skills”? What was the conceptual and methodological basis for such a program? What is meant by “comprehensive training” in the context of emerging professional identities and already existing practices? This dissertation attempts to answer these questions.

The educational institution in which this new conflict resolution skills training program was located was the Justice Institute of British Columbia. The Justice Institute,

known informally as the JI or slightly more formally as the JIBC, is a public post-secondary educational institution created in 1978 and located in Vancouver, the biggest city in Canada's westernmost province. Its function was, and is, to provide training and education primarily for vocational roles in the justice, public safety and emergency response fields—fire fighters, police officers, corrections officers, sheriffs, and paramedics. The JIBC also provides initial and continuing professional development programs on justice system topics to a wide range of justice and public safety professionals as well as to the general public. The Certificate in Conflict Resolution was created in the part of the JIBC devoted to public education, Community Programs, and was indeed Canada's first and for many years, only, post-secondary conflict resolution credential.

The dissertation title came from the words of Michael Fogel, an early instructor in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution and a leader in the B.C. and Canadian mediation field, as he spoke in our interview about his relationship with the Certificate and the creation of his own conflict resolution practitioner identity.

I'm just not sure how all of this would have unfolded ... it unfolded quite wonderfully It did take on, literally, a life of its own. I don't feel like I had much in the way of strategic planning in terms of my career. It seemed to just unfold. (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007)

The Certificate in Conflict Resolution, the careers of its early core instructors and the development of the field of practice in British Columbia all “unfolded wonderfully” during the decade from 1983 to 1993.

In this dissertation, I will explore that unfolding by

1. locating the Certificate in Conflict Resolution within the emergent field of conflict resolution and within the history of the Justice Institute as a public post-secondary institutions;
2. describing the development of the conflict resolution educator and practitioner identity and its impact on the field of practice in British Columbia;
3. demonstrating how the methodological approach to teaching and learning arose;
4. explicating the conceptual framework that informed the early conflict resolution curriculum;
5. assessing how lessons learned from this investigation of the first decade of the Certificate's life might inform its third decade.

The research topic, the exploration of the foundational decade in the JIBC conflict resolution educational program, was chosen in order to understand how one particular practice of conflict resolution education in one institution came into existence. The primary research goal was that by making visible its historical and theoretical context, the present-day practice of conflict resolution education in that institution could be assessed and improved.

[I]t is necessary to understand practice as enacted by individuals who act in the context of history and in ways constituted by a vast social web of social interactions among people ... (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2000, p. 578)

A narrative inquiry approach seemed to best allow for a focus on the enacting individuals as well as on the social web and the historical context. This resulting dissertation is both

historical and interpretive, telling the complex story of the individual and collective unplanned unfolding of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution. It draws on primary documents, relevant literature, my own professional experience, and in-depth qualitative interviews to explore what influenced, informed, shaped, and constrained the practice of conflict resolution education in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution at the Justice Institute of British Columbia during the first decade of its life.

This introduction provides a discussion of my relationship to my research topic and of what I consider to be the significance and value of the research. In Chapter 2: Research Approach, the narrative research principles used to gather the stories, and the process of interpretation drawn on to turn those stories into a text, are laid out. Sources of information, the written documents of the Justice Institute of British Columbia (JIBC) and the Certificate in Conflict Resolution (CCR) program, and interviews with people who had been associated with the early JIBC conflict resolution program and with the development of the conflict resolution field, are outlined. The interpretive process is identified as an iterative movement between the primary sources, relevant historical literature, interviews and my own personal experiences. Finally, the challenges associated with researching a program with which I have been closely associated are discussed.

Chapter 3: A Very Brief History of Conflict Resolution, gives an overview of the history of the conflict resolution movement in the United States and Canada. While neither the history of the conflict resolution field in North America nor a more specific focus on the history of the 1970s and 1980s conflict resolution movement is the topic of this dissertation, it is necessary to situate the Certificate in Conflict Resolution at the Justice Institute of British Columbia within that context. The Chapter 3 discussion of the

emergence of the conflict resolution field in North America deliberately foregrounds more direct influences on the JIBC Certificate in Conflict Resolution and de-emphasizes those where the connection seems less direct.

Chapter 4: The Founding of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution, examines the location of the Certificate within the British Columbia public post-secondary system and specifically within the unique Justice Institute of British Columbia. The creation of the Certificate was facilitated, perhaps even made possible, by the history and consequent unusual institutional characteristics of the JIBC, as well as the presence of particular individuals within that institution.

Chapter 5: The Early Years 1986–1990, documents the rapid growth in the number of JIBC mediation and conflict resolution courses and the resulting need for more people to teach and coach in the courses. The absence of a field of practice in the 1980s in British Columbia meant that conflict resolution trainers had to be created, rather than simply recruited. None of the early conflict resolution instructors set out to be conflict resolution professionals, it all just unfolded. The result was individual self-creation of identity as a conflict resolution practitioner and collective creation of a conflict resolution educational discourse, what would in later years be called the “JI way”.

In Chapter 5: Pedagogy, the particular teaching practices in the JIBC conflict resolution discourse are examined. A constellation of beliefs and practices came to characterize the JI way of teaching conflict resolution. One element was the adoption of a shared language of teaching that used the term “experiential” as the descriptor. Most trainers and coaches understood experiential as a set of teaching techniques—the exercises, discussions and coached role-play used ubiquitously in JIBC conflict

resolution courses—rather than as any particular educational philosophy. This technique-focused approach allowed contradictory beliefs about teaching and learning to co-exist under the experiential banner. However, all the approaches shared a constructivist view of how learning happened and the approaches to teaching and learning originating in the 1980s have remained essentially unchanged over time.

Chapter 7: Curriculum, traces the sources of the course content through examination of early course manuals supplemented both by the relevant related literature of the decade as well as interviews with early faculty members and administrators. The content originally drew on ideas about conflict and the resolution of conflict as articulated by social psychologist Morton Deutsch (1973) and expressed in family mediation practice. From 1983 through 1993, Certificate leader and primary curriculum developer, Marje Burdine (1987, 1990, 1991), as well as other early instructors, added content from Fisher and Ury's (1981) principled negotiation, and also drew from an eclectic collection of psychological theories. By the early 1990s the curriculum had coalesced into a particular "JI model" of conflict resolution. This consisted of a four-stage process that posited the satisfying of "interests", the "needs, desires, concerns and fears ... the silent movers behind the hubbub of positions," (Fisher & Ury, 1981, p. 42) as the basis for resolution, and micro-communication skills as the primary process tools. It also drew on psychological theories, particularly cognitive behaviourism, to explain the escalating dynamics in conflict and strategies for self-management. Due to its popularity the Certificate program faced no major external challenges and responded to content change suggestions through adding elective courses, leaving the core course content substantially intact.

In Chapter 8: Consequences of Growth 1990–1993, the rapid expansion of program offerings in the early 1990s and consequent doubling of trainer numbers led to increased competition for JIBC training work. Specific collective understandings of the relationships between faculty and administrators, between the program and the institution and amongst faculty came into existence. Program growth, conflictual relationship patterns, and hiring and training practices contributed to a solidifying of the JIBC conflict resolution discourse in the early 1990s.

In Chapter 9: Themes and Suggestions, the answers to the original research questions and the unanticipated story themes that emerged during the inquiry process are summarized. Recommendations are made for future development of conflict resolution educational practice at the JIBC and areas for future research are identified.

Situating the researcher

My job role was a primary motivator in undertaking this particular research inquiry. At the time the research started, I was responsible for curriculum development and faculty supervision in the Centre for Conflict Resolution at the JIBC. Gaining a greater understanding of the historical, theoretical, and methodological foundations of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution would, I believed, assist me in making more thoughtful decisions in the present.

My connection to the Certificate in Conflict Resolution and my interest in my research topic, however, went much deeper than a job role. I received my Certificate in Conflict Resolution as part of the 1987 graduating class, maintained a private practice as a mediator, facilitator and trainer from 1987 through 2000, coached and taught in the

Certificate in Conflict Resolution from 1986 to 2000 and worked as an administrator in the Centre for Conflict Resolution from 1997 to 2009. This more than twenty years of active involvement in the conflict resolution field in British Columbia had given me a deep practitioner-based knowledge of mediation, of how learning and teaching are framed within the Certificate in Conflict Resolution, of the content of what is taught in the Certificate and of the development of the mediation field of practice in British Columbia.

Like many practitioners in the field of conflict resolution, however, my understandings of the historical and theoretical sources of my work were weak. As a graduate student in education, I became increasingly curious about how conflict resolution education and the JIBC program in particular might be understood from outside my practitioner and administrator standpoint. Where had conflict resolution education come from? What theoretical perspectives had shaped the approaches to conflict I had been taught and that I had taught others? This curiosity was a major impetus for this research.

Significance

The value of this research lies in two areas: scholarly and applied. A study of this kind investigating a program in conflict resolution education for adults located in a Canadian post-secondary institution has not been previously undertaken. There is no research documenting the emergence of the conflict resolution field in British Columbia and barely any looking at Canada as a whole. Additionally, the interplay in a conflict resolution educational program between institutional location, field of practice development and individual faculty identity creation has not been previously articulated,

nor has the kind of detailed tracing of the theoretical sources of a conflict resolution curriculum and a conflict resolution pedagogy that I have attempted to present.

Conflict resolution scholar-practitioner John Paul Lederach (1995) called for such detailed examination of conflict resolution training.

Stated bluntly, conflict resolution training in the dominant North American culture represents among other things the packaging, presentation and selling of social knowledge. Whose knowledge, under what package, delivered through what mechanism, and received by what populations are all legitimate and necessary questions for investigation and study if we are to achieve a critical understanding of the training project. (Lederach, 1995, p. 6)

This dissertation responds to Lederach's (1995) legitimate and necessary questions and contributes to a scholarly understanding of the conflict resolution training project in relation to one specific educational program. It also furthers Canadian conflict resolution scholar-practitioner Cheryl Picard's (2000) research into how Canadian mediators make meaning of their work.

It would be useful in a future study to examine the training mediators receive. Were they trained in an academic setting or a professional program? Who trained them? What was the trainer's educational background? What was included in the course content? What ideological viewpoint was stressed? What model of mediation practice? ... much could be learned about mediation and its stage of development by examining the training of its workers. (p. 234)

Because of the focus on only one mediator training program, this inquiry does not allow for the kind of comparisons across different mediator training programs that Picard (2000) envisioned, but it does describe in considerable detail the ideological and process bases for mediator training at the JIBC and therefore makes a contribution to the research on mediation training and practice in Canada.

Charles Taylor's (1985) work on the relationship between theory and action provides a framework for the applied purpose and value of this research. He maintains that social theory can affect practice, that "... our self-descriptions can be constitutive of our practices" and may help "... make explicit the self-understandings which constitute our social life" (Taylor, 1985, pp. 104-105). The formulation of such self-understandings does more than merely describe. Making practitioner self-understandings explicit can be a key factor in the ongoing process of maintaining the health of a practice.

Through describing the individual and collective self-understandings of a group of people who created a conflict resolution educational program in a British Columbia post-secondary education institution in the 1980s, the formerly occluded theoretical bases of content and pedagogy are made visible within a particular historical and social context. This visibility might lead to the examination and re-examination of foundational theoretical beliefs necessary for assessing and changing practice.

CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH APPROACH

A narrative inquiry approach to hearing and to telling the story of the first decade of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was planned and identified in the original research proposal for this study. As the study progressed, I also drew on traditions of historical inquiry and ethnography. This qualitative research inquiry is historical, looking backwards at the 1983–1993 founding decade of a particular British Columbia conflict resolution educational program. It uses the primary sources of historical research, “the oral testimony of eyewitnesses, documents, records and relics” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, pp. 123-124) and adopts the interpretive stance of the historian, acknowledging the resulting narrative account as “a social text that constructs and reconstructs the realities of the past” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 375).

The initial research focus on tracing the development of ideas about conflict, about the resolution of conflict and about how best to teach people to resolve conflict draws on the tradition of intellectual history, a current or sub-field within the larger discipline of history, one that concerns itself with ideas “that have some substantial degree of explicit, consciously thought-out and often conceptually-inclined development” (Megill, 2004, p. 550). The study also draws on the longstanding observational and narrative traditions of ethnography, placing “specific encounters, events and understandings into a fuller, more meaningful context” (Tedlock, 2000, p. 455).

The research might be seen as located within educational ethnography, that sub-field “focused on ethnographic accounts of schools and educational settings” (Yon, 2003,

p. 411) or possibly in the much newer institutional ethnography created by feminist sociologist Dorothy Smith (2001). While institutional ethnography is similar to other ethnographic research traditions in using interviews, observations and documents, it

departs from other ethnographic approaches by treating those data not as the topic or object of interest, but as "entry" into the social relations of the setting ... exploring how people's lives are bound up in ruling relations that tie individuals into institutional action arising outside their knowing. (Campbell, 1998, p. 55)

This study shares an interest in institutions and, in particular, a focus on “how people in one place are aligning their activities with relevancies produced elsewhere, in order to illuminate the forces that shape experience at the point of entry” (DeVault, 2006, p. 294). However, I am not using an analytical frame that “proceeds by way of tracing the social relations people are drawn into through their work (with the term “social relations” taken in its Marxist sense to mean not relationships but connections among work processes)” (DeVault, 2006, p. 294). Therefore, although the research approach is an historical one and an ethnographic account of an educational institution, it is more precisely conceptualized and located in that “relatively new branch within the qualitative or interpretive research tradition” (Moen, 2006, p. 2) called narrative inquiry or narrative research. Narrative research is “increasingly used in studies of educational practice and experience” (Moen, 2006, p. 2) or, as Clark and Rossiter (2008) say, “narrative is on the move” (p. 61).

Narratives are a “form of discourse in which the events and happenings are configured into a temporal whole by means of a plot” (Kelly & Howie, 2007, p. 137). “Understanding ourselves and our worlds narratively, our attention is turned to how we

are engaged in living, telling, retelling and reliving our lives within particular social and cultural plotlines” (Clandinin & Huber, 2002, p. 161).

The narrative approach in qualitative research may refer simply to “the outcome of the research process” (Kelly & Howie, 2007, p. 138), where the final documentation of research conducted in a variety of ways is written up in a narrative form. Or the narrative approach may refer to a method of inquiry based on listening to and listening for stories in a dialogic relationship between researcher and research subject, creating a text from those stories and interpreting the text (Clandinin & Connelly, 1990, 1998; Kelly & Howie, 2007; Moen, 2006; Polkinghorne, 1988). Or a narrative research approach may be an overall conceptual framework, “both phenomenon and method” (Clandinin & Huber, 2002, p. 162). In this research process, a narrative research approach was used in all three ways: as the overall conceptual framework, as a guiding principle for the inquiry process of gathering and interpreting the stories, and as the format for presenting the interpretations.

A narrative conceptual framework

A narrative research approach starts with the assumption that narrative

is the primary scheme by which human existence is rendered meaningful. Thus, the study of human beings by the human sciences needs to focus on the realm of meaning in general, and narrative meaning in particular. (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 11)

Human beings organize our understanding of our lives through stories. “Everyday we are bombarded by a dizzying variety of experiences and we make sense out of chaos by establishing connections between and among those experiences” (Clark & Rossiter, 2008, p. 62). Personal narratives are how “human beings give meaning to their

experience of temporality and personal actions” (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 11). Our individual and personal sense-making always takes place, however, within the historical, social and cultural narratives that surround us and shape us. We choose the meanings we ascribe to our lives from the plot lines that are available to us: “As individuals are telling their stories, they are not isolated and independent of the context. On the contrary, it is important to remember that the individual in question is irreducibly connected to her or his social, cultural or institutional setting” (Moen, 2006, p. 4).

Our personal narratives are not fixed or static, rather “the self is understood as an ever-unfolding story” (Clark & Rossiter, 2008, p. 62). The story changes over time. We understand ourselves differently as “the life narrative is repeatedly revised and enlarged throughout one’s life to accommodate new insights, events and perspectives” (Clark & Rossiter, 2008, p. 62). The story changes depending on where it takes place, when it takes place, who else is present, and other environmental and contextual factors.

We story our identities in multiple and sometimes contradictory ways; in one context we see ourself as the hero of the story; while in another we are someone whose agency is limited. These multiple narratives allow us to manage the complexity of who we are. (Clark & Rossiter, 2008, p. 62)

Our stories also change depending on where we are telling them, to whom we are telling them and why we are telling them. Because individual narratives are always shaped by contexts, they are also seen as collective narratives.

[N]arratives are in part personal stories shaped by the knowledge, experiences, preferences, values and feelings of the people involved. At the same time they are collective stories that are shaped by the addressees and the cultural, historical and institutional settings in which they occur. (Moen, 2006, p. 5)

Finally, the overall conceptual framework of narrative research makes no claims to discovering or creating objective truth. “[T]he belief in the potential attainment of an objective reality of truth is rejected” (Moen, 2006, p. 5).

This research into the first decade of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was framed by these narrative research theories. I assumed that the stories I heard were true to the tellers, in the moment of the telling, in the context of telling the story to me. I assumed that the stories were connected, indeed shaped, by the contexts in which they occurred and that part of my task as the interpreter was to try and make those contexts visible. I assumed that there was no one true story and, therefore, that indisputable factual accuracy was not a realistic, or necessary, goal of this research. Rather, the goal was to build heightened understanding of our practice as conflict resolution educators in order to improve our practice as conflict resolution educators.

A narrative inquiry process

Moen (2006) comments that “the literature on narrative inquiry appears to be rather vague about concrete inquiry procedures” (p. 6) and, rather than prescribing specific methodological guidance, offers three characteristics of a narrative research process. First, narrative inquiry requires a collaborative and dialogic relationship between researcher and research subject; second, the creation of a written text from usually oral stories; and third, a hermeneutic interpretation of that written text. The following description of how this narrative inquiry took place is organized under Moen’s (2006) categorizations.

Relationship between researcher and research subject

My relationship with the research topic, the Certificate in Conflict Resolution, was lengthy and intimate. The beginning of this particular relationship story could be considered the first course I took in 1983 at the JIBC. I graduated from the Certificate in 1987, coached and taught in the Certificate courses from 1986 through 2001, and worked as an administrator in the Centre for Conflict Resolution from 1997 to 2009.

My relationship with most of the people who told me their stories was almost as lengthy, if not as intimate. While I interviewed several people for this research who were involved with the history of the field of conflict resolution but with whom I did not have a prior relationship, all had a relationship with the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training and were, likely, open to telling their stories to some degree because of my connection to the Centre. Most of the people interviewed, however, had been my colleagues on the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training faculty for many years. Some had been my classmates in the conflict resolution certificate courses in the 1980s; some had been my teachers in those courses. Many were, at the time of our interview, my administrative responsibility. Part of my job role in the Centre for Conflict Resolution at the time was to supervise and support faculty members through performance dialogues, organizing professional development events, consulting on teaching practices and intervening in cases of learner complaints as well as convening and facilitating faculty committees that reviewed and made changes in Certificate curriculum materials and assessment procedures.

In the ethnographic research tradition, this relationship to the research topic and to most of the research subjects would place me at the highest level of ethnographer

participation in what is being observed, a complete-member-researcher, “those who study settings in which they are already members” (Angrosino & Mays de Perez, 2000, p. 677). Kemmis and McTaggart (2000) describe it as insider research—and the insider researcher position has its complexities. It is seen as providing not only access to the setting and the people in that setting, but an automatic, empathic, shared experience-based connection.

On the one hand this can be a benefit, on the other a limitation. Researchers

seeing themselves, their understandings, their practices and the settings in which they practice from the perspectives of insiders, who see these things in an intimate, even a “natural” way that may be subject to the partiality of view characteristic of the insider perspective. (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2000, p. 590)

Thus a certain detachment may be lost due to the researcher being embedded in the situation. Additionally, in narrative research theory, it is held that the addressee, the person the story is told to, affects what story is told. On one obvious level, did my storytellers censor themselves because I was a Centre administrator? In particular, did they silence criticisms of the Centre for Conflict Resolution? Could fear of the consequences of displeasing me, their titular supervisor, constrain their voices? I have no way of knowing the answer to those questions but it did not seem so. The people I interviewed were all very early faculty members. Several pre-dated me. Several were retired. All were well-regarded and successful conflict resolution teachers and practitioners. My abilities to negatively impact their careers or their lives or even their Centre for Conflict Resolution course allocations were minimal, if not non-existent. My insider position did influence the stories I heard in other ways. Moen (2006), discussing narrative research with teachers, says that when the teacher-researchers enter the classroom “to collect their data, the scene is so familiar that it might be difficult to see

anything at all” (p. 7). I think I was limited by that kind of familiarity. I definitely heard more intimate stories than a stranger would have heard, but I probably did not hear all that a stranger might have heard because the shared history, the shared story, kept me nodding rather than asking questions.

Given the “multiple positions, selves, and identities at play in the research process” (Olesen, 2000, p. 227), feminist researchers in particular have “rethought the important issue of whether being an ‘insider’ gave ... access to inside knowledge” (p. 227). On the whole, they have concluded that it is a complex question with no clear answer, but that assumptions of sameness between researcher and researched are rarely accurate, even more rarely useful, and that the whole concept of insider knowledge is problematic because the assumptions about its unified, stable and unchanging nature are inaccurate (Olesen, 2000). In terms of this research project, this means that although I shared considerable history with many of the people I interviewed, our areas of similarity were situated beside our areas of difference, and my assumptions of shared understanding may have been, indeed likely were, inaccurate.

Narrative research claims that the relationship between the researcher and the research subject should be collegial and dialogic, as well as caring and comfortable (Moen, 2006). I felt comfortable, albeit excited and somewhat nervous, in my research-related relationships, and my storytellers appeared to be comfortable as well. Several commented that the interview process had been interesting and enjoyable. The collaborative and dialogic nature of the researcher/research subject relationship is most visible in the creation of the narrative, and I will discuss how collaboration and dialogue occurred between myself and my storytellers when I discuss the interpretation of the text.

The creation of the text

The creation of the text in narrative research usually means the translation from oral stories into written narratives. This section of the chapter will describe how stories were gathered and what was done with them.

At the beginning of the research, I created a set of research questions, shaped by my particular areas of curiosity, that I hoped would elicit the big-picture story of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution:

- What shaped the emergence of conflict resolution as a field of practice?
- What was the influence of the program's location in a public post-secondary institution?
- What was the inter-relationship between the educational program and the field of practice in British Columbia?
- What ideas about teaching and learning influenced the instructional approaches of the program?
- What ideas about conflict and the resolving of conflict influenced the content of the JIBC conflict resolution education program?

Both a search of the conflict resolution literature and interviews with several of the earliest Certificate in Conflict Resolution instructors were initiated. Additional interviewees, and additional stories, were gathered through a snowball interviewing process. In each interview I would be given more names—"someone who could talk more about ..." or "someone who could answer that question."

The interviews took place in peoples' homes or offices, usually one at a time, although there was one interview with three people. The interviews were carried out

following Miller and Crabtree's (2004) guidelines for depth interviewing, a "data-gathering process designed to generate narratives that focus on fairly specific research questions" (p. 188). In the opening part of the conversation the informed consent forms were presented and discussed.

One very critical aspect of the informed consent procedure was to ensure that the interviewees fully understood that the historical research design I was using would not keep their identities confidential, but that their real names would be used in the dissertation.

The decision to use real names in the final written narrative was made primarily because the research was historical, concerning itself with describing events that had taken in place in a public context. Using pseudonyms would, I believed, have limited the transparency and therefore the credibility of the historical descriptions and analyses. As well, the identities of the limited number of early Centre for Conflict Resolution Training administrators and trainers were not only a matter of public record, but were well-known in the fairly small circles of conflict resolution educator and practitioner communities in British Columbia and Canada. Using direct quotes at all would serve to almost inevitably reveal identities, and using direct quotes was a critical aspect of my narrative research process.

I therefore ensured that interviewees fully understood that their identities would not be kept confidential and explained that they would be sent the first draft of the dissertation and would be asked to approve the use of any quotes attributed to them and that any of their quotes would be removed on request. Their comments on the

interpretations made would be welcomed and that these additional clarifying or dissenting viewpoints would be included in the final manuscript.

If the interviewee was willing to proceed, and all the people I contacted were, the following broad questions were asked, with more specific questions asked as follow-ups as seemed useful in the context of the particular conversation:

- What was your first involvement with the JI? How did you get involved?
- What was the JI like then?
- What was your previous background/experience?
- How did you learn about conflict resolution?
- How did the Certificate get developed?
- How would you describe the early Certificate program?
- What would you say were the main ideas of the program?
- How were courses developed?
- What were the sources of the course content?
- How would you describe the approaches to teaching? What do you think they were based on?
- What was happening in the conflict resolution field in B.C. at that time? In Canada?
- How would you describe the evolution of the Certificate Program?
- What would you identify as major change points for the program?
- What do you think were the major impacts on the Certificate of being part of the JIBC?
- What do you see as most influencing the program over the years?
- What impact do you think the program has had?

- What else do you think it is important for me to know?

The interviews were recorded on a digital voice recorder. Immediately after each interview, I would write my impressions of the interview. Read retrospectively, these handwritten notes are a collection of emotional responses to the interview, confirmations of information heard in previous interviews, new or contradictory information surfacing, questions to pursue in the literature, and suggestions for additional people to interview. The digital interview recordings were sent electronically to a transcription service using a secure encryption process. Transcripts were returned electronically. Hard copies of interview transcripts were kept in a locked file cabinet in the office I was using at the Great Northern Way Campus of SFU. Electronic files of interviews were kept on two separate servers and the laptop I was using was kept in the locked cabinet in the locked office when not in use.

As the interviewing phase progressed, the original questions were adapted to focus more on specific information from a particular interviewee. At the same time I was searching out and reading books and articles mentioned by the interviewees or that concerned a term or concept referred to by the interviewees. These books, wherever possible, were ones that had been published in the same time period as the interviewees were remembering.

I read the transcripts repeatedly, listening for the story of the curriculum, the story of the teaching practices, the story of the JIBC, the story of field development. As seems to be common in qualitative research approaches, while I was gaining some understandings related to the research questions, I was also hearing answers to questions that weren't being asked. Three new story themes emerged—the creation of an identity as

conflict resolution professionals as the primary project for early program instructors; the emergence and prevalence of unresolved conflict between administrative staff and instructors and amongst instructors; and the stability, even rigidity, of the core curriculum and teaching practices over the 20 year life of the program.

Moen (2006) says that data for narratives can be gathered from many sources: “Data can be in the form of field notes, journal records, interview transcripts, one’s own and others’ observations, storytelling, letter-writing, autobiographical writing, documents such as school and class plans, newsletters and other texts, such as rules and principles, and pictures” (p. 6). The transcripts of the interviews were a major text from which the final narrative was created, and the story told in early JIBC documents was another. I read archival JIBC materials—the 1980 JIBC calendar, Community and Extension Program calendars from 1982 onwards, JIBC Annual Reports, Centre for Conflict Resolution Training Newsletters from 1986 through 1993, and early Certificate in Conflict Resolution course manuals—the same way I was reading the interview transcripts, for the stories. As preliminary story lines started to take shape in my mind, I looked for confirmations or contradictions in the documents. I also used the documents as prompts in some of the interviews, taking copies of early course schedules or course manuals to show people in hopes of eliciting more memories or, as the research progressed, because I wanted to ask particular questions.

At the same time I was attending to the books I was reading—the literature of conflict resolution, mediation, psychology, adult education published in the 70s and 80s. I was reading them for the bigger stories, the historical context of the emergence of the field of practice, the story of peace education in the United States in the twentieth

century, the story of Kurt Lewin and the National Training Laboratories, the story of Carl Rogers and the California human potential movement, and so on. All of my three sources, the people interviewed, the archival documents, and the literature, told stories and it was my interpretive task to shape all the plot lines into one credible narrative.

The hermeneutic interpretation of the texts

Approaches to qualitative data analysis range along a continuum from “technical, scientific and standardized strategies” where the researcher “has assumed an objectivist stance relative to the inquiry and has stipulated categories in advance” to “immersion strategies which rely heavily on the researcher’s intuitive and interpretive capacities” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 151). Historical analysis is considered always interpretive (Marshall & Rossman, 1999) and narrative analysis is described as always “an ongoing hermeneutic or interpretive process” (Moen, 2006, p. 7). Schwandt (2001) distinguishes between three theoretical approaches to interpretation: interpretivism, hermeneutics and social constructionism. Interpretivism holds that

it is possible to understand the subjective meaning of action (grasping the actor’s beliefs, desires, and so on) yet do so in an objective manner. The meaning that the interpreter reproduces or reconstructs is considered the original meaning of the action. (Schwandt, 2000, p. 193)

Unlike interpretivism, social constructionist epistemologies and philosophical hermeneutics dismiss the notion that there can be objective knowledge produced by a disinterested interpreter. Both agree that “we are self-interpreting beings and that language constitutes this being” and both “hold an affinity with the notion of the coming into being of meaning” (Schwandt, 2000, p. 198). Social constructionism and hermeneutics differ, however, on whether any interpretation can claim to be true, or at

least truer than any other. Weak constructionist theories attempt to “preserve some way of distinguishing better or worse interpretations” while strong constructionist theories “hold there is no truth to the matter of interpretation.” Philosophical hermeneutics, in contrast, “trusts in the potential of language (conversation, dialogue) to disclose meaning and truth” (Schwandt, 2000, p. 198).

A hermeneutic interpretation approach was both consistent with the principles of narrative research and with my own beliefs. Schwandt (2000) argues that the “doing” of interpretation is never merely a methodological question for the researcher; it is always an epistemological one.

The practice of social inquiry cannot be adequately defined as an atheoretical making that requires only methodological prowess ... as one engages in the ‘practical’ activities of generating and interpreting data and then transforming that understanding into public knowledge, one inevitably takes up ‘theoretical’ concerns with what constitutes knowledge and how it is to be justified. (p. 190)

The final narrative is therefore intended to be justifiable based on a hermeneutic approach to interpretation.

One important alignment between philosophical hermeneutics and narrative research lies in a shared view of the researcher, the storytellers, the stories and the texts as embedded in historical, social, and cultural contexts. In hermeneutics, interpreters are advised to consciously bring their personal, cultural and historical traditions into the act of trying to understand with an attitude of openness, eagerness, to have their pre-judgements, their prejudices, changed (Schwandt, 2000). In narrative inquiry, the research phenomenon, the stories, are “rooted in society as experienced and performed by individuals in cultural settings” (Moen, 2006, p. 5) and the interpretation of the stories is

also experienced and performed by an individual or individuals in a social, cultural and institutional setting. The complex personal, social and cultural history of the interpreter meets the complex personal, social and cultural histories of the storytellers.

In the hermeneutic interpretive approach, meaning does not exist outside of the interpretive act. It is not waiting somewhere to be discovered, but rather is negotiated. “Understandings are participative, conversational and dialogic ... understanding is something that is produced in that dialogue, not something that is reproduced by an interpreter” (Schwandt, 2000, p. 195). Schwandt is using the term “dialogue” to refer to the more customary hermeneutic interaction between the interpreter and the text. In narrative inquiry as well, there is an emphasis on the “collaborative, dialogic nature of the relationship between the researcher and her or his research subjects”: “The ideal is that the narrator and the researcher reach a joint intersubjective understanding of the narratives that occur during the research process” (Moen, 2006, p. 6). In narrative research the hermeneutic dialogue, the negotiation of meaning, is not simply a metaphorical concept, but a literal one.

This negotiation of meaning results in “a continuously developing narrative.... There is no single, dominant or static reality, but rather a number of realities that are constructed in the process of interaction and dialogues” (Moen, 2006, p. 5). There is a provisional final narrative, one that “opens for a wide range of interpretations by others who read and hear about the report” (Moen, 2006, p. 7). The final narrative includes both the negotiated agreement between the researcher and storytellers about the meaning of the stories told, as well as the representation of “multivoicedness”(Moen, 2006, p. 4), those instances where the researcher and the storytellers do not reach a joint

intersubjective understanding. The researcher does not impose unanimity where it does not exist.

To negotiate meaning with the people interviewed, I sent drafts of the narrative asking not only for their approval of their actual words quoted, but also for their comments on the use made of their words, the interpretations, the conclusions drawn, the meanings proposed. While not everyone responded to the invitation to participate in interpreting, a number of people did and with several people a back and forth process of e-mail communication and telephone conversations resulted in jointly agreed modifications to the text. Additions/clarifications/disagreements with my interpretations appear in the text in italics and marked “Comments”. The interpolation of the perspectives of others interrupts the smooth flow of my narrative and such interruption is precisely its purpose. It makes very visible what Kemmis and McTaggart (2000) call the fallibility of the narrative, the belief that

what we call “truth” is always and only provisional, that it is always fallible, that it is always shaped by particular views and material-social-historical circumstances, and that it can be approached only intersubjectively — through exploration of the extent to which it seems accurate, morally right and appropriate, and authentic in light of our lived experience. (p. 580)

The clarifying and particularly the dissenting views of the storytellers as they respond to my interpretations from within their own particular material-social-historical standpoint moves the concept that interpretation is always provisional from an abstraction to a tangible reality.

The hermeneutic approach also takes up Kemmis and McTaggart’s (2000) question of the moral rightness and appropriateness of the narrative. “To not make

judgements is to lose sight of one's orientation in moral space, which is to lose one's grounding as a human being" (Smith & Deemer, 2000, p. 888). Hermeneutic interpretation considers understanding as not separate from application. "A focus on understanding as a kind of moral-political knowledge that is at once embodied, engaged (and hence 'interested') and concerned with practical choice is a central element in the hermeneutic philosophies" (Schwandt, 2000, p. 196).

This focus on practical choice aligned with my interest in making recommendations that would lead to a re-assessment and perhaps a re-vitalization of conflict resolution education practice at the JIBC.

While both a narrative research process and my personal stance were consistent with a hermeneutic approach to interpretation, what took place in the actual task of interpreting was reading and re-reading, and writing and re-writing, many, many times. Each time I came back to a quotation, a story theme, a chapter, a paragraph, I would hear it differently, understand it differently.

Research challenges

Managing the overwhelming amount of data gathered was the biggest single research challenge. I cast my research net widely in the beginning and was then reluctant, indeed, unable to throw any stories back. It meant a large challenge in creating a coherent narrative. Any one of the story areas—the JIBC, curriculum, pedagogy, growth, identity creation, field of practice emergence, solidification—could have been explored through a more intense examination framed by particular theoretical lenses, and could, likely have benefited from such an examination.

It was also difficult to situate this research within an ongoing research conversation, to locate it beside or behind or within or against other research on the same topic. There is one other study of the JIBC (DeVries, 1990) and one of the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training learners (Hocking, 1996). I drew on both of them, but two Master's theses can hardly be considered a research tradition. In a broader sense, this research is located within a research conversation about the history of the conflict resolution field in North America but there is very little written on that topic either. Perhaps because of the newness of both the academic discipline and of the field of practice, serious historical accounts and analyses are only now beginning to be written in the United States (Coy and Hedeem, 2005; Crocker, 2006; McCold, 2006). I could find only a few fleeting references to field history in Canada (Irving and Benjamin, 1987; Picard, 2002, 2004).

Another much more specific challenge came directly from the historical nature of the research. Marshall and Rossman (1999) caution historical researchers to beware the fallibility of memory in gathering accounts from eyewitnesses and imply, in contrast, the reliability of documents. It seems likely that memories of events over 20 years ago may be less than completely factually accurate. What was equally or even more problematic was that the archival documents were also inaccurate. One of the primary sources was the course calendar published three times a year by the JIBC Community Programs. These documented what courses had been offered in each year, how many courses, and who had been teaching them. Consistently, the people I interviewed would tell me that they had started teaching or coaching one or two years before their names first appeared in the calendar, or that they had been teaching courses that were not listed. I might have

believed the documents rather than the memories but for two factors. I started coaching in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution in 1986. I know I started coaching in 1986; I remember it distinctly. Other people remember it as well, although perhaps not as distinctly. My name does not appear in the course calendar at all until 1992 and then as an instructor. Secondly, I have worked as an administrator in the Centre for Conflict Resolution and I have been involved in the production of many program calendars. I know that there are often errors in the calendars. Courses that are scheduled in advance do not run. Courses that are popular may have more offerings added. Instructors get sick, or busy, and other instructors are substituted. Peoples' names are left out. The course calendar is more a good guess at what might happen than a reliable documentation of what did happen. So, while the goal of the dissertation was not factual accuracy, the fallibility of the course calendars was intriguing and shook my confidence in the reliability of other archival JIBC documents.

Ethical considerations

My feminist readings and understandings have most shaped my thinking about ethics in research. Many feminist scholars have not been content to merely follow existing research ethics codes, but have attempted to grapple with concerns rooted in the disparity of power between researcher and research subject, concerns about representation and appropriation, silencing and voice, positionality and privilege. One way to address these concerns, according to Oleson (2000) is for feminist researchers to “conduct and make explicitly open and honest negotiations around data gathering, analysis, and presentation” (p. 233).

I did not foresee major ethical challenges in this research, however, I did follow Olesen's (2000) advice and negotiated clear agreements with the people I interviewed about anonymity, the process for approval of their quotes, and the process for commenting on the interpretations I made based on their stories.

Maintaining the anonymity of the individuals who participate in social science research is was at one time the norm for ethical research practice. In this study, however, I moved away from that assumption of anonymous interviewees primarily because the research design was historical. I was writing a narrative based in the voices of individuals who had been part of a particular educational program in a particular time period and saw their anonymity as neither required nor indeed possible.

The necessity for maintaining the anonymity of research subjects in non-historical and non-narrative social science research designs is not an uncontested assumption. The difficulty, indeed the impossibility of maintaining such confidentiality of research subjects' identities is explicitly acknowledged in the qualitative research literature. "Despite the signature status of privacy protection, watertight confidentiality has proven to be impossible. Pseudonyms and and disguised locations are often recognized by insiders" (Christians, 2000, p. 139). Van den Hoonaard (2003) argues that the reasons why "[a]nonymity figures prominently in all research-ethics codes" (p. 141) are primarily utilitarian, that "to strip the data of the names of the research subjects" is "one of the most doable ethical procedures" (p. 141). However, while anonymity may be easy and doable in large-scale survey research, "anonymity is a virtual impossibility in ethnographic research" (p. 141). In settings

such as a distinctive community, members will not only recognize themselves, but will also recognize others, either because of snowball sampling or because of the recognition of the distinctive characteristics of individuals in the study. (van den Hoonaard, 2003, p. 144)

While there is acknowledgement of the practical challenges in truly maintaining the anonymity of research subjects, the very notion itself has been questioned, particularly by feminist scholars. “Through anonymity, they claim, the voices of the research participants are lost and are, in effect, appropriated by the researchers” (van den Hoonaard, 2003, p. 149). It is feminist researchers, and particularly feminist researchers working in participatory-action-research modes, who have chosen to publish using participants’ real names, with the explicit permission of the participants, of course.

Linked with the use of real names is a second area of feminist ethical research practice, the involvement of research participants in the interpretation of the data. This involvement can range from opportunities to approve quotes and comment on the interpretations to a collaborative co-creation of meaning amongst participants and researchers (Olesen, 2000). For example, Grossman, Kruger and Moore (1999) based a study of the processes of a feminist research group studying resiliency amongst sexual abuse survivors on memos written by group members.

We told them they would see a draft of the article before it was published and have an opportunity to edit their own comments, and also to decide if they wanted their name associated with their comments...All group members have given permission to use their quotes and their real names for this article. (p. 119).

Using a similar approach, I asked all the people I interviewed for explicit permission to use their real names, and that permission was recorded on their consent forms. As well, all interviewees were offered the opportunity of reading the first draft of

the manuscript in order to approve the use of their quotes in context, and to comment on my interpretations.

While negotiation of the meaning of texts, coming to shared understanding between researcher and story-teller of the meaning of the story, is a central premise of narrative research (Huber, Clandinin & Huber, 2006; Clandinin, Pushor & Murray Orr, 2007; Moen, 2006), Olesen (2000) cautions that in research situations where participants together with the researcher frame the interpretations, issues of “evaluation and management of distortion” (p. 234) are raised. As an insider-researcher, and a long time member of the community I was writing about, there were both tangible and psychological benefits of being able to engage with colleagues and peers in an in-depth and sometimes sustained dialogue about the meaning(s) of events that were held now only in memory. For example, the introduction of additional viewpoints on a situation, and the consequent layering of opinions and perspectives in the final text.

The possible disadvantages of such dialogical and quasi-collaborative interpretive processes, as I understand them, are that as an insider, as a colleague, I might be unduly influenced by the opinions of others. Also, I might present “the story” in a deliberately flattering manner or allow my responsibilities as a researcher, as the crafter of the written narrative, to be over-ridden by the dissenting opinion of my interviewees. Olesen (2000) recommends as a corrective to these possibilities “a critical conceptual distance between the researcher and the participants to facilitate dialectally correction of distortions on both sides” (p. 235). While I cannot answer for my unconscious processes, the actual process of the research, including my reading of the literature and consequent enhanced understandings of historical and theoretical contexts did, give me this critical conceptual

distance. My awareness of what happened as a result of inviting my interviewees to comment on my interpretations was that it was indeed a process of dialogical, and dialectical, mutual correction that enhanced rather than detracted from the credibility of the narrative.

A specific ethical challenge about representation that I had not anticipated arose during the research and writing process. Most of my storytellers had worked closely together in the 80s and many had maintained close professional and friendship connections. I heard a lot of stories at an unexpected level of detail—who was arguing with whom about what, and who got let go and why, and who deserved to be let go but wasn't. Some of it was simply looking back 20 years later and remembering, but much was related to one of the themes that emerged—unresolved conflict surfacing in the early 90s between faculty members and administrators and between various groupings within the faculty. For some, those events seemed to be not only still vivid but also quite painful. I had to decide at what level of personal detail those stories got re-told. I decided that the occurrence of the conflict and the consequences of the conflict were important parts of the story and needed to be told, but that personal details would be left out. While it could be argued that this was an example of how my embeddedness in the community I was studying censored the presentation of the research findings, it could also be argued that re-telling emotion-laden accounts laced with personal criticisms served no useful purpose either to the research or the relationship between the interviewees and me or, more importantly, the relationships amongst the interviewees. Huber, Clandinin and Huber (2006) talk about the “relational responsibilities” (p. 212) of researchers as they navigate “the many complexities, uncertainties, and possibilities” inherent in the “participatory

relationship” between researcher and research subjects in narrative inquiry (p. 212). In this instance, I chose to honour what I saw as my relational responsibilities by adopting a mediative role, specifically by re-telling a conflict-saturated story using narrative mediation strategies of externalizing, naming and historicizing (Frank, 2006, p. 32)

At the start of this research, I familiarized myself with the set of questions that feminist researchers Fine, Weis, Weseen and Wong (2000) recommend as an ethical research audit. As the completion of the research, I re-visited and answered those questions.

1. Have I connected the “voices” and the “stories” of individuals back to the set of historic, structural and economic relations in which they are situated?

The narrative describes what happened in the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training in its first decade as shaped by individuals who were themselves shaped by historical, economic and structural currents. However while the multiple motivations in creating self-identity as a conflict resolution practitioner are foregrounded, the story is not analysed through the lenses of gender, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, ability/disability. I think that would be a very interesting and very useful way of “telling” the Certificate story.

2. Have I deployed multiple methods so that very different kinds of analyses can be constructed?

Because the narrative draws quite extensively on quotations from interviews and from archival JIBC documents, as well as referencing a historical and contemporary selection of literature from several different disciplines, another researcher, could, I think, use those same sources and come to a quite different interpretation. It is my hope that

other interpretations will be made. Based only on what is included in this dissertation, analyzing the Certificate in Conflict Resolution story through the lenses of professionalization or social movement co-optation theory, for example, seems possible.

3. Have I described the mundane?

Yes. Several readers have said “Far, far too much detail. Need more abstract summaries and less detail.”

4. Have some informants/constituencies/participants reviewed the material with me and interpreted, dissented, challenged my interpretations? And then how do I report these departures/agreements in perspective?

Yes. All the people interviewed as well as other JIBC colleagues have been sent the manuscript to read. Almost all responded and their comment(s) about interpretations, particularly the comments that disagreed with my interpretations, are included in the final text.

5. How far do I want to go with respect to theorizing the words of the individuals?

I have stayed at a fairly low level of theorizing. While I did measure words and particularly course content against theoretical standards, my primary goal was a sufficiently credible and detailed narrative to allow for future critical analyses.

6. Have I considered how these data could be used for progressive, conservative, repressive social policies?

Yes, but mostly in the context of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution reputation and the Centre’s choices about future programming. None of my critiques of interest-based approaches to mediating and negotiating in the context of complex historical worldview conflict are new.

7. Who am I afraid will see these analyses? Who is rendered vulnerable/responsible or exposed by these analyses? Am I willing to show him/her/them the text before publication? If not, why not? Could I publish his/her/their comments as an epilogue? What's the fear?

I deliberately did not include personal criticisms in my re-telling of the Certificate story because I did not want individuals to feel vulnerable or exposed. This choice eliminated some level of detail from the stories told which may have limited certain analytical possibilities.

9. What dreams am I having about the material presented?

Every night in my dreams, I write the same page over and over and over, but at least it is a different page each night. I think the dream is about the stress of writing, of trying to make sense of it all, of finishing, not about the content.

10. To what extent has my analysis offered an alternative to the "commonsense" or dominant discourse? What challenges might very different audiences pose to the analysis presented? (Fine et al, 2000, p. 127)

I challenge a dominant individualist discourse in both conflict resolution and education and suggest more historically, socially and culturally contextualized perspectives. While my preferences for more contextualized approaches to curriculum and pedagogy and, in particular, for a structurally transformative theoretical base are not dominant in adult education or conflict resolution practice generally in North America; they are not particularly marginal either. I think, indeed, I hope, that different audiences may bring differing interpretations to reading this narrative. The only interpretation that specifically concerns me is the possibility that my criticism of JIBC conflict resolution education practice, no matter how clearly situated it is in historical and theoretical rather

than personal or individual bases, may be mistakenly read as an attack on the JIBC program or as hurtful to individual JIBC practitioners.

But is it true?

My journey down the path that would lead to becoming a conflict resolution educator, a mediator, a graduate student in education and eventually a researcher and the writer of this dissertation began in a JIBC classroom in 1983. I remember learning from my mediation teachers, Marje Burdine and Fran Grunberg, that “truth was not a useful concept in mediation.” People in conflict get stuck arguing about who was right and wrong, who was lying, what was the real version of what had happened that led to the present situation. If the mediator allowed the parties to dwell on what constituted the truth, movement through the conflict and out the other side was unlikely to occur. Instead, the mediator should acknowledge that people always had different views on what happened in the past and gently, but firmly, direct the disputing parties to focus on how they wanted the future to be different from the past. Mediators avoided “the truth.” It was not helpful.

Twenty-six years later, I am finishing a several year long narrative research process that explores the first decade of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution at the JIBC. As I grapple with what Schwandt (2000) calls the researcher’s inevitable epistemological questions of “what constitutes knowledge and how it is to be justified” (p. 190), I come full circle to my long ago mediation training. In qualitative research, as in mediation, the truth concept is a slippery one: “One of the assumptions underlying qualitative research is that reality is holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing; it is not a single, fixed, objective phenomenon waiting to be discovered, observed, and measured” (Merriam,

1998, p. 202). In narrative research, rather than a description of objective reality, even a holistic and multidimensional objective reality, “there are different subjective positions from which we experience and interpret the world” (Moen, 2006, p. 7). This research seeks to explore these subjective perspectives, creating a narrative from many different voices.

Clandinin, Pushor and Murray Orr (2007) say that judgement criteria for narrative inquiry have not been fully developed, but that attention to the three commonplaces and the eight elements of narrative inquiry will assist in creating a research process and research product that is authentic, adequate and plausible. Narrative research “requires attention to narrative conceptualizations as phenomenon and method, and to the interplay of the three commonplaces of temporality, sociality and place” (Clandinin et al, 2007, p. 33). As well, authenticity, adequacy and plausibility will be enhanced by incorporating the eight narrative design elements: justification, naming the phenomenon, describing the particular methods used, analysing and interpreting in ways that emphasize the relational and contextual, positioning the research in relation to other research, describing the uniqueness of the study, considering ethical implications in the context of an ethic of care, and creating a narrative representation.

Several issues need to be considered in evaluating that narrative representation. Writing requires the researcher to be always thinking narratively and should consider the possibilities of a range of textual forms and the needs of a range of audiences, “the inquirer himself or herself, other participants, and an imagined reading audience” (Clandinin et al, 2007, p. 32). Resonance, how readers see or hear themselves in that narrative, is another representational consideration and, finally, ensuring that the social

significance of the work and the connection of the work to an ongoing research conversation is included (p. 33). While the narrative researcher “requires particular kinds of wakefulness” (Clandinin et al., 2007, p. 33) to pay attention to the design elements and the representational issues in narrative inquiry, it is the readers who decide whether sufficient attention has been paid to render the narrative a credible one.

I had hoped that asking to listen to some of the individual/collective stories of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution might be interesting, and possibly useful, to the storytellers as they looked back on an important decade in their working lives. For some of the storytellers, reading the drafts of the manuscript seems to have led to introspection and retrospection.

Comment: It was actually very absorbing and fascinating for me to read about those early years. It brought back many vivid memories that had somehow been buried in various crevices of my mind and heart. I especially enjoyed reading the quotes from others who were so vital to those early years and the amazing success we had. (Marje Burdine, personal communication, November 28, 2008)

Comment: I am so intrigued with what you are doing, Nym. It's pushed me into a huge process of introspection. How fascinating to have this opportunity to step back and take a look at over 25 years of work that was just unfolding intuitively and think about what was actually going on. (Joan Balmer, personal communication, January 5, 2009)

The individual stories were voices within the collective story of the Certificate and it was the story of the Certificate that I was most interested in telling. I hope that this narrative research, this telling and re-telling, will give all the people connected to the Centre for Conflict Resolution community, past and present, an opportunity to hear and assess the plotlines in which their individual stories were, and are, situated.

CHAPTER 3: A VERY BRIEF HISTORY OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION

The JIBC Certificate in Conflict Resolution came into existence because of a conflict resolution movement that swept the U.S. in the 70s and began to assume an organizational shape in Canada in the mid-80s. This movement was characterized by a rapid growth in the use of non-adversarial, alternative dispute resolution (ADR) processes, primarily mediation, in a variety of settings and in a context of excitement, evangelic fervour and socially transformative vision. This conflict resolution movement grew out of, and re-shaped, a pre-existing conflict resolution field.

That pre-existing conflict resolution field is generally held to be sourced in theoretical perspectives on organizational conflict and consequent practices of mediation, conciliation and arbitration in collective bargaining, spiritual traditions of non-violence and pacifism, peace movement activism which spurred a blossoming of academic research starting in the 1950s as well as peace education initiatives throughout the twentieth century, and the particular historical conditions of the 1960s and 1970s in the United States (Burgess & Burgess, 1997; Kriesberg, 1997, 2003; Schellenberg, 1982; Scimecca, 1998; Tidwell, 1998).

The Certificate in Conflict Resolution at the JIBC in its first decade saw itself as part of a conflict resolution movement in North America, and as connected to that movement through shared vision and values, and more materially, through organizational memberships and conference attendance. The Certificate in Conflict Resolution did not

see itself as part of a peace activism and peace movement history, nor a peace education tradition, nor as connected to academic peace and conflict scholarship. Therefore, I will discuss the contributions of the origin traditions (Tidwell, 1998) to the conflict resolution field of practice briefly, and then focus more extensively on the emergence of the conflict resolution movement in the U.S. and in Canada. Discussions of the U.S. conflict resolution field and movement in this dissertation are drawn primarily from the literature, but due to the all but complete lack of published accounts or analyses of the history of the Canadian field, I have drawn on interviews for a preliminary overview of Canadian field origins.

Origins of the conflict resolution field

Organizational relations made important theoretical and applied contributions to the field of conflict resolution. While conciliation and mediation in industrial disputes started in the U.S. in 1878 and in Canada in 1900 (Berkowitz, Goldstein & Indik, 1964; Edgar, 1908; Moore, 1986; Woods, 1955), the models used in those contexts were very different from later more non-directive mediation approaches. Nonetheless, labour-management mediation provided concrete examples of the effective use of mediation as a dispute resolution process using a third-party intervener, the concept of the mediator as a professional identity, the concept and practice of training mediators and a pragmatic focus on settlement. More broadly, what Tidwell (1998) calls the organization relations “focus on making conflict less costly and more efficient” (p. 12) was one of the primary rationales for the expansion of mediation into other spheres.

Ideas and practices from a number of spiritual traditions including Buddhism, Gandhi’s theories and practices of non-violence, as well as Quaker and Mennonite

traditions of “pacifism and humanitarianism” (Scimecca, 1998, p. 27) constituted a strong thread in development of both conflict resolution theory and practice (Boulding, 1962; Evans, Evans, & Kraybill, 2001; Lederach, 1995; 2003, 2005; Schrock-Shenk & Ressler, 1999; Zehr, 1990). Quaker practices of conciliation and mediation in particular provided actual examples of alternative dispute resolution methods (Scimecca, 1998; Picard 2000).

The transplanting of alternative dispute settlement systems to North America is thought to have come from Europe by way of the Quakers ... Their settlement procedures handled disputes ranging from commercial transactions to marital disagreements and coexisted with the English system of law providing disputants with a choice for how to deal with their disputes. (Picard, 2000, p. 31)

Scimecca (1998) also credits “the religious figure as third-party intervener or ‘peace-maker’ and how this has been institutionalized in religious organizations” (p. 26) as a foundational contribution to the development of the conflict resolution field.

Social movements focused on various anti-war and pro-peace conceptions and issues are the oldest and most continuous origin source for the conflict resolution field, (Osborne, 1987; Kriesberg, 1997; Tidwell, 1998). Originating in the last decades of the nineteenth century in the U.S., Canada and Europe, peace activism contributed an overarching moral purpose to the practice of conflict resolution—the creation of more peaceful individuals, families, workplaces, communities, and nations. Peace was an underlying vision and a passionate commitment of many of the founders of the conflict resolution field, and continues to inspire many practitioners today. It is, however, perhaps the least realized of the field’s goals.

Post-World War II peace movement ideology and peace movement activism provided one major impetus for the emergence of a network of peace scholars in the

1950s. Peace research in university settings in Europe and North America began to blossom in many different disciplinary fields, “at the end of a half-century of global total war and the beginning of the nuclear age” (Mason, 2002, p. 15)¹. An international and interdisciplinary peace research network developed, sharing “a strong belief ... in the possibility of integrating the eclectic perspectives of the social and natural sciences into a unified approach to the study of conflict applicable to all levels of society and all kinds of disputes” (Crocker, 2006, p. 2). They also shared a passionate commitment to the necessity and the value of their research. Kenneth Boulding captures the spirit of the new scholarship:

The reasons which have led us to this enterprise may be summed up in two propositions. The first is that by far the most important practical problem facing the world today is that of international relations—more specifically the prevention of global war. The second is that if intellectual progress is to be made in this area, the study of international relations must be made an interdisciplinary enterprise, drawing its discourse from all the social sciences and even further. (Boulding, 1957, as cited in *Introduction to conflict resolution*, 2001)

The contributions of the resulting academic peace scholarship to the field of practice are perhaps the best researched of all the field origin factors (Burgess & Burgess,

¹ Cf Smith & Carson (1998): “At this time peace research developed as a formal field of study in an effort to bring a cross-disciplinary focus to bear on the discovery and elimination of the causes of war. Prior to the mid-1950s, there had been no field of study known as peace research. In 1959, a handful of social researchers gathered in Norway to form the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) under the direction of Johan Galtung. Other institutes for peace research were set up in the next few years in Europe and North Americas. In Canada, Hannah and Allan Newcombe founded the Peace Research Institute Dundas (PRI-D). In 1964, the International Peace Research Association was founded ... Its American counterpart, COPRED (the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development) was created at about the same time. (p. 13).

1997; Kriesberg, 1997; Scimecca, 1998; Tidwell, 1998). They are also the most contested. Kriesberg (1991) identifies “an uneasy alliance” between scholars located in peace studies who saw conflict resolvers as far too focused on settlement and uninterested in the social, economic and political changes considered necessary for “peaceful relations between people” (Kriesberg, 1991, p. 615) and the practice-based conflict resolvers, who characterized peace scholars as “too utopian” (Kriesberg, 1991, p. 615), too removed from the practical considerations of everyday life.

Retrospective assessments see scholarship as spawning “many successes since its birth in the mid-20th century” (Crocker, 2006, p. 2).

The number of academic centers and departments dedicated to the study of social conflict continues to grow, spreading from North America and Europe to virtually all regions of the world. The number of conferences, journals, and professional associations dedicated predominantly to conflict resolution all point to the existence of a dynamic and vital field of study. (Crocker, 2006, p. 2)

Kriesberg (1997) believes that the scholars provided an intellectual basis for the emerging field of practice through the articulation of “three core ideas of CR [conflict resolution] that ‘crystallised’ in the 1970-1985 period” (p. 68):

the idea that conflicts often could be restructured and reframed so that partisans would regard the conflict as a shared problem that had mutually acceptable solutions ... that intermediaries can and do provide many services in assisting adversaries to construct mutually acceptable agreements to settle and ultimately resolve their conflicts ... that negotiators and mediators could learn to improve their skills to manage and settle disputes. (p. 68)

On the other hand, the failure of scholarship to generate theory sufficient to guide practice has been widely lamented in the literature. Scimecca (1998) states bluntly that “[c]onflict resolution simply does not have a theoretical base to undergird its practice.”

(p. 35) and Crocker (2006) suggests that there is no consensus on a systematic approach nor “any agreement on a core theory or even theories that might constitute the interior of the discipline’s boundaries” (p. 4). There is no consensus on what the contributions of academically situated peace and conflict research have been to the practice field.

A second direct outgrowth of peace movement ideology and activism was a tradition of peace education in the United States throughout the entire twentieth century (Harris, 2006; Mason, 2002; Osborne, 1987; Percival, 1989; Smith & Carson, 1998). Peace education was based on a belief that education, of both children and adults, was an effective way to create citizens who would abhor war and work for peace. Peace curricula in U.S. elementary schools date back to the early years of the twentieth century (Osborne, 1987; Percival, 1989) and peace studies programs in universities started in the 1960s (Harris, 1990, 2006).² A belief in the socially transforming power of education was taken up by the later conflict resolution movement and became a strong theme in its ongoing belief structure and practice.

The particular historical conditions of the 1960s in the U.S. that birthed the conflict resolution movement included a large and vigorous peace movement opposing the Vietnam war, other large-scale social movements, an upsurge in civil suits being taken to court with consequent overloading of the court system, or at least considerable

² Courses about peace, human rights and global issues began to proliferate on American campuses in the late 1960s...Manhattan College began a peace studies program in 1968, while Colgate University initiated a peace studies program in 1969.... In 1973 Bradford University in England established its peace studies program.... By the end of the 1970s several dozen colleges and universities in the United States had peace studies programs. (Harris, 2006, pp. xi - xii)

concern expressed about overloading the court system, and a general activist stance which promoted the creation of alternative institutions rather than, or in addition to, the reform of existing institutions.

United States conflict resolution movement emergence

Mayer (2004) situates the emergence of the conflict resolution movement in the U.S. in a historical picture where most conflicts had traditionally been resolved outside of formal legal systems through informal mechanisms such as churches, synagogues and mosques or through community or family elders. However, population increases, migration, and the creation of large social institutions meant that

informal conflict resolution mechanisms have been inevitably weakened, thus forcing more reliance on formal mechanisms ... and the cumulative effect of this trend has created a cumbersome, often alienating and sometimes terribly inefficient approach to conflict. (p. 158)

The formal mechanisms for resolving conflict were the court systems and one perspective on the emergence of the conflict resolution movement in the United States holds that the use of mediation and other ADR processes emerged when Americans began taking their conflicts to court in ever-increasing numbers and “alarms about delay were sounded by the judicial and legal establishments” (Folberg & Taylor, 1984, p. 4). Burgess and Burgess (1997) describe ADR emergence in the context of the “civil rights and other empowerment movements of the 1960s” and “an overburdened court system and a search for faster, less costly ways to resolve disputes” (p. vii). They argue that due to the “large number of civil lawsuits filed” as a direct result of the aforementioned social movements which created “strife and discontent on many fronts” (Folberg and Taylor, 1984, p. 4), mediation and other ADR options came to be seen as a solution, offered both

in programs closely connected to courts and through services provided by other organizations (Folberg & Taylor, 1984, p. 5).

A second perspective on the emergence of the conflict resolution movement is slightly different, describing it as a social movement promoting renewed citizen participation in a democracy, similar to other social movements of the time (Bush & Folger, 2005; Mayer, 2004; Wahrhaftig, 2004). Wahrhaftig (2004) also specifically identifies the civil rights movement and the peace movement opposing the Vietnam War, but not as causes of the problems that required an ADR response, rather as incubators for what he calls the community dispute resolution movement. Wahrhaftig contends that both peace activists and civil rights workers were “arrested, jailed and thus given an opportunity to observe the excesses of the criminal justice system from the inside” (p. 5). The result was that “many from the peace movement as well as the civil rights movement became involved in criminal justice reform” (p. 3). Coy and Hedeem (2005) situate the resulting community mediation movement in

the late 1960s and early 1970s, when neighbourhood and community activists were less interested in traditional reforms within existing political institutions and more committed to creating actual alternative institutions ... Community health centres; health food co-operatives; community mediation centres; neighbourhood food banks and programs; community legal co-operatives; community credit unions; worker collectives; and women’s resource centers, shelters and bookstores sprung up in neighbourhoods across the United States ... they shared in common a belief that community-based institutions ... were a tonic to democracy. (Coy & Hedeem, 2005, p. 408)

Kriesberg (1997) acknowledges both perspectives, situating them within a “constellation” of factors leading to “CR [conflict resolution] as a social movement” (p. 68) including first, that the conflict resolution movement was part of building community

institutions as a vehicle for community empowerment and societal change and secondly, that the growth of litigation and court congestion led to interest amongst some lawyers and judges in non-adversarial processes. Kriesberg (1997) adds peace activism as a third contributing factor. “CR [conflict resolution] seemed to offer peace movement members, whose numbers soared in the early 80s, a practical alternative to the nation’s reliance on military options” (Kriesberg, 1997, p. 68). A mass peace movement in North America in the 1970s and 1980s was fuelled by fears about nuclear war. “In June 1982 over one million people marched for peace in the streets of New York at the opening of the United Nations Second Special Session on Disarmament” (Smith & Carson, 1998, p. 16).

Kriesberg ’s (1997) fourth factor supporting the emergence of a conflict resolution movement in the United States was “the peacemaking and mediation activities of religious organizations, particularly those associated with the Society of Friends (Quakers) and the Mennonites” (Kriesberg, 1997, p. 68). Scimecca (1998) saw the Quakers and Mennonites as “further along in the institutionalization of conflict resolution as part of their religious mission” (p. 26) and Tidwell (1998) credits Quaker and Mennonite activists as “the first to take the burgeoning ideas of conflict resolution to the public” (p. 14). It was the taking of the ideas and practices of conflict resolution from the professional venues of labour-management conciliation and mediation and the academic environs of peace and conflict resolution research scholarship into the public arena through the provision of community-based and court-connected mediation programs that distinguished the new conflict resolution movement from the pre-existing conflict resolution field.

The very earliest documented example of a community-based program providing alternative approaches to dispute resolution I could find was New York's 1969 Board of Mediation for Community Disputes, established "to provide a continuing center to which parties involved in community conflict may turn for impartial assistance in settling their dispute" (Cormick & Allen, 1970) and its sister organization, the Center for Mediation and Conflict Resolution, set up "to provide training in negotiating and mediation for community, labor and management leaders" (Cormick & Allen, 1970). The early 70s saw the creation of more community-based and court-connected programs, one in Minnesota in 1971 (McCold, 2006) and a Quaker-run community mediation program in Media, Pennsylvania in 1972 (Wahrhaftig, 2004, p. 13).

Scimecca (1998) locates "one major official impetus for the growth of ADR" in a 1976 National Conference on the Causes of Popular Dissatisfaction with the Administration of Justice (p. 30) sponsored by the American Bar Association. "The conference concluded that alternative forms of dispute resolution, in particular mediation and arbitration, would reduce congested courts, reduce settle time and minimize costs" (p. 30). In 1978, the US Department of Justice "funded three experimental neighbourhood justice centers" (McCold, 2006, p. 25). The success of these led to 1981 funding from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration with the result that "community mediation programs and neighbourhood dispute resolutions centers began to proliferate ... by 1982, a US survey reported 200 mediation services across the country.... By 1985, that number had doubled" (McCold, 2006, p. 25).

Family mediation was another vigorous component of the conflict resolution movement of the 1970s in the United States. The term family mediation is generally

synonymous with divorce mediation—assisting separating and divorcing couples to come to mutual agreements regarding the future parenting of their children and to decide financial issues related to the ending of the relationship (Folberg & Taylor, 1984; Kriesberg, 1991; Tidwell, 1998). The U.S. roots are traced to the establishment of the Los Angeles County Conciliation Court in 1939. The Association of Family and Conciliation Courts (AFCC) was formed in 1963 in California and began publishing the *California Conciliation Courts Quarterly* (Folberg & Milne, 1988; Irving & Benjamin, 1987). The adoption of no-fault divorce laws in many states in the 1970s increased the number of divorces and promoted a view of divorce as a matter that had psychological as well as legal elements. A new profession appeared, the divorce counsellor, offering therapeutic interventions to assist divorcing couples to come to terms emotionally with the ending of their marriage (Coogler, 1978; Irving & Benjamin, 1987; Moore, 2003).

In this context of rising divorce rates, O.J. Coogler established the Family Mediation Association in 1975 and became known as the “father of private family mediation” (Irving & Benjamin, 1987, p. 47). He wrote many articles and the first text in 1978 and promoted family mediation tirelessly. Coogler attributed the motivation for his conviction that there was a “critical need for a more rational, more civilized way of arranging a parting of the ways” (Coogler, 1978, p. v) to his own difficult experience with divorce. His “structured mediation” was seen by later mediators as “excessively rigid” (Gaughan, 1987, p. 107), other models evolved and family mediation spread rapidly across the United States. “What is especially exciting about this new medium is that within a relatively brief period ... it has moved from a speculative ‘good idea’ into being a respectable and complex profession” (Gaughan, 1987, p. 107).

The conflict resolution movement and family mediation in particular, were not without critics. The focus on settling conflicts outside of the court system was characterized by Laura Nader (1998) as the imposition of a harmony ideology onto legal culture, fuelled by “rhetoric about mythical litigation explosions” (p. 54) and intended to impose “consensus, homogeneity and agreement” through silencing disputes and controlling the disenfranchised (p. 52). The mediation process is specifically criticized by Nader for having “no explicit standards of justice” (p. 53).

The ideology of mediation is visualised as a process that brings people together; disputes are re-shaped as communication problems rather than conflicts over values. Unequal power does not enter the paradigm, and disputes about facts and legal rights are transformed into disputes about feelings and relationships. (p. 53)

One example of mediation being viewed as "the destruction of hard-won legal gains" (Hart, 1984), was the criticism of divorce mediation by feminist advocates for abused women. The National Center on Women and Family Law in the United States took a public position against mediation in any divorce or family law matter in 1982 (Davies & Salem, 1984). Barbara Hart (1984, 1990) argued that the mediation process and outcome were very much influenced by the personal philosophy, knowledge and skill of the mediator and that transferring legal issues from the justice system to the social service system was contrary to women's interests.

There are no standards for mediation practice. There is no licensing of mediators. No specific training is required before commencing business as a mediator. Most mediators know nothing about violence against women except the false notions commonly held by most people in this culture. (Hart, 1984, p. 2)

Feminists argued that since wife abuse was very often a closely guarded secret, the mediator would likely be unaware of the history of abuse and would unknowingly

collude in the formation of agreements that did not meet the wife's interests. Davis and Salem (1984) summarize the state of the resulting debate within the mediation field succinctly:

The dispute resolution field is divided about the appropriateness of mediation in family violence cases. Some believe that such cases should not go to mediation; others believe that, with certain protections, there is a role for mediation. (p. 22)

Despite the controversies, by 1983, when the first public registration mediation course was offered at the Justice Institute of British Columbia, mediation in the U.S. was being used in a wide range of disputes:

family mediation, divorce mediation, custody mediation, landlord/tenant mediation, consumer mediation, court-annexed mediation, labor mediation, victim-offender mediation, school-based dispute resolution, inter-group dispute resolution, public policy dispute resolution mechanisms, peer mediation and other specialized efforts. (McCold, 2006, p. 27)

Education was one important area of conflict resolution movement activity. Conflict resolution skills and processes were quickly adopted by the pre-existing peace educator network in the K–12 system (Harris, 1990, 2006; Smith & Carson, 1998). Awareness of “escalating levels of violence in students’ lives” (Harris, 1990, p. 254) was a motivation for “applying peer mediation and conflict resolution techniques to schooling environments” (Harris, 1990, p. 254). Conflict resolution education in schools was not, however, limited to professional educators. Many of the early U.S. community justice/community mediation programs provided “training in communication and conflict resolution skills for formal education systems, ranging from pre-school through law school” (Hedeem, 2004, p. 127). Mediation training for adults was rooted in the very beginnings of the movement with the Pennsylvania Quaker-run community mediation

program in 1972 “quickly developing their own capacity to train volunteer mediators” and “playing a major role in providing mediation training” (Wahrhaftig, 2004, p. 13).

Training became one aspect of many community-based mediation programs.

By the mid-80s many community mediation programs, recognizing that their caseloads were too low to attract funding, saw the answer in training ... training became a valuable service that could be marketed to a broad spectrum of society ... Training has grown into an important income stream. (Wahrhaftig, 2004, p. 30)

At the post-secondary undergraduate level, in the 1980s “a wide variety of conflict resolution programs appeared” (Harris, 2006. p xiv). The 1982 George Mason University Master of Science in Conflict Analysis and Resolution was the first graduate degree in conflict resolution in the United States. The first Masters’ students were admitted in 1982 and a doctoral program, the first in the world, started in 1988 (Scimecca, 1998).

As well as spreading into many areas of application, conflict resolution in the 1970s and 1980s was also acquiring a public identity and traditions of practice. A number of practitioner organizations had formed—the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution (SPIDR) in 1973, and in the 1980s the Academy of Family Mediators (AFM), the National Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution (NCPCR), and the National Association of Mediation in Education (NAME). There was an explosion of publications, both scholarly and practitioner-oriented (McCold, 2006). Mediation in the U.S. was “mushrooming” (Mayer, 2004, p. 159) and it was that U.S. mediation practice and the U.S. conflict resolution movement that most directly influenced the emergence of conflict resolution in Canada.

Conflict resolution movement emergence in Canada

Mediators who were part of the early manifestations of conflict resolution in Canada saw themselves as part of a movement.

In those days, it really was a social movement. We really were interested in social change ... it makes sense when you think of the roots coming both out of reforming of the criminal justice system and the grassroots "It's time to give voice back to people.... We've become reliant on ... institutions to manage our social problems and we need to change that because we are very capable of managing our own problems if given the skills." (C. Picard, personal interview, February 21, 2007)

While early Canadian mediators understood themselves to be active in a movement, and used much of the same language to describe the tenets of that movement, Cheryl Picard clarifies that the Canadian movement was substantially different from the U.S. one.

My sense of the early years in Canada does not correspond with your statement that the US movement directly influenced what happened in Canada—we had different social problems and while we both perceived we were involved in a movement they were to achieve different ends. In Canada it was the grassroots efforts of the church for social justice and changes to the juvenile delinquents act and to adult sentencing that really gave birth to ADR in Canada. (Cheryl Picard, personal communication, February 2, 2009)

Field development in Canada was less driven by either social unrest or movement activism than in the U.S. The earliest manifestations of conflict resolution practice in Canada that I could find were family mediation initiatives across the country in the 1970s, the first Victim-Offender Reconciliation Project in Kitchener, Ontario in 1975, and a series of federal government sponsored pilot projects in the mid-to-late 70s testing various approaches to youth criminal diversion.

Family mediation appears to have migrated to Canada from the United States. A Federal government initiative, the “Divorce Counselling and Family Affairs Unit” was set up in 1969 “to fund and promote court-based conciliation services across Canada” (Irving & Benjamin, 1987, p. 49). The first conciliation court was created in Edmonton, Alberta in 1972 (Irving & Benjamin, 1987, p. 49). The creation of pilot project Unified Family Courts in British Columbia in 1974 was the impetus for a court-connected family mediator role, called Family Court Counsellors. In 1978, the British Columbia government passed the Family Relations Act.

It included custody and access, and guardianship and child support and spousal support. Training was more intensive then to include all of that and to bring into being the role of a mediator. (C. McKnight, personal interview, February 14, 2007)

A 1978 Corrections Branch brochure says the role of Family Court Counsellors is “to provide an understanding and dignified approach to the resolution of legal and personal matters resulting from a marriage breakdown” (Ministry of the Attorney-General, 1978, Programs of the Corrections Branch, Province of British Columbia).

By 1984, family mediation in divorce was available in virtually every province and both territories in Canada. A national organization, Family Mediation Canada, was created in 1985 to “educate the public to the ideas of family mediation, establish standards of practice, codes of ethics and training programs” (Irving & Benjamin, 1987, p. 48). The institutionalization of family mediation—and family mediation practitioners—made many direct and important contributions to the conflict resolution movement. Those contributions include the first popularization of the idea of mediation as an alternative to litigation; the expansion of a settlement-focused labour-management

mediation approach to include communication and emotional considerations; the earliest articulation of questions of mediator training, qualifications, ethics and standards of practice; and the first evangelical presentation of the benefits of mediation.

The first use of a victim-offender reconciliation approach, in Elmira, Ontario, in 1974, resulted in the establishment of the Victim-Offender Reconciliation Project (VORP) in Kitchener, Ontario in 1975. It is well documented in the literature of the field “as initiating the contemporary restorative justice movement” (Zehr, 2004, p. 305). Two probation officers, Dave Worth and Mark Yantzi, took the two young male perpetrators of 22 property offences to knock on the doors of their victims and ask what they could do. “The resulting restitution agreements became the impetus for the Kitchener Victim-Offender Reconciliation Program in 1975 with support from the Mennonite Central Committee and collaboration with the local probation department” (McCold, 2006, pp. 26-27). Funded by the Mennonite Central Committee and working in partnership with the local probation office, this program used volunteer mediators to bring together the perpetrators of minor crimes, often juveniles, with their victims. This face-to-face meeting was intended to discuss restitution and promote reconciliation.

By 1982 there were Mennonite sponsored VORP’s in Elkhart, Indiana, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Langley, British Columbia and Fresno, California (McCold, 2006, pp. 26-27). All were based in a “Christian peacemaking perspective” (McCold, 2006, p. 27) and differed from other mediation approaches in their emphasis on reconciliation, not settlement, as the goal. In 1983 the first Canadian mediation training manual was published by Community Justice Initiatives of Waterloo Region (Peachey, Snyder & Teichrob, 1983).

Another element in the beginnings of the conflict resolution field in Canada was a series of demonstration projects related to federal youth justice legislative reforms. Cheryl Picard remembers youth diversion projects testing various pre-charge and post-charge interventions including victim-offender mediation in Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

The federal government, the Solicitor General's department, was revising the Juvenile Delinquents Act and they were proposing, in the first version of the Young Offenders Act, this idea of alternative measures, community involvement, responsibility by offenders for their actions ... the Solicitor General's department funded a series of demonstration projects across Canada that would test some of the ideas that were being proposed in the new legislation.... The program that I was involved with in Halifax was one of those demonstration projects, and it was started in 1978. (C. Picard, personal interview, February 21, 2007)

While the Kitchener and Manitoba VORPs, the family mediation initiatives and the federal young offender alternative demonstration projects all began in the 1970s, there was little sense of a field or movement in Canada until the mid-1980s. It was the federally funded demonstration projects that initially brought people involved together from across the country.

These groups of people gathered together and met on a regular basis to talk through policy ... and to talk about our experience in mediation.... And so we had this kind of national organization.... We were brought in by the government to talk about what was happening, what worked, what didn't, those kinds of things. (C. Picard, personal interview, February 21, 2007)

In 1984, the Canadian field began to acquire an organizational presence with the formation of the Mediation Development Association of British Columbia and in 1985 Family Mediation Canada.

Institutionalization and professionalization

By the mid-1980s, a trend towards the institutionalization of mediation programs was apparent in the U.S.

In the early years of the field's growth, the Federal government funded Neighbourhood Justice Centers (NJC's) to provide free or low-cost mediation services to the public so that disputes could be resolved efficiently, inexpensively and informally. In the early 1980s, many of these NJC's were institutionalized and became part of city-, court-, or district-attorney-based alternative dispute resolution services. (Moore, 2003, p. 25)

From the mid-80s on, the term "community mediation movement" appears to have come to refer to programs and centres using volunteer mediators, based in communities, and usually having a social justice or community empowerment orientation. The term "alternative dispute resolution (ADR)" came to mean processes other than litigation, primarily mediation, conducted by paid, and increasingly professionalized, consultants in a variety of specialized practice areas.

This ongoing field development is framed in the literature in two main ways. One framing tells a success story of a spread into multiple arenas of conflict; increasing public acceptance and institutional support; the creation of a new profession of mediators, conciliators and facilitators with attendant professional organizations, journals and graduate schools; and a proliferation of academic research (Folberg & Taylor, 1984; Mayer, 2004; Bush & Folger, 2005). The other framing uses the term co-optation and sees conflict resolution's potential for promoting and enhancing individual, community and societal change as having been eroded, if not yet entirely eliminated, by institutionalization and professionalization (Bush & Folger, 2005; Coy & Hedeem, 2005; Mayer, 2004; Wahrhaftig, 2004).

The first decade of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution, 1983–1993, encompassed the time period where the conflict resolution movement became only a part of an overall professionalized and increasingly institutionalized field of conflict resolution practice.

I remember talking about the movement, the mediation movement in the 80s.... By the mid-nineties, people were saying, “ADR means additional dispute resolution.” and “appropriate dispute resolution”.... And some of us wanted to stand up and say, “But, but, but, hang on! It really is an alternative to adjudicative stuff and an alternative to the system.” And in the US it very much was. In the US mediation grew up in contradiction to law, and as part of the peace movement really, in the 60s ... I think we [in Canada] just fell heir to that in the mid-eighties and by the 90s, people were already looking at us and saying, “What movement? What is this, some kind of a religion?” (G. Sloan, personal interview, April 4, 2007)

Neither a community-based mediation service organization nor a university-based academic program, but created within the Community Programs branch of a public post-secondary institution that provided vocational training for people working in public safety and justice system-related roles, the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was motivated by a conflict resolution movement educational strategy, to pass on skills to attain the co-operative vision of interpersonal and intergroup peace to as many people as possible.

So the vision was to ... give people the skills to be able to take back control of their lives ... it was the social justice, social movement ideal that people can take responsibility, people want to and they should, and we need to promote that happening through education and training. (C. Picard, personal interview, February 21, 2007)

It also embraced a second movement strategy, to train mediators who could assist others in resolving their conflicts. Its first decade saw the shift from seeing mediation as a socially transformative activity to an understanding of mediation as a career.

CHAPTER 4: THE FOUNDING OF THE CERTIFICATE IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION

The Certificate in Conflict Resolution was created in the Community Programs department of the Justice Institute of British Columbia (JIBC). The JIBC was initially conceived as an experiment in justice system reform in the early-1970s under B.C.'s first New Democratic Party (NDP) government. It came into existence in 1978 as part of the B.C. public post-secondary system, but occupied a unique position within that system because of its provincial mandate to train and educate front-line workers and leaders in a number of justice and public safety-related fields, and the unusual funding and accountability relationships with various provincial government ministries resulting from that mandate.

While the academies and divisions of the JIBC provided pre- and post-employment training in a number of vocational roles, the role of the Community Programs branch of the JIBC was to offer educational programs on justice and public-safety topics to an interdisciplinary audience of justice and public safety employees and to members of the public. A broad interpretation of the meaning of “justice and public safety” allowed Community Programs to provide courses in a number of content areas newly-emerging into public awareness such as violence against women, sexual abuse of children and the use of non-adversarial methods, particularly mediation, to resolve family and neighbourhood conflicts.

In this chapter the history of the JIBC and Community Programs is examined and the institutional factors which led the JIBC to be, as initial Certificate leader Marje Burdine says, “fertile ground” (Personal interview, January 24, 2007) for the emergence of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution are identified. The development of that Certificate is traced from its roots in the first public-registration mediation course in 1983 to its birth announcement in 1986, a progression marked by exponential growth in the number of mediation courses offered and ever-increasing popularity of courses in related topic areas.

Origins of the Justice Institute of British Columbia

The election of B.C.’s first New Democratic Party (NDP) government in 1972 meant that “the winds of change swept through the province” (DeVries, 1990, p. 37). The original idea for what would become the Justice Institute arose in this short but intense period of reform in many areas of provincial government responsibility. The NDP government emphasized the role of B.C.’s community colleges in “serving the disadvantaged and under-educated” (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986, p. 91), but the original vision for the formation of the Justice Institute, then called the Justice Education Centre, did not come from college system directives but from initiatives to reform the administration of the justice system. It did, however, echo themes of public access to education, specifically in the case of the Justice Education Centre, access to legal and justice system-related information and education.

According to Bergman (1979)

The germination of the Justice Institute started in a hotel room in 1973. Several rather influential men in the justice

field were sitting around relaxing after a hard day of discussion relating to the “Task Force on Police Training” when one of them said “What would happen if....?” (p. 3)

A 1972 report by the British Columbia Branch of the Canadian Bar Association had called for examination and reform of the administration of the law in British Columbia and in 1974, the provincial government passed the Administration of Justice Act. That Act created the B.C. Justice Development Commission, having as its overall goal “to ensure that all the citizens of B.C. are provided with the best quality of justice by improving the courts, policing, corrections and the delivery of legal services” (Justice Development Commission, 1974, in DeVries, 1990, p. 20).

The Justice Development Commission set up a number of Task Forces as well as community-based Justice Councils. DeVries (1990) describes the reformist tenor of these initiatives as intended to increase and ensure citizen participation and to open up the justice system (p. 21). One task force was concerned with training and the 1974 Report of the Justice Development Commission Training Task Force recommended the establishment of a Justice Education Centre. The providers and the consumers of a range of justice related services would mix and mingle in what sounds like a combination of community centre, vocational institute and prison.

[It] would integrate training for personnel from corrections, courts, legal services and police with public community education programs. The Centre would include a specialized public library, classrooms, recreational facilities for the public ... legal aid and counselling, as well as operate as a community correctional facility. (DeVries, 1990, p. 21)

While the vision shifted over time, two themes persisted, integrated training for justice-related occupational roles, and community education programs.

There was considerable provincial government support for the idea of a Justice Education Centre. The Ministry of the Attorney-General, under whose auspices this new facility would reside, wanted to centralize training as a strategy to reduce fragmentation, “to remove the traditional barriers that were seen to isolate Police, Legal Services, Courts and Corrections from each other” (Stonecrest, 1980, p. 1). Indeed, the three major users of the proposed Justice Education Centre in its vocational institute identity—police, corrections and courts—all had reasons for being interested in the concept. The Corrections Branch of the Ministry of the Attorney-General had identified a need in the 1970s for enhanced basic recruit training to increase professionalization. Both “corrections workers as well as community workers were increasingly expected to professionalize and obtain further education in order to advance up the career ladder” (DeVries, 1990, p. 32). It also needed training for senior and middle managers, as well as continuing professional development opportunities. Training for a new community-based Corrections role, Family Court Worker, was needed but “presently undefined” (Cornerstone, 1974, p. 8). The Corrections Branch was part of the negotiations surrounding the proposed Justice Education Centre from 1974 on.

The enactment of the 1974 Police Act centralized responsibility for the training of police officers for municipal police forces, formerly the responsibility of the individual municipalities, in the B.C. Police Commission. First established in a group of mobile trailers behind the Seaforth Armouries in Vancouver, the British Columbia Police College was looking for better facilities as well as for an “expanded opportunity to integrate and coordinate police service training with other justice training programs”

(DeVries, 1990, p. 28). It became a second major player in the establishment of the Justice Institute.

The Court Services Branch of the Ministry of the Attorney-General also required enhanced training opportunities. Sheriffs required training for their expanding roles—“the service of documents, courtroom security and arrests, and escort of accused, convicted and mentally ill persons” (DeVries, 1990, p. 29).

While a need for additional training and co-ordinated training had been identified in corrections, courts and police, implementation details were sketchy: “It is impossible to predict the nature of many of these programs, how they might be taught, where they would be located or who would teach them” (Cornerstone, 1974, p. 8). What was clear, however, was that the responsibility for the proposed Justice Education Centre would lie with the Ministry of the Attorney-General (DeVries, 1990, p. 25) and, indeed, Stonecrest (1980) emphasizes that the control of justice-related vocational education and training would rest with the Ministry of the Attorney-General rather than the Ministry of Education.

[T]he initial discussions saw utility in the Justice Education Centre idea only in so far as it was an immediate creature of the Attorney-General’s Ministry.... Far from being affected by legislated constraints set down by the Ministry of Education, it was seen as a vehicle to influence other educational establishments in a manner rewarding to the Attorney-General. (p. 2)

This theme of control shapes much of the subsequent JIBC development. In 1974, however, it was practical rather than jurisdictional issues that were halting progress. No suitable location could be found for a Justice Education Centre.

The election of a Social Credit government in B.C. in 1976 meant that when the idea regained momentum, it did so under a somewhat different vision. A 1976 report on the establishment of a Justice Education Centre “expressed some fundamental changes to preceding versions and reflected a new wind blowing through the bureaucracy; as a catchword, ‘reform’ had been replaced by ‘financial restraint’ and ‘cost effectiveness’” (Stonecrest, 1980, p. 4). The cost-saving benefits of integrated training were now seen as the primary rationale for creating a Justice Education Centre. Consideration was also given to the idea of creating a multi-site campus by entering into affiliation with other educational institutions already active in the field as a cost-saver to avoid construction or renovation expenses, but was discarded due primarily to “the problem of control”:

If the Attorney-General’s Ministry was to exercise authority over justice training, an agreement would have to be reached which would grant the Attorney-General powers over course content, the employment and supervision of academic staff, programme scheduling, student selection and certificates granted as a consequence of successful course completion. (Stonecrest, 1980, p. 5)

Negotiating such agreements with existing post-secondary institutions proved, not surprisingly, impossible.

The founding of the JIBC

The Ministry of the Attorney-General, in late 1976, asked Gerald Kilcup, the Director of the B.C. Police College, to pull together a final plan for what was now being called the Justice Training Centre. Site acquisition became crucial as the lease of the B.C. Police College was expiring, Corrections Branch training was scattered amongst many facilities, and Courts Services had been given notice to vacate their Willingdon School training location (Stonecrest, 1980; DeVries, 1990). A proposal to purchase the vacant

Worker's Compensation facility was before the provincial government Treasury Board when a major complication arose. The provincial government put forward a new piece of legislation, Bill-82, the Colleges and Provincial Institutes Act, motivated by concerns about accountability for the use of provincial funds in community colleges and by a desire on the part of the Ministry of Education to exert greater control over the colleges (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986; Gaber, 2003).

The Act distinguished colleges, having a local or regional focus and wide programming responsibilities, from institutes, which would have a provincial focus but in a narrow program area. It removed colleges from a legal relationship with school boards, gave them corporate status, and removed local taxation as a contributor to college funding. While Bill 82 was read by the existing B.C. colleges as an attempt to entrench government control over their direction and programming and weaken local autonomy and control (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986) it was also, however unintentionally, directly relevant to the potential Justice Training Centre. Bill 82 granted the Minister of Education responsibility for all post-secondary institutions receiving provincial funding (Stonecrest, 1980, p. 12). Kilcup, the Director of the B.C. Police College and Justice Training Centre advocate and organizer, pointed out to the Ministry of the Attorney-General that this Bill 82 provision would shift control of the Justice Training Centre from the Ministry of the Attorney-General to the Ministry of Education.

This proposed bill clearly captures the developing Justice Training Centre as a Provincial Institution within the interpretation of the legislation and effectively removes it from the direct control of the Ministry of the Attorney-General. (Memorandum from D. Kilcup, Director B.C. Police College to R. Vogel, Deputy Attorney-General, August 9, 1977, in Stonecrest, 1980, p. 12).

Even though the funding for the Justice Training Centre would have come from the Ministry of the Attorney-General, not the Ministry of Education, it would nonetheless be subject to the oversight of the Minister of Education. After no doubt intense negotiation, a joint Ministry of Attorney-General/Ministry of Education proposal was developed, and the Justice Institute of British Columbia (the JIBC) was created as a provincial institute by an Order-In-Council April 27, 1978, falling under the College and Institutes Act.

The new Justice Institute of British Columbia had two main purposes:

1. That the highly complementary roles of the various components of the Justice System can be recognized and co-ordinated within a scheme for education and training of Justice personnel.
2. That training and education of Justice personnel should be, and appear to be, part of a larger community endeavor. (Bergman, 1979, p. 4, DeVries, 1990, p. 21)

The integrated training included not only Police, Corrections and Courts; but also fire services, adding “de facto a new dimension to the concept, that of public safety” (DeVries, 1990, p. 40).

For the Justice Institute of British Columbia, the capturing of the Ministry of the Attorney-General’s Justice Training Centre by the Ministry of Education and the consequent ongoing direct involvement of at first two, and subsequently many, government ministries created an unique set of funding and reporting relationships that set the JIBC apart from all of the other institutions in the B.C. post-secondary system. As Stonecrest (1980) suggests, the multiple masters involved in the JIBC would prove unwieldy:

Corrections Staff Development remained accountable to the Commissioner of Corrections, the Police Academy to the B.C. Police Commissioner; and the Fire Services Academy to the Fire Services Commissioner ... Like the horseman who rides off in all directions at once, each training component continues to respond to a unique set of expectations and historically-based needs while simultaneously trying to co-operate within the larger context of the Institute's affairs. (pp. 15-16)

Development of the JIBC

Other colleges and institutes in the B.C. system were governed in a traditional manner: a Board of Directors delegated authority to the principal or president of the institution, who delegated responsibility to various deans, faculty heads and administrative directors. At the JIBC, this management model was muddled by accountability without authority and mixed allegiances:

1. The role delegated to the Institute's Principal contravenes a basic tenet of good business practice. While he is fully accountable to the Board for the Justice Institute's management, he is not fully responsible for the majority of the Institute's training activities.
2. So long as their affiliation with the Institute is based on the financial contract model, and so long as their first allegiance in that relationship is with the Attorney-General's operational branches, it remains unclear how the core users ought to participate in achieving the Institute's broader objectives. (Stonecrest, 1980, p. 16)

If institutional governance was seen as somewhat problematic, so were the funding arrangements.

The complexities of the budget and funding process are so intricate that a further paper would be necessary to do it justice ... It is a co-operative working marriage between the funding sources. (Bergman, 1979, p. 19)

The 1978 agreement reached between the Ministry of the Attorney-General and the Ministry of Education provided for "the fiscal budget to maintain the core staff and support services of the Institute to be provided by the Ministry of Education" and that the

Ministry of the Attorney-General would “reimburse the Institute for services rendered” (Stonecrest, p. 13). The formula for payment for services rendered appears to have elements of both expediency and control.

1) The Attorney-General’s training components moved to the Justice Institute at mid-point during the 1978-79 fiscal year. In order to avoid an accounting nightmare, expediency prevailed. Agreements that served a temporary purpose now appear to have become entrenched.

2) More importantly, it appears that the Attorney-General’s Ministry believed that budgetary control, based on the contract model, equates with control over the direction of training programs. (Stonecrest, 1980, p. 17)

While complicated, the funding agreements nonetheless allowed for a functioning institution. Once the Justice Institute had been officially created, the provincial government offered as a location the former Jericho Hill School for the Blind on Fourth Avenue in Vancouver. Other government ministries began looking to the JIBC as a training location. Training of ambulance attendants funded by the provincial Ministry of Health moved to the JIBC shortly after its opening (DeVries, 1990, p. 39).

The new institution was in many ways thriving; however, the question of ‘who was in control’ of decision-making remained. “New and creative programs proliferated and increasing numbers of students walked the halls of the Justice Institute ... The roles of the two ministries, the client groups, the Justice Institute and the Academy Directors remained ambiguous” (DeVries, 1990, p. 63). The ambiguity reached a crisis point in 1983 when the Principal of the Justice Institute terminated the employment of the Director of the Fire Services Academy, against the wishes of the B.C. Fire Commission. Amidst a swirl of conflict and controversy, including allegations of inadequate accounting procedures (DeVries, 1990), the provincial government re-considered the

continuation of the Justice Institute. A joint team from the Ministry of the Attorney-General and the Ministry of Education studied four alternatives; maintaining the Justice Institute as it was currently constituted, re-locating JIBC programs to other post-secondary institutions, creating a new Ministry of the Attorney-General run facility or returning training functions to the various funding ministries (DeVries, 1990, p. 65). The report recommended keeping the Justice Institute but requiring

more detailed planning, procedures and communication by involved agencies, clarification of roles; clarification of what integrated training meant; exploration of pre-employment training; a study of the long range role of the Fire Academy; and improved cost accounting methods. The 12 pages of recommendations were followed by 13 pages of dissenting opinions and objections by various committee members. (DeVries, 1990, p. 65)

With the election of a Social Credit government in 1983, an overall government financial restraint program came into being. The subsequent interest in centralization and rationalization in post-secondary education (Gaber, 2003) included substantial funding cuts, a requirement for colleges and institutes to submit program profiles for approval by the Ministry and the promise of a formula funding system. Dennison & Gallagher (1986), somewhat dramatically, say of the B.C. college-system response, “[t]he 1983 government legislation is seen by some as the last nail in the coffin” (p. 95). For the JIBC, it was Stonecrest’s 1980 warning come true: “In times of close co-operation and readily available funds, the present financial relationship is workable and satisfactory. Should resources become scarce, however, the current division of financial responsibility could breed severe problems” (pp. 16-17). Certainly, the JIBC faced a severe problem as the Ministry of Education ordered it to close down: “In this time of severe financial restraint in the provincial government, the Justice Institute did not rank as a high priority”

(DeVries, 1990, pp. 65-66). In response to the closure directive, the Justice Institute management and public safety and justice supporters mounted an extensive lobbying campaign aimed at institutional survival and the Ministry of the Attorney-General agreed to take over responsibility for the Justice Institute from the Ministry of Education. While the institution did not have to close its doors, the next two years' budgets resulted in a loss of almost 1/3 of the staff (DeVries, 1990, p. 67).

The development of a formula funding system for colleges and institutes based on full time equivalencies (FTEs) offered some stability to the B.C. post-secondary system (Gaber, 2003) but unfortunately, the JIBC was not part of this funding system. Funds for program development and delivery came from various ministries directly to “their” Academies and JIBC centralized services and infrastructure became increasingly underserved. Ministry funders did not want to devote funds to non-program areas outside their control and not seen as having any direct benefit to “their” students. The original JIBC vision of integrated training was largely unattained.

[T]he Academies had divided lines of responsibility, towards their client sponsor on one hand and towards the Justice Institute Principal and Board on the other ... spending control in effect stayed largely in the hands of the Academy Directors and client sponsors. Integration of training was intended to be a central aspect of the JI identity. With each Academy to a significant degree free to pursue its own destiny, there was limited incentive and even less coercive power within the Justice Institute to achieve integrated training. (DeVries, 1990, pp. 86-87)

A 1984 audit by Treasury Board brought the question of institutional survival into prominence again, but no clear recommendations resulted and the JIBC carried on. In 1985, the responsibility for the JIBC moved to the newly created Ministry of the Solicitor-General and in 1988 back to the Ministry of Advanced Education and Training

(DeVries, 1990). More provincial government funded training programs came to the institution, both the Provincial Emergency Program (PEP) and the Pacific Traffic Education Centre, a partnership between the JIBC and the Insurance Corporation of B.C. in 1989 (DeVries, 1990, p. 73). Institutional survival was still not secure, however, as “rapid changes in the provincial government ministry structures required almost constant justification as to the rationale and efficiency of the Justice Institute organization” (DeVries, 1990, p. 72).

By the early 1990s, explicit linkages between the role of the post-secondary system and the economic growth of the province were prominent. *Partners for the Future*, a planning document for the entire BC post-secondary sector highlighted the need to focus on “a more highly skilled workforce ... and stimulate the economy within a competitive, knowledge-based environment” (Dennison, 1995, p. 18). In this context, the JIBC was once again assessed for its economic efficiency and effectiveness. Burch (1990) investigated the JIBC and in a report to the Provincial Cabinet outlined the pros and cons of by now familiar options:

- 1) Transfer of JIBC training functions to non-specialized community colleges.
- 2) Disperse JIBC training functions into respective client ministries.
- 3) Privatization of the justice and public safety functions of the JIBC. (Burch, 1990, p. 5)

Her recommendation, however, was that, because of its “specialized mandate, clientele, training model and instructor procurement” (p. 9) the JIBC not be dispersed, disbanded or privatized, but relocated:

The existing configuration and operation of the JIBC is the envy of other jurisdictions across North America and receives a high level of support and approval from its clients. It is also endorsed by a large and powerful lobby group ... It is recommended that for cost efficiency and effectiveness purposes, Treasury Board approve the relocation of the JIBC to a site within the Greater Vancouver Regional District. (Burch, 1990, p. 9)

Testifying to the JIBC's many masters, Burch's (1990) report has lines for signatures from the Ministry of the Attorney-General, the Ministry of the Solicitor-General, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Advanced Education, Training and Technology (p. 9). It is also noteworthy for the clarity it displays in laying out the reasons for recommending continuation of the JIBC, focusing back to integrated training but with a renewed emphasis on entrepreneurship:

In 1983 the JIBC was asked to become more entrepreneurial and actively market its programs and products. The JIBC has demonstrated that it is a leader amongst post-secondary institutions in privatizing its education products. In 1989/90 tuition/contract revenue had grown to \$2.3 million, or 630% above 1983 levels. (Burch, 1990, p. 3)

Privatizing the JIBC was unnecessary as the Institute was already "market-driven" and successfully so. For example, over five years, although there were impressive gains in the number of student training days (117%), there was little increase in staff (10%). The JIBC was clearly "doing more with less" and without any inconvenient "contractual problems" due to its unique secondment model of faculty procurement.

[I]nstructors are seconded or contracted from operational units in the field ... This model of teaching has significant benefits ... Experienced personnel who are competent and current ... Accountability and evaluation mechanisms are built into training, a factor which is often overlooked in other post-secondary institutions ... No contractual problems (strikes, severance) during government cutbacks as secondments or contracted instructors simply return to field positions if training needs are reduced. (Burch, 1990, pp. 3-4)

And the final accolade: “The JIBC has solicited thousands of hours of volunteer ‘goodwill’ at no cost to government. While this is often overlooked, it has substantially helped to reduce training costs” (Burch, 1990, Executive Summary). Burch’s (1990) justifications for the JIBC’s continued existence on primarily economic grounds of efficiency and cost-effectiveness were apparently persuasive. The JIBC did relocate in 1997 to a new purpose-built facility in New Westminster.

Community programs

When the Justice Institute of British Columbia came into existence as a provincial institute by an Order-In-Council April 27, 1987, it fell under the 1977 College and Provincial Institutes Act. Its mandate was to:

- a) provide courses of instruction which are consistent with identified needs specifically, but not limited to, Police, Corrections, Courts and Sheriffs;
- b) identify the educational and specific training needs for all components of the British Columbia Justice Services, including fire services;
- c) develop a co-operative system of co-ordination between its own programs and those of other institutes, colleges, universities, public schools and community-based organizations; and
- d) provide a provincial forum for discussion and examination of justice and socially-related issues. (DeVries, 1990)

None of the written sources on the history of the JIBC (Bergman, 1979; DeVries, 1990; Stonecrest, 1980; Kilcup, 1980; Kilcup, 1982) devote much attention to the fourth item in its mandate, the provision of “a provincial forum for discussion and examination of justice and socially related issues.” This function was located within a division of the

JIBC called Educational Services, initially understood in part as a learning resource centre for all the academies.

Educational Services had originally been created to assist the divisions or academies with learning resources, including a media centre and library, and to offer extension and interdisciplinary programming, as well as psychological and physical training services ... Educational Services was in a way the division that could serve the broader needs of the community more than could the individual academies. (DeVries, 1990, p. 48)

The “extension and interdisciplinary programming” arm of Educational Services was called Community Programs and it was here that the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was created. Both the overall history and context of the Justice Institute of British Columbia and the specific role and culture of Community Programs facilitated the creation of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution.

Pat Ross was hired as the Program Director of Community Programs in the Educational Services Division shortly after the JIBC opened. The JIBC wanted more than training for the various academies but

they weren't clear what that ‘more’ could be so in the initial language, it was discussion and examination of justice and socially related issues. Educational Services was managed by Larry Goble, and under that were the support structures, which were fairly minimal: Library, Media Centre, a Physical Education coordinator and, I believe, a psychologist who was doing work with the police. And then me as Program Director of Community Programs. So we were the programming arm separate from whatever the existing academies were at the start. (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007)

Community Programs quickly began offering courses. One focus was on providing programs for the “pure public” on justice and public safety-related topics. Another was on interdisciplinary topics of use to the different JIBC academies, the “early silos responsible for the training of those respective professional groups” (P. Ross, personal

interview, January 12, 2007). The interdisciplinary programs quickly began attracting a wider audience.

Initially the idea of interdisciplinary programs was interdisciplinary programs primarily for the police, courts and corrections employees. What happened quite quickly was for better or worse we expanded beyond those initial groups and started appealing to other people in the justice and public safety field. At first, our focus was primarily on the not-for-profits and the community agencies, but quite quickly we started appealing to nurses and teachers and social workers and others working in different professional streams. (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007)

This was noted in the earliest written documentation, the 1979-1980 JIBC Annual Report, as:

The Community Programs unit initiated programs and responded to requests for delivery of specific workshops ... Participants included a broad range of professionals from justice, health, social services and community groups as well as interested citizens. Programs offered last year covered such topics as sexual abuse of children, victims of crime, the new Family Relations Act, leadership training, wife battering and consumer law. (JIBC, 1980, p. 12)

The 1980 JIBC Calendar lists courses offered by Community Programs as well as the Police Academy, the Corrections Academy, the Fire Academy and the Courts Academy. The Community Programs courses included several for “managers and supervisors from a cross-section of justice and public safety professions” (p. 6) including *Integrated Management*, *Practical Approaches to Dealing with Deaf People in your Work*, *Human Resource Management*, and *Crisis Management*. There were also courses specifically for JIBC instructors, including *Instructional Techniques* and *DACUM Facilitator Training*. Conferences including one on *Public Liability* and another called *Sexual Abuse of Children in the Family* were open to anyone registering through Community Programs.

On the cover of its 1982 course schedule, Community Programs described its role and purpose as offering “a wide range of non-credit courses to a broad range of professionals, community groups and interested citizens” providing “individuals and groups in the area of justice and public safety” with:

- A forum for the discussion of justice and public safety issues
- Information and education on B.C.’s justice and public safety system
- Training to increase participants’ skills in dealing effectively with the system (JIBC, 1982b, p. 1)

Indeed, Community Programs seems to have had an early and ongoing commitment to live up to its name, to use education as a way of not only reaching into communities but of, in broad terms, community betterment. This direction can be traced directly to Pat Ross who had a quite specific view of how educational programs could assist the broader community. Before coming to Community Programs, Pat Ross had organized “the first interdisciplinary conference on family violence in B.C” using what she called an educationally-based approach to a sensitive social issue.

We first of all really raised the level of awareness about an issue in the community. We showed that through an educational context you could move forward a social issue. And we got the professional community on an interdisciplinary basis willing to try to address that issue, moving forward. And we kind of built the need for, or the demand for, more training and education on the whole area of family violence. (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007)

Pat Ross brought her vision of using public education to move forward on social issues to her role at the JIBC. She was operating in a new institution, developing new kinds of programming on issues that were, in many cases, newly emerging into public and professional view.

We were a pretty small team; there weren't many of us ... And we had the opportunity to initiate ourselves ... We didn't have a body that gave us mandated directions ... And you can see from the start with Community Programs we were given lots of scope and latitude, and I have to say there were very few times we were ever restricted in terms of content that we wanted to offer. (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007)

In the early years, the implementation of a community-focused educational vision was supported by resources, specifically monies allocated to Community Programs from the provincial government through the Ministry of Education for three positions and administrative support. The two original Program Co-ordinators in Community Programs were hired in 1981—Shelley Rivkin and Marje Burdine. Marje Burdine remembers her original role as organizing conferences on family violence in communities around B.C. that would bring together a range of concerned professionals.

The concept was that these were groups that worked together in the community and that they have common issues that are complex, particularly around subjects of family violence or changes within society that they need to respond to together. So the idea was train them together to have a common understanding of these issues. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

By January 1982 Community Programs had their own brochure and what Pat Ross describes as a “smorgasbord” of courses included *Burglary Protection*, *CPR*, *Fire Safety for the Disabled*, *Career Planning*, *Stress Awareness*, *Wife Battering* and *Auto Extraction*. The tuition fees for these early Community Programs courses reflected the economic cushion offered by the Ministry funding:

If you look at some of the early calendars, you'd probably be as shocked as I am now as what we were charging for things. It was like five dollars or 20 dollars. (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007)

In 1982 there were a number of free seminars, workshops and conferences including *Emergency Awareness*, *Burglary Prevention*, *A Public Forum on Sexual Abuse*

of Children and Adolescent Issues. Other offerings were priced at what Pat Ross calls a “token amount”: *Heartsavers: Basic Life Support* was \$13; a one-day workshop on *Wife-Battering* was \$15; and a *Career Planning Workshop* was \$20. On the other hand, *Advanced Cardiac Life Support: Instructor’s Course* was \$200. (JIBC, 1982b). The more expensive courses appear to have been designed for people employed in public safety and justice-related fields whose fees were likely subsidized by their employers while the fees for the public offerings were much lower.

Community Programs offerings expanded rapidly through the early 1980s. By 1983 there were 42 different courses with several being offered more than once and the mediation course that would become the foundation of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution first appeared.

The development of the first public registration mediation course

The original motivation for the development of the mediation course, which subsequently led to the Certificate in Conflict Resolution, was linked directly to Marje Burdine’s work in the family violence area in Community Programs.

I put on eight to 10 major conferences ... around the province with 200 to 300 people attending these in the different communities. I was dealing with adolescent suicide, child sexual abuse, abuse of the elderly, spousal abuse ... it was quite a grim agenda of topics, and led into my feeling that these communities are often trying to respond after the fact because of their isolation geographically and the lack of resources that were available to respond to family violence-related issues after the fact seemed so sad ... I thought there should be a more proactive way of trying to minimize the likelihood of these things occurring to start with. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

Marje Burdine was familiar with mediation as a process for addressing divorce and neighbourhood disputes because probation officers and Family Court Counsellors

were being trained as mediators through the Corrections Academy at the JIBC. Burdine saw mediation as a skill that could be relatively easily learned by community volunteers.

I thought, “Well, let's put on some training for volunteers and then be able to send large numbers of people back into these communities to be more of a proactive catalyst toward resolution rather than escalation.” That was the origin of it. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007).

The JIBC provided mediation training through its Corrections Academy for probation officers and Family Court Counsellors from its inception. Probation officers had always had some responsibilities for assisting families at the time of separation or divorce. Carole McKnight did her probation officer training in 1965 and remembers that her work with families around child support was not called mediation: “There was some sort of getting together with the couple and sorting it out, but for the most part—well, we never called it mediation in those days” (Personal interview, February 14, 2007). Wendy Hacking did her training as a probation officer a decade later and graduated just as the Family Court Counsellor role was coming into existence due to recommendations from the 1974 Berger Commission, the B.C. Royal Commission on Family and Children’s Law. “It was members from my [probation officer] training course ... who were solicited to be the first Family Court Counsellors,” she says. “And it was the impetus of that Unified Family Court pilot project that really started it” (Personal interview, April 16, 2007). Deborah White remembers her initial, and wide-ranging, experiences as an early Family Court Counsellor:

I was the person managing conflict through Port McNeill, Alert Bay, Sointula, Beaver Cove, Zeballos, Gold River, Port Alice.... it was me and the five police officers on the police boat.... I was also an officer of the court, so I also did investigations to make recommendations about where children should be placed as well as managing probation, kids' probation, adults' probation. So anybody who was in conflict with anybody had to

come and see me ... I also got called into a lot of community disputes ... And that's how I learned how to do it—by the seat of my drawers. (Personal interview, March 21, 2007)

The earliest written description of the Corrections Academy mediation training at the JIBC is in the 1980 Calendar: *Conflict Resolution by Mediation*.

The program will a) provide alternatives by which to resolve family conflict; b) identify situations in which mediation is appropriate; c) provide mediation skills; d) identify mediation obstacles and problem-solving techniques. Pre-requisites: Probation officers/Family Court Counsellors who have completed Block IV training and are currently carrying a caseload of ten or more F.R.A. [Family Relations Act] cases. (JIBC, 1980c, p. 3)

When Marje Burdine first wanted to learn more about mediation in order to begin realizing her vision of training community-based volunteer mediators to prevent family violence, she had Corrections colleagues in the same institution, very willing to share their knowledge.

I can recall Marje and I working well together and enthusiastically together as everybody was sort of learning this new thing ... I can remember Marje being in my classroom sometimes and me being in her classroom sometimes and sort of learning from each other. (W. Hacking, personal interview, April 16, 2007)

Deborah White also recalls a constructive and collegial relationship. “I remember Marje coming down to my office, and I remember going up to her office on the second floor and talking about it” (Personal interview, March 21, 2007). Unlike the Corrections Academy focus on family mediation, Marje Burdine’s focus was community.

She wanted to teach people generally in the community, not Family Court Counsellors but other people who would do community mediation. People who would be in community organizations that would take on conflicts in community settings ... that's what her main thrust was going to be. (D. White, personal interview, March 21, 2007)

The introductory mediation course for public registration developed by Marje Burdine was offered for the first time in 1983. Called *Co-operative Conflict Resolution: Mediation Skills*, the three-day course was described as co-sponsored with the Solicitor-General:

this workshop is designed to develop skills in conflict resolution involving a neutral third party. Participants will learn a mediation process which will assist them in dealing with clients in a conflict relationship. (JIBC, 1983b, p. 6)

Marje Burdine remembers choosing the course title based on fears that if it were simply titled Mediation people wouldn't know what the title meant and wouldn't register. Fears that the course wouldn't draw people were unfounded. She had planned for 20 students and had 35, the majority social workers and lawyers:

They were lined up in the hall and they would not go away. They wanted to be in there, so we pulled out all the desks and made room for as many people as we could get into the classroom. And that was an indicator to me that there was a huge interest in the professional field, which wasn't what I had originally targeted. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

The introductory mediation course was offered 10 times the first year and 15 times the next. In 1984-1985 a more advanced mediation course was developed, a Level II course five days in length that built upon the Level I material and focused more on professional practice as a mediator.

This program more deeply explores theory, strategies and skills related to conflict resolution through mediation, including issues of trust, power, resistance and dysfunctional behaviour. It will also consider ethical and legal implications for mediators. (JIBC, 1985b, p. 3)

In 1985, Community Programs offered a provincial forum on mediation featuring

information on programs and discussion of issues related to conflict resolution through mediation in the areas of separation and divorce, public schools, young offender, and community and neighbourhood. (JIBC, 1985b, p. 3)

In addition, courses in related content areas were offered: *Negotiations Skills* was offered five times in 84-85, *Assertive Communication* twice and *Defusing Hostility* four times (JIBC, 1984; JIBC, 1985a). There seemed to be a clear and increasing demand for courses in the conflict resolution area.

By September 1985, Community Programs had been renamed Extension Programs. A total of 33 conflict resolution-related courses were offered in that year (JIBC 1985a, pp. 12-13) including two levels of *Anger Management with Youth*, two levels of *Mediation Skills*, *Negotiation Skills*, *Defusing Hostility* and *Crisis Intervention* (JIBC, 1985d).

The creation of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution

A growing number of students were taking all of the conflict resolution-related courses offered and wanted still more. Pat Ross said that the “loyal following” that developed wanted to get beyond basics, so, “we tried to build levels of courses so that in order to get into Level 2 you had to have a prerequisite of Level 1. So as soon as you do that, you're starting to build a structure” (Personal interview, January 12, 2007). No one can pinpoint a specific moment when the idea of a Certificate occurred. Marje Burdine remembers it as an organic evolution coming from identification of educational needs related to effective practice as a mediator.

The first was a three-day course, and then ... Mediation Level 2, just thinking three days was just not enough to give people a solid enough basis so they would go out and begin to do some work.... So then we thought, “Okay, there's a lot of anger involved here. There should be

something around that.” And then, conflict is at the heart of all of this, so a conflict resolution course. And then, negotiation seemed to be a critical piece that's part of mediation that we hadn't addressed, so that's where that came from. (Personal interview, January 24, 2007)

Pat Ross frames the Certificate development as an Extension Programs response to both the strong demand for the courses and the existence of already developed courses and faculty expertise in related areas. As Marje Burdine became increasingly interested in mediation and other Community Programs faculty developed their own but related content areas,

I remember doing a bit of a road show. Marje and I went around and we talked to Dale Trimble. We talked to Stacey Holloway ... there were probably several others in those early years. I think to Joan Balmer quite early on. So we got talking to people about themes and threads. And as I say, it wasn't that we conceptually created a certificate program with certain streams, but we did find that ... several themes started to emerge. (Personal interview, January 12, 2007)

Student requests for some kind of formal acknowledgement of their mediation training also contributed to the certificate development. Many people had taken many courses—and they wanted to get the same kind of credit they did with their other professional development. “It seemed logical that we put some title to that, and "certificate" seemed to apply” (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007). The major obstacle to creating a certificate was a lack of resources to fund course and program development. While Community Programs had received direct funding in its initial years, that funding had disappeared by the time the idea of a conflict resolution certificate emerged. Extension Programs was operating on a cost-recovery basis and as Pat Ross says, “didn't have hundreds of thousands of dollars to invest in curriculum”.

Finding the resources to develop the Certificate was a challenge and a centralized JIBC curriculum development fund was an answer.

We needed to find a way to fund the development of a bunch of core work ... we did have a central fund at the JI that was one-time money that had been given to us by an assistant Deputy Minister for curriculum development. It wasn't ours in Community Programs; it was the JI's. So we put in an application for what to us was a huge amount of money, seventy thousand dollars, to invest in the development of these courses, and we got the funding. (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007)

The launching of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was, however, still a financial risk for Extension Programs and, as Pat Ross says, taking it on required a significant commitment to the concept: "The money wasn't ours. We had to pay it back. It wasn't a grant, it was a loan" (Personal interview, January 12, 2007).

One major benefit of the JIBC curriculum funding was that it allowed Marje Burdine to focus on the conflict resolution program area.

Without this funding, Marje would have remained involved in a wide range of programs that generated revenues to cover her salary. With the funds from the JIBC, a portion of these dollars were used to cover her time to coordinate the development of the program and provide "seed funding" in the early stages. (Pat Ross, personal communication, January 22, 2007)

Early trainers remember being involved in the process of identifying gaps in existing courses.

We started to have meetings about developing a program because we were realizing, "Well, people are learning mediation but they need communication skills. There are pieces of this they're not going to be able to get in two days of training. There are ... holes in this as far as people's skill level." So there started to be lots of get-togethers to try and figure out, "Where are we going, what are we developing?" Marje was clearly the head of that, the lead person. (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

The curriculum of the Certificate appears to have been developed more through the identification of individual useful content pieces than as an integrated whole. By January 1986, however, a 30-day certificate framework was in place: “six core courses totalling 147 hours and elective courses totalling 63 classroom hours” plus two competency-based assessments, one in mediation, one in negotiation (JIBC, 1986b, p. 3). The Certificate in Conflict Resolution was open for registration. Described as a new initiative “designed to meet the needs of a wide range of professionals for increased skills and knowledge in dealing with conflict in their work environments” the 1986 JIBC Annual Report indicated that “responses to the program have been very positive and the initial courses have all been over-subscribed” (JIBC, 1986a, p. 32).

Influence of the institutional location

The emergence of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution took place within an institution faced with what DeVries (1990) calls “a formidable array of challenges” (p. 125).

They had to create a structure that would achieve the organization’s mission and goals while providing evidence of greater efficiency than could be accomplished by other means. They had to negotiate with the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of the Attorney-General for workable funding arrangements while creating an internal organization that would allow the Academies to meet the needs of their clients and simultaneously serve the mission of the Justice Institute as a whole. (DeVries, 1990, pp. 125-126)

Each program area had to meet the often-changing demands of their primary client and funder while also supporting the overall functioning of the Institute. The JIBC was persistently assessed by both governmental and non-governmental bodies, all of which offered advice, and many of whom commissioned “a plethora of studies and

analyses” (p. 125). Its first decade took place in a period of economic recession and severe government spending restraint in the province of B.C. and the JIBC was “in general ... asked to justify its existence more often than might reasonably be expected of any organization” (DeVries, 1990, pp. 126).

In the context of these indeed formidable challenges, and arguably at least partially in response to them, specific JIBC characteristics developed that, I believe, facilitated and supported the emergence of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution. There are five key institutional characteristics:

1. a broad interpretation of the overall institutional and the specific Community/Extension Programs mandate,
2. a high level of divisional autonomy,
3. a culture of support for educational experimentation and tolerance for content area differences,
4. a ‘market-driven’ and entrepreneurial focus and
5. passion and commitment from JIBC employees to what they interpreted as their purpose as educators.

The first factor supporting the emergence of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was the mandate of the JIBC. The perceived lack of clarity of the JIBC mandate was seen as a problem, particularly by consultants outside the JIBC. “From one point of view, the mandate could be interpreted to include services to every person living in the Province” (Stonecrest, 1980, p. 50).

Stonecrest (1980) appears to think that this was an unrealistic goal—“the terminology of the Order-in-Council fails to indicate precisely what the Institute’s service area ought to be and offers very little help when an attempt is made to define the responsibilities which the Justice Institute has assumed” (p. 50). Writers from within the JIBC saw it as entirely appropriate. Kilcup, then the JIBC principal, wrote that given sufficient resources, the JIBC would be happy to serve “the total population of the province”:

The population served by the Education Services Division is first all justice and public safety employees trained by Municipal Police Forces in B.C., B.C. Corrections, B.C. Court Services, B.C. Fire Services and B.C. Ambulance Services.... A second population served by the division involves a variety of justice and public safety private agencies and community groups along with a number of client groups who approach the Institute for specific justice or public safety training ... A third population served by the Division involves a variety of public programs that are open to all citizens of B.C. This includes the total population of the province but tends to be focused on specific areas or communities that can be serviced by our limited staff resources. (1982, p. 47)

Community/Extension Programs appears to have been guided by this broadest possible mandate interpretation, one that encompassed both conflict resolution content and opened conflict resolution courses to registrants from all backgrounds, not simply those professions directly linked to justice and public safety.

A second factor supporting the emergence of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was a high level of decision-making autonomy regarding course and program offerings and course and program content within each academy and division. JIBC employee Vera Bergman (1979) envisioned “a delicate balance” (p. 14) between integration and differentiation within the JIBC but differentiation apparently came to outweigh integration.

From its earliest beginnings, the concept of the Justice Training Centre involved an organization whose identity would be more than the sum of its parts. ... Parochialism within training branches would be replaced by co-operation and cross-communication.... Implementation of the concept was not as straightforward as it originally might have appeared ... individual Academies largely went their own way in deciding how they would develop and deliver programs. (DeVries, 1990, pp. 86-87)

The “silos” (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007) operated in virtual isolation from each other. The main reason cited for this high level of divisional/academy autonomy and the low level of centralized control (and of centralized services) was the close funding and accountability relationships between each academy/division and its major ministry client. One consequence of the underfunding of centralized infrastructure and services and the autonomy of the academies/divisions was minimal central institutional structures for course or program content approval in comparison to more traditionally structured and funded colleges and institutes. The academies and divisions needed to be able to respond quickly to a major client request for training in a new content area. Unlike the Academies, Community/Extension Programs was not answerable to one major ministry client but the organizational structure of largely autonomous academies and divisions did mean that, as Pat Ross describes it, “We didn't have somebody telling us what programs to do” (Personal interview, January 12, 2007).

While the organizational structure that enabled each academy/division to operate autonomously was a primary factor in the emergence of a certificate in a new and unknown content area, it could also be argued that Community/Extension Programs was simply not very visible on the institutional radar. This speculation is based on the virtual absence of references to Community/Extension Programs in any of the published histories of the JIBC, or in the numerous external consultant reports on the JIBC's future.

The persistent threats to JIBC survival largely involved the Academies and their relationships with their major clients. It is possible that institutional attention and energies were focused on more pressing matters than the oversight of programming in what appears to have been seen as a relatively minor JIBC program area.

A different and more positive reading is that the Educational Services Division and Community/Extension Programs were, as DeVries (1990) says, “an important symbol of the Justice Institute concept” (p. 48). If indeed, as DeVries (1990) believes, the Institute “grew out of a period of idealism that prevailed not only in British Columbia, but across the country and North America in the 1960s and early 1970s” (pp. 125-126) then Community/Extension Programs may have been valued as a “holder” of the original commitment to a community-focused and idealistic vision. Whatever the interpretation, it appears clear that Community/Extension Programs, like all the other academies and divisions within the JIBC was “to a significant degree free to pursue its own destiny” (DeVries, 1990, pp. 86-87).

While more speculative, it also seems likely that the history of the use of mediation by Family Court Counsellors was another contributing factor in the acceptance of a Certificate in Conflict Resolution as a valid JIBC program offering. Mediation was already a “technology” approved by the larger justice system, specifically the Ministry of the Attorney-General, and this may have offered a certain legitimacy within the JIBC institutional context for the content area of the Certificate.

A third factor supporting the emergence of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution at the JIBC was an institutional climate that embraced educational innovation and at least tolerated differences. Formed as a “unique, experimental organization” (DeVries, 1990,

p. 127) the JIBC is described consistently by early writers in terms of energy and newness.

The Justice Institute's most striking feature is its novelty. Begin with the fact that its role is unique within the Canadian scene, add in its youth, consider its many masters, recall its origins, and the picture emerges of an energetic young organization that is searching after its real identity while attempting to service an important training need at the same time. (Stonecrest, 1980, preamble)

DeVries (1990) thought the institutional climate was very positive despite the challenges: "the organization's history is characterized by excitement and commitment amongst those who worked in and around the organization" (p. 127). The words of the people who worked at the JIBC in the 1980s support DeVries' assertion. Wendy Hacking says that "it was a wonderful four years of my career ... although there were certainly differences; the synergy of the whole was really very exciting" (Personal interview, April 16, 2007). Deborah White agrees:

The Justice Institute was very cutting edge in terms of what we were offering. People were doing really interesting things like going abroad and bringing people in from all over the place to learn all about how paramedics did their work here in BC. It was very, very exciting. (Personal interview, March 21, 2007)

While considerably more research would need to take place before it could be stated with any certainty that experimentation, innovation, excitement and creativity were present in all JIBC academies and divisions in the 1980s, there is nothing in the published accounts or the interviews done for this study that would indicate otherwise. There were some indications that academy/divisional autonomy at least sometimes shaded into division/academy territorialism and competition. "[A] degree of territorialism within the various uniformed services was noted ... particularly in the uniformed services, there is a

strong degree of pride and tradition that can present an obstacle to integrated training (DeVries, 1990, pp. 86-87).

Bergman (1979), writing shortly after the formation of the JIBC, demonstrates an optimistic view even as she acknowledged potential difficulties in what she called “co-habitation”:

The future of the Justice Institute can only be viewed in an extremely optimistic light. The potential and the personnel are there. It is an extremely difficult undertaking and growing pains will be obvious in all departments. Morale of staff will fluctuate with the changes from autonomy to co-habitation. Unconscious power struggles will emerge between institutional departments, between ministerial departments and between ministries. The settling in process may take several years. (p. 36)

Early conflict resolution instructors remembered competition, unconscious or otherwise, amongst academies/divisions.

It was as an organization pretty competitive internally. My sense of it was that often Corrections and Police Academy and Firefighters worked at cross purposes a fair bit and really didn't trust and get along with each other particularly well and were always conscious of who got what training area.... that sort of stuff seemed to be fairly prevalent. (M. Govorchin, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

They also commented on what they saw as contrasts between the Community/Extension Programs divisional culture and what they describe as the almost paramilitary culture of the rest of the organization: “I think we were viewed as an oddity. I think the JI was at that point quite paramilitary in a sense” (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007). In conjunction with this, there appeared to be a certain lack of knowledge, if not suspicion, of conflict resolution.

Well, it was, you know, chain of command. People were nearly saluting around there. There was a lot more uniform wearing around the place; even seconded staff would often be in uniform. Teaching in rows ...

people double-timing around the place ... you'd see that sort of stuff. Because I had a lot of contact almost immediately with those other academies, I'd get a lot of, "So what are you guys about anyways? I see you're sponsoring this conference on New Age dah dah ... Is this like one of these EST organizations?" ... you'd get that kind of suspiciousness about who we were and what we were doing. (M. Govorchin, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

Balancing the memories of suspicion, however, were those of a welcome informality and warm collegial interactions—a “family feel” (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007).

The JIBC institutional climate appears to have contained elements of competition and difference between the various uniformed services and their histories and traditions, between the uniformed services and the Community/Extension Programs people, as well as warm social connections across those differences. Perhaps because each academy/division had virtually total internal control over their own programs and curriculum, there was no particular need to work together and, therefore, no particular opportunity to clash with each other over specific program content. Tolerance, at least at the social level, amongst the historically very separate uniformed services now residing under one roof seems to have been a basic tenet of JIBC organizational culture. It seems likely that practices of tolerance were extended to the instructors in other program areas. The Certificate in Conflict Resolution may have been seen, in Mario Govorchin’s words, as “counterculture or academic or intellectual or whatever” (Personal interview, February 1, 2007) but it was also apparently seen as having every right to exist at the JIBC.

The fourth factor supporting the Certificate in Conflict Resolution birth and growth was the cost-recovery environment of Community/Extension Programs. The cutbacks in government education funding in 1983 meant that all JIBC centralized

services were even more seriously underfunded than previously. After the initial Ministry of Education core funding was eliminated, Community/Extension Programs balanced the vision of community-focused education with the need to generate sufficient revenue to continue to exist. Courses and programs that did well, that attracted large numbers of students, continued to be offered and additional courses in the content area developed. The courses in mediation and conflict resolution were popular. Their contributions to the overall revenue of the Institute would have been valuable and investment in a Certificate seen as a worthwhile risk. The risk paid off: “We actually ... repaid the (\$70,000 curriculum fund) loan much earlier than was originally planned. We did it within a couple of years” (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007).

Burch (1990) lauded the JIBC for its 630% increase in contract revenue between 1983 and 1989. She saw the Institute’s success in implementing the provincial government’s 1983 directive to become more entrepreneurial as a major reason for recommending the continued existence of the JIBC. Community/Extension Programs, and the Certificate in Conflict Resolution, appear to have been a contributor to this growth in contract training. As DeVries (1990) points out, the reach of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was significant: “In one year [1989-90] Educational Services delivered programs by contract to 65 different ministries, agencies and educational institutions ... The Division continued to deliver a Conflict Resolution program which attracts participants from across North America” (pp. 73-74).

Early Certificate program staff remember it as being financially successful. Indeed, says Nancy McPhee, “The program had come to a certain point, and then it just kind of doubled in size and then we were making a ton of money” (Personal interview,

February 8, 2007). The revenue not only covered direct program costs and program staff salaries but some of the profits went into JIBC general revenues. The growth of the Certificate and its expanding revenue-generating capacities contributed to the financial sustainability of Community/Extension Programs and the JIBC as a whole. Quite possibly, at least according to Burch (1990), the contract training generated by Community/Extension Programs through the Certificate in Conflict Resolution contributed to the Institute's survival.

In thinking back on the creation of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution, Pat Ross, Program Director in Community/Extension Programs, identifies "the philosophy of the Justice Institute itself as one of the cornerstone influencers". The Institute's interests in interdisciplinary programming and in serving the broader community were combined with an "environment that enabled us as senior administrators to take risks in unknown content areas" (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007).

Certainly, the institutional context was supportive of risk-taking in new program areas. Nevertheless, while the environment was perhaps uniquely positioned to nurture a new conflict resolution program, the Certificate would not have come into existence without the commitment of specific individuals to the subject area. Pat Ross felt supported by her institution as an administrator in initiating new courses and new programs, but she also brought a personal interest to the topic of conflict resolution.

I was interested in ... how people resolved conflicts in organizational settings ... And I'd worked as a social worker. I knew the problems people in helping professions had, the percentage of problems that they encountered where conflict was an issue.... I knew people needed tools. (Personal interview, January 12, 2007)

Marje Burdine's commitment to making mediation and conflict resolution training widely available was central in the memories of the people interviewed. "The driving force that made it happen" (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, March 13, 2007), Marje Burdine was remembered as drawing others into the Certificate vision through her passion for the possibilities of mediation and conflict resolution.

I felt that she [Marje] had a very strong vision and mission ... and she was wanting to gather like-minded people to make it happen. And that was my earliest memory of the whole program—getting a bunch of people that were excited about the potentialities of what could happen here and what we could offer to the community ... what can human beings really accomplish if they put their minds to it rather than waste time fighting? ... What would it take to help people see another way? (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

All of these elements—the broad interpretation of the JIBC mandate, the high level of academy/division programming autonomy, the institutional climate of educational innovation and creativity, the revenue-generating focus and the commitment of Marje Burdine and Pat Ross—meant that the Certificate in Conflict Resolution not only could emerge in the JIBC, but that quite possibly the JIBC was the only post-secondary educational institution in British Columbia in which it could have done so. As Marje Burdine says

I have to say I'm so grateful to the JI because it did fund this program, it did support it ... It did nurture it to the point that it's at today. I don't know where else it could have happened. It's not the kind of program that would be generated within an academic arena, and the JI had that practical cross-system environment that was fertile for something like this to develop. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

CHAPTER 5: THE EARLY YEARS 1986–1990

The Certificate in Conflict Resolution was created in 1986 in large part in response to strong registration in existing courses and demand for more courses. Once established, the program grew rapidly. Indeed, the popularity of the courses and the Certificate, and the consequent dramatic and rapid growth in numbers of courses, number of registrants, and number of Certificate enrollees were the predominant themes of the first years of the Certificate. In this chapter aspects of that growth are outlined and the resultant creation of a body of conflict resolution educators and practitioners examined. The influence of the Certificate program's existence on the development of the field of conflict resolution practice in B.C. is described.

Growth

The number of Conflict Resolution Certificate courses offered at the JIBC grew each year—42 in 1986, 50 in 1987, 74 in 1988, 81 in 1989, 119 in 1990 and 166 in 1991. Courses were also being offered widely around British Columbia in partnership with other colleges and on a contract basis throughout Western Canada and the northwestern United States. From its inception, the Certificate drew students from a wide range of backgrounds with a variety of motivations for taking courses. Marje Burdine describes the 35 people enrolled in the first eight months of the Certificate:

We have 35 unique individuals formally enrolled, each with special reasons for choosing to invest in this area of learning.... Some of their applications for this training include: developing or advancing careers in family or organizational mediation, increasing job satisfaction, upgrading professional competency, teaching children and adolescents problem

solving skills, humanizing bureaucratic systems, building model programs or communities, resolving community disputes, dealing with hostile or difficult clients, developing diversion programs for youth which include conflict resolution skill training and teaching lifeskills to mentally handicapped persons. (Burdine, 1986, p. 2)

Of those first Certificate in Conflict Resolution registrants, 10 were employed in social service agencies, 10 with the B.C. Corrections Branch, four in provincial government ministries, three in education, three were graduate students, two were self-employed and there was one person each in the police, B.C. Hydro and hospital categories (Burdine, 1986, p. 2). "It wasn't trying to be high end. It was appealing to the public at large, the community, as I recall" (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007).

By January 1987 there were 45 people enrolled in the Certificate and two, Jan Crawford and Donna Lea Hawley had graduated (Burdine, 1987, p. 2). That year saw the creation of a specific institutional "home" for the Certificate in Conflict Resolution, the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training (JIBC, 1987b, p. 3).

What happened is a lot of people were saying, "Well, what houses the Certificate Program ... Who do we contact?" So we came up with the theme "Centre for Conflict Resolution Training" because we wanted to emphasize that we were a training program. We weren't a place for people to come and get their conflicts resolved. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

The Centre for Conflict Resolution Training was originally conceptualized as the contact point for the Certificate in Conflict Resolution; as demand for courses increased the Centre became the administrative base for a vigorous contract training business as well.

By 1988, there were over 150 enrolled in the Certificate (Burdine, 1988). In the 1989 Centre for Conflict Resolution Training Newsletter she wrote

Our Program has expanded significantly over the past year with 110 courses offered at the JI and other locations across Canada. This represents over 2000 students, many of whom are enrolled in the entire 30-day Certificate Program. Several of the courses have filled weeks in advance of the course dates and we do regret the delays some of you have faced in enrolling in the courses of your choice. (p. 1)

The JIBC had a provincial mandate and, from the beginning, Community Programs took courses and conferences to all parts of British Columbia. The Certificate in Conflict Resolution followed this pattern. The 1986 through 1990 Extension Programs Calendars list courses in Nanaimo, Trail, Kitimat, Mission, Victoria, Surrey, Whitehorse, Powell River and White Rock. Contract training was even more wide-ranging. The Centre for Conflict Resolution Training would customize existing courses or design specific courses for clients and in 1989

delivered courses for B.C. Transit, B.C. Hydro, B.C. Tel, MacMillan Bloedel, Corporation of Richmond, Township of Langley, Yukon College, Okanagan College, University Hospitals, Ministry of Forests, Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Environment and Parks, Yukon Land Claims Negotiators, Surrey School Board and Allied Indian Metis Society. (Burdine, 1989, p. 3)

The popularity of the JIBC conflict resolution courses was built on their content and, perhaps even more, on the positive reputation of their trainers and coaches. Having enough highly effective trainers and coaches to deliver all the courses was a major challenge from the very first mediation course in 1983. The creation of conflict resolution trainers and coaches was a major project of the early years.

The creation of conflict resolution trainers

The use of practitioners as trainers was a strong commonality across the very different content areas of the JIBC academies and divisions. Trainers were considered

content experts not because of their academic education or their teaching credentials, but because of their practical field-based experience. The uniformed services academies of the JIBC used a secondment model. A police officer, a corrections officer, a paramedic would leave their regular responsibilities for two or more years to teach at the JIBC and then return to the field (Burch, 1990; DeVries, 1990). In Community/Extension Programs, where the courses offered were usually only a few days in length, a secondment model was impractical, but the commitment to using trainers who worked in the field remained.

Almost immediately after offering the first mediation course in 1983 Marje Burden needed more trainers.

It was difficult getting trainers for the program, so the first several courses, probably the first couple of years, I was the only trainer ... I was developing courses, writing manuals, training ... putting on the courses, and then trying to train trainers who could come in and take over some of these. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

Because there was no field of conflict resolution practice yet in existence in B.C. the usual JIBC model of hiring practitioners from the field was not possible. Some of the earliest conflict resolution trainers in addition to Marje Burdine were already teaching for Community Programs in other content areas. Dale Trimble, Joan Balmer and Stacey Holloway all taught for Community/Extension Program in the early 1980s and all became trainers in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution. Dale Trimble's anti-violence counselling work initially brought him to the JIBC.

Pat Ross ... invited myself, Dan Stone and Fred Van Fleet to design a workshop on crisis intervention ... and that I spun into crisis intervention workshops, defusing hostility videotape, defusing hostility for front office workers. And somehow in there I got involved with Marje in the early courses. (D. Trimble, personal interview, February 16, 2007)

Joan Balmer was teaching for Community Programs at the JIBC through Ryane Consulting, a “management consulting firm that ... did primarily supervisory and management training” (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007). Marje Burdine recruited Joan Balmer through a program designed to interest already-experienced trainers in other content areas in conflict resolution.

If I could find trainers who were training in the interpersonal skill area, communication, whatever, I thought that might be a pool to tap into. So I put on a training program one summer for about 15 trainers ... that was way back when, just desperation trying to find people that could come in and help put these courses on. Out of that group I think I only ended up with two or three ... the rest ... it didn't ignite something for them. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

It did ignite something for Joan Balmer:

My memory is that Marje had gotten very excited about the field of conflict, and she wanted to present an alternative to the adversarial process ... so this was an attempt to ... bring people in to see the way of co-operating and working together rather than working against each other. And of course that fit with my values and ideals. (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

Stacey Holloway was teaching courses related to troubled kids.

As I remember it ... Marje came to me one day and said, “I'm thinking of starting a new program in conflict resolution ... Do you want to train for me?” And I remember thinking, “Sure, except that I don't know a great deal about it,” ... But I remember being kind of excited. It was an opportunity, and it was pretty brand-new. (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

Marje Burdine's second major recruitment strategy was to identify promising future coaches and trainers in courses she was teaching.

I did take the first training and Marje Burdine was the instructor ... within, a month or two ... I was asked to be an instructor ... obviously, I was very enthusiastic in the course.... I must have had some discussions with Marje

and then I became a co-facilitator with her. It was the really early days. (F. Grunberg, personal interview, April 25, 2007)

There were a number of benefits to recruiting people taking the courses. They were already interested in the conflict resolution content and familiar with the classroom approaches.

In 1986, the first year the Certificate Program was in existence, there were 11 trainers listed in the Program Schedules teaching the required courses: Marje Burdine, Lee Rengert, Joanne Ransom, Fran Grunberg, Dinah Stanley, Douglas Chalke, Dale Trimble, Joan Balmer, Michael Fogel, Joyce Bradley and Bronach Cannell (JIBC, 1986b; JIBC, 1986c; JIBC, 1986d). Most were either pre-existing JIBC trainers or people who had been students in the JIBC mediation and other conflict resolution courses. They were divided relatively evenly between those with a law background and those from a social services/therapy background.

Lee Rengert was the only one who was not local and he was also unusual in that he was already a content expert: “Associate Professor of Education, University of LaVerne, California and private consultant and trainer specializing in anger and aggression” (JIBC, 1986b, p. 4). Marje Burdine met Lee Rengert at a conference in the USA. He appeared for the first time as a speaker at a 1985 Provincial Forum on Mediation (JIBC, 1985b, p. 3) and returned almost immediately to teach a course called *Anger Management and Conflict Resolution with Youth* (JIBC, 1985c, p. 3).

The trainer group began to shift and change almost immediately. By 1987, Lee Rengert’s name had gone from the trainer list and Karen Haddigan Blackburn’s had appeared. Karen vividly remembers her invitation to become a trainer.

I was working in Co-op Housing as a Project Manager and I got a flyer ... advertising the Mediation 1 course at the JI ... Marje taught the course.... I was really enthusiastic in the class and I think Marje saw me as a keener ... I was signed up for Level 2 but I hadn't even taken it yet and I got a call from her ... "Would you like to train to be a trainer?" My feeling was I just learned this, how could I be teaching it? I was intimidated by the idea, but also intrigued. But Marje decided I was what she was looking for. And I guess it was at a time when she was seeing there was going to be a need for a lot of instructors so, I got this phone call out of the blue and with absolute fear and excitement said, "Yes, of course." (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, March 13, 2007)

By 1988, Bronach Cannell had gone from the trainer list. Dinah Stanley and Randy Boychuk had appeared and, as Michael Fogel recalls, Marje Burdine was no longer the only person recruiting trainers. "I brought Randy in. Randy was an instructor in counselling psych at UBC ... at some point, I introduced him to Marje ... and then he came onboard teaching" (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007).

The core training group

By September 1988 a list of Senior Trainers appeared: Joan Balmer, Michael Fogel, Karen Haddigan, Paula Temrick and Stacey Holloway (JIBC, 1988d, p. 3). The core training group grew slowly for the next several years. Mario Govorchin, who worked at Vancouver General Hospital with Stacey Holloway and was introduced to the Certificate in Conflict Resolution through her, joined the trainer list in 1988. In 1989 Marg Huber, Arthur Ridgeway and Gordon Sloan's names were added.

Marje hired Arthur Ridgeway ... she was bringing people in that were just quite extraordinary, folks who were just kind of leaders in their field. And she'd just phone them up and say, "Well, I took a course from you." I think she'd taken a course from Arthur at the university. And she said, "You know, I like who you are and why don't you come and do this?" (N. McPhee, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

Gordon Sloan was introduced to conflict resolution not through the JIBC but through mediation training for lawyers offered through Continuing Legal Education (CLE). He describes his initial 1985 course, taught by CDR Associates from Boulder, Colorado, as a “conversion experience”.

It absolutely rocked my concept of what I might be. And within two years I had thrown conventional law out, thrown my office out ... and I was mediating and training.... I personally got into training ... in 1987, in Iowa, because we moved there for a couple of years.... Then when we came back to B.C. ... I started to do a little bit of training for CLE ... and ... it was at that point that I did a little bit of coaching with the JI and then started to train. (G. Sloan, personal interview, April 4, 2007)

Dale Zaiser was a teaching colleague of Stacey Holloway’s at Douglas College “and one day Stacey said "You should come over and train at the JI." I said, "Well, I really don't know anything specifically related to conflict." "Oh, you can do it," she said ... so I went over and I met with Marje Burdine and ... she said sure” (D. Zaiser, personal interview, February 1, 2007).

By 1990 Marje Burdine had moved from a place of desperation to find others who could teach the courses to a stable and committed core group of trainers. Pat Ross saw the formation of this small and tightly-knit faculty group as necessary in the development of an integrated Certificate rather than just a collection of courses.

As we designed core courses, we needed to limit the people that worked on them because we were looking for a standard. So it was no longer a consultant comes in on an ad-hoc basis. Instead, we are saying, "This is a cohesive program. You have to fit what you do in with what somebody else is going to do...." It had to be people who understood what we were trying to accomplish ... could do the spectrum of the courses ... and be a small enough group that they could meet and work on a logical flow of students’ learning from this course to the next course. (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007)

Both Pat Ross and Marje Burdine saw the group of core trainers as people with a commitment to and an understanding of the program content as well as the necessary instructional abilities. Pat Ross also emphasized having the time and energy to contribute to program development. There are indications that people who were not able to make that considerable commitment of time, energy and interest left: “I got very involved in child abuse prevention and I got hired by the Vancouver School Board in ’86 or ’87. So I kind of left at that point” (F. Grunberg, personal interview, April 25, 2007). The people that stayed were able to make their JIBC conflict resolution training work a priority.

The coach role

As well as a trainer, each required course in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution needed several coaches. The term “coach” first appeared in the descriptions of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution in 1987 with the calendar indicating there would be one skills coach for each five participants for the skill-building role-plays (JIBC, 1987c, p. 3). In 1988, the role of coaches was described as assisting instruction:

Most courses in the Centre are delivered by our Senior Trainers. Other instructors are also involved with complementary expertise and specialization. Most instruction is assisted by trained skills coaches who work with small groups. (JIBC, 1988d, p. 2)

Coaches came in on the last day of a course and worked with a group of five learners organizing the role-play practice sessions and giving feedback. Several coaches were needed for each class and provided an additional paid classroom role.

When I started coaching for ... the JI, it was to structure the Day 3 stuff and help people apply what they were learning. Help people bring it into the context of the role-play and then see what they thought about it and how it affected others. (E. Azmier-Stewart, personal interview, February 10, 2007)

The principles of coach recruitment seem to have been very similar to those of trainer recruitment, with Marje Burdine looking for people who had some experience of group work (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007). Being a coach required less of a time commitment than being a trainer and for some that made coaching desirable.

Marje was the director of training at the Vancouver Volunteer Centre when I met her and I was a volunteer ... so we sat on boards together and we knew each other and we became friends.... I was on the periphery as she was developing the mediation course.... She wanted me to train for her and, you know, it was one of those things. I couldn't quit my day job so I kind of hemmed and hawed. So I coached a lot. (N. McPhee, personal interview, January 28, 2007)

For some people, it was more possible to arrange one day off from another job every now and then than to arrange three or five days in a row. For others, coaching made sense as part of their immersion in conflict resolution learning and their own personal circumstances.

As the program developed, I just took courses as they came along.... I don't know that it would have been good for me to be an instructor earlier on ... still dealing with two small kids and trying to figure out my life and all the rest ... and Marje probably felt that, too. So I just decided I would coach in anything I could. Marje made the arrangement that I could take a course and coach for it and it wouldn't cost me anything for the course. So I was one of those people who took every single new course that came along and coached for it. (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007)

A common pattern was using learners in the conflict resolution program and then, in later years, graduates of the program, as coaches, most of whom might move on into training, although the very earliest trainers did not necessarily do any coaching before starting teaching. As the program grew and the number of trainers stabilized, coaching increasingly was seen as a classroom role in itself rather than simply a prelude to becoming a trainer. Coach names are listed for the first time in 1991 in what was then

called the Interdisciplinary Studies Fall Calendar: Elizabeth Azmier-Stewart, Pamela Coots, Sandy Dunlop, Donna Dussault, Kelly Henderson, Wendy Hilliard, Nancy McPhee, Ronald Monk, Tom Northcott, Michael Raynolds, Jill Schroder, Jacquie Waechter.

Trainer and coach training

The early conflict resolution trainers and coaches brought varying levels of previous teaching experience, from extensive to non-existent, with them. They all, whatever their teaching backgrounds, had to learn specific conflict resolution content and specific teaching practices as well. The trainers learned primarily through observing and co-teaching. Marje Burdine uses the term “mentoring” to describe this process.

They would come in first and just observe the training and then take on half the course themselves and then finally the whole thing. I would sit in on their training as they did it and give them feedback. So then they would mentor someone else. So it kind of grew through that process. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

She was the central figure, the first-generation model and mentor.

In terms of style, I think ... we all began teaching the same way, in a very conversational interactive way, because that's who we first saw teach. Marje and others who were teaching in those early days were conversational and interactive. I believe we modelled on them without even knowing we were modelling. (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007)

By the late 80s it had become, as Stacey Holloway says, “very much each of us teaching one another in many ways” (Personal interview, February 1, 2007). The entry process for trainers included taking the courses as learners, observing others teach the course, coaching in the course, co-teaching and then teaching on their own.

We did a lot of co-teaching, it seemed, in the very early, early days. One day, I could be co-teaching ... and the next day, I could be coaching So it was very fluid in terms of what we were doing and when we were doing it and it was always to expand our experience ... It was one day you coach, one day you taught. It was a very bootstrapping kind of environment. (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007)

The entry process was not standardized, however. Sometimes it was shorter and sometimes it was longer.

I never coached ... maybe I did once in Neg 2 for a couple days ... I know I was immediately teaching after observing Joan Balmer and Karen Haddigan each in one course. (D. Zaiser, personal interview, February 1, 2007).

Gordon Sloan, on the other hand, had a longer entry process.

I remember finally going to Marje and saying, "Marje, I wasn't anticipating that I'd be doing all this coaching. I'm happy to do some—but you know, aren't I going to teach courses?" And I remember ... so vividly, Marje in her office ... saying, "Well, you can't expect that you're just going to arrive and immediately start delivering these courses. I mean, we have a whole evaluation thing we have to go through with you." And I remember feeling, "But, but, but" ... I think what she meant was, "Look, neophyte, people have to check you out before we're going to turn you loose." (G. Sloan, personal interview, April 4, 2007)

No one remembers a structured training process for coaches.

Nobody taught me. ... I guess I observed how coaching was done and assimilated some of that. Then I pretty much had free rein to use my experience and knowledge of the material and my gut sense of what would be helpful. (E. Azmier-Stewart, personal interview, February 10, 2007)

Training to be a coach? Mostly being with other trainers and coaches ... the standard way of our learning was to learn from and with each other. (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007)

Whether the entry process was long or short, observing how others taught or coached and then doing it yourself seems to have been the primary way that both trainers and coaches learned their respective roles. Under the pressure of more and more courses

needing trainers and coaches, entry processes for new trainers were sometimes abbreviated and, for coaches, were often non-existent. Nonetheless, it all seemed to work out.

Marje had immense faith that you could do an excellent job. She just trusted that it would all be fine. And 98 percent of the time she was right, and then there was the odd time it was like “whoops, what's going on here?” There were, you know, a couple of little missteps along the way. But, I think her instincts were pretty darn good with most of the people that she got involved with the program. (N. McPhee, personal interview, January 28, 2007)

Collegiality

What the people who formed the core training group between 1986 and 1990 remember most vividly from those early years is the excitement of being part of creating something new in close co-operation with a group of like-minded others. Marje Burdine actively involved early trainers in course and program development.

It was an exciting time. It was an opportunity to really develop something that was new ... we were kind of developing the program as it went along. ... we designed how we were going to deliver it, we looked at the coursework we were trying to do and designed interactive exercises. We put that together, we tried them, we tested them with each other, we co-taught. (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

Those years are remembered now as a time of great collegiality, creativity and excitement. “It was the most exciting thing to be part of a team that was so creative and just loving it and deeply committed to the work. It was the most rewarding years of ... all the years I’ve been a trainer ... just so exciting” (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007). The relationships that formed were social as well as professional. “It was a social group because we all liked each other and ... we socialized together as well. Some deep

friendships formed. There was a bonding of us as a team.” (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, March 13, 2007)

The training group was small enough that disseminating new ideas was not difficult and there was, in fact, little content specialization. “We all knew every course because we all taught every course” (D. Zaiser, personal interview, February 1, 2007).

The core group of trainers not only coached in each other’s classes and mentored each other through co-teaching, they spent time together outside the classroom talking about what they were teaching, creating both their teaching practice and themselves as conflict resolution teachers. That creation was hard work. “People worked really hard to prepare for those courses. They took it really seriously. Everybody was dedicated” (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007). At the same time as creating their course exercises, their handout materials and their training strategies, the core trainers and coaches in the Certificate were creating themselves as conflict resolution practitioners. As Michael Fogel says “it was just all happening at the same time”:

We started developing, thinking about new courses and we would each, every once in awhile, come in with a new idea about a course or some new ideas about changing courses or expanding courses—so we were all doing it all at the same time, creating curriculum, teaching, coaching, mediating. (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007)

Development of practitioner identities

People who were core conflict resolution trainers at the JIBC not only made a commitment to be available to coach and teach, but also seemed to have made a commitment more generally to the emerging field of conflict resolution practice, to develop or claim a new identity as a mediator and, for many, to promote and develop the overall practice field as well. Becoming a conflict resolution practitioner meant becoming

a mediator, developing a private practice offering third-party assistance to people in conflict. “Within three years of starting teaching at the JI we were all full tilt in private practices ... training and mediating.... We were considered pioneers in dispute resolution ... and we were busy” (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007).

We were all getting mediation practices of one kind or another. So we would talk about that. Some of us were mediating in Westcoast and some of us were starting to get phone calls for private mediations and suddenly we were watching this other practice develop as well and infrequently but sometimes, we would co-mediate. (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007)

Trainers said yes to mediation cases, whether they felt ready or not. “I was just basically using the med manual and going with what I'd learned in counselling” (M. Govorchin, personal interview, February 1, 2007). Connection with the JIBC and, specifically, exposure to potential clients through teaching in the conflict resolution classes, was one major way the new conflict resolution practitioners initially found clients.

I started mediating pretty quickly after starting to instruct. The people who came to the classes saw us in action—we were seen as the ‘experts’. So I can’t remember if the first one was somebody who approached me or somebody who approached Marje and she said, “Do you want to try this because this is a non-profit and you work in non-profit?” ... So I just went in with what I knew from the training plus what I knew just organically, instinctively from my past work with groups. (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

Being known in the other JIBC academies and divisions was an asset to Mario Govorchin’s mediation practice. “My mediation and group facilitation started in my contact with other [JIBC] areas. They basically would hire me on to go in and facilitate a huge conflict at Surrey Pre-trial ... because I had that connection with that area” (M. Govorchin, personal interview, February 1, 2007).

By 1988, teaching in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution had become a practitioner identity claim in itself. Michael Fogel, Paula Temrick, Joan Balmer and Karen Haddigan are all described as “Senior Trainer, Centre for Conflict Resolution Training” (JIBC, 1988b, pp. 3-4) ahead even of their mediator and other private practice claims. Teaching at the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training at the JIBC both required and created a practitioner identity.

Although moving into private practice appears to have been both a desired and a required career path for JIBC conflict resolution trainers, private practice in an only barely-emerging practice field was not a financially secure situation. Committing to being a trainer for the JIBC conflict resolution program, becoming a private practice mediator and a mediation advocate seemed, at the time, like quite a risk.

I remember in the very beginning wondering if it was going to be a fad. You know, is this going to actually turn into something, or is it just going to be around for a while and then disappear? (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

It turned out to be, indeed “something”. But taking the very real risk of claiming and creating an identity as a mediator, a conflict resolution practitioner, encompassed a range of motivations.

As Stacy Holloway indicates, wanting to make a difference was a strong motivator: “In those days we didn't talk about “can you make a living as a mediator?” We talked about what kind of difference can you make in people's lives ... I think it was more around social transformation” (Personal interview, February 1, 2007).

Having access to a professional identity without the kind of extensive educational pre-requisites of most professions was another motivator and another benefit.

I didn't come to the table with standard credentials—a degree or another professional designation—and I got the opportunity to advance in the field. ... I knew that in the States ... you couldn't be a mediator unless you were a lawyer ... I truly appreciated the opportunity I got to develop into a professional through my experience. (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

Self-identification as a professional had complex aspects.

Do I belong here? Because I wasn't a professional. I was a mom. At the time I wasn't in the workforce ... I had a BA and some rich experience as a child care worker in therapeutic settings, some community building, some teaching, but I didn't have a professional label ... And I remember that being somewhat intimidating ... I had to learn to value my kind of philosophical and spiritual approach to this and know that it was valid in and of itself. I did gain a professional identity as a practitioner because work came to me—and for many reasons I loved it, but I can't say it was a smooth marriage with my roots. (E. Azmier-Stewart, personal interview, February 10, 2007)

The professional rates of pay, however, were not to be overlooked:

I've got to be honest. One of the biggest things for me was what I made for a living. It allowed my wife to be home for a number of years, allowed us latitude that I didn't have working in social services ... we still live in a society where money brings you all sorts of power and influence that you don't have when you don't have it ... More than that, being able to be in control of my life. (M. Govorchin, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

The benefits were not just the money, or the status, but also a sense of doing interesting, valuable work that was under one's own control.

It's allowed me to have pleasure in my work and excitement in my work and exploration in my work. I haven't had to step into a box ... That would've been a killer for my own spirit. It's allowed me the kind of life of learning and expression at work, not just on weekends. It's an elegant position to be in, in this world. (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

An elegant position indeed—socially transformative or at least socially valuable work that offered a high degree of personal control, professional status and paid well.

It was the dependability of income from teaching and coaching work at the JIBC as well as the access to potential private practice clients through teaching and coaching that provided a material base for the claiming of a new mediator practitioner identity by the early trainers in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution. While the goal of private practice was to mediate, the financial mainstay for most people was training, both for the JIBC and privately. “95 percent of my work was training or public speaking at that point. I was very JI-reliant” (M. Govorchin, personal interview, February 1, 2007). Connection to the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was what made the risk of leaving behind one’s previous source of work identity, and work income, possible.

Contributions to the development of the field of practice

It appears that there was, as Michael Fogel says, “an inextricable relationship” (Personal interview, January 25, 2007) between the JIBC educational program in conflict resolution and the growth of the field of practice. JIBC trainers and administrators were leaders in B.C. and Canadian conflict resolution organizations. They were founders of B.C. community-based mediation services and involved in introducing new areas of practice in B.C. including commercial and school-based mediation.

Certificate in Conflict Resolution trainers and coaches played important roles in the development of the field of conflict resolution in B.C. and Canada. Involvement in the newly developing conflict resolution membership and service organizations supported a professional practitioner identity, offered additional access to actual mediation cases, and provided an outlet for the social transformation passion of conflict resolution movement converts.

The JI provided an opportunity for people with similar ideas to begin to germinate them. So I think the JI was absolutely critical in the development of the whole mediation movement in BC and maybe in Canada. I think it really deserves a lot of credit for pioneering it. (F. Grunberg, personal interview, April 25, 2007)

The JIBC Certificate in Conflict Resolution appears to have functioned as a focus, a gathering place for people interested in mediation. Marje Burdine in particular is remembered both within the JIBC and within the field in Canada as a tireless promoter of mediation in the 1980s. She was a central point of connection between the program and the developing field and was directly involved in the formation of the Mediation Development Association of BC, Westcoast Mediation Services, and the national organization, The Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution.

I can't even imagine ... how [the field] would have developed. It would have developed, obviously, but I don't know how it would have developed because there was such a connection between the Justice Institute and Marje and the development of the field of mediation. (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007)

The Mediation Development Association of British Columbia (MDABC) was founded in 1984 and was dedicated to promoting the use of mediation across all practice areas. Marje Burdine remembers MDABC as having “a strong family component” but wanting to be “broad, generic ... applying mediation to all areas” (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007). MDABC served as the BC provincial affiliate of a national organization called Family Mediation Canada, which formed in 1985. “Although it was conceived by people primarily interested in family mediation it was intended to embrace all types of mediation” (Wendy Hacking, personal communication, February 2, 2009).

The BC Mediation Development Association was starting up with a handful of people who were ... largely in a variety of professions but somehow intrigued with this notion of family mediation and wanted to get

together to foster both education amongst the professional groups as well as public education and information about this opportunity ... I think when the Mediation Development Association of BC was established ... that was a milestone. I think when Family Mediation Canada was established it was a milestone. (W. Hacking, personal interview, April 16, 2007)

Marje Burdine is very clear that the JIBC Certificate program and the field organizations such as MDABC were entirely separate entities: “other than that there were a lot of the same individuals involved, there was no formal connection” (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007). The reality that “there were a lot of the same people involved,” however, meant that the boundaries between the JIBC Certificate and the development of field organizations are seen by others as less clear. Carole McKnight, for example, assesses the impact of the JIBC program on the field as “huge”.

It was a catalyst for the development of professional organizations like the Mediation Development Association of BC. It was people like Marje Burdine and Marg Huber and the instructors like Michael Fogel who were among the first directors ... those people because of their interest in mediation played a leadership role in developing and organizing those societies. (C. McKnight, personal interview, February 14, 2007)

The centrality of Marje Burdine’s name in many of the accounts of early B.C. field development recurs in memories of the national conflict resolution organizations. Cheryl Picard identifies a 1984 Toronto conference as a precursor to the development of Canada’s The Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution, now called Conflict Resolution Canada.

The Network was first developing, and it wasn't called The Network, of course, in those days. It didn't even have a name, because we didn't want to narrow ourselves. We wanted to be open to everyone ... Marje was on the board in those early years, and that's how I got to know her personally and certainly what she was doing professionally. (C. Picard, personal interview, February 21, 2007)

As well as shaping the earliest mediation organizations, people associated with the JIBC program played leading roles in establishing early B.C. community-based mediation services. Elizabeth Azmier-Stewart, a coach in the JIBC Certificate program along with a very early JIBC mediation instructor, Dinah Stanley, were involved in a community-based mediation centre in Victoria, now the South Island Dispute Resolution Society, but then the Victoria Association for Community Diversion/Mediation (VACD/M). Donna Dussault, a coach in the JIBC Certificate program along with with another Certificate graduate, Susan Broadfoot, started the Surrey White Rock Mediation Services Society. But the community-based mediation program most directly connected to the JIBC Certificate was called Westcoast Mediation. Marje Burdine remembers the impetus for establishing Westcoast Mediation Services as a response to learner requests for practicum opportunities as mediators.

So we started the Westcoast Mediation Centre, and that was to give people a practicum opportunity at the same time as provide an inexpensive if not free mediation service to the community. We could handle neighbourhood disputes, family disputes, non-divorce which we thought we shouldn't be handling ... School, parenting, you know, all kinds of issues that we felt could come to this Mediation Centre. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

Marje Burdine defines the “we” who set up Westcoast Mediation Services as the core Certificate trainers and herself as well as a few students. One of those JIBC students who became very involved was Marg Huber, who started taking courses in 1983 and “loved it ... it was so congruent with my beliefs, my values, my experiences”.

At that time ... they had the beginnings of a mediation organization that was run out of the Justice Institute called Westcoast Mediation Services. ... it was a volunteer organization. I signed up for that. ... I just decided I would just do everything I could to involve myself in the field. (Personal interview, April 26, 2007)

Westcoast Mediation Services provided mediation services to clients and opportunities for practice to beginning mediators out of the JIBC lounge at the Jericho campus successfully and effectively for a number of years. Marg Huber chaired Westcoast for many of those years and recalls:

Many of the JI instructors wanted to work with us because we had casework ... But we got to the point where we had fifty mediators and we certainly didn't have that much casework ... and so it ran into the dilemma that has become so typical in this rapidly developing field, we had large numbers of people who wanted to mediate and very few cases. And then as they developed expertise, people wanted to be paid for their casework, and were no longer willing to volunteer. So it became unsustainable in the longer term. (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007)

In the short term however, Westcoast Mediation Services provided a practice focus and served as a B.C. manifestation of the U.S. community mediation centres that were such an integral part of the conflict resolution movement. Westcoast also provided the starting point for another JIBC related mediation field leader. Michael Fogel had been a lawyer and judge in southern California before moving to British Columbia. He enrolled in the Counselling Psychology program at the University of British Columbia. In one of his first courses he got talking to the woman beside him.

Before I knew it, I had told her of my interest in mediation ... she looked at me stunned and she said, "Talk about synchronicity, I happen to be on the board of Westcoast Mediation Society. We're a grassroots community-based mediation organization and I would love you to consider joining in some way." (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007)

It was the policy of Westcoast that anyone wanting to mediate had to have taken Mediation Skills Level One at the JIBC so Michael Fogel took the course and it happened that Marje Burdine coached his small group.

After the course, she asked whether or not I would like to coach in the program. I said, "Marje, I just took the course." And she said, "Yeah, but

you've got the skills ... I would really like you to come onboard." And that's the beginning. (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007)

Michael Fogel was one of several JIBC Certificate instructors, who became leaders in developing specialized areas of mediation practice new to B.C. He became the first Director of Mediation Services for an organization called the British Columbia International Commercial Arbitration Centre (BCICAC) in 1986.

The area of school-based peer mediation also involved JIBC trainers and began almost simultaneously in both Vancouver and Ottawa. Brian Luckock was JIBC trainer Stacey Holloway's husband, a high school Vice-Principal and "the first educator to complete the program at the JI" when he attended a conflict resolution conference in eastern Canada.

He met Cheryl Picard ... and they decided that they needed to put conflict resolution in schools ... And Cheryl put in a program at a high school in Ottawa ... And Brian put it in a Frank Hurt Secondary School ... the first peer mediation program in Canada. (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

Cheryl Picard remembers the peer mediation program she developed for Woodruff High School in Ottawa.

When I came to Ontario ... after a year or so ... I got involved with some people who were setting up a community dispute resolution centre here in the city. And one of the things that I was saying to them was we should do some school mediation programs. I had been introduced to it at one of those conferences I had been at ... I was quite involved with NCPCR at that time ... so we set up what we say now is the first peer mediation program in Canada in 1987 ... Vancouver was also, with Stacey and Brian, ... doing peer mediation work around that time. (C. Picard, personal interview, February 21, 2007)

Cheryl Picard and Stacey Holloway's stories of starting peer mediation programs at almost the same moment point to the importance of the conferences of the emerging

Canadian national conflict resolution organizations as sites for connection, information-sharing and the spread of new practice ideas.

JIBC faculty were early and regular presenters at such conferences.

Our conference presentations have increased the J.I.'s visibility as a leader in the field of conflict resolution in North America. Stacey Holloway represented the JI at the NAME (National Association for Mediation in Education) Conference in California and at the Dispute Resolution in the Schools Conference in Victoria. Paula Temrick presented a workshop on parent-teen conflict at a Ministry of Social Services and Housing Conference in Kelowna and gave a two-day mediation workshop at the Family Mediation Canada National Conference in Halifax. Marje Burdine also presented in Halifax on Mediation Pitfalls. Mario Govorchin presented "Conflict Resolution for Peace Officers" at the National Network Conference in Ottawa. Marg Huber represented the JI at the U.S. Academy of Family Mediators Conference in Boston, presenting a Native mediation model, which she helped develop. Dale Zaiser gave two sessions on managerial conflict resolution for the Ministry of Forests conference in Kelowna. (Burdine, 1990, p. 2)

As well as having the expertise to present talks and workshops about a wide range of mediation applications, JIBC Certificate trainers had reputations for excellence.

Marje and Stacey were unbelievably impressive trainers, and I ... took any courses I could take from Stacey and brought her to Ottawa a number of times to do some of the anger workshops that she was doing.... I just remember it as being extraordinarily impressive and really good stuff. (C. Picard, personal interview, February 21, 2007)

Thus, the existence of the JIBC Certificate in Conflict Resolution appears to have been an important factor in the development of the conflict resolution movement in British Columbia and Canada, particularly as measured by the development of mediation organizations. JIBC trainers were also instrumental in initiating new areas of practice.

Comment: About the Centre's contributions to the field, in the early 90s Gordon Sloan and Jerry McHale worked with staff of the Ministry for Children and Families in the development of a Pilot Project in Child Protection Mediation. Among the early mediators in that project were

Dinah Stanley, Ron Monk and I ... Marje Burdine, and Ed Jackson and Ron Monk and I went as a team to Nova Scotia to teach child protection mediation. (Elizabeth Azmier-Stewart, personal communication, February 13, 2009)

Through offering contract courses widely as well as presenting at conferences in both Canada and the United States the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training gained a reputation for leading-edge excellence in both content and pedagogy.

CHAPTER 6: PEDAGOGY

The Justice Institute of British Columbia through its Centre for Conflict Resolution Training is committed to the development and delivery of extensive training in conflict resolution. The Centre is responding to the growing demand for skills training in interpersonal conflict resolution, anger management, mediation and negotiation.... The Certificate in Conflict Resolution is the only one of its kind in Canada and is offered in response to the needs of those interested in both a well-rounded and in-depth experiential course in conflict resolution leading to a certificate.... The Certificate Program requires that participants complete the courses and readings and demonstrate a satisfactory level of proficiency in both mediation and negotiation skills. (JIBC, 1987b, p. 5)

This 1987 description of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution contains a number of words and phrases—“skills training”, “experiential”, and “proficiency”—that represent particular historically constituted ideas about teaching and learning. The ideas about teaching and learning and the specific pedagogical approaches that formed the JIBC way of teaching conflict resolution were set in place in the 1980s as part of the creation process of the Certificate by the people training in the program and remained relatively static over the next 20 years.

The most common description of the CCR classroom approach both in JIBC written materials and in interviews with early faculty members was that the program was “experiential”: While “experiential learning in its wider usage is both a philosophy and a practice” (Boud, 2005, p. 244), the use of the word “experiential” as a pedagogical descriptor was understood by Certificate in Conflict Resolution trainers as a practice, as a set of teaching techniques—the exercises, discussions and coached role-play used ubiquitously in conflict resolution courses. The focus on technique allowed different

adult education philosophies, that is different understandings of the purpose and meaning of teaching and learning, to co-exist under the experiential banner. The use of experiential as an all-purpose descriptor to cover both practice and philosophy heightened illusions of theoretical and philosophical unanimity and masked contradictions.

Comment: Nym, this definitely wasn't true for me. I did see the use of these tools as an educational philosophy that assisted learners in the changes necessary for dealing more effectively with conflict, with moving out of the standard adversarial learned behaviours. What is also true is that I just took it for granted that this approach was what we all were steeped in and didn't think to actually discuss it. (J. Balmer, personal communication, January 2, 2009)

While the adult education philosophies in use in the Certificate were contradictory in many ways, they were unanimous in seeing learning as an individual and, at least partially, cognitive act. All accepted a notion of the learner as a distinct and autonomous self who could engage in a concrete experience—role-playing, for example—then separate that experience from the cognitive process of reflecting in order to make meaning, i.e. “learn”, from those reflections. The unproblematic acceptance of this constructivist notion of experiential learning (Fenwick, 2001; Fenwick, 2003) as both how people learn and the “best” way for people to learn has remained both unexamined and unchanged since the 1980s. Newer theoretical perspectives consider the underlying premises of a constructivist notion of experiential learning problematic and are particularly critical of its individualistic, context and “culture-free” conception of learning.

The experiential banner

Required or core courses in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution all followed a similar pattern. They were three to five days long. They started with introductions and some kind of warm-up exercise and proceeded with short lecturettes by the trainer interspersed with small and large group discussions, large group, small group and dyad exercises, small group and dyad skills practice, and extensive role-playing. The last day of each course was a full role-play day. Groups of five people spent the day doing individual videotaped role-plays and receiving feedback from a coach.

I have not been able to trace exactly how the term coach came to be used in the Certificate. The earliest reference to “coaching” that I found was to a 1970 psychological experiment in assertiveness training.

In one study patterned after procedures developed in an earlier experiment (McFall and Marston, 1970) non-assertive college students were trained in assertive behaviors in a program which included the components of symbolic verbal modelling, practice or rehearsal sessions, and informational “coaching” by the therapist. (Marlatt & Perry, 1975, p. 133)

Coaching for improved performance in a business rather than in a therapeutic context apparently originated with the publication of *The Inner Game of Tennis* by Timothy Gallwey in 1975.

Gallwey based his method on the belief in the innate ability of people’s bodies to learn and to perform. He focused on allowing his students to learn through their own experiences on the court. He saw the coach’s role as asking questions to help players to increase their awareness of how they played and to adjust accordingly.... Many of those who came to learn the Inner Game were business people. They soon saw that the new messages they were hearing on the court could be applied in their boardrooms, as well. (Kennedy, 2007)

Gallwey's learning-from-experience approach to tennis, and subsequently business, apparently resonated with human relations and organizational development consultants. References to coaching first appear in the 1978 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators, and University Associates publication, in an article called "Types of Process Interventions". Coaching interventions are defined as "a type of process intervention aimed at facilitating the acquisition of desirable, functional habits of interacting" (Freedman, 1978, p. 165).

The coached role-play component of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution courses, wherever it originated, was a defining feature of the program's instructional methodology. A highly interactive approach to teaching and learning was another. Early Certificate trainers use the terms interactive, participatory and experiential interchangeably to describe classroom approaches.

I remember in general my experience, because not having been a teacher before, my experience ... of teaching in law school was ... being talked 'at' ... so it was my first exposure ... to this kind of engaged, interactive teaching style and I quite liked it. And I believe we just all embraced it. (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007)

The conflict resolution classrooms were often described in terms of their differences from traditional or conventional post-secondary classrooms, particularly in regards to the emphasis on doing, rather than hearing about, or talking about, doing.

I think one of the tenets of the program from the beginning was can you find a way to ensure that you're not just a talking head at the front of a room that delivers information in a lecture format.... Can you actually give people the opportunity to try that skill? (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

Marje Burdine was the original model for new trainers in the program and she instilled a clear awareness of the importance of hands-on approaches as opposed to lecturing. As

well as organizing training sessions to help trainers “understand the value of doing it,” she would sometimes sit in on classes.

Some people leaned a little more toward a lecture format, some quite a bit more ... it was a struggle at times to bring them back from spending half a day or three quarters of the day lecturing, to making sure people got hands-on opportunity. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

Karen Haddigan Blackburn remembers that her understanding of what she was supposed to be doing as a trainer was organizing and presenting the courses the same way Marje Burdine did:

I don't know that we had specific discussions about training but I was shown Marje's methodology, which was part lecture, part demonstration and part participation. And I knew that that format had worked really well for me and others thought so too, so it made sense to model the way Marje had put it together. (Personal interview, February 8, 2007)

Nancy McPhee remembers learning very specific and detailed approaches to training from Marje Burdine.

She was the one who taught me ... how to figure out exercises and make agendas with times on them.... She was pretty organized ... from 9:30 to 9:45 you were going to be talking about this, and then at 9:45 you are going to get them to do this, and then they would debrief it and.... So I learned all that stuff from her, learned all about standing at the front of the room and how it all worked. (Personal interview, January 28, 2007)

Marje Burdine called her pedagogical approach “experiential training.” The primary experiential training technique was to put people through a structured exercise and then a structured de-briefing.

You draw on what they have experienced in life and what they've also experienced in that structured experience that you put them through. And you debrief that with them in a way that helps them discover what they already know, but also what they've just learned. So there's very little lecture and reading—it's a very active and participatory approach to learning. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

Her experiential training knowledge came from her own training from a California-based consulting company called University Associates. Two particular adult education philosophical traditions, progressivism and humanism, informed the University Associates approach and, in North America in the 1970s, were typical of the field of adult education, and particularly the area of workplace learning.

A progressive adult education orientation

The emphasis on the debriefing of structured experiences and the language used in the earliest published description of University Associates—“learning-by-doing,” “laboratory experiences,” “human relations training,” and “organization development” places University Associates in a National Training Laboratory (NTL) organizational development/human relations tradition.

The University Associates staff of educational consultants, experienced facilitators and organization development specialists emphasizes an experiential learning approach that utilizes structured experiences, role-playing, feedback and other learning-by-doing techniques that have been shown to result in positive growth for participants. (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1969, back cover)

The National Training Laboratory Institute (NTL) formed to continue social psychologist Kurt Lewin’s research into effective training methods for enhancing group problem-solving capabilities after his death in 1947. Lewin, known in psychology history as the father of social psychology (Benjamin, 2007; Hergenhahn, 2001; Hunt, 1993), was responsible for numerous ideas and practices that influenced not only psychology but also the disciplines of adult education, organizational development, community development and conflict resolution. Lewin is described as a social scientist who believed that “research on social problems was not enough; it was critical to discover ways to use that

research to change situations, to make individuals better, to make groups better, and to make societies better” (Benjamin, 2007, p. 185). When Lewin was asked in 1946 by the American Jewish Congress Committee on Community Interrelations and the Connecticut Interracial Commission to “help train a group of community leaders to deal more effectively with interracial tensions and help change racial attitudes” (Benne, 1964, p. 80) Lewin agreed. “The basic idea of the seminar followed Lewin’s action research: diagnosing problems, finding solutions to them, exercising the solutions and planning carefully the actions to be taken ‘back home’” (Miettinen, 2000, p. 58). From an adult education philosophy point of view, Lewin’s, and thus NTL’s, approach to adult learning was located within the progressive school. A progressive adult education philosophy “stresses the authority of science, the use of the experimental method and problem-solving” (Lange, 2006, p. 96).

In Lewin’s initial 1946 community leader training seminar “the major teaching-learning method employed was group discussion, supplemented by role-playing both to diagnose behavioural aspects of the problems presented and to practice alternative approaches to the solution of these problems” (Benne, 1964, pp. 81-82). The three group process observers reported to the group leaders and researchers each day over dinner and, as the story goes, participants soon asked if they could join in on the staff discussions.

The consequences were electrifying:

Before many evenings had passed, all participants, the commuters as well as the residents, were attending these sessions.... Participants reported that they were deriving important understandings of their own behavior and of the behavior of their groups. To the training staff it seemed that a potentially powerful medium and process of re-education had been, somewhat inadvertently, hit upon. (Benne, 1964, pp. 82-83).

It was this inadvertent process that was later hailed as “an innovation in the technology of education” (Bradford et al, 1964, p. 1) and, even more glowingly, “a method of stimulating and supporting learning that seemed more effective than any tried before” (Benne, Bradford, Gibb & Lippitt, 1975, p. 4).

Lippitt, Bradford and Benne continued the conference work after Lewin’s death, organizing the first “human interaction laboratory” (Fraher, 2004, p. 116) in Bethel, Maine, in 1947. That laboratory included an ongoing group feedback mechanism, “the Basic Skills Training (BST) Group, in which an anecdotal observer made observational data available for discussion and analysis by the group” (Benne, 1964, p. 83).

The BST group was only one part and, certainly originally, only one small part, of the laboratory trainings. Other pedagogical methods included daily lectures on various behavioural science theories, role-play sessions involving all participants, group discussions, and the playing back of audiotapes of group sessions. (Benne, 1964). It was, however, the BST group. re-named the T-group in 1949 and later ‘sensitivity training,’ that came to dominate perceptions of the NTL approach.

The pedagogy employed at the NTL workshops was one in which participants were helped to diagnose and experiment with their own behaviours and relationships during group learning activities. Staff members, called Trainers, guided participant learnings within the laboratory community and facilitated the transfer and application of learning outside the laboratory. (Fraher, 2004, p. 117)

NTL’s T-group sensitivity training spread rapidly. The organization “quickly gained a worldwide reputation as an organization at the cutting edge of social science research and innovation in understanding group behaviour” (Fraher, 2004, p. 117). Tensions escalated, however, between the founding Lewinian-oriented staff, who saw the laboratory

experience as “the development of skills for the sake of amelioration of some social problem” (Plumb, 1993, p. 19), and the newer psychotherapeutically-oriented staff, who were inspired by the humanist psychology of Rogers, Perls and Maslow. The latter saw the sensitivity training, soon to be called “encounter groups,” as a way to help individuals reach their potential through self-actualization. “Finally, in the early 1960s these two factions split and the encounterists centered on the West Coast in the new ‘growth centers’ that were forming” (Plumb, 1993, p. 19).

The encounterist side of the 1960s NTL split evolved into the immensely popular and widely influential human potential movement. The other side of the split maintained a more traditional Lewinian orientation and did some work directly related to social change and community betterment, primarily T-group applications in community settings. The main focus for the non-encounterist NTL practitioners, however, was providing training for “the requirements of a specific occupational population” (Benne, 1964, p. 109) which evolved into a new field called organizational development (OD).

From the late 1950s onward, OD began to be the major revenue generator for NTL, enhancing its name recognition and prestige within the business world but moving away from the ethos established by Lewin a decade earlier.... During the sixties ... demographics shifted from a high percentage of academics and intellectuals towards increasing numbers of business entrepreneurs who prioritized economic goals over democratic values and the study of group behaviour. (Fraher, 2004, p. 119)

By the end of the 1960s NTL was no longer doing research and was experiencing much competition from its own NTL-trained members for OD contract work. University Associates, the OD and human relations training organization that provided Marje Burdine’s experiential training expertise, appears to have been on the human relations/organizational development side of the NTL split, despite its California location.

UA might well have been among the increasing number of independent OD consultants, trained by NTL who “competed with NTL for the lucrative contracts” (Fraher, 2004, p. 120).

The fields of organizational development and adult training, and many of the specific instructional methodologies used in the JIBC conflict resolution program were very much influenced by NTL concepts, language, and group learning techniques. However, adult education as a field of practice was equally, and perhaps even more strongly influenced by the other side of the NTL split, the human potential movement.

A humanist adult education orientation

The encounter group practices of the human potential movement evolved diversely and dramatically from the original NTL T-group.

“Basic encounter” is most commonly used in reference to training in which the focus is on personal growth rather than the development of interpersonal skill. Primarily a West Coast phenomenon ... groups are usually composed of individuals or couples desirous of expanding their potential, overcoming personal problems or discovering joy.... Sessions are usually free-swinging and experimental and personal growth is often fostered by dramatically achieved insights. (Lyon, 1971, p. 122)

The theoretical premises of the eclectic human potential movement came from humanistic or third-force psychology. It was called third-force psychology in opposition to the two major forces or schools of psychology in the 1950s and 1960s, behaviourism and psychotherapy. It was called humanistic because it

sees humans as indivisible wholes. Any attempt to reduce them to habits, cognitive structures, or S-R [stimulus-response] connections results in a distortion of human nature ... psychologists use a scientific method to cut themselves off from the poetic, romantic and spiritual aspects of human nature. (Hergenhahn, 2001, p. 520)

Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers and Fritz Perls are the names associated with humanistic psychology. Plumb (1993) asserts that Maslow and Rogers “founded humanistic psychology ... and they encouraged the growth of the human potential movement as the public expression of that science” (p. 5).

The human potential movement spread widely and was extraordinarily popular in its various manifestations. “Its influence was felt in most of the major institutions of society—in business, religious, educational and governmental institutions” (Plumb, 1993, p. 4). Two early Certificate in Conflict Resolution trainers remember its influence on their lives. Dale Trimble was a therapist who got involved with sensitivity training while he was in high school south of Seattle

Myself and another student whose boyfriend had done some stuff at Esalen were leading sensitivity groups in Sociology class, doing trust falls and blind walks and doing little mini, micro lab kind of stuff until the Vice Principal found out and put a stop to it. (D. Trimble, personal interview, February 16, 2007)

For Dale Trimble the appeal of the human potential movement work was its immediacy. There was “something magic about being involved in things that were happening in the moment, in experience. Very in contrast to a lot of mainline academic stuff” (D. Trimble, personal interview, February 16, 2007). Another highly influential Certificate in Conflict Resolution instructor, Joan Balmer, connected with the human potential movement ideas while going to university in Brandon, Manitoba.

I'm in Brandon University, in the very conservative small city that I grew up in. I was an adult student, starving for some new understandings of life and human nature. Brandon University was teeming with new ideas because there was all sorts of U.S. professors that had immigrated to Canada in protest of the Vietnam war ... I stepped onto a magic carpet when I stepped onto campus ... along came Virginia Satir ... another time a Gestaltist came to B.U. ... these were rich times of change and

exploration and I took part in as much as I could. (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

Both Joan Balmer and Dale Trimble completed Master's Degrees in Humanist Psychology through Antioch University. Joan Balmer describes its experiential focus.

There was a theoretical part, and you had to be working on your self, not just going in and working on other people and the third part was a practicum.... I did a three-month program up at Cortez Island as part of the Master's program ... it was all experiential ... the whole program was focused on what you know about yourself ... total self-awareness. And then how do you bring that forward into the world? (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

One of the ways that both Joan Balmer and Dale Trimble brought their education and their values into the world was through teaching at the JIBC. They brought a humanist educational philosophy with them. This educational philosophy called on Carl Rogers as its primary theoretician, and "here and now experience" as its primary technique.

A whole current of the human potential movement was devoted to influencing and reforming the formal education system, its goal "to move some of the so-called Esalen approaches into the educational establishment" (Brown, 1971, p. 20). Called variously humanistic education, affective education, psychological education or confluent education, its proponents critiqued what they saw as an overemphasis on cognitive dimensions of learning and an undervaluing of emotional aspects.

Humanistic Education, the integration of cognitive learning with affective learning, is a natural outgrowth of Humanistic or Third-Force psychology ... isolating cognitive learning from affective learning is a mistake—a mistake, the impact of which we are feeling on campuses and in classrooms all over this country. (Brown, 1971, pp. 3-4)

The solution to this mistake was the incorporation of human potential movement approaches to self-knowledge and authenticity into all levels of the education system.

“The work of individuals like Maslow, Rogers and Perls and of institutions like Esalen, the N.T.L. groups, Synanon and mental-health organizations has provided oases in the impoverished dustlands of education” (Brown, 1971, p. 16).

Carl Rogers’s educational theories were particularly influential and clearly focused on the growth and fulfilment of the individual: “He emphasizes the self-actualization of the learner and he argues that the goal of education is a fully functioning person” (Jarvis, 1983, p. 96). Rogers (1969) developed a number of principles of learning: that human beings have a natural potentiality to learn, that learning is enhanced by doing, that self-initiated learning involves the whole person, and that learning how to learn is critically important. Jarvis (1983) notes the centrality of Rogers’ belief that learning required “retaining openness to experience so that the process of change can be incorporated into the self” (p. 99).

While Jarvis (1983) claimed Rogers’ “uses therapeutic techniques for educational ends” (p. 97) and criticized him for blurring the lines between therapy and education, American Malcolm Knowles (1980) used Rogers as a main source for his articulation of the principles of andragogy—the art and science of teaching adults—in *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy*. Knowles’ principles of adult learning are: that adults are self-directed learners, that adult learning is motivated by need, that adults bring life experience as a base for current learning, and that adult learning is problem-centred (Knowles, 1980). Knowles’ concepts of andragogy became widely known and one result was a popularization of the humanist psychology ideas of adult learning sweeping enough to be called a movement: “Knowles’ ideas are responsible for a sweeping wave of change in the 1970s where lecturers became

facilitators of dialogue, and learners exercised voice in determining the issues, goals and applications of course materials” (Fenwick, 2003, p. 8). Roger’s (1969) conceptualization of experiential learning as self-actualizing education was interpreted and popularized by Knowles (1980) to such a degree that experiential learning and a humanist educational philosophy have been considered synonymous in the subsequent adult education literature (Cranton, 1992; Fenwick, 2001; MacKeracher, 2004).

Marje Burdine’s training with University Associates drew on both an historic progressive philosophical education tradition from NTL roots as well as the newer humanist educational philosophies of Rogers (1969) and Knowles (1980). Her adult education orientation would probably be best described as a progressive/humanist mix. Both Dale Trimble’s and Joan Balmer’s reflections on their purpose as conflict resolution teachers seem consistent with descriptions of the humanist education philosophy. For Dale Trimble, conflict resolution education “created a community of meaning around that area identified as knowing self in the midst of conflict” (D. Trimble, personal interview, February 16, 2007). For Joan Balmer, the goal was openness and awareness.

We were hoping—at least I thought we were hoping—to get people really comfortable with their own depths and then with each other's depths, so to speak. So a lot of openness and honesty and bringing awareness to what's going on internally and how that gets played out behaviourally—essential learnings in order to be able to be more effective in working cooperatively in conflict. In other words, self-awareness, self-understanding, and self-knowledge are the very foundations of skill use and the true potentiality for collaboration. (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

The humanist educational beliefs shared by Marje Burdine, Joan Balmer and Dale Trimble would have created many commonalities. All would have stressed the importance of respecting the previous experience of the learner and of creating a safe and

respectful classroom atmosphere conducive to learning. However, they may have held somewhat different definitions of experiential. Marje Burdine defines experiential primarily as an approach to skills training based on de-briefing a trainer-designed experience in ways that encouraged linkages between new learning and previous learning. This approach assumes a belief that “real learning takes place when learners discover knowledge for themselves and assimilate it into pre-existing experience” (Lange, 2006, p. 101). From a humanist orientation, the goal is more “to develop the full potential for the self-actualization of every person” (Lange, 2006, p. 101).

In this view, humankind is viewed through the lenses of humanist psychology, and the individual is seen as central; there is virtually no attention to the socio-cultural context. The emphasis of this orientation is on meeting the needs of the individual adult learner. Those who practice out of this frame see adult education as helping others reach personal fulfilment via self-directed learning. (Tisdell & Taylor, 1999, p. 8)

In the humanist philosophy, “the relationship between the teacher and the student is central”:

Student-centred learning is founded on respect and the idea that the teacher only facilitates, not dictates, learning.... Humanist teachers are responsive and empathetic, have positive beliefs about people and are self-actualized in order to assist others in their self-actualization process. (Lange, 2006, p. 101)

A mixed progressive/humanist orientation and a pure humanist orientation would also conceptualize the purpose of experiential learning differently. The progressive/humanist meld would likely see experiential learning as a goal driven methodology. The original Lewinian approach saw experiential learning as a technology that was highly effective in achieving the educational goal: “the development of skills for the sake of amelioration of some social problem” (Plumb, 1993, p. 19). The OD/human relations practice that

evolved from the Lewinian roots was less concerned with the amelioration of social problems and more concerned with assisting businesses in “reducing turmoil” (Fraher, 2004, p. 119) and “increasing people’s effectiveness” (Pfeiffer & Goodstein, 1982, p. vi). However, while the purposes were different, experiential learning was nonetheless seen by both traditional Lewinians and human relations/OD consultants as a “technology”, a methodology, used to achieve particular goals. In contrast, the pure humanist orientation focus was more concerned with what insights could be drawn from the immediate “here and now” interactions within the learner group. Both of these conceptions of experiential, “goal-driven,” which represented a more progressive adult education orientation, and “here and now,” which I see as a pure humanist orientation, were embedded in the pedagogical practices of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution. Because they both used the term “experiential”, the differences between them were never explicitly noticed or acknowledged.

Comment: I don't relate to this distinction between these 2 different philosophies. For the learner to build new learning upon previous learning is just another way of talking about building new learning upon self awareness which does, in my mind, lead to personal growth. I guess for me, the cognitive, emotional, and behavioural are all essential components of our curriculum in all courses in varying degrees. I'm not sure if I'm accurate on this and I do believe different instructors put perhaps more emphasis on certain aspects than others. But what it does boil down to for me, Nym, is wanting to clarify that behaviour and skill building are still a key element in my philosophy. (Joan Balmer, personal communication, January 2, 2009)

A behavioural teaching philosophy was the third influence on the pedagogical practices of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution. While it is easy to see that the perhaps subtle differences between a progressive/humanist orientation mix and a pure humanist

orientation might be overlooked, it is less easy to understand how the more contradictory philosophy of behaviourism could be subsumed under the “experiential” description.

A behaviourist adult education orientation

Behaviourism entered the Certificate classrooms not just through the ideas and practices of individual trainers, although it did indeed enter that way, but through the prevailing pedagogical orientation of the educational institution in which the Certificate was located. The “extensive training in conflict resolution” (JIBC, 1987b, p. 2) promised by the Certificate in Conflict Resolution existed within an institution that provided both initial and continuing occupational training to police officers, sheriffs, fire fighters, corrections officers and paramedics. Training was what happened at the JI:

Training is usually related to achieving precise objectives: applied to animals, it is meant to make them obey; in sports, it is meant to help athletes win; in the army, it is meant to make soldiers physically tough and morally compliant. In formal education, training refers to professional and vocational activities carried out both in technical schools and in adult education institutions ... mostly ... related to the world of work. (Ollagnier, 2005, p. 618)

The JIBC was a technical institute and the activities carried out within it were directly related to the world of work. Its overall approach to teaching and learning can best be described as competency-based vocational training. “If you look around at some of the other parts of the JI, the competency-based is very strong ... that's what the police do, that's what Corrections does. It's the JI model” (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007).

The JIBC training was for specific job roles with competencies specified by the employer. It fits Cornford's (2005) definition of competency-based education as “training

to agreed performance standards ... carefully delineated programs which include only skills and knowledge relevant to the immediate training objectives; employment of criterion-referenced rather than normative assessment” (p. 141). Both “skills training” and “competency-based education” are terms associated with a behaviourist adult educational orientation. Behaviourism itself refers to a theoretical perspective originating in psychology. Behaviourism as a school of psychology originated in the early twentieth century and came to prominence, and dominance, in North America in the mid-century. Learning was considered to be behaviour change, and always observable, specified by the teacher and then elicited and maintained through reinforcement and reward.

This philosophy obtained its greatest success in vocational and technical training, particularly in skills training, where learning is observable and measurable. The ideal in behaviourist adult education is behavioural objectives set by the teacher with the content arranged in a sequential manner. (Lange, 2006, p 98)

The JIBC-wide assumption that people were learning skills or competencies for use in their workplace roles influenced the Certificate in Conflict Resolution. The Community/Extension Programs unit of the JIBC, where seminars, workshops, and courses were designed not for one specific occupation but for “professionals, community agencies and interested citizens,” (JIBC, 1986c, back cover) also maintained the emphasis on “training to increase participant’s skills on the job” (back cover). Marje Burdine remembers the very earliest mediation courses as intended to provide learners with “the skills to ... complement the work that they're doing, whether it was legal work or social work or whatever” (Personal interview, January 24, 2007) and the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was advertised as

suggested for those in the fields of psychology, social work, management, counselling, corrections, law and education. The courses have been accorded Category 1 status by the B.C. Psychological Association for the purpose of professional development. (JIBC, 1987a, p. 4)

The program emphasis was on “learnable, teachable skills” (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007) and this focus on usefulness in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution courses was both congruent with the JIBC philosophy overall and attractive to many of its early learners.

I thought that it would be really useful in my work developing housing co-operatives and training members in self-management ... I remember being really excited because it ... just seemed really practical and usable ... I could apply the skills immediately. (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

People taking the conflict resolution courses were assumed to be, like Karen Haddigan Blackburn, already employed, and taking time off from work to take courses that would directly and immediately enhance their work capabilities. Accessibility to people working full-time was a primary factor in Certificate structure. Courses were two to five days in length and offered weekdays during the day. There were few requirements for course order and courses were offered repeatedly throughout the year. People could start taking courses anytime, take them in (almost) any order, over any length of time, and could enrol in the Certificate whenever they chose.

The accessibility of courses based on the intended learners being full-time workers, the focus on practicality and workplace application, and the framing of the content as skills are all indications of Certificate alignment with the overall JIBC technical vocational identity.

As well as an institutional behavioural educational approach, the Certificate in Conflict Resolution included specific behavioural approaches to the teaching of interpersonal skills. Lee Rengert, the anger and aggression expert from the Faculty of Education at the University of LaVerne, California, brought with him into the Certificate program an approach to teaching interpersonal skills called “structured learning.” In 1986 he taught a course at the JIBC called *Anger Management for Youth*, sub-titled *A Curriculum for Teaching Anger Management Skills to Adolescents and Young Adults*. Rengert’s course was not intended for youthful enrolees, but for adults who would be working with young people in some capacity. His course manual, therefore, contains both content about anger and content about how to teach anger management. The how-to-teach approach is called “structured learning” and is credited to Arnold Goldstein.

The structured learning ... or psycho-educational approach to developing interpersonal skills provides a safe, supportive environment for participants to learn and practice new behaviours before applying them out in the world. It consists of four basic components:

1. Modelling: Observing the specific skills to be learned.
2. Role Playing: Rehearsing the skills under coached conditions.
3. Performance feedback: Receiving positive feedback as skills are developed.
4. Transfer of training: Use of journals and assignments to bring the skills to the out of class environment. (Rengert, 1986, p. 3)

Psychologist Arnold Goldstein (1981) gives the context for the development of the structured learning approach. Differing from the three major models in place at the time—psychotherapy, humanism and behaviour modification—it did not assume that “the patient had somewhere inside himself, as yet unexpressed, the effective, satisfying,

or healthy behaviors whose expression was amongst the goals of the therapy” (Goldstein, 1981, p. 1). Rather, psychological skills training was a radically new approach that saw “the helpee more in educational, pedagogic terms”:

The psychological skills trainer assumed he was dealing with an individual lacking, deficient, or at best weak in the skills necessary for effective and satisfying daily living. The task of the skills trainer became, therefore, not interpretation, reflection or reinforcement but the active and deliberate teaching of desirable behaviours. (Goldstein, 1981, p. 1)

Goldstein (1981) described structured learning as an outgrowth of Albert Bandura’s work in social learning theory (p. 2). Its major applications were in the teaching of daily personal and interpersonal skills to a range of people with various cognitive, psychiatric and developmental disabilities who were being de-institutionalized in the United States.

Structured learning was decidedly different in intention, assumption, goal and purpose from humanist or progressive educational approaches. It saw the learner as deficient and the teacher as the prescriber of correct behaviour: “The overall goal of structured learning is to lead trainees to a high level of 1) skill acquisition, and 2) skill transfer, and to do so in a prescriptive manner” (Goldstein, 1981, p. xi). Lee Rengert was apparently not a pure behaviourist but had adopted the newer cognitive-behavioural approach. He added to Goldstein’s model two additional steps, both cognitive in nature. “Since the Transforming Anger skills are holistic rather than strictly behavioural in nature, I have added two additional components ... Discussion and Cognitive Practice” (Rengert, 1986, p. 3).

A cognitive-behavioural approach in psychology arose out of dissatisfaction with the dominant strict behavioural approach combined with the emergence of the semantic or cognitive psychological approaches. Cognitive-behaviourism provided not only a

pedagogical approach but also a great deal of the content in the *Dealing with Anger* and *Dealing with Interpersonal Conflict* courses. Stacey Holloway, Mario Govorchin and Dale Zaiser all came into the Certificate in Conflict Resolution from social service/therapeutic backgrounds and found Rengert's approaches very familiar.

We were cognitive behavioural therapists ... what you think influences how you feel, which influences the behaviour choices you make ... it got literally written in to some of the stuff we taught.... If you look at Rengert's early stuff, he must have been a cognitive behavioural therapist. (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

Just to confuse matters, Rengert's use of the term "holistic" and his highly interactive classroom practices lent a distinctly humanist gloss to his educational orientation.

Lee was the first person that I really remember working there. He did some fabulous stuff with us I thought. But he was very California. He did outrageous stuff. I think he even flopped on the floor once and kicked a temper tantrum or something ... we wouldn't have gone quite as far as he was willing to take us. (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

Rengert's apparently mixed humanist/behaviourist orientation helped obscure the fundamental differences between his structured learning approaches and the pre-existing humanist and humanist/progressive orientations already present in the conflict resolution classrooms of the mid-80s.

Comment: I would say unite or integrate rather than obscure. (Joan Balmer, personal communication, February 2, 2009).

While Rengert's blending of more than one teaching orientation was typical of the philosophical meldings that tend to characterize actual adult educator practice (Cranton, 1992; Tisdell & Taylor, 1999). Elizabeth Lange (2006) describes adult educator orientations as "mental maps" that are "created through the intersection of biography and context" (p. 93) and different trainer and coach adult educational orientations would have

come from the different professional and educational backgrounds of trainers, personal histories in formal and informal learning environments, individual learning preferences, individual worldviews, all creating sets of beliefs about the purpose of teaching and learning. Those beliefs, those philosophies, would have affected classroom practice: “our philosophy informs our practice, which in turn informs and helps develop our philosophy” (Tisdell & Taylor, 1999, p. 6).

Karen Haddigan Blackburn remembers complaints about different ways of teaching the same course. “Everybody had their own way of teaching the courses, not just in style but eventually about substance as well ... so then there was concern that the students weren’t getting the same thing”(Personal interview, February 8, 2007). One example of how the different adult education orientations would have manifested in the conflict resolution classrooms lies in different views of the purpose and process of role-play practice. All required Certificate courses included a full day of coached role-play. Learners engaged in a role-play, attempting to practice what they had been learning in the first two days of the course: negotiate, mediate, manage anger, or resolve an interpersonal conflict. They then received feedback. In the frame of reference of a progressive educator, the role-play would be seen as an experiment in trying out new behaviour, and feedback from the other group members and the trainer/coach would be an opportunity to hear how the new behaviour impacted others. From the humanist point of view, the role-play and the feedback sessions were opportunities to discover and reflect on information about self as negotiator, mediator, anger manager or interpersonal conflict resolver which might lead to changes in self-understandings and therefore relationships with others.

Comment: Improved relationships are essential, not just for the relationship itself, which is not to be minimized, but for the creation of

solutions that neither party would have thought of on their own, in fact, ultimately for transformative solutions. (Joan Balmer, personal communication, February 2, 2009)

From a behaviourist orientation, role-play was the practice of a pre-determined set of skills in a pre-determined order. The feedback came from the trainer/coach in the form of what had been done well in the performance and what needed improvement.

In these critiques it is crucial that the behavioural focus of Structured Learning be maintained. Comments must point to the presence or absence of specific, concrete behaviours, and should not take the form of general evaluative comments or broad generalizations” (Goldstein, 1981, p. 21).

However, Rengert’s inclusion of a cognitive psychology viewpoint moved the role-play approach from pure behaviourism into an acceptance of the importance of the learner cognitively processing the role-play experience and the feedback and, therefore, aligned it more closely with the reflective approaches of progressivism and humanism.

Comment: Lee's integration of all 3 philosophies was an important support for me. It was in synch with my goals for skilful conflict resolution. In their role-plays, how does the student express what they are learning about their own habits and styles through their behavioural changes, and how does that affect the relationship and the outcome? It's true that I'm not interested in formulaic skills whether they be communication skills or process skills. I'm not interested in technique as much as what is 'real and how does that get expressed non-defensively'. What kind of agreement are they working out? Is it truly meeting the needs, interests, and concerns of both parties engaged in the conflict, or is it just a good use of formulaic skill? (J. Balmer, personal communication, February 2, 2009)

Philosophical adult educator orientations are shaped both by individual biographies and by the “the larger, pervasive cultural ideology” (Lange, 2006, p. 93), and it is in a larger and certainly pervasive ideology about learning that it is possible to see underlying commonalities in the differing philosophical orientations. While the purpose and the process of mandatory role-playing could differ from classroom to classroom or

coaching group to coaching group. depending on the adult education orientation of the trainer/coach, all three educational orientations considered role-playing a touchstone of the experiential approach and an effective, powerful and unproblematic educational methodology, particularly well-suited to mediation and negotiation learning. As Fenwick (2001) asserts, however, “experiential learning cannot be discussed apart from its political, social and cultural contexts” (p. 32) and role-play as a pedagogical methodology is embedded in political, social and cultural assumptions. The trainers in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution, regardless of the differing philosophical orientations they brought to their classrooms, all accepted the validity of role-playing as an educational methodology because they all, even the cognitive-behaviourists, shared a constructivist view of experiential learning. A constructivist understanding is based on a “central premise that a learner is believed to construct, through reflection, a personal understanding of relevant structures of meaning derived from his or her actions in the world” (Fenwick, 2001, p. 18). This belief system understood the learner as a consistent and bounded self who could engage in an experience (in this instance role-playing) that was both concrete and simulated, real and unreal, and then separate that experience from the cognitive process of reflecting on it in order to make specific meanings—learnings—through the process of cognitive reflection.

Educators had developed a variety of ways to enhance this process; by facilitating adults’ critical reflection on experience, by instigating holistic’ experiences in educational settings, by coaching and mentoring adults to enhance their learning in the midst of experience and by assessing adults’ experience. (Fenwick, 2001, p. 7)

One of the main criticisms of this constructivist view of experiential learning is that it assumes definitions of self, experience; reflection and learning that take insufficient notice of context and exhibit a lack of understanding of power:

Context involves the social relations and political-cultural dimensions of the community in which the individual is caught up. the nature of the task, the web of joint actions in which the individual's choices and behaviours are enmeshed, the vocabulary and cultural beliefs through which the individual makes meaning of the whole situation and the historical, temporal, and spatial location of the situation. (Fenwick, 2001, p. 28)

The constructivist approach to learning in the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training classrooms was based on assumptions of learner and teacher sameness, and learner sameness. It saw political-cultural dimensions as irrelevant or, perhaps more accurately, simply did not see political-cultural dimensions at all. The content of the role-plays was drawn from the social-cultural worlds of the trainers and the process of role-playing required an ability—or at least the ability to pretend to have an ability—to extract oneself from context, to pretend to be a different person, or at least in a different place, a different time, a different situation. No wonder MacKeracher (2004) describes role-playing as “a difficult and anxiety-producing technique” (p. 164).

While constructivist approaches in general are critiqued for their vision of the learner as “an autonomous, rational-knowledge-making self, disembodied, rising above the dynamics and contingencies of experience” (Fenwick, 2001, p 29), the problems with role-playing in particular come from ignoring the social organization of knowledge: “all knowledge is constructed within power-laden social processes. Experience and knowledge are mutually determined, and experience itself is knowledge driven and cannot be known outside socially available meanings” (Fenwick, 2001, p. 29).

While role-plays in all classes were enmeshed in cultural, political and social processes, the power-laden implications were made most visible when role-play was used as a methodology to determine whether the “appropriate” meaning had been constructed, whether the “right” learning indeed had occurred. One area of criticism of the constructivist view of experiential learning focuses on educators’ intervention in and management of experiential learning for the purpose of assessment. In the Certificate in Conflict Resolution, the end-of-program mandatory assessment was an hour-long mediation role-play and an hour-long negotiation role-play that were intended to provide a demonstration of competence upon which a pass/fail decision for the entire Certificate was based. Not only did this experientially-based activity surface different and conflicting ideas about the function and form of assessment, it provided a vivid example of what happens “when the private journey of discovery and learning is brought under public scrutiny and observation” (Fenwick, 29001, p. 31).

Comment: The centrality of role-play as a learning tool was challenging. For some of us who were doing First Nations training there was profound discomfort with how we were using role-play and the effect it had. In hindsight I think we were imposing our mould and it was an example of our cultural bias that perpetuated a power imbalance by not valuing other ways of knowing and other ways of demonstrating knowing. There were many discussions and the driving force ended up being that if it was a Certificate it had to have a standardized assessment tool. I think changing that was too deep a challenge to our structures to get picked up. With the benefit of reading your Fenwick quotes and hindsight I’m thinking that if we had had a theoretical discourse we might have been able to make a different sense of our discomfort and been able to have a more effective response. (Elizabeth Azmier-Stewart, personal communication, February 13, 2009)

End of program assessment

The end-of-program assessments have been a focus of attention and of controversy within the Certificate in Conflict Resolution consistently throughout its life.

“Marje developed assessments early on and the whole assessment program went through a lot of changes over time ... developing criteria, developing measurement ... that’s very tricky. As you know, it’s not black and white at all” (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007). The Certificate requirements were completion of 210 hours of classroom training plus passing a videotaped role-play assessment in mediation and another in negotiation. It was part of the JIBC educational belief system that a credential required a test of competence.

You could take the courses, but if you wanted a Certificate you needed assessment. Now, within the JI model you can give a Certificate based on a theoretical test. That didn't make a whole lot of sense in conflict resolution.... We never even considered going to theory-based testing. (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007)

The hands-on emphasis of the Certificate mandated a hands-on evaluation method.

It wasn't about writing a test or knowing it in your head. It was can you actually do it? ... That was what it was all about ... that was the backbone of what Marje believed, that you had to be able to do it. You couldn't just write an exam or tell somebody. (N. McPhee, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

The dominant humanist educational orientation of early conflict resolution faculty emphasized the importance of the assessment as both a valuable part of the learning experience and a positive learning experience in itself.

And then we could actually look at the video if ... they wanted to challenge the outcome or they didn't understand it, we would go over it and try to achieve what we were hoping we were teaching, which was to gain a mutual understanding of what happened in that assessment.... What I heard was how much people appreciated the assessments, because it gave them a sense of validation and clarity about what they were able to do. And they could repeat it if they had to ... it was tied to the learning process. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

Nevertheless, there was no ignoring the reality that the assessment, however positive a learning experience it might be, was a behaviourally-based pass/fail test. The test was a performance assessment, a demonstration of the “performance” of a complex task or complex set of skills. The use of performance assessments has been extensively debated in the educational literature. Arguments for the use of performance assessments stress that its assessment of skilled task performance is a far better match with real-world, particularly work-related competencies, than written forms of testing and that it measures “valuable or meaningful forms of mastery” (Archbald & Newmann, 1988, p.vi).

Criticisms tend to focus on the difficulty, indeed the impossibility, of ensuring test reliability and validity. Reliability and validity are testing concepts originating in the dominant psychometric approach to test construction. “Using the thermometer analogy, reliability is established if the instrument can be shown to give nearly identical temperature readings, plus or minus a small and predictable margin of error, when used repeatedly under the same conditions” (Berlak et al, 1992, pp. 183-184). It has not been possible to show that either the role-play performance assessment used in the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training program, or any other performance assessment, consistently gives nearly identical results. Inter-rater reliability, the degree to which different testers would similarly mark the same performance, is a major issue in all performance assessments (Berlak et al, 1992; Cumming & Maxwell, 1999; McBee & Barnens, 1998).

Validity refers to the degree to which the test actually measures what it professes to measure. In performance assessment, validity concerns are heightened by consistent research findings that performance in a particular test situation is not necessarily replicable in another situation, even the exact same test situation on a different day, never

mind the real world applications that many performance assessments, including the JIBC negotiation and mediation ones, were intended to simulate (McBee & Barnes, 1998; Cumming. & Maxwell, 1999).³

Echoes of these larger educational debates can be heard in the arguments about how best to do performance assessments in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution. While a performance assessment is always a behaviourally-based test, there are different approaches to the writing of the performance criteria, atomistic and holistic, representing different levels of specificity and detail. Atomistic approaches are very detailed, identifying “every single element and step and stage in skilled performance” (Cornford, 2005, p. 143). In contrast, a holistic approach “focuses more on the effectiveness of performance overall. It also places more responsibility on the assessor since all elements relating to standards are not stated explicitly and thus are more subject to individual interpretation” (Cornford, 2005, p. 143).

Marje Burdine’s approach to assessment design was a holistic one.

It also had to make room for people that were able to achieve the outcomes but in their own peculiar way. The question was how far could they deviate from the model we taught if they achieved the outcomes.... So it was partly looking at an individual's approach in internalizing what we were trying to teach versus what on paper we would say we need to be able to see. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

³ Recommendations for ameliorating the poor reliability and validity results of performance assessments call for very detailed and specific descriptions of the task, for extensive assessor training, for always allowing multiple performances across multiple tasks, and of never using performance assessment results for high-stakes decisions (Cumming & Maxwell, 1999; Quellmalz, 1991; Miller & Linn, 2000).

In this view, “there wasn't a rigid way of assessing. It was more an internal common sense way of saying, ‘Have they been able to achieve the outcomes and maintain their role of the catalyst in that happening?’” (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007). Other instructors and assessors took a more atomistic approach, looking at the demonstrated achievement of defined criteria, what was written on the paper, as a better indicator of success in the assessment and of a less subjective process.

The Justice Institute also had me hiring Family Court Counsellors. So every year we would do interview processes ... we put this criteria together about what we were looking for ... I showed it to Marje, and she said, "Would you do something like that for us?" ... Because what was happening up to that point is there was ... assessment, but there wasn't any specific criteria. There would be an assessor. They'd watch what was going on, and they'd decide. (D. White, personal interview, March 21, 2007)

Perhaps partially because the underlying theoretical differences between atomistic and holistic assessment approaches were never articulated or discussed, arguments about the “right” way to assess proliferated:

Agreeing on assessment criteria was a challenge—we became aware of how differently we each approached it. Some instructors insisted that students show specific skills and methods, while others said that getting to a collaborative outcome was all that was needed, and there were opinions everywhere in between. It was clear that we didn't agree on some fundamental things. (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, March 13, 2007)

Pedagogical arguments in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution were rare and occurred mostly about assessment criteria and marking, perhaps because it was the one part of the Certificate program where a lack of consensus on approaches and results was actually visible. Otherwise, trainers worked alone in their classrooms and could give whatever particular personal pedagogical spin they chose to the material they were teaching.

However, the assessment arguments were solely around what to mark and how to mark. There was agreement that negotiation and mediation role-plays were an appropriate and common-sense way to decide who had learned the most important elements of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution curriculum and should, therefore, be awarded the Certificate. Whether a holistic approach or a more atomistic micro-skills assessment approach was used, however, the deeper constructivist assumptions of role-play assessment were not questioned. What was common sense about how to mediate, how to negotiate and how to assess that mediation and negotiation learning represented particular culturally and contextually based understandings.

The JIBC Conflict Resolution program was aligned with the rest of the North American practice field in seeing performance assessment through role-play as the best way to determine whether a mediator could actually mediate. The Certificate in Conflict Resolution's end-of-program assessment was strongly linked to a sense of program accountability.

It was as good as we could come to actually hands-on assessment of what they would do when they walked out of the room. We felt accountable for what the Certificate stood for. We were saying, "This person has achieved a certain level of competence," and that should be recognizable in the work that they do the day or week or month or year after they leave our program. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

This interest in attesting to the ability of mediation graduates to practice mediation in a competent fashion was part of a wider concern in the field of practice about how to determine mediator competence. Starting in the late 80s the overall conflict resolution practice field grappled with questions of setting and assessing qualifications and standards for mediators. A lengthy consultative and collaborative process initiated by the

U.S.A. practitioner organization SPIDR (the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution) resulted in the 1995 publication of *Performance-based assessment: A methodology for use in selecting, training and evaluating mediators* (Test Design Project, 1995). This document outlined the rationale for using a performance role-play to determine what competencies mediators were using, and what competencies they were lacking. Offered as a resource to mediation agencies that might be hiring mediators, training mediators, or determining mediator qualifications for authorization to practice in a specialized area, it presented several role-play assessment options using different language to describe the competency criteria.

Many of the leading scholars and practitioners in conflict resolution in the late 80s and early 90s thus engaged in a lengthy process of considering mediator qualifications and how they might best be determined. They were unable to come up with a different or better method of testing mediator abilities than performance assessment, an evaluative process in use since 1986 by the JIBC Certificate in Conflict Resolution to test mediation and negotiation students. This speaks both to the dominance of role-play in conflict resolution training practice and the dominance of performance assessment in the determination of qualifications to practice in a range of other professions (Segers, Dochy, & Cascallar, 2003; Smit & Van Der Molen, 1996; Tate, Foulkes, Neighbour, Campion & Field, 1999)

The JIBC conflict resolution pedagogy

The JIBC conflict resolution pedagogy was based on a constructivist view of experiential learning and included practices and philosophies drawn from progressive, humanist and behaviourist adult education philosophical traditions. The original model

for teaching practice in the certificate was provided by Marje Burdine who used and taught others an experiential training approach that included elements of both progressive and humanist educational approaches. The progressive adult education elements were sourced specifically in the work of the U.S.-based National Training Laboratory (NTL). Marje Burdine's experiential training approaches also drew on the humanist adult education philosophical traditions of Knowles' (1970) principles of andragogy. A second strong humanist orientation came into the Certificate directly from the 1970s humanist psychology vision of education as self-actualization via early instructors. There were also strong behaviourist influences on the program. First, the overall competency-based vocational training approach of the JIBC and its requirement for proficiency assessment set an overall behaviourist context. Second, an overtly behavioural teaching philosophy and model of teaching interpersonal skills called structured learning was brought into the Certificate by instructor Lee Rengert. Third, "inner behaviourism" (Lange, 2006, p. 98) or cognitive-behaviourism, provided much of the anger and conflict resolution course content. Lee Rengert was instrumental in introducing this approach and it was built on by early instructors Stacey Holloway, Mario Govorchin and Dale Zaiser, who self-identify as having brought cognitive-behavioural understandings into their classrooms from their previous human service/therapeutic backgrounds.

Comment: I'm not sure about this conclusion. I would be very surprised if Lee in any way saw himself as Behaviourist. I would love to know Lee's opinion of this and I'm wondering if you're aligning him Stacy, Dale and Mario in that particular way is an accurate assumption. Do they/did they see themselves as behaviourists? (Joan Balmer, personal communication, February 2, 2009)

Each of the three adult education orientations or philosophies directly influenced pedagogical practices in both complementary and contradictory ways. For the progressive

school, coming out of NLT, interpersonal skills training was the route to enhanced individual and group problem-solving abilities that could then be applied to making scientific progress on social issues by enhancing citizen participation in a democratic society. Many legacies of the NTL adult training approaches were visible in the Certificate classrooms. The Certificate in Conflict Resolution described itself as skills-based and saw itself as enhancing the necessary interpersonal skills of resolving conflict. This use of the word “skills” and the concept of training in interpersonal skills came from NTL as did the term “feedback.” According to Plumb (1993), Lewin borrowed the term from the electrical engineers at MIT. In both the NTL trainings and the Certificate in Conflict Resolution classrooms there was a focus “on modifying individual’s directly observable behaviour through a variety of feedback exercises” (Fraher, 2004, p. 117).

NTL popularized role-playing, originating in a therapeutic technique called psychodrama created by Viennese psychotherapist Jacob Moreno in 1953 “as a skill development program for delinquent girls living in an institution” (Flowers, 1975, p. 159), moving it from the therapeutic into the educational milieu. NTL also promoted the use of “cognitive aids—the provision of organizing ideas or frameworks through brief lectures, hand-outs or video clips” (Smith, 2005). As well as lecturettes, flip chart outlines of summarized content were standard in Certificate classes. Finally, the use of the terms “training,” “trainer” and “participant” came from NTL. Overall, as first noted by Hocking (1996), the progressive education tradition exemplified in NTL provided the Certificate in Conflict Resolution with numerous methodologies, language usages, and teaching strategies.

The behaviourist school saw interpersonal skills training as leading to effective interpersonal functioning in work and social settings. In the JIBC conflict resolution classrooms, behavioural approaches were seen in the specification of learning objectives for each course, in the use of scripts to teach various communication skills and in the teaching of a staged conflict resolution, negotiation or mediation model as a linear and prescriptive process and, of course, in the end-of-program assessments.

The humanist school saw increasing self-awareness about one's own intra- and inter-personal interactions through experiential activities as a way to facilitate personal growth and remove barriers to self-actualization. It emphasized the characteristics of the adult learner, the importance of self-directed learning, the necessity for respecting and drawing on the adult's pre-existing life experiences, and the need for a caring, warm and facilitative learning environment. The humanist orientation is visible in the JIBC conflict resolution classrooms in a number of ways. There is the egalitarian furniture arrangements (always clusters, U's or circles); the almost universal solicitation of learner's reasons for taking the course; and goals for personal learning at the beginning of each class. (The latter led to ongoing controversy amongst faculty members over whether the trainer should then attempt to meet those learning goals at the expense of meeting the pre-defined course learning objectives or ignore learner desires in the interests of covering the mandatory curriculum content.) Humanism is visible in the belief that learners learn from each other as well as from the trainer, in the shift in language from trainer to facilitator and in the use of exercises which ask the learner to specifically link the classroom experience to past experiences. A humanist orientation shapes the Centre for Conflict Resolution expectation that all instructors and coaches will "walk the talk,"

that is they will resolve any conflicts with learners using the collaborative approaches they are teaching. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, a strong practice exists across Centre for Conflict Resolution classes of coaches and instructors making themselves available to learners inside and outside of class time as mentors, advisors and generally warm, helpful and caring people. This emphasis on the personal relationship between the learner and the teacher is characteristic of a humanist orientation.

There were two adult education philosophical orientations identified in the literature as current in the 1980s that were not present in the faculty and, therefore, the classrooms of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution. The first was the liberal orientation (Lange, 2006; MacKeracher, 2004; Tisdell & Taylor, 1999) that saw the purpose of education, and educators to “fully develop the rational and moral powers of learners” through “the systematic study of a subject area” (Lange, 2006, p. 96). The liberal orientation was the predominant philosophy in traditional university education.

The role of the educator in such a frame is to be the expert, and to deliver knowledge in the most expeditious way possible, primarily through the lecture method. Such an approach is sometimes referred to as the “banking model of education” where knowledge is deposited into the heads of learners similar to how one deposits money in the bank. (Tisdell & Taylor, 1999, p. 6)

The anti-theoretical and anti-intellectual themes present in the JIBC conflict resolution discourse likely originate in an oppositional reaction to this dominant liberal educational philosophy.

The other missing orientation was the radical (Fenwick, 2001, p. 14), liberatory (MacKeracher, 2004, p. 22) or radical/critical (Lange, 2006, p. 101). This orientation saw the goal of education as social change: “to challenge injustice and lack of freedom and

promote social change towards societies that are safe, just, peaceful, ecologically sustainable and fully democratic” (Lange, 2006, p. 101). Given the peace and empowerment goals of the conflict resolution movement out of which the Certificate in Conflict Resolution emerged, it is perhaps surprising that its educational philosophy was not more aligned with the radical/critical educational orientation. However, the radical philosophy held that education was not ever neutral but always political, that the transformation of the basic structures of society, “an economic system premised on self-interest and greed, a political system that allows power to be concentrated in the hands of a few and a social system that considers only some people as normal” (Lange, 2006, p. 101) was necessary. These transformational beliefs were not congruent with the functionalist bases of the conflict resolution curriculum, nor the requirement for neutrality and impartiality as a mediator, nor the belief in individual learning, individual aspiration, individual change and individual success that marked the predominantly humanist ideology of the Certificate faculty. The status of the humanist orientation as alternative, even political in its individualistic way, sufficed.

Experiential learning’s focus originated in political attempts to resist the authority and hegemony of scientific knowledge and to honor people’s own experience ... experiential learning was focused on celebrating through acknowledgement the importance of inner experience, human dignity and freedom to choose. (Fenwick, 2001, p. 31)

There were three adult education orientations present in the Certificate program—progressive, humanist and behaviourist—but because even the behavioural structured learning approach used demonstrations and coached role-play as primary instructional methodologies, the similarity in techniques obscured the differences in philosophy and they were all simply seen as experiential. With the incorporation of a cognitive-

behavioural approach that moved away from the behavioural emphasis on reinforcement to include cognitive processing as a primary part of learning, all the philosophical orientations could be subsumed under a constructivist view of experiential learning. Fenwick's (2001) description of the instigator and the coach roles in experiential learning certainly seem to apply to Certificate classroom practice. The instigator role means involving learners in experientially based classroom activities such as role-plays. In the coach role, the educator "guides learners to reflect on choices in the 'hot action' of experience so they will analyze undesirable outcomes and make corrections" (p. 22). These seem highly recognizable descriptions of the roles faculty members assumed in the 1980s and continue to assume today. There is little reason to believe that Certificate pedagogical practices have changed since the mid-1980s.

When I think back on it, this is going to sound kind of bizarre but, they [trainers] were all doing pretty much what they're doing now. There would be a little talking, and then we'd have an exercise, and then ... we'd be sent off ... "go and find a partner and do something". My recollection is ... they'd talk about a concept, tell a little story and then get you to go off and do an exercise. And that I think has really been maintained all the way through. (N. McPhee, personal interview, January 28, 2007)

The pedagogical practices in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution Conflict and the beliefs about those practices were laid down very early in the life of the Certificate. Conversations about teaching and learning in the first decade focused on the technical aspects of classroom practice: "We would get together and share ideas and exercises and ways we were doing things. We would do that with some frequency ... I don't recall ever talking about a philosophy of teaching. In fact, I feel certain we didn't" (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007). This emphasis on practicality, on the "how-tos" has remained and there have been few opportunities for Centre for Conflict Resolution

coaches and instructors to critically examine their teaching and coaching beliefs or to engage with more recent theoretical perspectives on adult learning, in general, and experiential learning, in particular. These newer perspectives examine the “meaning and relationship of learning and reflection, wondering whether certain models of experiential learning are too simplistic” (Fenwick, 2001, p. 27). Merriam (2008) says “Adult learning is a complex phenomenon that can never be reduced to a single, simple explanation” (p. 94) and, overall, the newer perspectives see adult learning as far less individual and cognitive and far more complicated, multidimensional, and contextual than the predominant JIBC approaches encompass.

It appears that adult learning research and theory-building are expanding to include more than just a cognitive, individual understanding of learning. The mind, body, spirit, emotions and society are not themselves simply sites of learning; learning occurs in their intersections with each other. (Merriam, 2008, p. 97)

Fenwick’s (2001) explorations of the criticisms of constructivist experiential learning are of particular relevance to Centre for Conflict Resolution teachers and learners. She summarizes theories that question whether reflecting on experience is a straightforward cognitive process and that foreground questions of the “eurocentric, masculinist view of knowledge creation” (Fenwick, 2001, p. 27) that privileges such cognitive rationality. “It denigrates bodily and intuitive experience, advocating retreat into the loftier domains of rational thought from which ‘raw’ experience can be disciplined and controlled” (Fenwick, 2001, p 29). Fenwick (2001) says she provides these criticisms not to negate the contributions of the constructivist approach to experiential learning but to “encourage more thoughtfulness in their adoption (Fenwick, 2001, p 27). To be more thoughtful, more self-critical, more aware of the wide variety of

theoretical perspectives on adult learning—these seem worthy goals for Centre for Conflict Resolution faculty.

I think a lot of us as instructors, because we learned how to teach from the instructors that taught us, unless you were doing other things and learning from other people and learning about teaching, ... you just did the same thing over and over and over ... you're teaching conflict resolution when you've done it 150 times before, so you just show up and you teach the same things and use the same exercises and you don't really think about how you could do this differently. (N. McPhee, personal interview, January 28, 2007)

Comment: Could I add something? There has not been much encouragement to be able to see what others do in the classroom, nor to incorporate new ideas into our teaching. I wonder if that stops us from changing what we do. (Nancy McPhee, personal communication, February 2, 2009)

CHAPTER 7: CURRICULUM

The curriculum of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution in its first decade was synthesized from an eclectic collection of relatively accessible ideas about communication, mediation, anger management, stress, negotiation, conflict and human nature brought into the Certificate by the individuals who were the earliest trainers. The curriculum was infused with the beliefs and values of the conflict resolution movement and based its teaching on application rather than directly on theoretical understandings sourced in academic conflict scholarship.

The primary criterion for the selection of ideas to be incorporated into the curriculum appears to have been teachability. The original courses had a goal of training competent conflict resolution practitioners, specifically mediators, and while the vision of who was expected to enrol in, and benefit from, the Certificate in Conflict Resolution had broadened substantially even by 1986, that original focus on mediator training endured as an emphasis on skills-based, practical, pragmatic approaches.

Curriculum development in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution 1983 and 1993 can best be described as an accretion process. New course content was added to the Certificate without a thorough examination of the fit with the theoretical foundations of the existing curriculum. This layering of potentially and sometimes actually contradictory theoretical perspectives is a significant feature of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution curriculum overall.

By the early 1990s a JIBC conflict resolution discourse had coalesced. At its most simplistic level, this JIBC conflict resolution model held that conflict had a bad reputation as negative and destructive and that, while conflict could indeed be these things, a skilled conflict resolver could make conflict useful, productive, even positive. A skilled person understood the physiological basis of anger, effectively managed his/her own anger and successfully defused the anger of others. A skilled person was an excellent listener, using open questions, paraphrasing, empathic response, reframing, and summarizing to elicit and understand the issues and interests of the other, and an assertive speaker to communicate his/her own needs in the conflict situation. Conflict could likely be resolved by making a commitment to the goal of win-win and then following a four stage model which consisted of setting a positive and collaborative tone, identifying the issues to be resolved, identifying the interests underlying those issues, and brainstorming possible win-win solutions. If this approach to direct resolution by the parties involved did not work in a particular situation, it would probably help to call in a neutral third-party, a mediator.

This discourse represents the main ideas that were taken up into the Certificate curriculum out of the many competing theoretical perspectives on conflict and its resolution. They came primarily from psychological and communication scholarship, and emphasized resolution approaches that were almost exclusively individual and interpersonal. Material was adapted and framed without attribution, and modified by the “common sense” understandings of trainers. This JIBC conflict resolution discourse has remained relatively intact, embedding particular boundaries and limitations. Nonetheless, it made important contributions to the teaching of conflict resolution in Canada.

Creating curriculum

One assumption that I held when I started this research was that the early course developers and trainers would be able to identify specific published sources they had used in developing the Certificate in Conflict Resolution curriculum. The people who were there at the time did not, however, remember specific sources. “I don't remember drawing on anybody but each other. Honestly, I don't” (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007).

There was no intention to present the knowledge base of an existing academic discipline in the Certificate; neither was there an overall systematic curricular design process. Marje Burdine was the first and primary manual writer, “sitting in her office clacking away on her old IBM Selectric typewriter” (N. McPhee, personal interview, February 8, 2007). She wrote the first mediation course manual in 1983 as a stand-alone course to train volunteer mediators and the other courses were developed to extend and supplement the original mediation content in response to high enrolment and student demand.

Early trainers remember the collegial, collective and practice-based atmosphere of course and program development.

There was Marje leading the way with this grand idea of a program and there was all of us contributing our ideas to what that program would look like and what courses we could specialize in and what we thought people needed and how that would all work together. (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

The collegial nature of early development contributed to the difficulties in retrospectively pinning down where ideas originated. “It would be so impossible, I think, to give individual credit because we were doing it all so much together” (M. Fogel, personal

interview, January 25, 2007). Giving credit, at least in the generally accepted academic sense of citing sources, was not a prominent feature of course material creation: “I don't think we were worried about crediting too much back then” (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007). Indeed, this appears to be true, alas for the researcher.

Obviously we didn't pay much attention to copyright, did we? It troubled me later to see some of Lee's [Rengert] material not credited to him, but when I think about it, I realize that some of his material he stole from other people and didn't credit them. So it's just kind of like we weren't too careful about that. (D. Trimble, personal interview, February 16, 2007)

New ideas and new materials were welcomed, regardless of their original sources. A number of early instructors brought with them areas of expertise and often specific teaching materials already in use. In the early 1980s Joan Balmer, for example, was teaching negotiations and other management and supervision related courses in Community Programs at the JIBC as a consultant with a company called Ryane Consulting. She thinks that considerable amounts of Ryane materials, particularly negotiation material, “probably filtered in”.

A lot of material came out of Ryane, like intent-action-effect. We were doing that in our leadership courses all the time. I did a workshop with Marje once with the SPCA—the animal shelter group. I used the intent-action-effect concept at that point, and she picked that up and it was in the program. I don't think I even knew very much about where it came from. (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007).

Comment: I have often wondered if the intent-action-effect model came from Chris Argyris' work with meaning making and the ladder of inference. It is similar theory. (Nancy McPhee, personal communication, December 12, 2009)

Trainers' pre-JIBC professional backgrounds also played a role in shaping the curriculum. Stacey Holloway thinks that awareness of the principled negotiation content may have come into the Certificate curriculum via Michael Fogel “because he was a

lawyer and a judge and had come out of California, he had some understandings around ADR and dispute resolution that the rest of us didn't have” (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007). Similarly, Stacey Holloway’s own background influenced her curriculum contributions. Her 1980s Douglas College psychiatric nursing program colleague Dale Zaiser remembers that he and Stacey brought some of the more advanced communication skills content.

I'd come from teaching adult psych as well as interpersonal communication. Based on this background, Marje had me write the original Critical Skills manual drawing on some of the work of ... Gazda and Egan. We brought a lot of that stuff because we were teaching communication skills.... I know after we were teaching at Douglas we brought that ... Gazda's view of empathy, confrontation and respect (Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, and Level 4). (D. Zaiser, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

There is documentary evidence supporting Dale Zaiser’s memory. An undated Centre for Conflict Resolution archived folder containing handout materials labelled “Critical Skills, Dale Zaiser Hand-outs” includes a sheet on *Responding to feelings* credited to Gerald Egan, Exercises in Helping Skills, 1975, which appeared unchanged, and still credited to Egan, as page 20 in the 1992 *Critical Skills for Communicating in Conflict* manual. *Responding to feelings* remained in all subsequent *Critical Skills* manual editions, although the credit disappeared.

The collegial and creative atmosphere of course and program development remains vivid in the memories of the people who taught in the program in the 1980s. All the trainers were actively involved in developing teaching materials to supplement the course manuals.

Curriculum to some degree was developed by virtue of each of us creating our own agendas and making our own decisions about what other pieces

we were going to include in the agenda. We often shared those with each other ... That's often how the courses got changed and developed and redeveloped. (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007)

Each succeeding manual version incorporated some of the supplementary materials that had been developed by individual trainers. The parts of manuals and the supplementary handouts that were most widely adopted by all or most trainers became, over time, the consensus content of the curriculum.

The JIBC library was also a source of material. "In the library we used to take a page from whatever related to upgrade something. Most of it was related, not direct" (D. Zaiser, personal interview, February 1, 2007). One widely-used source of course material in the JIBC library was the publications of University Associates from the 70s and 80s (Pfeiffer, 1984–2003; Pfeiffer & Ballew, 1988a, 1988b; Pfeiffer & Goodstein, 1982–1983; Pfeiffer & Jones, 1969; Pfeiffer & Jones, 1972–1981).⁴ University Associates publications went through several name changes but in all incarnations an annual handbook was published consisting of short articles, descriptions of experiential exercises, and actual handout materials written by a variety of organizational development practitioners. The University Associates materials were designed for use in training settings and therefore needed no translation or even re-typing. They were eminently accessible, both in the sense of available in the JIBC Library at no cost, and in the sense of already being written with a goal of making potentially complex content understandable to learners. Subscribers to the Handbook(s) were allowed, indeed

⁴ University Associates is an educational organization engaged in international publishing and consulting in human relations training, research and education. (A handbook of structured experiences for human relations training, vol. 1. Pfeiffer, J.W. & Jones, J. 1969, Back cover)

encouraged, to make use of the contents in their work as long as credit was given: “The materials that appear in this book ... may be freely reproduced for education/training activities. There is no requirement to obtain special permission for such uses” (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1978, inside front cover).

Many of the early handout files of Centre for Conflict Resolution trainers contain photocopies of articles, role-plays and exercises from the University Associates handbooks. Some, no longer credited to University Associates, such as the Old Woman/Young Woman drawing (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1978, p. 40) illustrating how different people see different images in the same picture became standard hand-outs in courses for the next 20 years, while others, both adapted role-plays and adapted articles, made their way into course manuals.

Another increasingly important source of course content was the trainers’ emerging mediation practices. Role-play scenarios in particular were developed from trainers’ actual mediation cases. “We started creating role-plays based on our own experiences ... I always changed some of the facts and circumstances. But they were based on real mediations” (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007). Articulating an overall Certificate in Conflict Resolution focus on personal experience rather than texts as the source of knowing, Marg Huber saw her students in the conflict resolution courses and her mediation clients as the source of more than just role-play ideas. “In those early days ... there was very, very little theory ... our casework was our teacher, our participants were our teachers” (personal interview, April 26, 2007). To a considerable extent, early trainers were unaware of the bodies of conflict, conflict resolution, negotiation and mediation theory that were in existence and that formed the

theoretical roots of the material they were teaching. They tended to believe that theory was both non-existent and not useful, and were, therefore, not consciously aware that the choices they were making in including or eliminating particular content from the curriculum were theoretical choices.

The curriculum of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution developed not from a curriculum plan based on disciplinary knowledge but from a process of accretion, the development and re-development of courses. Material used in classes came from articles and exercises designed for training settings that were easily accessible, from the knowledge and materials that different trainers brought from their previous teaching or other professional work, and from trainer learnings from their developing mediation practices, synthesized into what they individually saw as most important to teach and what “worked” in the classroom.

The remainder of this chapter will look at the theoretical roots of the content in particular courses, in the order in which the courses were first developed, and bring into visibility the choices made in taking up certain theoretical paths and not others. First, the mediation course content is examined, then the anger course developed originally by Lee Rengert, tracing that content back to its sources in the discipline of psychology. Next, the negotiation course content and the influence of the Fisher and Ury (1981) popularization of a “principled negotiation” approach are discussed. Finally, the content of the JIBC 1991 conflict resolution course manual is explored as an example of the emergent JIBC conflict resolution model, and its contributions and limitations are assessed.

Mediation Content

While Marje Burdine wrote the first mediation course manual in 1983, the earliest version I could find is dated 1987 and titled *Mediation Skills Manual: How to Mediate a Dispute*. The title is important. Burdine is not attempting to write about mediation, but rather to write about “How to mediate”. “The manual is designed to accompany a skills-based training course. It provides a practical model and integrates concepts, theories, skills and techniques to assist in applying the model to a wide range of disputes” (Burdine, 1987, p. 1). As well as a “how-to” focus, Burdine proposed that her manual would teach a process that could be used across a “wide range of disputes.” It is a generic mediation model, not limited to any one field of application.

Because of her location in the JIBC Marje Burdine knew of the family mediation training being offered through the JIBC Corrections Academy.

I thought, “Well, that's an interesting course that we already have going. It's just its focus is so primarily family, and it's only available to Corrections.” So I started reading about it and learning more about what was happening in the States ... I found a course being offered by Dr. Sheila Kessler, who was one of the main names in training in the States, and she was coming to Seattle to put on a 2½-day training program. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

She attended Kessler’s Seattle mediation training and then “put a rough course together based on what I learned” (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007).

Not only was Marje Burdine’s initial mediation training directly with Sheila Kessler, but her other source of mediation training knowledge, the JIBC Family Court Counsellor mediation training, was also based on Kessler’s work.

Mary Murray was one of the people the JI sent to Atlanta, Georgia to learn from Sheila Kessler ... so the model that she designed was based ... pretty much directly on Sheila Kessler’s work. And then ... we all took training

from whoever we could and it evolved from that point. But ... Sheila Kessler was the original model that was used. (W. Hacking, personal interview, April 16, 2007)

Kessler is therefore doubly the source for the 1983 JIBC public registration mediation course content. She came to her practice as a mediation trainer from a background as a therapist, specifically a divorce counsellor. She was one of the creators of a “body of theory that addressed the emotional-psychological aspects of divorce” (Folberg et al, 2004, p. 5) that emerged in response to the adoption of no-fault divorce provisions in the United States and the increase in divorce rates in the 1970s. By 1978, Kessler was describing herself as a marital and divorce mediator at Georgia State University (Kessler, 1978).

Kessler’s approach to mediation, as laid out in *Creative Conflict Resolution: Mediation* (1978), is a primary source of the ideas underlying the earliest JIBC mediation curriculum. In this publication, she defines mediation as “disputing persons call in a neutral 3rd party to facilitate the process. The disputants make their own decisions” (p. 9) and presents a four-stage mediation model: Setting the Stage, Defining the Issues, Processing the Issues, Resolving the Issues. She clearly situates her mediation training within the conflict resolution movement context, arguing for the removal of disputes from the courts and the creation of lower-cost, less formal and more effective resolution methods. “We need to get simple conflicts out of the hands of well paid professionals and return them to the people.... Anyone can participate in mediation or be a mediator” (Kessler, 1978. p. 4).

Kessler uses social psychologist Morton Deutsch's (1973) ideas about co-operative and competitive approaches to conflict as her theoretical base. The mediation process is structured as a co-operative process.

A co-operative process involves open and honest communication. Each person is interested in informing and being informed ... any positive bonds are reinforced by statements detailing, "This is what we have in common". Thus the scope of the tension is limited rather than expanded ... by alluding to the overall positive framework.... Co-operative sees the problem as mutual—two individuals working jointly on an acceptable solution. Mutual respect is reinforced by eliminating blame as part of the process. (Kessler, 1978, pp. 3-4)

Kessler sees the role of the mediator as creating Deutsch's co-operative climate by ensuring full communication between the disputing parties, emphasizing common ground, preventing blame, and facilitating an atmosphere of mutual problem-solving. This Kessler approach, based on Deutsch's theoretical perspectives operationalized in a four-stage mediation process model, was taken up by Marje Burdine, and subsequently taught to thousands of students through the JIBC Centre for Conflict Resolution Training courses: "The Kessler model just was so simplistic and common sense and so easy to understand and follow. So that's what I based my program on" (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007).

Burdine's mediation model retains Kessler's four stages, renamed as Introduction, Generating the Agenda, Exploring the Issues and Agreeing on the Resolution. Both Kessler and Burdine stress the use of "rules" (Kessler, 1978, p. 20) or "guidelines" (Burdine, 1987, p. 17) to govern the process of the mediation, and even more specifically, to structure how communication will take place. Kessler proposes seven rules:

1. I agree to share all the information pertinent to the issue.

2. I agree to put my anger aside and deal with the issues in a fair manner.
3. I agree not to use outside audiences to sway the other person.
4. I agree to abide by the final agreement made.
5. I agree to not use the information gained in the mediation against the other person.
6. I agree that what happens in mediation is fully confidential.
7. I agree to the use of a tape recorder within the mediation so that we may recheck the information and facts at a later date. (Kessler, 1978, p. 59)

Burdine (1987) proposes eight. The language is slightly more formal, no tape recording is mentioned and the limit to the mediator's confidentiality is spelled out.

1. All pertinent information will be shared.
2. The parties will refrain from interrupting, blaming or name-calling.
3. All communication will be kept confidential, except in the case of child abuse, which must be reported by law.
4. The parties will be encouraged to address each other (rather than the mediators) as much as possible. Direct communication increases understanding.
5. Anyone can stop the mediation if they feel it is not productive, including the mediator.
6. A separate meeting with either party and the mediator may be called at any time that it would assist the process.

7. The parties will abide by any agreement, which they form through mediation.
8. Other (in consensus with the mediator and the parties)

Having mediation clients agree to the guidelines was a critical, and usually initial, mediator task.

In line with their practitioner preparation goals, both Burdine and Kessler give detailed 'how-to-mediate' instructions. Burdine (1987) suggests ways of "avoiding pitfalls or unproductive discussion" (p. 24) including "respect the agenda, avoid past storytelling or fault-finding, move from the general to the specific, ask for behaviours to describe abstract concepts" (p. 24) that echo Kessler's (1978) advice to "go from the general to the specific, define the conflict in the minutest behaviour possible" (p. 33). Like Kessler, Burdine presents a short overview of the mediation model, presents each stage in detail, including the "goals" (Kessler, 1978) or "key concepts" (Burdine, 1987), and then specific techniques useful or necessary in each stage. Like Kessler, Burdine includes a listing of mediator organizations and a bibliography.

Building empathy through communication is central in Kessler's mediation approach and in fact Kessler describes mediation as "putting a framework around an assertive exchange" (1978, p. 4). Kessler directs mediators to ask disputants to express their needs related to the conflict situation but frames this as part of encouraging empathy through effective communication. She uses a definition of needs taken from transactional analysis (p. 50): "Empathy towards the person's needs will also increase the creative alternatives open for resolution.... Transactional analysis systematizes some of these needs in the ego states: parent, adult and child" (p. 50). By 1987, however, Burdine is

using both the term “needs” and the terms “position,” “issue,” “interest” as popularized in a negotiation context by Fisher and Ury (1981). She describes the mediator’s role in uncovering what lies underneath the opening statements of the mediation clients.

The parties may not even be aware of what is beneath their own positions.... There are a variety of techniques, which the mediator uses to explore the interest beneath the positions. Interests are simply the parties’ needs, wants, fears and concerns. Once these are clear and understood, the pathway to a resolution is much more apparent. (Burdine, 1987, p. 27)

While I was not able to find a copy of the 1983 mediation manual written by Marje Burdine, she and others agree that the “interests” language was not present in that earliest version. “Marje included in her first manual, I think, in stage three, the questions of what’s important to you and what concerns you about that. And she didn’t refer to the answers as interests” (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007). By 1987, however, the answers to the “what’s important and why” questions recommended for Stage Three of the mediation process are referred to as “interests.”

Other influences on the 1987 mediation manual included two newly published books on mediation, Folberg and Taylor’s (1984) *Mediation: A Comprehensive Guide to Resolving Conflicts without Litigation* and Christopher Moore’s (1986) *The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict*. Both were included in the 1987 JIBC mediation manual bibliography and both were part of the JIBC library at that time.

Moore (1986) presents a “Continuum of Conflict Management and Resolution Approaches” (p. 5) arranged from less to more “increased coercion and likelihood of win-lose outcome” (p. 5) starting with conflict avoidance, progressing through informal discussion and problem-solving, negotiation, mediation, administrative decision, arbitration, judicial decision, legislative decision, non-violent direct action and violence.

A “dispute resolution continuum” (p. 4) appears in Burdine’s 1987 mediation manual, but includes only negotiation, mediation, conciliation and arbitration. The wording is also slightly neutralized. “As the Parties move along this continuum from Negotiation to Arbitration, they increasingly relinquish the amount of control they have over the outcome of the dispute” (p. 4). This dispute resolution continuum became one of the analytical frames taught consistently in Certificate courses from 1987 up to the present although it was never, in any manual edition, credited to Moore.

Moore (1986) also proposes a twelve-stage mediation model and it appears that some of his stages have been incorporated as steps under Burdine’s (1987) four stages. For example, Moore (1986) lists the final four stages of mediation as “aid the parties in developing settlement options, assist in assessing the options, promote final bargaining, aid in developing an implementation and monitoring plan” (p. 25). Under Stage Four: Agreeing on a Resolution, Burdine (1987) lists “clarify the goal for problem-solving, determine criteria for fair agreement, generate options, explore implications, detail steps for implementation, check for feasibility, write the memorandum of agreement, determine basis and plan for evaluation” (p. 8).

Folberg and Taylor’s (1984) contributions to the 1987 mediation manual are more speculative. In a chapter called “Methods for Enhancing Communication,” they provide examples of specific statements that the mediator could use to begin the mediation session as well as examples, through written dialogues, of acknowledgement, reflection, explanatory statements and various types of questions along with a strong recommendation for the use of open questions by the mediator to elicit information. Burdine (1987) devotes six pages out of 79 to questioning and also uses dialogue

examples extensively. Folberg and Taylor (1984) are also concerned with “Ethical, Legal and Professional Issues” for mediators (p. 244) and this may have influenced the inclusion in Burdine’s (1987) manual of a section on “Ethical and Legal Issues” (p. 56). Folberg and Taylor distinguish between “Mediation Guidelines “(p. 341) covering process rules and an “Employment Contract” (p. 339) covering mediator payment, session scheduling and clauses aimed at eliminating mediator liability, “we agree to hold the mediator harmless against errors, omissions, or future negative consequences,” and ensuring that the mediator is not called on to testify in any subsequent court proceedings (p. 339). Burdine (1987) likewise offers an “Agreement to Mediate” (p. 16) containing similar clauses.

As well as the content from these sources that became incorporated into the mediation course manual, it is instructive to look at what did not get picked up. Kessler (1978), Folberg and Taylor (1984) and Moore (1986) all provided either a brief or expansive history of mediation and attempts, minimal to substantial, to explain why mediation worked based on theoretical frameworks. Folberg and Taylor (1984) and Moore (1986) wrote books and had the luxury of extended length. Nevertheless, what I would describe as a lack of historical and theoretical context surrounding the presentation of the JIBC mediation model was not merely a matter of length restrictions but represented a particular focus on accessibility and usability.

I think the other thing that's really important, and I think also in Fisher and Ury's work, is just the simplicity of it, the ease in understanding it. They don't have a lot of jargon and neither did Kessler.... I think that's so refreshing to be able to use common every day language and capture such concepts and skills. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

Marje Burdine deliberately and consciously wrote the early mediation manuals using “common everyday language,” emphasizing what was necessary to learn in order to be able to mediate and de-emphasizing less hands-on, more theoretical content. Her goal was clarity and usability for beginning mediators; a straightforward mediation model offered that clarity. Michael Fogel remembers how a structured and linear mediation model provided both security and comfort for beginning mediators, and beginning mediation trainers.

They were teaching very directly to the four-stage model ... very stage-oriented, very “this needs to happen in this stage and this needs to happen in that stage”.... And at the time that made sense given that we didn’t really have a lot of experiential foundation as a community let alone individually ... we all felt, in the early days, much more secure with the structure and presenting it pretty much in a model-oriented way. (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007)

While mediation was taught in a very structured and model-oriented way and usability was prioritized over theoretical or contextual understandings, the mediation approach taught at the JIBC was nonetheless based on theoretical frameworks. By 1987 two different theoretical framings for mediation were embedded in the manual: mediation as assisted communication and mediation as assisted negotiation. One frame used by Kessler and, I believe, Burdine, was based on Deutsch’s (1973) ideas about the primacy of shifting perception, communication and emotion in conflict from a competitive to a co-operative orientation. According to Kessler (1978), solutions flowed from the creation of “empathy” (p. 50) and the “assertive exchange” (p. 4) between the parties, from their mutual understandings, their changes in perception and emotion, gained from listening and speaking. LeBaron (2002) describes this communication approach. “It [conflict] arises from poor communication, often exacerbated by poorly designed systems and

unequal power. Third parties were trained to employ a range of communication strategies such as active listening, using tools like re-stating and re-framing in a staged process framework that is designed to manage and moderate emotional intensity”. (p. 8). This framing saw mediation as assisted communication.

The second theoretical framing saw mediation as assisted negotiation and was based in the principled negotiation approaches of Fisher and Ury (1981). The negotiation framing, as described by LeBaron (2002), saw “the integrative potential of ‘win-win’ solutions:

Conflict was seen to arise from competition over resources and differences over material things. To address it we devised analytical frameworks, problem-solving approaches and logical, staged processes. Success meant getting to ‘yes’ about the material matters at issue. (pp. 7-8)

One fundamental difference between the communication and the negotiation framings is over the nature of conflict. In the communication framing, conflict is defined based on subjectivity and perception. In the negotiation framing, conflict is understood as objective and material issues requiring negotiation. In both framings, the discussion of “what’s important and why” (Burdine, 1987) or “interests” (Fisher and Ury, 1981) was part of the mediation process. For Marje Burdine adding the interest language to the original Kessler(1978) mediation approaches was a clarification rather a contrast.

I think Fisher and Ury had such a huge impact because they gave very distinct terms to concepts that before were in the material but not necessarily identified.... I think we were looking more at what's important to you, and why is that important? And those two questions get at interests. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

Burdine incorporated the interest language into a pre-existing communication framework in the 1987 mediation manual. Awareness of each other's subjective reality formed the wellspring for solutions.

Stage Three: Exploring the Issues.... This is where the real work occurs. Through responding to the mediator's exploring and probing questions, the parties gain more clarity about the issues in dispute. The mediator focuses on what the parties find to be most important to each of them, what they each need, want, fear, assume, expect or have concerns about. Once the parties are more aware of their own and each other's perceptions and needs, problem solving and the generating of options evolves as the next step. (Burdine, 1987, p. 10)

Burdine's wording did not replace the communication framework with a negotiation framework but allowed a mediator working from a communication framing to incorporate the interests of the disputing parties as another, and powerful, arena for communicating. In Burdine's writing, interests were broadly defined, synonymous with perceptions, assumptions, fears, expectation, wants and needs. Solutions flowed out of understanding. However, Burdine's wording also allowed mediators working from a negotiation framing to see the promotion of effective communication between the parties as one element of a successful negotiation process.

There is both a theoretical and an applied difference between the two positions: one, seeing that the role of the mediator is to assist mutual communication about perceptions and needs out of which solutions may evolve or, two, seeing that the role of the mediator is to facilitate the coming to agreement on concrete negotiable issues and that this outcome is assisted by full and effective communication.

Whether mediation is primarily a communication or a negotiation process is a question that was not resolved in the 1987 JIBC mediation manual and has, in fact,

continued to surface in various faculty disagreements about course content and course focus since. The addition of the concepts of principled negotiation to the original mediation communication framing is one example of the accretion process of curriculum change. It is also an example of how layering in new ideas with the praiseworthy goal of aiding clarity and promoting usefulness, without thoroughly examining how the new ideas mesh with the existing content, may instead unwittingly create conceptual confusion.

Anger Content

The content of all subsequent conflict resolution and anger courses in the JIBC Certificate in Conflict Resolution were shaped by the developer and teacher of the original courses, Lee Rengert. Much of the psychologically-based content that distinguished the Certificate in Conflict Resolution curriculum from other contemporary negotiation and mediation training providers came from Rengert. “It's kind of a seed of a lot of stuff that's done now, if you think about it, right? Expectations, listening, assertion, limits, problem solving” (D. Trimble, personal interview, January 29, 2007).

While Rengert's content was drawn primarily from a research-based psychology perspective, it is important to note that it came to the JIBC classrooms not from its academic origins but from the “steady stream of ... psychological self-help books” (Schur, 1976, p. 2) that characterized the human potential/awareness/personal growth movement of the 1970s. The psychological self-help literature was extensive and accessible, presenting complex ideas in somewhat simplistic and, therefore, easier-to-teach framings.

Rengert appeared for the first time in the Extension Program schedule as a speaker at a 1985 Provincial Forum on Mediation and is described as being from the Faculty of Education, University of LaVerne, California (JIBC, 1985b, p. 3). He returned almost immediately, and taught a course called *Skill Building in Anger Management and Conflict Resolution with Youth*.

This workshop will present interpersonal skills and strategies for constructively managing angry feelings and behaviour, as well as interpersonal conflict for those involved with youth. Participants will have the opportunity to assess and develop their understanding and skills level through discussion, demonstration and practice. (JIBC, 1985c, p. 2)

By September 1985, a Level Two *Anger Management with Youth* course had been added: “This workshop will allow participants an opportunity to practice and develop the anger management skills and strategies identified in the Level One course. Particular attention will be given to individual training needs and skill development” (JIBC, 1985d, p. 2).

When the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was announced in January 1986, Lee Rengert and Marje Burdine were co-teaching a course called *Conflict Resolution: Dynamics, Styles and Applications* (JIBC, 1986b) and, from April-June, 1986, Lee Rengert was teaching another new course, *Dealing with Anger, Hostility and Resistance in Conflict Situations*:

This course presents theory, techniques and approaches for effectively managing angry feelings and behavior, hostility and resistance encountered in conflict situations. Participants will build skills in specific intervention strategies while developing an integrated approach to anger management. Particular emphasis will be on practical techniques and skills for assertively confronting, defusing, and disengaging in angry conflict situations and for moving through anger to constructive problem-solving. Skill practice will include video feedback. (JIBC, 1986b, p. 4)

By 1987, both the conflict resolution and the anger courses were being taught by other instructors. I was not able to find Lee Rengert during my research process. Instead, I relied on the memories of people who worked with him in the mid-1980s and on two manuals: the original manual from his *Skill Building in Anger Management and Conflict Resolution with Youth* course (Rengert, 1986) and *Dealing with Anger, Hostility and Resistance in Conflict Situations* (Rengert, 1987).

Rengert's overall conceptual framework was that managing anger and conflict was a "holistic" process involving "mind, body, behavior" (1987, p. 26) and he stressed the environmental factors affecting anger and aggression. His students filled out a questionnaire called "The Non-assaultive Environment: Self-Inventory" (copyright Lee Rengert, 1983) which gave a score on awareness, assertion, limits, expectations, human contact and self-awareness. Qualities of assaultive environments were powerlessness, confusion and isolation; qualities of non-assaultive environments were empowerment, clarity and coalition (1987, p. 24).

The content for Rengert's body-related course goal of managing physiological stress featured "The Arousal Cycle" (Rengert, 1987, p. 27) and this content became a foundational theory piece in JIBC courses over the subsequent 20 years. The Arousal Cycle is a graph with "heart rate" on one axis and "quality of judgement" on the other. It offers an explanation of anger as a neurophysiological phenomenon affecting thinking and behaviour. The five phases of the Arousal Cycle are the Trigger, "an event that triggers the rest of the arousal cycle." Triggers can be external or internal, "created through memory, perception, or your stress level" (p. 24). Next is Escalation where "the body's arousal system prepares for a crisis" by "pumping adrenaline into the blood

stream.” If nothing occurs to interrupt the arousal cycle, the “Crisis” occurs: “The body has maximized its preparation and a physiological command is issued, Take Action!’ Unfortunately our quality of judgement has been significantly reduced at this point and decisions are not made with our best reasoning ability” (p. 28). Next is the Recovery phase where “the body begins to recover from the extreme stress and expenditure of energy.... Quality of reasoning begins to replace the survival response” (p. 28). Finally, in the Post-Crisis Depression,

The body enters a short period in which heart rate slips below normal ... awareness and energy return to the forebrain to allow the person to assess what has just occurred. This assessment often leads to feelings of guilt, regret and emotional depression. (p. 28)

The Arousal Cycle has no citation or attribution in either the 1986 or 1987 manual but in the Dealing with Anger manual (1991) edited by Stacey Holloway it is attributed to Paul Smith.

He [Lee Rengert] was the one who brought the arousal cycle ... although it was the work of a fellow by the name of Paul Smith who actually first came up with that model. It was a management of assaultive behaviour model out of the States. I remember reading it in a journal somewhere, and then I could never source it. I could never find it again. (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

Joan Balmer remembers Rengert describing the California research that underlay the Arousal Cycle graph.

What he told us ... was that in order to research anger responses, people were hooked up to biofeedback apparatus to track what was going on physiologically with their anger. Humans have a parasympathetic and a sympathetic system and they can't both be operating at once, or perhaps a better way of saying that is the physiological strongly impacts the cognitive capacities, in fact governs it. (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

The notion that there was a clear link between stress and anger and that the physiological arousal of either stress or anger could, and should, be “self-managed” using a “relaxation response” (Rengert, 1987, p. 10) appears to have evolved from the original biomedical concept of stress popularized by Hans Selye’s in the 1970s (Lazarus, 1993; Jacobs, 2001, Viner, 1999). This neurophysiological understanding of anger, and consequent physiological self-management strategies, formed a basic theoretical and applied component of Rengert’s courses and, indeed, of all future JIBC anger courses as well.

Rengert’s third course goal, “use cognitive processes to support effective problem-solving behaviour” (1986, p. 4) formed the “mind” section of the anger management body, mind, behaviour trinity and, judging from the amount of content in his manuals, was emphasized in his teaching. He presents Differentiating Thoughts, Feelings and Behaviors (1987, p. 29), Styles of Distorted Thinking (p. 15), and Six Emotionally Destructive Attitudes (p. 14). Attribution Theory and Anger (p. 30) discusses how expectations shape perception and behaviour. Managing Expectations (p. 22) recommends “self-parenting” as a strategy for “when we begin to think in ways that undermine our effectiveness” (p. 22). Lessons for Personal Transformation (p. 16) was adapted from a 1979 book called *Love is Letting Go of Fear* by Gerald Jampolsky and is a list of affirmations, positive statements intended to be repeated to oneself. A brief excerpt will convey the flavour.

My belief system influences my feelings. I can choose to experience peace of mind instead of fear ... This instant is the only time there is. I am determined to live today without past or future fantasies.... I am responsible for what I see. If you do not feel free, it is because you have not yet declared your own freedom. You are waiting for it to be given to you. You will wait forever. (Rengert, 1987, p. 16)

All of these concepts—differentiating thoughts, feelings and behaviours, distorted thinking, destructive attitudes, managing expectations, affirmations—originate in a school of psychology called cognitive-behaviourism, albeit, certainly in the case of Jampolsky, as interpreted through a humanist psychological filter, what Joan Balmer calls “California”:

His material was really straight out of California ... Lessons for Personal Transformation ... they were really working down there on honouring self and this instant is the only time there is. California at that time was doing some very leading edge work on self-awareness, both cognitively and emotionally and combining that with meditation and spiritual understanding. (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

Cognitive-behavioural therapy was an attempt to incorporate an acknowledgement that cognition existed and influenced behaviour into the pure behaviourism dominant in North American psychology in the mid-twentieth century, described by Meichenbaum (1975) as “a ‘shaky’ marriage between the technology of behavior therapy and the clinical concerns of semantic therapists” (p. 363).

Albert Ellis was the first of the semantic therapists, publishing his rational-emotive therapeutic approach in 1962. Rengert recommends Ellis’s *Anger: How to live with — and without — it* (1977) in his resources list, but by 1986 Rengert could draw on many different therapeutic approaches to changing behaviour through changing thoughts that had evolved from Ellis’s starting point. Two approaches in particular seem to form much of Rengert’s curriculum. The first is systematic rational restructuring, “procedures whereby an individual may be taught to reduce maladaptive emotional responses by learning to label situations more accurately. Simply put, the approach involves teaching people how to ‘think straight’” (Goldfried & Goldfried, 1975, p. 89). The use of

systematic rational restructuring had become widespread in therapeutic circles by the time Lee Rengert was teaching anger management at the JIBC in the mid-1980s: “We used to use cognitive restructuring as part of our eclectic approach as therapists in a prison program dealing with violent male offenders ... I was involved in leading the section of the treatment program based on ‘thinking errors’ made by sexual offenders. All of that was an adaptation of rational emotive therapy. It was Ellis' work” (D. Zaiser, personal interview, February 1, 2007).

Rengert uses the term self-talk to refer to the process of replacing “maladaptive” thoughts with “productive” ones in his 1986 manual and credits Raymond Novaco for the material on self-talk and anger (pp. 11-12): “Over-reacting, under-reacting and coping self-talk may influence your feelings and behavior at 3 stages of a conflict or an angry experience. It is most effective if you can develop some coping self-statements for each stage” (Rengert, 1987, p. 12). While all of Rengert’s many “mind” approaches to managing anger arose from a cognitive-behavioral psychological and therapeutic starting point, self-talk is one of two approaches that Rengert’s early faculty colleagues remember best.

He was big on building the skill of managing one's self talk. That's where that came from ... He would have us standing with two other people, whispering in our ear, and one could be, "Oh, this is awful; I can't handle this," and then the other voice might be the aggressive voice of "just put him in his place, make him suffer the way I'm suffering" ... and we were to practise managing these self talk voices and replacing them with more encouraging thoughts. (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007).

The self-talk content from Rengert’s 1986 manual remains, almost unchanged and uncredited to either Rengert or Novaco, in all later anger course manuals.

The second “mind” approach introduced by Rengert that remained highly influential in the certificate curriculum was reframing. “He brought in reframing too, as a concept.... Reframing. Bandler and Grinder ... they ended up doing reframing in NLP ” (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007). Rengert (1987) defines reframing as “a re-wording technique to emphasize a positive goal, emphasize common ground, eliminate accusations of blaming, identify the underlying need and expand to a fuller meaning” (p. 21). Reframing is also a cognitive restructuring technique. I was not able to find its origin, but it was popularized by Richard Bandler and John Grinder (1981), the founders of Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP). While reframing is presented by Rengert in 1987 in the same section of the manual that deals with other cognitive re-structuring techniques, in later Centre for Conflict Resolution Training manuals it is considered a communication skill.

Rengert’s fourth and last course goal for the learners in his 1986 *Anger Management for Youth* course, “increased skill in behaviours which facilitate effective conflict resolution and problem-solving” (p. 4), offered content on communication skills and a “win-win problem-solving process” (1987, p. 4). While the focus of the “body” and the “mind” content of the anger curriculum dealt with managing one’s own anger, the behaviour elements focused on responding to another person’s anger and win-win problem-solving.

Comment: The behavioural elements focused on expressing anger appropriately as well as responding to the other person’s anger so that understanding could develop, rather than defensiveness take over. Thus anger could be worked with in such a way as to support win-win problem-solving, rather than to subvert it. (Joan Balmer, personal communication, February 2, 2009)

Assertion skills formed the main emphasis of the communication skills content. Assertiveness training, or assertion skills training, was another approach to behaviour change originating in a therapeutic psychological base. Assertiveness training originated with clinical psychologists in the late 1950s and early 1960s as a therapeutic technique to reduce levels of fear and anxiety that were interfering with a patient's functioning (Flowers, 1975). Two concepts—personal rights and the passive, assertive, aggressive continuum—were recommended as critical content for therapeutic intervention.

[A]ssertion should be clearly differentiated from aggression. Clients seem to understand this distinction if the behaviour is placed on a continuum

Passive-----Assertive-----Aggressive

in which assertion is the right to ask and the right to refuse, without involving the deliberate violation of another person's rights. Aggression ... does involve the violation of another's rights and often involves the use of a more imperative request, i.e. a demand.... Passive behaviour is the stance that one does not have the right to ask or refuse. (Flowers, 1975, p. 163)

Robert Alberti and Michael Emmons (1970) spread what was a therapeutic concept into the popular understanding through the publication of *Your perfect right: Assertiveness and equality in your life and relationships*. Assertiveness training workshops became very, very popular. Marketed as “the behaviour therapy that's sweeping the country—the most useful and successful technique ever developed to turn the tables on the everyday manipulators in your life” (Schur, 1976, p. 83) by 1975 “training in self-assertiveness was the latest [awareness] movement fad” (Schur, 1976, p. 82). Assertiveness was promoted as a way to get one's needs met in any setting—intimate relationships, social relationships, work and career interactions, consumer

transactions. From the bedroom to the board room, all that was needed to live a fulfilled life was assertion.

In the JIBC Certificate in Conflict Resolution, an elective course called *Asserting Yourself Under Pressure* was developed and offered first by Dale Trimble in 1986 (JIBC, 1986b, p. 3). It has been offered as an elective course taught by different instructors and under slightly different names in every term since. In the 1986 JIBC anger course manual, Lee Rengert applied assertiveness specifically to angry interactions. He outlined assertive communication for confronting, de-fusing, and disengaging (p. 16). These formed the primary “responding to anger skill sets” of all subsequent JIBC anger courses. In the 1987 manual the “assertive options—confronting, de-fusing and disengaging” (p. 7)—had been joined by “Guidelines for Assertive Expression” (p. 9) which introduced steps for communicating assertively attributed to Bower and Bower (1976). Sharon Bower and Gordon Bower were the authors of *Asserting Yourself: A Practical Guide for Personal Change* and material adapted by Rengert from that book consisted of “do’s and don’ts” for “describing, expressing and specifying.” This appears to be the first inclusion in the JIBC curriculum materials of what later came to be called the DESC script for asserting: Describe, Express, Specify, Consequences.

One page on active listening was included in Rengert’s communication content. Active listening originated in the work of the founder of the humanist school of psychology, Carl Rogers. Rogers (1902-1987) was originally trained in the psychoanalytic tradition but came, through his counselling practice, to an approach he called “non-directive counselling” (Hergenhahn, 2001). He later came to call his approach client-centred when he “realized that the therapist had to make an active

attempt to understand and accept a client's subjective reality" (Hergenhahn, 2001, p. 525). This active attempt consisted of "active listening skills that allowed the therapist to reflect content and emotion, thus helping the client reach change through self-exploration and understanding" (Benjamin, 2007, p. 173). Active listening as a "helping" process not reserved for professional therapists but accessible to anyone spread widely and became increasingly extended and codified:

The characteristics first described were termed accurate empathy, non-possessive warmth and genuineness.... Working with Rogers at the university of Wisconsin, Truax, Carkhuff and a host of others began to investigate ... certain conditions or dimensions offered by the therapist, when present at high levels, led to growth on the part of the client and, when absent or present only in low levels, led to deterioration of the client ... as the research progressed several new dimensions were discovered and scales for rating these dimensions were developed. (Gazda, Asbury, Balzer, Childers & Walters, 1984, p. 5)

Active listening skills were included in all Certificate in Conflict Resolution core course content and were featured in a specific elective, *Critical Skills for Communicating in Conflict*, first offered in 1989 (JIBC, 1989a, p. 5). In 1987, however, Rengert focuses on Active Listening as particularly useful in conflict situations (1987, p. 2). He offers a description of attending body language, featuring the SCOLER, a recipe for "communicating your interest to the other person" (1987, p. 3) by remembering to "Square your shoulders to the other person.... Concentrate fully on the person you are trying to understand ... Open your posture towards the other person ... Lean forward a bit ... Eye contact is important but tricky ... Relax" (1987, p. 3).

Rengert's final behavioural content piece, a five-step process for "win-win problem-solving" (1987, p. 4) served as the basic template for the future interpersonal conflict resolution model.

1. Encourage the other person to share their side of the conflict including both feelings and perceptions. Use Active Listening and Depersonalizing skills. Repeat back the major feelings and perceptions identified to be sure you heard correctly.
2. Ask the other person to now listen to your view of the conflict, then share your feelings and perceptions. Use Assertive Expression.
3. Encourage the other person to share their needs/ideas for a solution. Listen actively, restating their needs/demands.
4. Now share your needs/ideas for a solution keeping in mind that you want a mutual solution to the conflict, not a win-lose solution.
5. If a solution is not becoming apparent, suggest that you both try to think of some new alternative, which would allow both of you to feel good about the solution. (Rengert, 1987, p. 4)

According to Rengert, this problem-solving process came from George Bach as “a Fair Fight strategy” (1987, p. 4). Bach co-authored *The Intimate Enemy: How to Fight Fair in Love and Marriage* with Peter Wyden in 1970 and his idea of “creative fighting” became popular: Schur (1976) describes fighting fair as one of the self-help recommendations coming from the human potential movement, specifically as one example of the movement valorization of the expression of feelings.

By fighting creatively, we will give free rein to our own feelings and also get new and useful feedback about how the partner feels. According to Bach we should fight ‘by appointment only’.... The important thing in non-violent altercation is to fight constructively.... Constructive fighting is open and honest ... and relies heavily on mutual good will. (Schur, 1976, p. 114-115)

A possible source for Bach and Wyden (1970) appears to lie in the explicit teaching of problem-solving as a the cognitive-behavioural therapeutic option. Goldfried and Goldfried (1975) refer to “research and theory on problem-solving” (p. 107) dating back to 1950 and describe a specific five-stage problem-solving process taught to individuals

as an enhanced coping strategy. The first stage involves a general orientation that “helps one to recognize a problematic situation when it occurs ... and to avoid impulsivity.” Stage two “consists of defining the problem situation in concrete terms and examining the relevant issues involved” followed by “the generation of alternatives stage,” then “a time of actual decision making when he selects the optimal course of action from the various alternatives available” and finally the verification stage “when he assesses the effectiveness of the solution” (Goldfried & Goldfried, 1975, p. 107).

I was not able to trace the links between the therapeutic five stage problem-solving approach, Bach and Wyden’s (1970) fighting fair process, and Sheila Kessler’s (1978) four-stage mediation model. However, the degree to which the concepts overlap suggest that some linkage or at least some influence exists.

Lee Rengert made substantial content contribution to the curriculum of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution. Joan Balmer believes that Rengert’s influence “gave us a very solid foundation ... A lot of permission to really try and get people to look seriously at what they're doing in the context of conflict” (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007). Rengert brought a psychological, specifically a cognitive-behavioral orientation to the management of anger and conflict originating in the work of Albert Ellis and generally called cognitive restructuring. The particular cognitive re-structuring techniques of changing one’s self-talk and re-framing were the two that endured in the Certificate curriculum over time. Another constant element in subsequent JIBC courses was Rengert’s “arousal cycle graph explaining the physiological basis of anger. Rengert’s behavior content, communication and problem-solving skills and strategies, originated in humanist psychologist Carl Roger’s active listening, behaviour therapy’s assertion, and

Bach and Tyley's (1970) fair fighting. All of these approaches were available through easily accessible, popular writing aimed at a general readership.

Negotiation Content

The earliest Certificate in Conflict Resolution Negotiation course manual I examined is undated and shows no copyright attribution. It is titled *Negotiation Skills Level One* and is stapled which means that it was produced after the creation of the Certificate in January of 1986, when the two levels of negotiation courses were announced as core courses, and before 1987, when manuals started being copied on three-hole punch paper and inserted into binders. This manual (1986?) contains the Negotiation Process (Section I, pp. 1-7), Negotiation Techniques and Strategies (Section II, pp. 1-15), Skills (Section III, pp. 1-9), readings and an annotated bibliography (Section IV, pp. 1-6). A detailed agenda for a three-day course is included and lists three American Bar Association videos, a fishbowl role-play, and "negotiation rehearsal role-play with video" as course activities. There is also a photocopy of a *Fortune* magazine article, dated September 19, 1983, called How to be a Better Negotiator.

The negotiation model presented is a "process, adaptable to the needs and issues being negotiated" (I, p. 2). It consists of three sections;

I. Pre-conference preparation

II. Conference: A. Introductions and climate setting, B. Contracting, C. Opening Statements, D. Dialogue, E. Problem-solving, F. Agreement Formation

III. Post-conference: A. Implementation, B. Evaluation and adjustment. (I, pp. 3-4)

There is a worksheet for participants to write down the “substance needs” and the “process needs” for themselves and the other negotiator (Sec. I, p. 6) and a page on “defensive vs. supportive climates” (I, p. 7). This page says at the bottom “From *The Art of Negotiating*, Nierenberg” (I, p. 7).

The Conference section credits Fisher and Ury’s (1981) *Getting to Yes* for pages on principled negotiation (II, p. 2), and how to handle dirty tricks (II, p. 15). Negotiating power (II, p. 4) is attributed to a Fisher (1983) article in *American Behavioral Scientist*; methods of opening negotiations and lowering resistance to negotiating (II, pp. 13-14) to Christopher Moore. Three pages on time elements, handling tough questions, patience, active listening, limited authority, team negotiating and writing the agreement were attributed to *Negotiating Techniques: How to Work Toward a Constructive Agreement* written by Gruder in 1985 (II, pp. 8-10). The Skills section had unattributed material on communication pitfalls and active listening techniques, a summary of research findings on successful negotiator behaviours attributed to Neil Rackham and four pages on understanding hidden meanings and meta-talk attributed to Gerard Nierenberg.

By 1991, the JIBC Negotiation Manual had expanded from 40 pages to 103. The Justice Institute held copyright and Karen Haddigan, Marje Burdine and Tom Northcott were named as editors. There was a much higher degree of content similarity to the mediation course material. The negotiation model had been reduced to four stages, the communication skills content had increased from 2 pages to 10 and all content attributions had disappeared with the exception of a statement on page 1: “We want to particularly recognize the major contributions that *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement*

Without Giving In, by Roger Fisher and William Ury, has made to our program by providing the foundation for development of principled negotiation.”

Much of the 1986 content remained, re-titled, reworded and sometimes expanded. The 1991 four-stage negotiation model, Set the Climate and Establish the Guidelines, Define the Issue and Set the Agenda, Explore Issues and Interests, Problem-solve and Form the Agreement (pp. 10-28), incorporated most of the 1986 process as steps or tasks under the broader four stage headings. The language of pre-conference, conference and post-conference disappeared from the negotiation model. Some material from other JIBC manuals had been included, specifically the Dispute Resolution Continuum from the 1987 Mediation Manual, now called “The Intervention Continuum” (1991, p. 3) and the Arousal Cycle graph and text from Rengert’s 1987 Dealing with Anger (1991, p. 7).

Other new material in the 1991 *Negotiation Skills* manual included a number of self-assessment tools for course participants including the end-of-program negotiation assessment criteria (pp. 14-18), a Negotiation Skills List containing attending, responding, confronting, immediacy, questioning, reframing and refocusing as areas where the learner can “determine your level of negotiation skills” (p. 12) and a Negotiation Skills Inventory-Self Assessment (pp. 84-87). There were 15 pages of role-play scenarios, which may have been, in the case of “The Mighty Mushroom,” (pp. 67 and 68) brought into the Certificate in Conflict Resolution from Ryane Consulting and possibly originated with the Harvard Negotiation Project.

Helen Ryane was really, really big on the Harvard Project at that time, so that's what we were bringing into our Negotiation courses ... that magic mushroom exercise, that would have come from us. I think a lot of our negotiation theory and skills actually probably filtered in. (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

Some role-plays may be adaptations of ones published by University Associates in their 1970s and 1980s handbooks (Pfeiffer, 1984–1993; Pfeiffer & Jones, 1972–1981; Pfeiffer & Goodstein, 1982–1983). Others contain details specific to Canada and British Columbia, for example “Federal Contract Negotiation” (Haddigan et al, 1991, pp. 73-75) and were likely original scenarios developed by the manual editors or other Centre for Conflict Resolution trainers based on cases drawn from their private practices.

I attempted to trace the sources of the ideas in the JIBC negotiation curriculum by starting with the people given credit for material in the 1986 manual. I was not able to find Gruder or Rackham, but Christopher Moore was one of the founders of CDR Associates in Boulder, Colorado, and author of a comprehensive and ground-breaking 1986 book called *The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict*. The writer of the 1986 JIBC negotiation manual credits a 1983 Moore title, *Mediation*, which may have been an informational booklet or a training manual written by Moore for CDR Associates.

Gerard Nierenberg’s work contributed heavily to the 1986 manual. He was a prolific writer on negotiation, publishing two books in 1968 and another every couple of years thereafter. He is described on the book jacket of his *The Complete Negotiator* (1986) as

the father of contemporary negotiation. In 1966 he started The Negotiation Institute, Inc. and began his pioneering effort to define, structure and teach this critical art. He is the author of many books, including eight best-selling books on negotiation. He is a senior member of the New York law firm of Nierenberg, Zeif and Weinstein.

Nierenberg (1986) represents negotiating as a “co-operative enterprise” (p. 34) where “negotiators do not play a negotiating game. They are adept at understanding and

accommodation. They are fully aware of the necessity of finding a common ground of interest and they avoid the pitfalls of a competitive I-must-win-the-game attitude” (p. 39). He defines negotiation very broadly, holding that every need and every desire may be an occasion for negotiating. He laments the lack of a unified negotiation theory and proposes that his “Need Theory of Negotiation” (p. 31) could fill that theoretical gap. Nierenberg starts with the five levels of the Hierarchy of Needs developed by psychologist Abraham Maslow in the 1940s: physiological, safety, love/belonging, esteem and self-actualization. He adds three levels of approach—interpersonal, interorganizational and international—and six varieties of application (p. 110).

You can then use the matrix figure of 126 individual cubes, each of which represents a different negotiating gambit, to help generate creative negotiating ideas.... The more alternative ways you have of handling a negotiating situation, the greater will be your chances of success. (pp. 110-111)

Niernenberg’s 126 negotiating gambits made little lasting impression on the JIBC Certificate curriculum. Roger Fisher and William Ury (1981) eclipsed Nierenberg both in book sales and in the extent to which their principled negotiation approach entered the popular imagination and the JIBC curriculum. Their *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In* (1981) is accessible, uses everyday language and is based on only four principles: separate the people from the problem; focus on interests, not positions; invent options for mutual gain; and insist on using objective criteria (pp. 10-11). These four principles became the foundation of the Certificate negotiation course content and migrated into other course content as well. The sources of Fisher and Ury’s (1981) thinking, therefore, represented the theoretical roots of much of the Certificate curriculum.

Roger Fisher's academic education was in law and William Ury's was in anthropology but both were part of an interdisciplinary network of scholars interested in studying conflict. Their ideas about principled negotiation came out of the academic research on negotiation, specifically game theory based conflict resolution research, research into collective bargaining in the United States and psychological research, especially that dealing with problem-solving. The game theory roots are referenced in their consistent use of a game metaphor to describe negotiation. "Talking about interests, options and standards may be a wise, efficient and amicable game, but what if the other side won't play? ... Change the game simply by starting to play a new one (Fisher & Ury, 1981, p. 112).

Game theory was a major focus of conflict scholarship. It grew "out of a more general area known as 'decision theory' which gives a mathematical analysis of decision situations" (Schellenberg, 1982, p. 168). 'Decision-theory' was based on the idea that what motivated a person's choice of action was not money alone, but a range of values that could be analyzed in terms of utility:

During the nineteenth century, philosophers and economists began to talk about 'utility' as the measure of subjective value. Utility was held to be a measure of one's fundamental interests, but both its psychological and its mathematical foundations remained fuzzy. It was not until the middle of the twentieth century that a theoretically sophisticated theory about the foundations of utility became generally accepted. This was largely the work of John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern. (Schellenberg, 1996, p. 110).

As Schellenberg (1996) explains it, Von Neumann and Morgenstern approached the question of utility in terms of relative preferences when faced with a choice and derived a theory that "allows us to extend a quantitative approach for conceiving utility to, literally,

all kinds of human preferences” (p. 110). Utility theory became “the starting point for modern decision theory generally and for game theory in particular”(Schellenberg, 1996, p. 112).⁵

Game theory, initially the province of mathematicians, was quickly adopted by economists and by theorists in other social science fields. Mathematical genius John Nash created equilibrium theory, a fundamental building block of game theory, in 1950. Anatol Rapoport, another mathematician, was specifically interested in conflict scholarship. He was a co-founder of the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* in 1957 and was a leader in applying game theory to conflict resolution (Tidwell, 1998, p. 70). Game theory-based research about conflict focused on strategy and required several starting assumptions:

First, it is assumed that people will make rational choices, from which they will estimate the probability of any given action and take only those actions, which appear rational. Second, game theorists assume perfect knowledge, that is to say, when behaviour is modelled through game theory it is assumed that individuals know all there is to know and that neither party knows more than the other. (Tidwell, 1998, p. 70)

It is important to understand that these assumptions of rational choice and perfect information were required so that a “mathematical analysis of the way interest conflicts may be resolved for all kinds of situations” (Schellenberg, 1996, p. 113) could be created. They were not principles of human behaviour based on observation. While utility theory removed the mathematical fuzziness from the study of how people met their fundamental ‘interests’ in decision situations, it left untouched the psychological fuzziness.

⁵ Game theory is the study of the ways in which *strategic interactions* among *rational players* produce *outcomes* with respect to the *preferences* (or *utilities*) of those players. (Ross, 2008)

The focus on game theory as a primary site for conflict resolution research, both at the mathematical model level and through laboratory-based experiments using college students as games players, perhaps lay less in the depth of its theoretical or applied possibilities as in the constraints of the experimental research paradigm prevalent at the time. While game theory had “the appeal of rigour” (Tidwell, 1998, p. 71), later writers are lukewarm in their evaluation of its contributions: “Well over one thousand studies based on experimental games had been published by 1985. Much of this research ... was mindless—being done because a convenient experimental format was readily available” (Deutsch, 2000, p. 14). Game theory did, however, provide much of the language of conflict resolution and particularly negotiation.

Games theory has given to the study of conflict some useful terminology. Win-win, for example, refers to events wherein both parties in a game obtain a positive payoff; this is also called a positive-sum game. A zero-sum conflict is a game in which one party wins and the other loses an equal amount. A negative-sum conflict is one in which both parties lose. (Tidwell, 1998, p. 72).

Fisher and Ury (1981) drew their negotiation game metaphor as well as the term “win-win” and the term “interest” from the game theory literature. The game theory tradition also influenced Fisher and Ury not only in language use but also in underlying assumptions of negotiator rationality and self-interested utility motivations and it is these underlying assumptions that have been seen as most problematic in this theoretical trajectory.

Avruch (1998) critiques the elevation of calm, logic, rationality and “maximizing” to an “essential axiom” (p. 6) in conflict resolution theory. He sees those terms instead as

culturally-based descriptions of the preferred meeting behaviours of white, middle class American business people:

In its starkest form in conflict resolution studies this model comes to us in the mathematical theory of games.... With slightly fuzzier edges it comes to us in the bargaining theories of the economists. Rationality and maximization are conserved although some of the mathematical strictures are loosened.... And, often refracted by social psychologists, it comes to us in a slew of semi popular theorizing about conflict resolution, most notably in *Getting to Yes* by Roger Fisher and William Ury. (Avruch, 1998, p. 6)

Avruch (1991) is also highly critical of the idea that emotions were “something that one must ‘get past’ ... to get to ... the underlying stratum of rationality where ‘efficient’ problem-solving is possible” (p. 7). The idea that emotions interfered with the resolution of conflict, indeed fuelled if not downright caused conflict, and needed to be reduced, calmed, managed was certainly an assumption in the principled negotiation approach and, therefore, an assumption present in the core curriculum of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution.

A second source of underlying theory for Fisher and Ury’s (1981) negotiation writings looking at a “real-life” negotiating situation, collective bargaining. In 1965 Walton and McKersie proposed a behavioural theory of labour negotiating which identified four negotiation “sub-processes.” Fisher and Ury’s later language of positional bargaining and principled negotiation directly echo Walton and McKersie’s distributive and integrative bargaining.

The first system of activities comprises competitive behaviors that are intended to influence the distribution of limited resources. This pure-conflict subprocess is called “distributive bargaining.” The second system comprised activities that increase the joint gain available to the negotiating parties. They are problem-solving behaviors and other activities that identify, enlarge and act on the common interests of the

parties. This is called “integrative bargaining.” (Walton & McKersie, 1991, p. xv)

In their 1965 research, Walton and McKersie synthesized ideas from a variety of sources, including conflict resolution game theory research and social-psychological theories of problem-solving. They described integrative bargaining as a three-step joint problem-solving process where agreements were reached through a three-step process: Identifying the problem; Searching for alternate solutions and their consequences; and Preference ordering of solutions and selecting a course of action (1991, p. 137).

Fisher and Ury’s (1981) *Getting to Yes* did not provide a negotiation model but was

a philosophic text not a sequential process text. Getting to Yes ... doesn’t even really talk about stages. It talks about four principles.... I think it teaches new lenses through which to look at the problem. (G. Sloan, personal interview, April 4, 2007)

The Certificate in Conflict Resolution, in contrast, relied heavily on a sequential stage and step model to operationalize the principled negotiation philosophy. The four-stage negotiation model explicitly paralleled Marje Burdine’s 1983 four-stage mediation model and also closely paralleled the stages and steps and indeed the language of the mid-70s descriptions of therapeutic problem-solving in the psychological literature.

Goldfried and Goldfried (1975) describe the first stage of a therapeutic problem-solving process as “Problem definition and formulation” and advise the problem-solver to “define the various aspects of the situation in relatively concrete terms ... translate abstract terms into concrete examples” (p. 105). Similarly, the 1991 Negotiation Skills manual of the Centre for Conflict Resolution in Stage 2 (Define the Issues and Set the Agenda) tells the negotiator to “break the issue into ‘digestible chunks’” (Haddigan et

al.,1991, p. 27). The recommendation to use brainstorming to generate alternatives is found in the second step of the problem-solving model and the fourth stage of the negotiation model.

Generation of alternatives: The research most relevant to this stage of problem-solving is based on “brainstorming” techniques.... As a kind of focused free association, the procedure is based on two principles: 1) deferment of judgement and 2) quantity breeds quality. The deferment of judgement states that if an individual can temporarily withhold any evaluation of his solution, there is a greater likelihood ... good solutions will be produced. (Goldfried & Goldfried, 1975, p. 106)

Compare the above wording with the JIBC description.

Stage 4: Generate options for agreement. Use a brainstorming technique to generate options, but postpone evaluating them until no more are coming up. (Haddigan, Northcott & Burdine, 1991, p. 31)

Goldfried and Goldfried’s (1975) step 3 advice to use “utility theory in evaluating the ‘goodness’ of any particular course of action” (p. 106) predates but also prefigures the “The end result of a negotiation is a wise result that meets the interests of both parties to the greatest degree possible” (Haddigan et al, 1991, p. 35). These correspondences are so marked that it seems probable that the language of therapeutic problem-solving came into the JIBC negotiation model directly from the psychological literature.

The 1986 JIBC Negotiation Skills course manual drew on a number of sources, primarily books written for a non-academic audience on the application of academic research on negotiating. By 1991, however, the JIBC *Negotiation Skills Level One* course manual had taken Fisher and Ury’s (1981) four principles of negotiation as its only acknowledged theoretical base. Fisher and Ury (1981) sourced their ideas in the academic research on negotiation, specifically game theory-based conflict resolution research research into collective bargaining in the United States, and psychological research, into

problem-solving. The Centre for Conflict Resolution acknowledged a deep sense of theoretical indebtedness to Fisher and Ury, but apparently without an explicit awareness of the academic research trajectories from which Fisher and Ury had synthesized their ideas.

The Centre for Conflict Resolution was also influenced in its negotiation curriculum by Kessler's 1978 mediation model, using it as a template for its own four-stage negotiation model. The Centre for Conflict Resolution negotiation model also bore a strong resemblance to the therapeutic model of problem-solving. The negotiation content of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution had quite clear theoretical underpinnings and represented the most direct linkage between the JIBC classroom and academic conflict resolution scholarship. It also represented a view, based on the game theory origins, that saw conflict as a concrete problem to be solved, a specific issue to be negotiated.

[I]nterest-based negotiation is rooted in an individualistic worldview where the ultimate value in personal and social life is individual satisfaction. ... Essentially, interest-based negotiation is utilitarian and its main goal is to resolve substantive issues. (Sutherland, 2005, p. 89).

Interest-based negotiation was formulated on notions of rationality and saw emotions as interfering with the calm and logical stance needed for coming to an efficient agreement. This view of conflict was in direct contrast to the more perceptually, emotionally and subjectively-based views of conflict embedded in the anger and the mediation courses. In the overall JIBC conflict resolution discourse that solidified in the early 90s both the objective and subjective conflict perspectives were, somewhat confusingly, present.

The JIBC Conflict Resolution Model

The term “conflict resolution” is used prominently in the JIBC Certificate, first in its title and secondly as the title of one of the six required courses in the original certificate. Both of these uses appeared first in 1986 when the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was announced in January and a new course, *Conflict Resolution: Dynamics, Styles and Application*, taught by Lee Rengert and Marje Burdine, was first offered.

This course will explore the origins and dynamics of conflict including situational, societal, cultural and individual. Participants will assess their own approaches to conflict resolution and consider alternatives to improve their effectiveness in a variety of situations. Skill practice will include video feedback. (JIBC, 1986b, p. 3)

This course description is all I have of the material for the original 1986 course. In his previous *Skill Building in Anger Management and Conflict Resolution with Youth* courses, Rengert had presented conflict resolution as the problem-solving end-result of successfully managing anger—one’s own anger and/or that of the other person or persons—plus the use of effective communication to engage in a win-win problem-solving process. But for the new Certificate, conflict and anger were separated.

The earliest *Conflict Resolution: Dynamics, Styles and Applications* course manual that could be examined is dated 1991, edited by Stacey Holloway and Marje Burdine. It is marked as the “2nd Edition” and is, as far as appearances go, the finished version ready for copying and binding before distribution in the courses.

The introduction to this 1991 manual sets out the goal of the course:

Conflict is normal. It is part of everyday life and can be a positive or negative experience. When we are in conflict we often feel hurt, angry or frustrated because things don’t go the way we want them to go. We often wish we could improve the situation and act differently. This manual will

assist you to develop the skills of conflict resolution in a supportive and practical manner. (Holloway & Burdine, 1991, p. 1).

Page two defines the terms “issue,” “position” and “interest” in the same language used in the negotiation courses. Page three offers a subjective definition of conflict as “the opposition of needs, values, wishes or perceptions resulting in stress or tension” and lists the “cost of conflict” and “positive functions of conflict.” “Sources of conflict” are described as:

Differing goals; differing philosophies, beliefs or values; differing perceptions; clashing emotional needs (pride, respect, affection); limited commodities or resources; ambiguous roles, responsibilities and boundaries; differing ways of behaving (routines, procedures, methods, styles). (Holloway and Burdine, 1991, p. 3)

Page four is a diagram called the Dynamics of Conflict credited to Lee Rengert. It shows eight elements—emotions, power, behaviour, time demands, setting, values, stress, and expectations.

There are many dynamics or elements, which influence people in a conflict situation. The escalation or de-escalation of each element has a compounding effect on the others. For instance, an escalation in time pressure may intensify stress and emotions, lower expectations, reduce power and alter values and behaviour. The setting in which the conflict takes place presents behavioural constraints or freedoms which directly affect other factors. (Holloway & Burdine, 1991, p. 4)

Methods of Conflict Resolution (pp. 5-6) contrasts win-lose and win-win disputes and page seven presents the “Interpersonal Conflict Resolution Model.” This model consists of four stages: “Establish a Positive Environment, Clarify the Issues, Clarify Interests, Problem-Solving.” It is consistent with the four-stage mediation and negotiation model but uses somewhat simplified language.

A following page on conflict styles shows the accommodator, the avoider, the competitor-director, the compromiser and the collaborator. These conflict style descriptors are taken from the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument, which has been used in the introductory courses of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution since the very earliest classes.

Comment: I remember teaching a Leadership course at the J.I. for Ryane Consulting before Marje had started the new Program on Con Res. It may have been the first time I met Marje, when she asked to sit in on the section I was doing on the Thomas-Kilman. It involved what I call strategies for dealing with conflict—the 5 styles—and the tactics that supported these styles, some of which focused on relationship building and some that focused more on the task or the outcomes. (Joan Balmer, personal communication, January 2, 2009)

Created in 1974 by Kenneth Thomas and Ralph Kilmann, the Conflict Mode Instrument was based on Blake and Mouton's 1964 Managerial Grid Model which assessed managerial style against two axes: concern for people and concern for task (Blake & Mouton, 1975). Thomas and Kilmann re-named the two axes concern for relationship and concern for goals and assessed each conflict style in terms of the degree of assertiveness and the degree of co-operativeness involved (Volkema & Bergmann, 1995).

Pages 10 through 21 of the 1991 conflict resolution manual focus on communication skills—active listening, “I” statements, describing behaviour rather than assumptions, questioning, and clarifying assumptions. Worksheets are included. There is one page on power (p. 22), and the remainder of the manual consists of scenarios (pp. 23-26), a “how to give feedback” instruction page (p. 27), an “observer’s worksheet” (p. 28), student feedback forms (pp. 29-32) and a bibliography (p. 33).

1991 saw the introduction not only of this new Conflict Resolution manual, but also of new versions of Negotiation Skills, Mediation Skills and Dealing with Anger. Prior to 1991, course materials were drawn from a number of sources. The four new course manuals in 1991 represented a completed and much more self-referential core curriculum. Credits to other writers or other sources of ideas for the most part disappeared and much more consistency amongst the various required courses appeared. The re-writing of all of these Certificates required courses meant the consistent articulation across core courses of a JIBC conflict resolution model and thus a coalescing of the JIBC Certificate in Conflict Resolution core curriculum.

Theoretical sources of conflict resolution content

The words “conflict resolution” refer back to an inter-, or multi-, or trans-, or a-disciplinary field of academic study.

Conflict, its resolution and prevention, comprises an *a-disciplinary* study, that is a synthesis that goes beyond separate disciplines, beyond interaction between separate disciplines, and beyond any synthesis of approaches from several disciplines. An a-disciplinary approach accepts no boundaries of knowledge. (Burton, 1996, p. xii)

The first academic journal in the discipline, however defined, was started in 1957. Called *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, it was published through the University of Michigan and edited by Kenneth Boulding and Anatol Rapoport.

I have suggested earlier in this dissertation that the growth of the conflict resolution movement and the popularization of mediation were less influenced by the academic field of conflict resolution scholarship than by the social change and community empowerment sensibilities of the 1960s and 1970s and the examples of

Quaker practices of conciliation and mediation as well as labour mediation. I have further suggested that it was the conflict resolution movement that formed the backdrop for the Certificate in Conflict Resolution and inspired its original mediation courses. However, in the 1991 JIBC foundation course, *Conflict Resolution I: Dealing with Interpersonal Conflict*, makes visible the typically complex, contested and contradictory aspects of the academic conflict resolution field. This visibility lies not in explicit reference to particular theories, or theorists, but because in defining conflict, in presenting ideas about the sources of conflict, and in putting forward mechanisms for resolving conflict the JIBC conflict resolution course curriculum inevitably and necessarily adopted particular theoretical positions on conflict and its resolution and discarded others. The JIBC conflict resolution teachings adopted a subjective definition of conflict, and a functionalist perspective on the function of social conflict and a primarily psychological perspective on the resolution of conflict. These theoretical positions worked together to remove the concept of conflict as taught at the JIBC from historical and societal frames and to locate it almost entirely as an individual and interpersonal phenomenon.

Early conflict theorists came from a variety of academic disciplines and were interested, primarily, in why conflict existed. A very broad categorization of the three main disciplinary perspectives would be called biology, sociology and social psychology. The tradition of conflict scholarship called, variously, biology (Schellenberg, 1982), human nature (Kriesberg, 2003), or the inherency perspective (Tidwell, 1998) is generally traced to Darwin, and conflict is seen as “a product of biological evolution” (Schellenberg, 1982, p. 10). Conflict scholars identify major biology theorists as Freud, who saw “aggression as intrinsic to human behaviour” (Tidwell, 1998, p. 46), and Lorenz

and Ardrey, who extrapolated from their studies of aggression and territoriality in animals in the 1950s and 1960s to present “a picture of aggression in which humans have no control; they are enslaved by their own evolutionary history” (Tidwell, 1998, p. 46). The biology or inherency school of conflict theory had little direct influence on the practice field of conflict resolution, or on the Certificate in Conflict Resolution curriculum, functioning primarily as a position to be vigorously refuted.

In 1989 a distinguished international group of geneticists, anthropologists, psychologists, biochemists and other researchers summarized the state of scientific knowledge about the bases of war and violence.... The statement concludes that “it is not scientifically correct to say that war or any other violent behaviour is genetically programmed into our human nature.” (Kriesberg, 2003, p. 33)

A second school of early conflict theory, called the sociological theory by Schellenberg (1982), the contingency perspective by Tidwell (1998), and social systems by Kriesberg (2003) is characterized by theoretical perspectives which view conflict through lenses of structural analysis with little or no emphasis on individuals. Ideas about the societal function of conflict fall within the sociological school and the functionalist belief adopted by the JIBC program is one of two contrasting theoretical models. The first, the the consensus or functionalist model, emphasizes the positive role of conflict in maintaining “the inherent order, harmony and wholeness of society” (Stewart, 1998, p. 7). It originated with German philosopher Georg Simmel (1858–1918) and saw conflict as having an integrative and socializing function by bringing together contending forces and integrating members into a group (Tidwell, 1998, p. 62).

The second sociological model, the conflict and change model, originated with Karl Marx (1818 – 1883) and held that “every society rests on constraints of some of its

members” (Schellenberg, 1982, p. 71). Social conflict, therefore, is both inevitable and required in order to fight against such constraints (Schellenberg, 1982; Tidwell, 1998).

The functionalist school had much more influence on the development of conflict resolution scholarship and practice in the United States than did the conflict and change model. American sociologist Lewis Coser (1913–2003) based his highly influential 1956 *The Social Functions of Conflict* directly on Simmel’s work (Tidwell, 1998, p. 65). Much conflict and conflict resolution research in American behavioural and social science circles was spurred as a result of the publication of Coser’s book (Scimecca, 1998, p. 21).

Following the Simmel/Coser tradition, the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training curriculum taught the functionalist perspective,⁶ arguing that efforts should always be made to defuse conflict; it should never be escalated in pursuit of social change goals. This choice is evident in the editing of Christopher Moore’s diagram “Continuum of Conflict Management and Resolution Approaches” (Moore, 1986, p. 5). The original included legislative decision, non-violent direct action and violence as potential approaches, while the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training version of the continuum ends with arbitration. However, the Certificate in Conflict Resolution curriculum overall

⁶ For example, the 1991 Conflict Resolution course manual describes the “Positive Functions of Conflict”: Prevents stagnation; Stimulates interest and curiosity; Raises and resolves problems; Results in personal and social change; Adjusts norms to new situations; Prevents the escalation to more serious conflicts; Stimulates the search for new facts and solutions to problems; Increases group cohesion and performance (Holloway & Burdine, 1991, p. 3).

made little use of sociological theories of conflict that emphasized structural societal analysis. Instead, it chose theoretical perspectives emphasizing individuals with little or no focus on structural societal analysis. This third major school of conflict theory is called by Tidwell (1998) the interactionist perspective (p. 30), by Kriesberg (2003) the relations between adversaries, and by Schellenberg (1982) social psychology.

Social psychology appears to also function as a theoretical bridge between conflict theorists, looking at why conflict exists, and conflict resolution theorists, looking at how conflict happens and, therefore, how it might be made to happen differently. Social psychology gave the Centre for Conflict Resolution a direct theoretical base in the work of social psychologist Morton Deutsch. Deutsch was a graduate student of Kurt Lewin's, and while Darwin, Marx, Freud, Simmel and Coser are all claimed as "significantly influencing the writings of early social psychologists on conflict" (Deutsch, 2000, p. 11), Lewin was the first conflict scholar firmly located in social psychology. He came to the U.S. from Germany in 1932, taught at Stanford, Cornell, and the University of Iowa and, in 1946, became centrally involved in the Research Center for Group Dynamics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Benjamin, 2007; Hergenhan, 2001; Hunt, 1993). His primary contribution to conflict theory is considered to be his field theory (Tidwell, 1998, p. 65). Lewin's proposal that groups were dynamic wholes and that the essence of group membership was interdependence provided the base for Deutsch's (1973) work on positive interdependence —co-operation— and negative interdependence—competition (Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1991, p. A-4).

Deutsch (1973) locates himself as part of the post-World War II shift from the study of conflict to the study of conflict resolution.

I started my graduate study not long after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and my work in social psychology has been shadowed by the atomic cloud ever since. The efforts reported in this book reflect my continued interest in contributing the understanding of how to prevent destructive conflicts and initiate co-operation. (Deutsch, 1973, p. ix)

Deutsch's (1973) ideas about conflict are situated within his larger analytical framework of positive interdependence, or co-operative structures. Co-operative structures emphasize trust and trustworthiness, a willingness to be influenced, an ability to influence, and an acknowledgement of shared goals (Deutsch, 1973; Bunker & Rubin, 1995; Kessler, 1978). Deutsch in his 1973 *The Resolution of Conflict* defined conflict subjectively and discussed the variables affecting the course of conflict, the functions of conflict, a definition of conflict, typologies of conflict and typical issues in conflict (pp. 4-17). In somewhat adapted form, these writings are recognizably the source of content in the JIBC 1991 *Dealing with Interpersonal Conflict* course manual.

Deutsch (1973) emphasized the importance of communication in creating a co-operative environment that would lead to a constructive engagement with conflict and the strong linkage between communication and conflict (Putnam, 2006) is evident in the JIBC conflict resolution core curriculum. The specific contributions of communication scholars Hocker and Wilmot (1985) are particularly apparent. Hocker and Wilmot (1985) define conflict as "a natural process, inherent in the nature of all important relationships and amenable to constructive regulation through communication" (p. 6) and conflict behaviour as a learned set of communication skills.

Conflict behaviour can change; it is not an inborn set of responses, but rather a developed repertoire of communication skills that can be learned, refined and put into action in everyday life. You don't have to stay the way you are! (Hocker & Wilmot, 1985, p. 4).

They define conflict as “an expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals, scarce rewards, and interference from the other party in achieving their goals” (p. 20). They discuss conflict styles, “patterned responses to conflict” based on the Thomas and Kilmann categories. Their idea of power “currencies” (p. 72)—expertise, resource control, interpersonal linkages, personal qualities, and intimacy—may be the (unattributed) source of the 1991 conflict resolution manual’s page 22 list of “sources of power” in conflict.

By 1991, theories drawn from psychology and communication formed one theoretical base for the JIBC conflict resolution program content and the root influence of Morton Deutsch was clear. An emphasis on the creation of co-operative climates as a strategy for resolution is apparent in all the 1991 manuals, whether the specific content is negotiation, mediation, dealing with anger or resolving conflict. This is seen perhaps most prominently in the Stage 1 titles of the JIBC models—Setting the Tone in mediation (Burdine, 1987, p. 80), Set the Climate in negotiation (Haddigan et al, 1991, 12) and Establish a Positive Environment (Holloway & Burdine, 1991, p. 7) in resolving interpersonal conflict. Not only did Deutsch’s (1973) theories contribute very substantially to the content of the Justice Institute conflict resolution program, but his strategy for the increased resolution of conflict, skills training, formed a primary rationale for the existence of the program and a direction for the pedagogical emphasis in the Certificate.

Other common elements across the manuals emerged by 1991. Certain key content pieces were repeated in the all of four revised core course manuals and they can be seen as most important or, put another way, most useful to Certificate instructors in

providing a theoretical and practical framework within which they could most effectively teach about conflict and its resolution.

These repeated content pieces were the Continuum of Conflict diagram, the four stage model, the definitions and explanations of the words position, issue, and interests, the anger arousal cycle diagram, and the specific communication skills of asking open questions, reflecting feelings, paraphrasing, responding empathically, reframing and summarizing. These elements, I suggest, formed the consensus agreement on conflict and its resolution that coalesced in the Centre for Conflict Resolution curriculum by 1991, and was called by students over the next decade, both jokingly and seriously, “the JI way”.

These consistent elements represented two somewhat contradictory theoretical perspectives. The first was the psychological/communication trajectory exemplified most clearly by Deutsch (1973) and Hocker and Wilmot (1985) where conflict was believed to be caused by differences in perceptions, and communication was central to fostering the co-operative climates required for conflict de-escalation and resolution. What people most needed to resolve conflict was “a developed repertoire of communication skills” (Hocker & Wilmot, 1985, p. 4).

A second theoretical trajectory originated in a lengthy and substantial body of work on negotiation that used game theory as a major knowledge-generating frame and laboratory game-playing experiments as a methodology.⁷ This theoretical perspective held that conflict was resolved through the negotiation of concrete issues once

⁷ Another strand in this second theoretical trajectory studied the processes of collective bargaining and coined the term “integrative bargaining” (Walton and McKersie, 1991).

emotionality associated with the conflict had been sufficiently defused. The JIBC defining of position, issue, interest and the embedding of these concepts in a four stage sequential model designed to move conflicting parties away from arguing positions to identifying issues, exploring underlying interests and then creating mutually beneficial solutions was a direct application of that scholarship.

The Certificate in Conflict Resolution curriculum therefore embedded beliefs that a conflict, which was defined subjectively as perception, could and should be resolved using a negotiation process that required the conflict to be defined in material and concrete terms, as negotiable issues. This juxtaposition of communication and psychology-based view of conflict as subjective, with a game theory-sourced negotiation process emphasizing rationality and self-interest, created a fundamental theoretical contradiction in the overall JIBC Certificate in Conflict Resolution curriculum.

By 1991 the JIBC conflict resolution discourse had also limited its focus. Contrast the description for the 1986 *Conflict Resolution: Dynamics, Styles and Applications* course with that of 1991. In 1986 learners are offered a course where they will “explore the origins and dynamics of conflict including situational, societal, cultural and individual” (JIBC, 1986b, p. 3) In 1991 the course had been re-titled *Conflict Resolution I: Dealing with Interpersonal Conflict*: “This course explores the sources and implications of interpersonal conflict within various contexts. Participants will have an opportunity to assess their current approaches to resolving conflict and to broaden their range of options” (JIBC, 1991a, p. 7). The resolution of conflict, as taught in the JIBC Certificate in Conflict Resolution, had by 1991 laid claim solely to the individual and the interpersonal.

Cutting Edge and Crystallization

The crystallization of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution core curriculum in the early 90s was a significant marker in the history of the Certificate and represented a certain maturity and self-confidence within the program. All the early trainers remember a sense of being involved in a program that was something very leading edge, very innovative, not only in B.C. but in all of Canada and the western U.S. “We had a huge reputation in the early years ... we were cutting edge for a long time” (N. McPhee, personal interview, February 8, 2007).

I had an opportunity a number of times to come to Vancouver ... and to go to the Justice Institute and see what was happening.... that was my first ... exposure to the JI.... It was impressive, and it was leading edge, and it was kind of way ahead of anybody else that was doing anything ... certainly in Canada and many places in the United States. (C. Picard, personal interview, February 21, 2007)

In contrast to the early and mid-80s, when trainers remember being unaware of other conflict resolution field developments, by 1991 there was a definite sense of being connected to a larger conflict resolution movement and an emerging field of professional practice:

We were so in love with the work and the field and [being] a part of its growth and feeling the excitement and the adrenalin that came with being on the leading edge, innovative and creative. It was so amazing. (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007)

The content of the Certificate curriculum was, at the time of its crystallization in 1991, quite topical, aligned with current thinking in conflict resolution education and conflict resolution practice. I base this assertion to a considerable extent on the contents of a 1987 book, *Conflict Management and Problem-Solving: Interpersonal to International Applications* edited by Dennis Sandole and Ingrid Sandole-Staroste, that

contains edited transcripts of lectures presented at George Mason University in Virginia, USA. The lectures were organized by Bryant Wedge, who founded the Center for Conflict Resolution at George Mason University, and was in the process of creating a Masters Program. The lectures were intended to “to test out the mix and fit of subjects and the philosophy and the purpose of the [Master’s] program” (Wedge, 1987, p. 2) through an inclusive process, “bringing together representatives of both academe and practice in a common forum” (Wedge, 1987, p. 1).

The lectures were a useful comparison for the curriculum of the Certificate on Conflict Resolution at the JIBC because they represented curriculum content that another post-secondary education institution was considering in designing the first graduate level conflict resolution program in the United States but were not solely a traditional overview of theoretical perspectives on conflict. Wedge was “oriented toward practical applications” (Avruch, 1998, p. 3) and he invited lecturers “professionally involved in conflict management ... from academe, government, business and non-profit organizations” (Sandole & Sandole-Staroste 1987, p. 5).

There were high levels of consistency between what was being taught in the JIBC program and what was being discussed for possible inclusion in the George Mason program. The Sandole anthology, like the JIBC, emphasized the third-party intervener role. “After a gestation period of several decades, the role of the third party has emerged in the 1980s as a central concern in the study of conflict and conflict resolution” (Laue, 1987, p. 17).

Mediation content was substantial. There were discussions of mediator neutrality (Laue, 1987), mediator roles (Laue, 1987; Dugan, 1987), mediator ethical stances

(Scimecca, 1987), mediator institutionalization and professionalization (Laue, 1987; Scimecca, 1987) and mediation process models (Colosi, 1987). There were discussions of a number of third-party applications—divorce and family, environmental, community, labour-management. Morton Deutsch contributed a chapter and Dean Pruitt's chapter, *Creative approaches to negotiation* (1987) closely corresponded with the JIBC negotiation course content in its emphasis on “the win-win or problem-solving approach” (p. 75) and “integrative agreements” (p. 69).

What was not present in the JIBC curriculum, but did form a considerable part of the Sandole and Sandole-Staroste (1987) anthology, was the entire area of international conflict. The JIBC program did not incorporate either a focus on international applications of peace-making nor the considerable body of theoretical knowledge that informed the international relations area. The JIBC focus on the individual and interpersonal excluded the international.

This was perhaps the cause of a major difference between the program at the JIBC and the George Mason one. They both came out of the conflict resolution movement, and like all of the original movement-inspired educational efforts, focused on the development of process skills to resolve conflict. However, the George Mason program, because of its academic location, necessarily also valued theoretical approaches, and saw its purpose as creating knowledge as well as creating mediators. The JIBC program had no interest in knowledge creation for its own sake; its sole goal was to equip people with skills. Having drawn on the ideas about the resolution of conflict circulating in the 1980s, and having put together a practical, and eminently teachable curriculum that graduated people who could demonstrate in a role-play their ability to conduct an interest-based

negotiation and mediation, the JIBC program believed it was successfully meeting its goal.

However, the memories of the early JIBC conflict resolution faculty that their program was leading edge appear to be founded in a realistic appraisal of what was happening in the North American education and practice field in the 1980s.

The Certificate in Conflict resolution made several specific and innovative contributions to the teaching of conflict resolution. It popularized a four-stage negotiation model created by taking Fisher and Ury's (1981) four principles of principled negotiation and operationalizing them in a negotiation version of Sheila Kessler's (1987) four-stage mediation model. It created consistency between the teaching of interpersonal conflict resolution, negotiation and mediation by using variations of the same model for each of these three processes. It popularized the incorporation of content related to self-awareness and emotions, particularly anger, in mediation and negotiation training and also the teaching of micro-communication skills as essential elements of mediation and negotiation.

We were considered pioneers ... we were teaching the stuff that no one else was really teaching ... And other programs modelled themselves after us ... we came in with this notion of parties talking directly to each other, managing conversation so they were successfully talking about what was important and how come ... And I truly remember that that was considered phenomenal learning for many. (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

It was the elements originating in psychology and communication that made the JIBC Certificate in Conflict Resolution unique.

I always viewed the JI course, or series of courses and electives, as just very, very comprehensive.... The other view I had, and I think it's shared

by a lot of people, is that there is a certain social science emphasis to the JI approach and the JI material. (G. Sloan, personal interview, April 4, 2007)

This social science emphasis strengthened an orientation to application as well as to the interpersonal and the individual. It moved the program away from been seen as relevant only to potential practitioners and instead, as relevant to a wide range of prospective students and clients, for who has not experienced conflict with another person? The curriculum emphasis on generic rather than situation or context specific applications of mediation and negotiation was a deliberate choice, reflecting a belief that mediation and negotiation could be applied in any setting. Additionally, for an educational program that needed to generate revenue to survive, this generic approach offered the flexibility of applying one set of teaching materials to many potential clients and students.

By 1991, the Certificate in Conflict Resolution at the JIBC had developed course content that was interesting, widely relevant, practical, popular and easy to teach. The JIBC Certificate was particularly effective in reaching many, many thousands of people with what LeBaron (2002) calls the “staged processes and communication skills training modules” necessary “to formulate structures that could be taught easily, in a language that made conflict a part of our everyday lexicon” (p. 18). What the Certificate curriculum lost with its emphasis on interpersonal conflict and generic teachable skills was an acknowledgement of the complexity of conflict and of the range of theoretical perspectives and intervention possibilities. Its content crystallization also meant that the core curriculum changed little in response to new thinking or in response to the challenges and critiques that emerged as the conflict resolution field continued to develop.

The Certificate's standard practice was to deal with suggestions for new content by adding elective courses. An elective course was usually developed, unpaid, by the person proposing it. Elective courses might or might not attract sufficient enrolments to run and might or might not persist past a couple of semesters. They were seen as supplementary content and did not affect the content of the core courses or the criteria for passing the final assessment. This pattern of responding to developments in conflict resolution theory or practice sufficiently substantial to come to the attention of the Certificate by offering elective courses is most dramatically visible in the Certificate's response to the critiques that arose in the early 1990s of the culturally-constructed and culturally-limited boundaries of the mediation field.

Michelle LeBaron directed an extensive research project on conflict and culture through the University of Victoria's Institute on Dispute Resolution from 1990 through 1994 examining "the appropriateness and effectiveness in multicultural settings of informal non-court options for conflict resolution" (LeBaron Duryea, 1994, p.vii)

The mediation model used widely in North American community conflict resolution centres was found to be based on a number of cultural biases and culture-bound assumptions ... These blind spots may unnecessarily restrict the effectiveness of third-party intervention as tool in a multicultural society. (LeBaron Duryea, 1994, p.vii)

Marg Huber was the new Director of the Centre for Conflict Resolution at the JIBC as of 1993 and had a strong interest in cross-cultural conflict resolution. Her work with different cultural groups in a B.C. community context as well as with First Nations organizations and communities led her to work with LeBaron on the multi-cultural research project. She wanted to integrate cultural perspectives into the JIBC curriculum.

I believe strongly that conflict is contextual and that the cultural context, in many ways, determines the direction that the resolution of conflict takes, as well as the process used to get there.... I believed we had ignored all that to date in the development of the program, and with all my heart I wanted to address it in a fundamental way. (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007).

Given the dominant individualist bent of both content and pedagogy in the Certificate, it is perhaps unsurprising that

most of the trainers weren't that interested in the cultural work or the level of change that would have been required to integrate cultural considerations into all aspects of the program. So the core program remained pretty much the way it had always been, with courses related to culture and conflict added as electives, only as "add-ons"—much to my personal chagrin. This created a major tension between trainers and administration because the level of change required was not something that could be imposed on the very group that had designed and taught it over many years. (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007).

The relegation of content about culture and conflict to elective courses, and the overall faculty unwillingness to engage with critiques of mediation practice and training as culturally biased, represented more than just a solidification of core course content. It was a hardening of the boundaries of the JIBC conflict resolution discourse. It was perhaps sourced in a reluctance to engage in difficult and uncomfortable personal and collective self-examination or perhaps simply in little available time due to increasingly busy training and intervention practices. Whatever the reasons, valuable theoretical and practical approaches to the understanding and resolution of conflict craved by the cultural critiques did not enter the core curriculum.

LeBaron's culture and conflict research was only one part of a whole spectrum of theory-building and practice development that emphasized a more complex, relational and contextual view of conflict and insisted on the consideration of social, historical,

political and cultural contexts in designing training or interventions. LeBaron (2002, 2003a, 2003b) came to theorize conflict as operating on three levels: material, communicative, and symbolic. She wrote about intervention and training approaches that were creative rather than linear, intuitive rather than strictly rational and engaged with people and with conflict emotionally, physically and spiritually as well as cognitively by drawing on means such as metaphor, storytelling, ritual, and other and arts-based approaches.

Another major theorist-practitioner who raised compelling questions about cultural biases is John Paul Lederach. His 1995 book, *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures*, introduced the idea of an elicitive rather than a prescriptive approach to both intervention and training. Lederach advocates conflict transformation rather than conflict resolution. Resolution concentrates on “substance and content”, while transformation

centers its attention on the context of relationship patterns. It sees conflict as embedded in the web and system of relational patterns ... Resolution has tended to focus primarily on methods for de-escalating. Transformation involves both de-escalating and engaging conflict, even escalating in pursuit of constructive change. (Lederach, 2003, pp. 30-31).

Lederach locates all his work within a framework that “understands peace as embedded in justice” and “advocates non-violence as a way of life and work” (Lederach, 2003, p. 4). Dyck (2006) recommends the use of Lederach’s “nested time dimension model of peace and justice building” (p. 533) as well as Marie Dugan’s 1996 “nested paradigm of conflict foci—issue, relationship, sub-system and system” (p. 531) as key theoretical elements in “structurally transformative training”(p. 530).

Graduates of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution at the Justice Institute of British Columbia, however, would not have encountered the ideas of LeBaron, Lederach or Dugan in the required courses of their educational program.

Comment: I tried hard in those years to address the criticisms relating to the need to diversify practice to reflect cultural diversity—but these changes could not be imposed by administration on trainers who held a different view. (Marg Huber, personal communication, February 12, 2009)

The Certificate did not incorporate the new relational and contextual approaches, the “next wave of conflict resolution practice” (LeBaron, 2002, p. 18) into its core curriculum. This articulation of a consistent JIBC conflict resolution model in the core course content in 1991 and the resistance to substantial change in that core course content thereafter meant a strengthening of an inward focus and a lessening of connection to changes in the field of scholarship and of practice.

CHAPTER 8: CONSEQUENCES OF GROWTH 1990–1993

Growth both in the public registration Certificate courses and the contract courses was constant from 1986 through 1989 and then very rapid from 1990 through 1993. The public registration courses were full with wait-lists. Marje Burdine remembers that it was common to “have 60 people on a wait list two months in advance” (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007).

Several summer courses [11] will be added to the existing schedule since most courses have near-capacity enrolments. (Burdine, 1991b, p. 1)

The demand for courses outstripped the availability of classrooms at the JIBC in Vancouver. By September, 1990, courses were being offered at another location in Vancouver as well as at the JIBC (JIBC, 1990c, p. 5). “They didn't have enough space at the JI to be running all the courses, so she [Marje] was renting ... the Italian Community Centre out on ... Grandview Highway” (N. McPhee, personal interview, February 8, 2007).

Certificate enrolments increased to over 800 in 1992 (Burdine, 1992). Also by 1992 there were “23 college co-sponsored programs in B.C., Yellowknife and Whitehorse” (Burdine, 1992, p. 2).

Pat Ross considers the expansion of the Certificate through partnerships, especially with other colleges, as a major contributor to the growth of the program:

We worked with the community colleges.... That provided a vehicle to reach the province in a way we couldn't have done on our own.... We already had relationships with a number of the colleges and had tried joint

programming with them in a range of ways. Part of what made it successful I believe is ... that we weren't FTE funded, so they could count the students ... and there was great demand for the program, so there were lots of students, and that was important to them. (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007)

FTEs (full time equivalencies) formed the basis for government funding for the college system but not for the JIBC. The contractual arrangement between the JIBC and the community college partners was a straight forward revenue share. The community colleges not only got some of the direct revenue from course registrations but could also count the student training days (STDs) towards their institutional totals which would increase the amount of government funding they received. It seemed a popular approach.

We were just flying by the seat of our pants most of the time ... I had colleges all over the province. We had Northern Lights College at Fort St. John, we had a college in Prince Rupert and Smithers and Terrace and Cranbrook, Kelowna, Williams Lake ... I remember we had the Penticton Community Services, and they cosponsored the entire program up there. (N. McPhee, personal interview, January 28, 2007)

The September to December 1991 Calendar for what was by then called Interdisciplinary Studies lists “out-of-town courses” in Courtenay, Dawson Creek, Fort St. John, Grand Forks, Kelowna, Nelson, Prince Rupert, Quesnel, Whitehorse and Tacoma, Washington (JIBC, 191c, pp. 12-14). “We offered it everywhere ... we offered it around the province. We offered in other provinces, in Washington State” (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007).

The contract business was booming—and lucrative. Nancy McPhee remembers costing a contract for the provincial Ministry of Transportation before meeting with their representative.

We'd carefully costed out if we did this much training and this much travel, and we had it up to about a \$96,000 contract. And the guy says to

us, "Oh, round it up to \$100,000. That would be way better. Just do that."
So we rounded it up to 100. (Personal interview, January 28, 2007)

Early instructors have clear memories of some of contract road trips to other parts of
Canada.

I went off with Marg Huber and Michael Fogel delivering a five-day family mediation training for the government of New Brunswick. So we all went back there and we used some local coaches too, and we had a wonderful time. (G. Sloan, personal interview, April 4, 2007)

To accommodate so much growth, four new instructor names were added in 1991: Deborah White, Michael Altshuler, Sally Campbell and Jim Toogood. By 1992 Tom Northcott, Elizabeth Azmier-Stewart, Michael Raynolds, Kelly Henderson and I were on the trainer list as well (JIBCa, 1992). The addition of nine new trainers in two years doubled the number of trainers. All of the new trainers were Certificate graduates and already working as Certificate coaches.

I remember working as a planner, so I've got all the contract work that we were doing plus all the colleges ... It was just nuts.... And I said to Marje, "We need more trainers. We've got to have more people. There's just too much work." ... so we kind of cast our minds around. Your name came up. And Marje said, "Yes, Nym would be great. Why don't you phone her?" I said, "Okay." And Ron Monk was the same. And Michael Raynolds was the same.... so we would just phone people up and say, "Well, how would you like to be a trainer?" (N. McPhee, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

A practice of finding new coaches who lived in the region where courses were being offered began.

I had a big white board in my office, and sometimes we'd have people in Grand Forks and Smithers and Washington State, Victoria ... We used to have people all over the province. And then we'd try to find coaches, so Marje would say, "Well, go look at the student list and see if you can find someone who lives nearby." So we'd phone people up and say, "Do you

want to coach?" "Oh, sure." No training, no nothing. And they'd just show up and ... work for us. (N. McPhee, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

For people attempting to earn a living as private practitioners, mediators, the training or coaching days at the JIBC were virtually guaranteed income, given the popularity of the courses, and therefore desirable. "Growth was Marje's vision. Marje wanted growth ... And that was fine. We all wanted more work.... and that's what she did. She really grew the program" (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007).

Popularity and success

The Certificate in Conflict Resolution not only was, it was also seen as, the leader in conflict resolution training in British Columbia. Its first decade was marked by exponential popularity and growth. That popularity and growth can be explained in part by the JIBC program's lack of competition.

I think its certificate program demanded far more of people than any other program I had heard of. So there was the JI, there was CLE, Continuing Legal Education, which had about three courses ... there was one other ... the BCICAC required certain courses to be taken and others could be substituted for them, but they did some training. Other than that, I don't think anyone was doing any training in the late 80s, early 90s, mid 90s. (G. Sloan, personal interview, April 4, 2007)

The Certificate was the biggest program in Canada and perhaps in all of North America well into the 1990s. "There were others but we were definitely the predominant one" (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007). The program used personable, often charismatic, and certainly always competent trainers. The requirement for trainers to be practitioners both added credibility and strengthened applicability.

I think the other thing that defined us in particular is that we were always practitioners. We weren't just teachers. Not only could we teach this, we'd

been there ... we drew anecdotally from a ton of experience. (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

And, perhaps most important, people found the program very useful.

I think that the entire time I was there, I never heard the end of feedback from people that was exactly the same as my feedback on my first course. "I can't believe that this is here—I needed this kind of framework ... it's a piece of learning that we never got in school but it's basic human 101 dealing with people ... it's really broad in its applications". (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, March 13, 2007)

It clearly had a significant and positive impact on many thousands of individuals learners in the courses.

The actual content of the program itself has been transformational ... many of the people, most of the people, who've gone through the program ... students say constantly, "This changed my life and how I interact in my organization, in my home, in my family." (Pat Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007)

One explanation of the Certificate's popularity lay in content that was broadly applicable, generic, and skills-focused—it could be applied in many different ways. Trainers and learners could read into the curriculum content an ideological and practical orientation consistent with their individual beliefs and motivations. That range of readings allowed many to be attracted to the courses for very different reasons.

One reading was that of the conflict resolution movement and the peace movement, an ideological orientation towards imprecise but egalitarian and peaceful social change goals.

The program itself when I first came into it, I saw it as a much more idealistic place and a less pragmatic place than there is now. I saw people teaching in the role of advocates ... for the cause, meaning alternative dispute resolution and a peaceful world. (M. Govorchin, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

Elizabeth Azmier-Stewart, for example, read her own peace activism in the curriculum content:

I had grown up in a family where my mother identified herself as belonging to the international peace movement ... in my late teens at the height of the Civil Rights Movement, I did some training in nonviolence at a Quaker Center for peace studies ... plus I was very much involved in the peace movement and the antiwar movement in the '60s ... mediation just built on all my values. It seemed like such an expression of where I was and everything that I had done in the past, in terms of peace and peacemaking. (E. Azmier-Stewart, personal interview, February 10, 2007)

While she valued the interpersonal focus of the JIBC courses, she also read it as a route into social change.

In the 80s I was raising kids and my focus had shifted to the interpersonal realm. I saw the JI as offering many interpersonal tools and opportunities to re-examine our beliefs about ourselves and others, and about conflict and about resolution. I believed the interpersonal focus would eventually lead to the question of how power was used and the role of other contextual forces and therefore was another route to creating a more just and inclusive world. (E. Azmier-Stewart, personal interview, February 10, 2007)

A second reading, important for many, was that of personal transformation, a route to enhanced personal relationships.

When I'm out doing interventions or I'm out teaching, people come up to me and say, "Oh, I remember taking classes with you" ... people will say things like "That program changed my life!" ... And often people say the biggest impact was on their life personally. It changed their family dynamics, it changed their marriages, and it changed how they dealt with their kids. (D. White, personal interview, March 21, 2007)

This reading of the curriculum content, in particular, was an affirmation of curriculum and pedagogical focus. The entire base of the curriculum rested on approaches to conflict resolution centred in the interpersonal arena. The personal transformation reading also co-existed with most, if not all, other readings.

A third reading, one dominant in the earliest days of the Certificate, was that of providing tools for the helping professions. Joan Balmer remembers, “when we started it seemed to me we had a lot of self-help or non-profit people coming” (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007). Several trainers locate their educational practices within this helping reading. Mario Govorchin says “for me it kind of filled that ‘make everyone feel better, help people out’ need” (Personal interview, February 1, 2007). Dale Zaiser saw teaching conflict resolution skills as a faster way to reach, and help, more people than he ever could as a therapist.

I was never a social cause person ... I was always more concerned with “what's applicable to you personally?” ... I would've stayed as a therapist, but it would be too hard acquiring clients one hour at a time. This program allowed me, in a clandestine sort of way, to pay attention to improving people's life in a different sort of format. (Personal interview, February 1, 2007)

While the helping reading was primarily attractive to learners working in social service-related roles, by the early 90s the notion of conflict resolution skills being useful in all work setting had become a fourth, and dominant, reading. The Certificate is described by the January 1990 Extension Programs Course Schedule as “created to meet the needs of a wide range of professionals for dealing with conflict in their work environments” (JIBC, 1990a, p. 6) and in that term offered two specifically workplace-focused elective courses. *Conflict in organizations; Symptoms, origins and strategies* (p. 9) was designed to “increase awareness of organizational conflict and provide options that participants may then apply in their own situations” (p. 9). *Conflict resolution in the workplace* “will provide a road map and skills to help employees resolve conflict and help reduce workplace tensions” (p. 9).

The workplace improvement reading saw conflict resolution skills as an enhancer of work performance. It was taken up by individuals interested in career advancement, as well as by employers interested in decreasing the costly impacts of employee conflict. Because the Certificate content was skills-focused, the workplace improvement reading could be seen as ideologically neutral and therefore useful across union-management lines.

We started working with the Steelworkers and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Teamsters and the Longshoreman ... their motivation was, "Hey, management's taken on a new tack. Teach us how to do it, too." (M. Govorchin, personal interview, February 1, 2007).

The majority of learners coming to JIBC conflict resolution public registration courses from the late 80s on were there because they wanted to deal with their workplace conflicts better, and/or because they wanted to acquire skills that would be seen by their employer as enhancing their opportunities for promotion, and/or because they were being supported by their employer to attend courses as a form of professional development, or, less frequently, because they had been sent by their employer to be "fixed" (Wilkinson, 1996). The flourishing delivery of conflict resolution courses in workplace settings on a contract basis is another indicator of the dominance of the workplace improvement reading. Whether it was an accurate representation of the motivation of the majority of the trainers is questionable, but that this reading provided their bread-and-butter is indisputable. For many trainers, workplace applications were also meaningful and positive: "The difference you make in a workplace setting when you take people and teach them how to communicate successfully with each other and resolve differences ... there's no question in my mind it's been transformative" (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007).

A fifth and final reading was of the Certificate content as preparing mediators for practice. This was an original goal of the courses and an enduring theme.

I think it was a baseline for a lot of training qualifications.... The JI was the reference point for much of that and if you took a JI course that was trusted. So the public and the government departments in general and specifically the ones where mediation was being widely used, and the court system, all were referencing their requirements for training to the JI course. (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007)

While mediator preparation was of considerable interest to many of the original Certificate faculty and administrators, it was important to only a fairly small percentage of Certificate enrollees (Wilkinson, 1996).

Comment: As I remember, it was extremely contentious as to whether the JI certificate was a credential for practicing mediation. The field at large wanted to determine requirements of mediators in terms of training (standards of practice), but because of our dominance in the field, people wanting to get into it were using our certificate to indicate they were qualified. For many years we pulled our mediation assessment just for that reason. (Marg Huber, personal communication, February 12, 2009)

Conflict

The consequences of rapid and dramatic program growth were not all uncomplicatedly positive.

As it got bigger ... there was less of that congruent and integrated feeling ... There were all sorts of people ... and because everybody was sort of a solo ... there wasn't as much integration and collegiality and coming together to really ponder on where are we going, what are we doing, how is this moving, is it moving in ways that take us into new depths and where we want to go? (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

Competition for work eroded collegiality, and tensions in the atmosphere of camaraderie became evident.

It was a highly competitive field. For a bunch of collaborative people there was always a lot of competition around who got to teach what and who

should be teaching what and how many days of training you got versus how many days of training somebody else got and ... it wasn't fun. (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

It wasn't fun from the administrator's point of view either. The form of the trainer-JIBC relationship meant that while trainers could not count on a guaranteed income nor a guaranteed number of days, the Institute could not count on the trainer's availability.

It was difficult because the program was growing and there were a lot of trainers and a lot of coaches, and a number of the trainers would really rely on the program for the main part of their income ... I was put under pressure by some of them to almost guarantee them X number of courses per year which was really difficult to do. At the same time many of these people also had jobs elsewhere, so I couldn't also count on them because they could say, "No, I'm not available that day. I'm doing a course in the school," or wherever else. So it was a difficult balance to keep the courses with high-quality trainers who couldn't be on contract. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

Marg Huber sees the shift to seeing mediation and training as a career as one major factor in the escalation of the conflict.

That was a huge shift because then people were talking about their bread and butter and we were the bread and butter for a lot of trainers because we offered so many courses that they now could comfortably teach to criteria they were familiar with.... When this area of practice is people's livelihood, I think that brings with it all these other things that are so deeply imbedded in our society ... that you compete for greater advantage when you're trying to get ahead in your field. (Personal interview, April 26, 2007).

Each trainer or coach was contracted individually to teach or coach certain courses on certain days and this practice opened up potential for differing rates of pay.

I remember teaching a few courses, getting wind of the fact that somebody else was teaching similar courses, and it had been what I helped develop. And they were getting an extra \$160 a day, and I kind of lost it. (M. Govorchin, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

The original trainers had been designated as senior trainers with a higher pay rate than the newer trainers, as well as more access to courses. The cut off line between original and therefore senior, and the newer and therefore lesser-paid, trainers was an arbitrary, and contentious, one.

As we evolved, there became a designation called ‘senior trainers’, and the original group were the senior trainers and then there was everyone who came after. And at some point, the senior trainers were told that the others resented us because we had special privileges—we were paid more, we developed new courses and we taught more of the core courses. But we were shocked. We had had no idea they felt that way or that we were seen as ‘prima donnas’. Something changed after that. (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

While the conflict may have originated in competition for training days, it broadened into a number of other areas. Ownership of materials was one.

For the most part, we all contributed stuff and it got lost as to whose idea was what and who contributed what which was fine for some of us. For some of us, it wasn’t so fine. And ... there was some tension around ... the whole notion of who owned what and who was getting credit for what. (M. Fogel, personal interview, January 25, 2007)

The sites of conflict became more numerous and the topics less concrete, “about all kinds of things” (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, February 8, 2007).

They were things like ... who’s teaching their own thing rather than the agreed curriculum, or how much of our personal lives should be disclosed as examples when teaching the concepts ... where the line should be drawn and who’s being appropriate and who’s not and who’s a good trainer and who isn’t and who’s having a conflict with Marje ... there was lots of conflict among the trainer community and between the trainers and Marje. (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

Pat Ross sees some of the conflict as inevitable given the Certificate faculty model where the content expertise of the faculty contractor could well clash with JIBC administrative “guidance”.

One of our challenges has always been, particularly for Community Programs under whatever iteration, the fact that we don't have full-time permanent faculty. We're dealing with people who are independent, who often are our competitors. So we relied very much on our coordinator position to be the linchpin for providing the standards and guidance in terms of the classroom delivery. ... I think the trainers from the start ... saw themselves as the experts. That was probably a flaw in the model. And there were always some levels of tension between the role of our person, whether it was a coordinator or program director, and their role. (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007)

Marje Burdine remembers challenges arising from the “strong individuals” involved and the pressures of program growth.

There was a lot of growth ... and one of the challenges is always to have quality trainers and not compromise that, quality coaches, and make sure ... and that there was a sense of team and a sense of respect between people. And again, that's a real challenge because we were very strong individuals, strong individuals all of us, and I guess I had very high standards for what I wanted to have the program be about, and I didn't want to compromise that. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

Marg Huber saw conflicts both from the trainer and the administrator role.

Terrible conflict. ... I was in the fortuitous position of having been in both positions, of having been an instructor for many years before I took over Marje's job. And I have to tell you when I sat in that seat I much better understood the pressures on Marje.... It's easy to take shots ... and yes, there was a huge amount of conflict, for courses, for who was going to teach what course and all the rest of it and who was in line behind who and who had how many courses to teach, etcetera, and then a lot of hard feelings directed towards Marje ... A lot of it was fuelled by enormous pressure that I don't think I understood at the time. (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007)

The intensity and unresolved nature of the conflicts seems particularly ironic given the content of the courses those involved were teaching.

We were competing with each other for courses instead of trying to work together in a way that drew out people's strengths and created something for the greater good of all ... Surely we should have been able to do this, if

we were putting ourselves out as experts in this field who were willing to walk our talk. Surely we should have been able to collaborate and transcend our differences. (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007)

What is not merely ironic but painful is the legacy of those unaddressed conflicts—mistrust, disconnection, separation.

It grew to such a stage ... that there were sides taken and lots of gossip and subtle threats about your future as a trainer. And it was very, very ugly and a lot of conflict. There were confrontations and explosions and then gossip about those. Some people left. ... I guess we pointed the finger at Marje quite a bit ... I just drifted further and further away ... and did my work and went home. And ... the group started to disband. There was no collegiality. (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

Like the stability of curriculum and pedagogy, the patterns of conflictual relations amongst faculty members and between faculty members and administration that developed in the early 90s continued over time.

Comment: I think many of the tensions between faculty and admin which existed in the early days were addressed after much discussion, when leadership changed hands, and resulted in more clarity in terms of criteria and vision. Ongoing tension from that time on was in my mind more related to competition and complacency issues, and the fact that we were now providing a living for trainers and coaches, (with all the associated financial issues) not inventing something new anymore. But certainly there was a pattern of tension that continued and a lack of collaboration. (Marg Huber, personal communication, February 12, 2009)

Ossification

In the 1990 to 1993 period, the Certificate in Conflict Resolution experienced exponential growth and unparalleled popularity and success. Much work had taken place on curriculum re-development, resulting in new versions of four required course manuals in 1991 in which the consensus elements of the core curriculum had coalesced into a recognizable JIBC conflict resolution model. A second generation of trainers, all of

whom were Certificate graduates and coaches, had been hired and the pedagogical approaches of the first generation of trainers adopted by the second. A considerable level of unresolved conflict existed amongst faculty and between faculty and administration. Mediation was beginning to acquire more visibility both as a legitimate dispute resolution process and as a career. Marg Huber describes her memory of a shift that occurred just as a consequence of the maturing of the program, from the heady excitement of beginning to the work and worry of maintaining,

A huge switch happened somewhere in those years, when we no longer were in that strongly innovative beginners' phase, as a young program which was so exciting to me, and I think to everybody. There was some real grief involved in that. We weren't having as much fun as we used to have. It wasn't as deeply satisfying. (Personal interview, April 26, 2007)

Several factors contributed to the solidifying of a "JIBC conflict resolution discourse" between 1990 and 1993. One, likely the most significant factor, was simply the growth of the program. "It was just taking off like you wouldn't believe ... We were flying people around all over the place, and it was amazing" (N. McPhee, personal interview, January 28, 2007). The success of the program meant that an enormous amount of administrative work was required to keep it functioning. In 1990 there were four staff people listed as working in the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training (JIBC 1990a). By 1993 the number had doubled to eight (JIBC, 1993b). However, this growth in staffing was apparently still not sufficient to meet all the demands.

There are currently over 800 people registered as candidates for the Certificate Program. As you can imagine, this is stretching our resources considerably and we are constantly looking at other ways to be able to respond to the requests for more courses, more assessments and more time from the staff. (Burdine, 1993, p. 1)

As more and more attention needed to be paid to managing the logistical demands of such a large program, time and energy for open-ended and creative conversations diminished.

In addition, re-examination of curriculum content or pedagogical practices was not required as a response to outside criticisms or outside competition as there was little of either.

The practice of hiring new coaches from the pool of Certificate graduates and new trainers from the pool of Certificate coaches was a stabilizing, indeed self-replicating, element. “As the reins got handed over ... the new trainers used our training materials” (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, February 8, 2007). They came as coaches and trainers into a program that had already-developed content, already-developed teaching approaches and already-developed patterns of relationship amongst trainers and coaches and between trainers and coaches and administrators. They knew how classes were supposed to be taught because they had been learners and then coaches in those classes. “The move from bringing in people with external expertise that can be an additive to the program to home grown, was a huge shift” (D. Zaiser, personal interview, February 1, 2007).

Program graduates who became coaches and then trainers were people who were committed to the ideas of collaborative conflict resolution that they had been taught as students in the Certificate and were usually strongly attracted to the possibility of careers as mediators and conflict resolution trainers. As the educational program grew, so did the practice field. The increasing popularity of mediation as a profession, or a least as a

career, brought more learners to classes but it also increased competition for work both inside and outside the JI.

There were more people coming into the program in transition in employment and wanting to be mediators, “We want to be trained as mediators so we can make a living.” And there were many instructors that operated that way, too. (S. Holloway, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

The conflict amongst faculty and between faculty and administration that was based at least partially on competition for training and mediation work was itself a factor in working against collective conversations that might have led to curricular, pedagogical or relationship shifts. Such opportunities were minimized as the original group “who did all of the work together ... kind of blew apart over the conflicts” (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, February 8, 2007).

Everybody became too busy to get together, they didn’t have time for a bunch of meetings.... I remember there were efforts at meetings to develop curriculum and people were saying, “I’m not going to come to a bunch of meetings to write the curriculum for this place. Pay me.” (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

Conflict and an increasing shift to seeing conflict resolution training and practice as a career eroded the collegial but unpaid collective creation of course and program materials and ended the social/professional program gatherings where new ideas, new field developments and new practice approaches had previously been debated and integrated into the curriculum.

The face of the JI curriculum—the linear four stage model, the centrality of role-play and the centrality of interests as a basis for resolution stayed the same, but there was a wide variation amongst individual trainers that challenged the way we presented the model, the centrality of interests and the ubiquity of role-play especially as it related to our First Nation students. The seeds for potential change were there. The question is what were the dynamics that prevented them from being picked up and

developed to a greater degree? (Elizabeth Azmier-Stewart, personal communication, February 13, 2009)

While the program continued to expand throughout the 1990s and the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training implemented many new initiatives and responded in many ways throughout that decade to the changing requirements of the educational institution, the B.C. post-secondary system, and the increasing professionalization of mediation, the core curriculum content, the pedagogical practices, and the relational patterns between faculty and administration and amongst faculty groupings remained substantially unchanged. After the early 1990s when the core curriculum had coalesced, pedagogical practices had been adopted by a new generation of trainers, and the mistrustful relational patterns frozen in place, all subsequent change efforts had to take place in the context of those patterns, had to work against the inertia of what already was.

Comment: I can't remember exactly how things went, but my experience was that the conflicts and the program continued to shift all during the time I was there I don't remember things 'crystallizing' or 'freezing in place' during those years. Definitely, the headiness and much of the creative synergy had gone, but we were still dynamically working on the program. (Karen Haddigan Blackburn, personal communication, January 29, 2009)

It is not the purpose of this dissertation to examine the Certificate in Conflict Resolution during the middle and later 1990s and into the 2000s, but several of my interviewees responded to the theme of ossification and their comments paint a vivid picture of both the immense energies that went into new initiatives and change attempts as well as the challenges associated with making changes in the context of such a large and well-established program.

Comment: I have a lot of trouble with your major theme of ossification ... I don't recall ever considering our program to be the definitive word on

the subject, and spent a lot of time reflecting on how the program served the community at large, and which community it served!! ... To me it seems as though the major challenge we were all dealing with which caused us so much angst in the years post '93 was managing growth. Overall I did find it very difficult to make substantial changes in the program because there seemed to be a big investment on the part of many in keeping it intact, as we had such positive feedback and because the trainers thought of themselves as experts and had shifted from the creation phase into the career phase. (Marg Huber, personal communication, February 12, 2009)

The influence of the requirements of the institution, of the post-secondary system and of the increasingly professionalized field of mediation on the Certificate form a notable theme.

It feels that once you come under the wing or under the direction of the overall institution, that there's boundaries—not this maverick, free, let's see where we need to go kind of organic group ... I felt a sadness personally that it put us in the mainstream rather than “What is the next evolving development in this immense and important field of conflict?” (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

Comment: All of us used the original materials as a base but we expanded and brought in change and adaptation from our current practices and from our roots ... I see the role of the self-replicating nature of the trainers and training as less of a factor in our ossification than the institutional response ... I would place a lot more weight on the pressures created by institutional needs and administrative priorities in making program decisions to continue offering more of the same rather than growing the seeds of change that were present to explain the ossification. Decisions got made for economic reasons and to synchronize us with of the rest of the post-secondary system in a way that increased our rigidity and sameness. (Elizabeth Azmier-Stewart, personal communication, February 13, 2009)

Institutionalization, driven by the size of the Certificate program, its increasing visibility within the JIBC, and learner requests for transfer credit which required aligning the Certificate with the credit-granting practices of the B.C. post-secondary system were all factors promoting program stability that began to emerge in the early 1990s but

intensified dramatically later in that decade. As Marg Huber sees it, this resulted in “a stifling effect on creativity and spontaneity” and led to the Certificate “conforming to the larger requirements ... imposed from the system at large” (Personal interview, April 26, 2007).

As we became bigger we lost flexibility. We lost a lot of the creativity we had in the early years because we had to standardize within our own program, never mind with the field or other educational institutes ... getting all those standards in place and developing criteria and equivalencies took a lot of our time and focus. It meant much tighter learning goals and objectives ... The success of the program dictated it in many ways, because other educational institutions now offering conflict resolution courses wanted to measure their programs against ours. And the field at large was growing rapidly. There was pressure from the field to create standards of practice to protect the public from unethical practice. We lost a lot of our uniqueness in this process, in my view. (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007)

Perhaps ossification is too harsh a term to describe the stabilizing of core course curriculum, pedagogical practices and relational patterns in the early 90s.

Comment: It's ironic that the unique institutional factors of the JI—the ability to adapt to changing political priorities which was an institutional survival strategy, the cost-recovery nature of the program, the requirement for generating revenue and the changing place of the JI within the post-secondary system—all factors that contributed to the program's creative growth in the beginning were the same ones that contributed to limiting the institutional take-up of our innovations. (Elizabeth Azmier-Stewart, personal communication, February 13, 2009)

It does, however, appear that despite a number of concerted efforts, and many interesting and valuable initiatives in other areas, the Certificate in Conflict Resolution Training did not implement substantive changes in what was taught in the required courses in the Certificate nor in how those were taught. Another constant was a persistent sense of mistrust between faculty members and administration including perceptions of unfairness in hiring, course allocation and pay, as well as ongoing divisions among

various faculty groupings. As Nancy McPhee says in terms of the program evolving “when I hear myself talk about it, no, it hasn't evolved very much ... and that's kind of sad” (Personal interview, January 28, 2007).

While there were both material and emotional reasons for the difficulty of implementing fundamental curricular and pedagogical change and while program stability was likely a benefit in ensuring a recognizable JIBC curriculum and pedagogical “brand”, the price of an increasing disconnection from the newer developments in theoretical understandings of conflict and additional options for intervening in conflict was a high one. The cost of the broken relationships is incalculable.

CHAPTER 9: THEMES AND SUGGESTIONS

The purpose of a final chapter in a dissertation is traditionally to summarize the research findings, and to put forward recommendations for the improvement of practice and further research. In a narrative, the purpose of the ending is to present the outcome of the story, the “completed episode” (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 18).

[N]arrative is a meaning structure that organizes events and human actions into a whole, thereby attributing significance to individual actions and events according to their effect on the whole ... Narrative provides a symbolized account of actions that include a temporal dimension. (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 18)

In this final chapter, I will attend to all these purposes: to summarize my research findings, to link the significance of the actions already described to the temporal whole, the outcome of the story, and to make recommendations.

Answering the research questions

What shaped the emergence of conflict resolution as a field of practice?

The JIBC Certificate in Conflict Resolution was part of a conflict resolution movement that emerged in the United States in the 1970s. Mediation programs, both community-based and court-connected, were created to divert cases from the court system, to offer a speedier and perhaps more satisfying resolution process for disputants. Additionally, community mediation activists saw mediation programs using community volunteers as an alternative to the formal justice system, as putting the power to resolve disputes back into the hands of the people, and as a vehicle for individual and community

empowerment. A parallel upsurge in the use of mediation between divorcing couples to make agreements about parenting and asset division, called family mediation, also spread rapidly in the 1970s and 1980s and saw itself, and was seen as, part of the overall conflict resolution movement. Education in conflict resolution skills in K–12, university-based programs, and community-based adult education offerings, flourished as part of movement activity.

In Canada the first manifestations of a conflict resolution field were a series of pilot projects related to Unified Family Courts in the 1970s using mediators and the 1975 creation of the first Victim-Offender Reconciliation Project (VORP) in Kitchener, Ontario. A third early Canadian initiative was a late 1970s federal government-funded series of demonstration projects across the country testing different alternative measures processes for juveniles. The people working on those projects were brought together by the federal government periodically and that network was the precursor to the first Canadian mediation organizations.

The conflict resolution movement both in Canada and the U.S. was characterized by energy, enthusiasm, and an “evangelical” (Tidwell, 1998, p. xi) belief that the use of mediation and the teaching of conflict resolution skills would create peaceful individuals, families, organizations, communities, and eventually nations.

The value of the exploration of conflict resolution movement emergence in the United States and Canada that forms Chapter 3 of this dissertation lies in two areas. Conflict resolution is relatively new both as an academic discipline and as field of practice and is emergent and eclectic. The history of the conflict resolution movement is only now beginning to be written, and most of the writers of those histories are located

within the academic peace and conflict studies area (Kriesberg, 1991, 1997, 2003; Schellenberg, 1982; Scimecca, 1998; Tidwell, 1998). The examination in this dissertation of what theoretical perspective were influential, what practice approaches were adopted, and what connections to the rest of the field were established by a British Columbia post-secondary training program illuminates that history from a different vantage point. It may permit more comparisons across field developments in different parts of North America as well as providing a detailed example for the exploration and analysis of how theories and practices migrated, and which ones did so.

Second, there is virtually no documentation of the emergence of the conflict resolution field in Canada. The preliminary sketch presented in this dissertation is therefore both valuable in itself and, more importantly, valuable for the questions it suggests for further exploration. For example, there appear to be differences between the origins and development of the field of practice in Canada and the United States that should be explored further.

What was the inter-relationship between the educational program and the field of practice in British Columbia?

In the absence of any earlier research or any published writings, I explored the inter-relationship between the existence of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution at the JIBC and the development of the field of practice in B.C. through interviews. The existence of the JIBC conflict resolution program had a very significant influence on the development of the field of practice in B.C. The Certificate in Conflict Resolution at the JIBC functioned as a gathering place for people interested in mediation, and its trainers, coaches, administrators and students made substantial contributions to the development

of the field. JIBC administrators and early faculty members played leadership roles in many of the newly forming mediation organizations including the Mediation Development Association of BC, The Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution and Family Mediation Canada. Trainers, administrators and students were instrumental in starting community-based mediation programs and in introducing new applications of mediation practice to B.C. Additionally, JIBC approaches to teaching mediation and conflict resolution were spread through conference presentations and contract trainings throughout Canada and the western United States, although the influence of the program was most visible in western Canada and the Yukon. The JIBC Certificate in Conflict Resolution during its first decade was both affected by and one player in the evolution in B.C. from a movement vision of mediation as a practice of social transformation to mediation as an institutionalized and professionalized aspect of mainstream dispute resolution technologies.

There is no doubt that this research is preliminary and additional research particularly into the specific histories of the community-based mediation service organizations, the histories of the mediation membership organizations, and into the topic of the relationship between the introduction of mediation/ADR and the response of the legal profession, particularly the impact of the education and training initiatives of Continuing Legal Education (CLE) in B.C., would be most useful. This research has just touched on the shift from movement to profession in mediation field development and a much more detailed exploration of that topic is warranted.

What was the influence of the program's location in a public post-secondary institution?

The Certificate in Conflict Resolution emerged out of the historical context of a North American conflict resolution movement, but was created and located in the much more specific context of a British Columbia public post-secondary institution, the Justice Institute of British Columbia. The original idea for the JIBC emerged in a period of justice system reform in B.C. in the early 1970s. It was to provide integrated training for justice system-related roles under one roof and also to provide access to the public to justice and legal education under that same roof. The vision was that boundaries between professional roles, and boundaries between the professionals and the public, would disappear. By the time the JIBC was actually created in 1978, that vision had shifted to one of improved efficiencies and cost-savings. These two themes, an idealistic and reformist approach to justice system-related issues, and a pragmatic emphasis on efficiency and minimizing government expenditures on training, endured throughout all subsequent JIBC history.

The JIBC was unusual within the B.C. post-secondary system. It had a unique mandate as the provider of training to all B.C. government-funded justice, public safety and emergency health services employees and as a result of this mandate had truly peculiar funding and accountability relationships with a number of government ministries, leading to an institutional culture that was both pre-occupied with institutional survival and, possibly as a consequence, very supportive of new and innovative program development, particularly of those programs that were popular with clients or students.

The Certificate in Conflict Resolution was created in the Community Programs branch of a JIBC division called Educational Services, where, as the name implies, a wide range of innovative educational offerings were created to serve the inter-

disciplinary needs of the various professions being trained at the JIBC, as well as the legal and justice-system educational needs of the general public. One particular focus was the development of conferences and courses on the newly emerging topic of family violence, and co-ordinator Marje Burdine was hired in 1981 to set up such conferences around the province. Concerned at the lack of resources available for preventing or responding to family violence in the smaller B.C. communities, Marje Burdine conceived of a plan to train community volunteers as mediators who could intervene in conflict situations before they escalated to the point of violence. She went to Seattle to a two-and-a-half day training offered by University of Georgia divorce mediator Sheila Kessler, and developed and offered the first public registration course in mediation in Canada in 1983.

A high level of demand for mediation and other conflict resolution-related courses, combined with a desire to offer more advanced courses and to respond to student requests for some kind of credential, led to the launching of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution in January 1986. The emergence of the Certificate was facilitated by several characteristics of JIBC institutional culture including a broad interpretation of the overall institutional and the specific Community/Extension Programs mandates, minimal centralized processes for the approval or control of program content based on the extremely high level of divisional autonomy, a culture of educational experimentation and a requirement for generating income within a 'market-driven' and entrepreneurial institution.

The value of the detailed examination of the history of the JIBC and the founding of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution in this dissertation may lie in its contribution to the relatively sparse literature on the specific histories and analyses of post-secondary

educational institutions in the B.C. public system. Even more specifically, the JIBC story may affirm through its similarities, and contest through its differences, the theme of struggle between local control/institutional autonomy and centralized provincial government control that appears to characterize much of the history of the B.C. college system (Dennison, 1995; Dennison & Gallagher, 1986; Gaber, 2003; Levin, 2000, 2001, 2003). It was the uniqueness of the JIBC that allowed the Certificate in Conflict Resolution to emerge. It would have been difficult, likely impossible, for a program based in no well-known academic discipline, and preparing practitioners for a non-existent job role, to develop in any other B.C. public post-secondary site.

What ideas about teaching and learning influenced the instructional approaches of the program?

The pedagogy of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was constructed from ideas about learning and teaching in circulation in the 1970s and 1980s, particularly the new ideas about adult learning formulated by social psychologist Kurt Lewin and his successors in National Training Laboratories, humanist psychologist Carl Rogers and adult educator Malcolm Knowles. These progressive and humanist adult education orientations clashed within the Certificate in Conflict Resolution with a more prescriptive overall JIBC competency-based behavioural approach and a highly specific behavioural way of teaching interpersonal skills called structured learning, although this latter was more frequently transmuted in the Certificate into a cognitive-behavioural approach. The differing educational philosophies were never articulated, and the unarticulated philosophical differences fuelled sometimes quite conflictual opinions on teaching and particularly on the structure of the end-of-program performance assessment.

Trainers with differing philosophical orientations shared classroom techniques and also shared a primarily constructivist understanding of learning, one that privileged a de-contextualized cognitive-rational process of reflection on concrete experience as the best way for people to learn. The teaching practices of the trainers in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution were set by the time of the emergence of the Certificate in 1986. New trainers learned how to teach from watching existing trainers and this apprenticeship model of trainer preparation, plus a lack of opportunity to examine ideas about teaching and learning, meant that the teaching practices have remained substantially unchanged.

By tracing particular adult education orientations and their migration into the Certificate in Conflict Resolution via particular individual trainer biographies, as well as by tracing the lineages of particular pedagogical methodologies and the adult education philosophies that underlie them, this dissertation contributes to understandings of how and why particular adult education discourses develop and are taken up in particular contexts. Additionally, the stories of the individual trainers illustrate educator identity creation in an adult education context, an area of teacher identity less well-explored. Finally, the ubiquity of the experiential approaches, and particularly of the role-play methodology, in other conflict resolution, mediation, and negotiation training programs, whether based in academic locations or in community ones, means that this detailed examination of the theoretical and historical roots of the pedagogical practices of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution may be of benefit more broadly.

What ideas about conflict and the resolving of conflict influenced the content of the JIBC conflict resolution education program?

The question about what ideas about conflict shaped the content taught in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution was originally, in my mind at least, the central question in my research. I wanted to understand the theoretical bases of the program content, the “intellectual history.” I had fondly, but wrongly, imagined that the early faculty members would be able to tell me what books they had been reading when they created the early course manuals and that it would be relatively easy to trace back to the origins of the particular ideas embedded in the course content. The people I interviewed remembered U.S. mediation trainer Sheila Kessler as the source of the early mediation course content, Lee Rengert as the source of the anger course content, and William Fisher and Roger Ury’s 1981 *Getting to Yes* as the source of the negotiation course content. My efforts to trace the ideas in Kessler’s 1978 mediation training manual, Rengert’s 1986 and 1987 course manuals, Fisher and Ury’s popular, indeed, best-selling 1981 book comprise most of the content of Chapter 7 in this dissertation.

Kessler’s mediation approaches were based on Morton Deutsch’s (1973) theories about co-operative approaches to conflict, and her mediation model seems to have been an adaptation of a psycho-therapeutic problem-solving model. Much of Rengert’s course content on anger and conflict appeared to have been sourced in the ‘self-help’ literature of the human potential movement. Much of that popular literature was based on cognitive-behavioural psychological theories originating in the 1940s with Albert Ellis, plus a goodly strain of pure behaviourism, a substantial dollop of Carl Roger’s humanist psychological theory, and a trace of Freudian theory; in summary, an eclectic collection

of psychological theories of the twentieth century. Another important element was drawn from popularizations of biomedical research on stress and the relaxation response.

The negotiation course content appears to have travelled the shortest distance from its academic research origins to the JIBC classrooms. Fisher and Ury based their 1981 book on ideas current in the conflict resolution discipline of the time, particularly Walton and McKersie's 1960s research on collective bargaining paired with the empirical research findings of laboratory experiments based on game theory, itself an outgrowth of utility theory.

By 1991 when new versions of four required Certificate course manuals were produced, (*Dealing with Interpersonal Conflict, Dealing with Anger, Negotiation Skills Level I* and *Mediation Skills Level I*), a JIBC conflict resolution model had coalesced. Its main elements were: an emphasis on understanding self in conflict primarily through the use of the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument, the physiological and cognitive management of anger, a four-stage sequential mediation, negotiation and interpersonal conflict resolution model, and a focus on the use of micro-communication skills to elicit and reveal interests as the route to win-win resolution. Theoretical contradictions, in particular a resolution process based on assumptions of rationality and objectivity paired with a definition of conflict based on perceptions and emotions, were embedded in the curriculum.

The JIBC conflict resolution course content was sourced in theories about conflict and its resolution that were individualistic and interpersonal, rather than cultural, historical, or societal. This individualistic and interpersonal focus was chosen for reasons of teachability and applicability across the widest possible range of potential students and

contract clients, in time-pressured training situations, rather than as a result of discussion and debate leading to conscious adoption of a particular theoretical perspective.

Curriculum content in the Certificate's core courses remained quite stable in succeeding years with new content in the Certificate being presented in optional elective courses only. One result of this stability was that new developments in both theory and practice in the conflict resolution field, such as the critiques of mediation practice and mediation training as culturally biased and the more contextual and relational approaches to the resolution of conflict that arose from those critiques, were not incorporated into the core curriculum of the Certificate.

The value of the tracing of the roots of the Certificate curriculum in this dissertation lies first in the description of the curriculum development as a process of accretion, various layers being laid down by the chance occurrences of who was present as instructors and what their previous professional backgrounds had been. This contributes to the scholarly conversation on curriculum development by adding to those perspectives that see curriculum development as less about planning, or the careful articulation of disciplinary bodies of knowledge, and more about historical trends and the pressures on the educational institution from outside (Slaughter, 1997).

However, the primary value of the surfacing of the theoretical roots of the conflict resolution curriculum at the JIBC may lie in its challenge to the notion that the Certificate was only a practically focused, skills-based program that eschewed theory. All practices are based on theories, whether those involved in the practice are consciously aware of those theories or not. Charles Taylor (1985) holds that if the theoretical and historical bases of practitioner views are not made evident, it may be difficult for practitioners to

become critical concerning their own practice (Taylor, 1985, p. 93). He considers the making visible of the theoretical and historical bases of practitioner beliefs to be essential in allowing practitioners to consider their self-understandings of practice in order to decide if, or how, the practice should continue or change.

We may be led to formulate some self-understanding in order to rescue a practice, to make it possible to continue it, to put it on a securer basis, or perhaps to reform it, to purify it. The point, one might say, of the formulation here is just to provide the constitutive understanding necessary for the continuing, or reformed, or purified practice. (Taylor, 1985, p. 105)

The dissertation content that concerns itself with the theories about conflict and its resolution that underlie the Certificate curriculum will assist in making visible the historical and theoretical bases of the beliefs that shaped the Certificate in the 1980s. It may be, as Taylor (1985) believes, that becoming aware of their theoretical bases, of their self-understandings, may lead not only my JIBC colleagues but other conflict resolution educators and practitioners to a continued individual and collective practice that is committed to ongoing active and critical examination.

The unanticipated story

The research questions created at the beginning of the research process represented the directions I wanted to explore. The people interviewed were politely willing to answer my questions, but the story they wanted to tell wasn't in answer to any of my questions.

The story they told had classic elements. A group of people united in an important cause. Bonded by excitement and idealism, they created an educational program, and they created themselves as conflict resolution practitioners. They had no plan to do so, it

all just unfolded. They brought everything they knew about teaching and about conflict and worked very hard to find the best ways to teach their students and help their clients. They joined and led conflict resolution practitioner organizations, they introduced new areas of mediation practice to B.C., and they formed mediation service agencies.

Their educational program was enormously successful. They were asked to teach all over the country. Thousands of people flocked to their classes and gold flowed into their pockets. But as the educational program got bigger and bigger, and the group of colleagues, of friends, of visionaries relied more on conflict resolution training and mediation practice for their income, tensions arose. Status, reputation, pay rates, number of JIBC training days—all became conflict issues. The people and the educational program continued to be very successful but the friendships shattered, the vision splintered, the excitement faded.

The juice wasn't there anymore. But the juice was definitely there in the beginning. And there was a group of people excited and passionate to work together and figure this out. And once that disintegrated, I never felt it again. (K. Haddigan Blackburn, personal interview, February 8, 2007)

The end of this story, the outcome, has in a very real way not yet happened. The Certificate in Conflict Resolution continues to attract learners and continues to offer those learners practical, and often personally transformative conflict resolution knowledge and skills in highly participatory and interactive classroom contexts. However, the story told in this dissertation, the story of the first decade, ends in 1993. The main themes of that story are the unplanned and unforeseen unfolding of the educational program and of careers as trainers and mediators, the excitement of the collegial and collective curriculum creation and then the subsequent conflict and erosion of collegiality, and a

perception that the core curriculum, the pedagogical practices and the relationships, stopped changing.

Unfolding

Factors that contribute to an understanding of the popularity and growth of the Certificate in its first decade include its lack of competition, and its useful, personally relevant, and well-taught content that was attractive to a wide range of students and clients because of the multiple possible readings of its ideological and practical orientations. However, there is also a way that the growth of the Certificate defies strict cause and effect explanation. In memory, it all just unfolded, an idea whose time had come.

We came in and all of a sudden it went really big ... it's like the idea whose time has come ... we just sort of stepped into a momentum that was gathering and gave it a framework and gave it a voice and a place to really work. (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

That momentum that the JIBC program stepped into was the conflict resolution movement, and perhaps Marje Burdine captures the movement moment best.

I think when we started the program it was a concept that was waiting to happen, and who knows why these things happen. It almost seemed like a bubble ready to burst, and quickly, in various places around the world. ... The world seemed ready for it. (M. Burdine, personal interview, January 24, 2007)

The JIBC started an educational program in conflict resolution in a decade where the world seemed ready to embrace that content. By 1990 it was the undisputed leader in conflict resolution training in British Columbia, the Yukon, and all of western Canada.

We did a hell of a job ... these were the courses to take, this was the place to come ... and we blew any competition out of the water. (M. Govorchin, personal interview, February 1, 2007)

Creation of identity

One main project of this first decade for the individuals who made up the core training group of the Certificate, arguably the primary project of the decade, was the creation of identity as conflict resolution practitioners, as mediators in private practice. Mayer (2004) notes that mediators tend to have a number of co-existing motivations for entering the practice, but that making a difference in the world is frequently an important one. “Most mediators do this work not simply out of an interest in the field or a sense that this is a reasonable way to make a living, but because they believe mediation is contributing in an important way to improving our world” (p. 105). Picard’s (2000) research into how Canadian mediators constructed the meaning(s) of their work found

[t]he more recently an individual became a mediator the more likely they were drawn to do this work for reasons associated with personal growth and job satisfaction. Conversely veteran mediators were more likely to be drawn to work as mediators by visions of social transformation and empowerment. (Picard, 2000, p. 222)

Early Certificate trainers, all veteran mediators by the time I interviewed them, expressed a range of motivations for entering the field. Overall, making a difference in the world, or at least in people’s lives, was a consistent theme. However, the reasons articulated for engaging in the work of conflict resolution were more mixed than Picard’s (2000) respondents seemed to indicate. Certainly themes of social transformation and empowerment were prominent, however, job satisfaction reasons were also prominent. Other motivations which seem to fall outside of Picard’s (2000) categories were the accessibility of a professional mediator identity without the lengthy and arduous educational and apprenticeship provisions of most professions, the ability to be of assistance to others, the degree of control over the conditions of one’s working life that

private practice mediation and conflict resolution training offered, and the ability to have the material benefits of good pay and control over working conditions while staying connected to a personal sense of values.

The documentation of conflict resolution practitioner identity creation in this dissertation, particularly the examination of the complex motivations for adopting such an identity in the absence of a local field of practice and before any local sense of profession had emerged, makes a contribution to the scholarly conversation on mediator professionalization (Picard, 2000; Scimecca, 1998).

Conflict

Being a trainer or a coach at the JIBC was a badge of mediator credibility and a boost to a mediation career. By the early 1990s competition for the benefits of JIBC training work in a private practice context of more mediators than mediation cases fuelled an atmosphere of tension and unresolved conflict amongst JIBC trainers and coaches and between the trainers/coaches and the administrators. While those conflicts may have been sourced in the inevitable differences between institutional requirements and trainer desires regarding control of hiring, pay rates, course allocation, and scheduling, one alternative analysis is offered by Fraher (2004). She researched the historical cycles within several “idea organizations,” including National Training Laboratories in the U.S. and the Tavistock Institute in England, and found that idea organizations are highly creative, innovative and frequently very successful in their early years but then stagnate. She attributes much of this stagnation to consistent patterns of internal conflict between the older, founding generation who develop “strong emotional bonds with ‘their’ ideas” and the younger generation who frequently feel “that their full capacities remain

unrecognized” and that they “can never be accepted as full members of the organization” (p. 5). The founding generation tends to experience criticism of the original ideas as a personal attack. Organizational conflict then plays out “as if it were an intergenerational family drama ... causing feuds and splits to develop” (p. 5). While this analysis seems in some ways applicable to the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training, it was not so much the ideas of the founders that were criticized as their perceived status and pay, and personal attacks were not merely perception. Nonetheless, the analysis is useful: the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training conflicts certainly did, in many ways, play out like an intergenerational family drama.

Whatever the sources of the conflict, inter-generational or located in the material factors of unprecedented program growth, competition for training and mediation work, and lack of clarity or consistency regarding pay rates and course allocations, one consequence was that the strong social and professional bonding of the 1980s and the collective and collegial process of course and program development eroded. It appears that the people involved were not successful in applying the conflict resolution approaches they were teaching to the overall Centre situation. It is possible that individualistic and interpersonal applications of an interest-based negotiation approach were ineffective as a resolution method because the conflict situation was neither merely individual nor simply interpersonal, but influenced by systemic JIBC institutional structures as well as by larger cultural themes of hierarchy, status and power. It appears that the individuals involved attributed their inability to resolve the conflict to insufficient personal skill in both self and others, rather than deficiencies in their theories of conflict and its resolution.

Solidification

Although Fraher (2004) is describing the idea organization and training provider, NTL, when she says it “rode the waves of its successful training programs ignoring the closed, self-serving system it was creating” (2004, p. 123), that description could perhaps equally well apply to the JIBC conflict resolution program. A number of factors contributed to the hardening of the boundaries of the JIBC conflict resolution discourse in the early 1990s. Core course curriculum had coalesced into a JIBC conflict resolution model, pedagogical practices had been adopted unchanged by a new generation of trainers, and a conflictual pattern of relationship between faculty and administrators and amongst faculty had become set in place.

The success of the program, its excellent reputation, and near-monopoly status meant that there were few pressures from outside competition or criticism to drive re-examination of content or pedagogy. The continued rapid growth of the program meant that simply managing its day-to-day functioning required considerable amounts of focus and energy. Energy and focus were also drained by the ongoing and unresolved conflicts amongst faculty and between faculty and administration. Overall, there was little widespread appetite amongst the majority of faculty members for engaging in self-examination and change to the core program. The Certificate in Conflict Resolution therefore did not move newer currents in conflict resolution theory-building and practice into its core course curriculum in the early 1990s, those based in criticisms of cultural bias and emphasizing a more complex and relational view of conflict and its resolution.

The discussion of the solidifying of the boundaries of the curriculum, pedagogy, and relationships in the Certificate in Conflict Resolution in this dissertation adds an

example to the scholarly conversations about the relationship between practice and institution, the perhaps inevitable process whereby an innovative educational practice is influenced and concretized by the requirements of the institution in which it is housed and the larger systems of which it is a part (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2000; McIntyre, 1983).

Does it matter?

Looking back on the Certificate in Conflict Resolution from a vantage point in the 2000s, it is hard to escape the conclusion that not keeping current with the newer approaches in theory and practice was a disadvantage for the JIBC.

By the time I left in 2001 I felt we were no longer leading edge even though it had grown to be a very well-attended program. The field was by then developing based on research and theory, and our program was not grounded in research and theory. In my view, because it did not reflect the increasingly diverse community in which it was located, it was no longer as relevant. (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007).

However, the conflict resolution educational experience for students in the 1990s and the 2000s continued to be practical, useful, interactive, and certainly for some, personally transformative. Given the benefits of the practical training Certificate enrollees received, does it matter that the core curriculum and the teaching practices had remained stable?

I think it does for four reasons. First, I believe that it is the ethical responsibility of any educational program to carefully evaluate and thoughtfully incorporate (or reject) newer, more complex, and more critical perspectives as they are articulated in its field of study and practice. Secondly, for such an influential program as the Certificate in Conflict Resolution, that ethical responsibility is heightened.

The JIBC Certificate program through its success was responsible for popularizing a particular conflict resolution discourse that featured self-management, communication, and solutions based on interests in B.C. “We were major in articulating that and making it accessible and getting it into more mainstream places. I think we've had a huge impact in that regard” (E. Azmier-Stewart, personal interview, February 10, 2007). This “JIBC conflict resolution discourse,” as it had developed by the early 1990s, influenced governmental public consultation and decision-making processes, legal system applications, public school curricula, dispute resolution processes in professional bodies, and the popular understanding of ways to resolve conflicts.

It contributed to a shift in the culture of government. I remember [then Premier] Mike Harcourt coming to the Mediation Development Association in the early '90s when he first got elected and saying that he intended to bring mediation into government processes. Lots of government people got JI training and within a few years we began to see changes reflected in programs. And now it's mainstream in some places—maybe even in danger of being co-opted. (E. Azmier-Stewart, personal interview, February 10, 2007)

The failure of the Certificate to incorporate critical perspectives in theory and practice articulated over the past fifteen years into its core curriculum has, I believe, disadvantaged all of its learners and graduates, but particularly those learners and graduates involved in complex historical and worldview-based conflicts. For example, the JIBC delivered many contract courses in negotiation and mediation to provincial and federal departments negotiating treaties between Aboriginal peoples and the state, to B.C. crown corporations and resource companies, and to B.C. Aboriginal communities and organizations. Many of the people taking these JIBC courses were involved in longstanding land and resource negotiations or treaty negotiations. Because the Centre's core curriculum adopted a highly individualist and functionalist theoretical base in the

1980s and had not incorporated criticisms of the mediation field as culturally biased in the early 1990s, it lacked sufficiently culturally and contextually nuanced theory and practice to teach others how to meaningfully engage with worldview conflicts.

If we make fundamentally different meaning of the world, then all of our attempts to improve communication or expand the pie of our material resources will fail because we may not be addressing our deeper differences that continue to fuel conflicts. (LeBaron, 2003b)

The Centre's lack of recognition of its own worldview, one that valued individualism, rationality, and efficiency, "where the ultimate value in personal and social life is individual satisfaction" (Sutherland, 2005, p. 89), or even that it had a worldview, meant that its model of negotiating and mediating was inadequate for addressing complex, historical, and intercultural conflict.

The negotiation processes established to resolve historical intercultural conflicts between Indigenous peoples and the state are based on ahistorical, uncultural ADR models that fail to take Indigenous history, diplomacy, law and peacemaking practices into account. (Regan, 2006, p. 13)

At best, the JIBC negotiation and mediation training was ahistorical and monocultural. At worst, it strengthened the "subtle forms of symbolic violence that permeate conflict resolution processes established to address the historical grievances of Indigenous peoples" (Regan, 2006, p. 13). Marg Huber comments that a discussion of cultural appropriateness and developing training for and with First Nations communities is

a much larger issue than you reflect here. No Aboriginal voice was able or willing to speak for all First Nations, so training needed to be tailored to each First Nation and fundamentally owned by each First Nations community and designed accordingly, which at the time we were not able to do. (Marg Huber, personal communication, February 12, 2009)

I agree with Marg Huber that I am skimming over a very complex topic that would repay a much more extended exploration. It remains my belief, however, that the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training was unable to offer its learners, Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal, a conflict resolution education that included a range of culturally and historically nuanced conflict analysis and conflict intervention possibilities.

A third reason for seeing the boundary-hardening of the JIBC conflict resolution discourse early 90s as problematic is a pervasive sense amongst faculty members that something important has been lost somewhere along the way. Many of the Certificate faculty members interviewed expressed a perception that the program no longer felt leading edge, that the excitement, the life, the juice, the sense of purpose, were no longer there. “I don't think it's as potent as it was then ... I don't think we're the leading edge anymore ... this is going to sound really odd, but it seems boring, you know? It doesn't seem exciting anymore” (N. McPhee, personal interview, February 8, 2007). While there may be an element of nostalgia for the exciting days of the program's and the trainers' youth, another possible, or supplementary, explanation is that the expressions of loss come from the differences between early idealistic visions for the Certificate and the perhaps inevitable adaptations, shifts, compromises, and failures in the implementation of that vision over time. The original purpose of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution coming out of the conflict resolution movement was to equip individuals with the skills necessary to negotiate or mediate the conflicts they came across in their family, neighbourhood, and work lives. The vision was that if enough individuals had the skills to resolve their conflicts co-operatively and non-violently, an attitudinal and behavioural

shift would take place that would change the adversarial nature of institutions, communities, and whole nations.

By training many citizens in conflict resolution skills, one would be passing on peacemaking skills and tools for democratic participation. A critical mass of trained conflict resolvers could transform an institution or a community. (Wahrhaftig, 2004, p. 30)

To some extent, those attitudinal and behavioural shifts have taken place, at least for some of the people who took conflict resolution courses from the JIBC.

Mediation isn't the answer to world peace.... I never had any grandiose ideas about it solving all the problems of the world. But I do really strongly believe that the people who have had the training ... have learned how to relate to conflict in a different way, in a healthy way. ... So I can only say from my point of view as one of the early people, I feel very, very positive in terms of its impact on myself, my community, my students, my world. (F. Grunberg, personal interview, April 25, 2007)

Overall however, not only the Centre for Conflict Resolution faculty, but also the North American conflict resolution practice field seems to be looking back at the original vision, and the progress towards that vision, and feeling a sense of loss.

As a field we have achieved wide exposure for our conflict resolution and transformation ideas. Few people are confused these days about the difference between mediation and meditation. Mediation services are available in many communities, schools and workplaces. At the same time, the many trained mediators have not eliminated intractable conflict. Differences in class, ethnicity, race, gender and other identities seem to be intensifying rather than diminishing. (LeBaron, 2002, p. 19)

Much of the more recent practitioner-focused literature (Bush & Folger, 2005; Wahrhaftig, 2004; Mayer, 2004) echoes LeBaron's (2002) concern that the field has failed to realize the hopes of its early proponents. Mayer (2004), for instance, considers that the field is facing a serious crisis and that "the way in which this crisis is approached will determine the future shape of the field, indeed its very existence" (p. 3).

The people who came to coach and teach and do administration in the JIBC Centre for Conflict Resolution Training in the 1980s were all, to greater or lesser degrees, motivated by some kind of ideological vision: of ending violence in families, communities, nations; of more functional workplaces and organizations; of healthier and happier individuals; of more responsive and democratic social institutions. The perceptions of loss may well be grounded in the grieving for the unrealized ideal and may mirror the larger field of practice.

A fourth reason for being concerned about program growth and change, or the lack thereof, is a very pragmatic consideration based on my belief that there are concrete consequences to perceptions that the program is not offering new and innovative content.

What I'm finding now is I really want to take more courses, but I look at the calendar and ... there's not a lot of new ones ... there has to be sort of a new edge, you know? Something that stimulates people to want to go back and take things ... what I see now is little pockets in the mediation field of people who are developing their own training, and I think the JI has to be very worried about that. (C. McKnight, personal interview, February 14, 2007)

Suggestions for the improvement of practice

One goal for the applied aspects of this research was the improvement of conflict resolution education practice at the JIBC through examining the theoretical roots of the practice. I base my ideas for some specific directions for that examination in the words of John Paul Lederach (1995). He advocates a

move beyond the rhetoric of dispute resolution training, and what it purports to do, to a critical examination of training as a project, a socially constructed, educational phenomenon comprised of purpose, process, and content and inherently encompassing culture and ideology. (Lederach, 1995, p. 6)

My recommendations for the future will focus on content, process, and purpose, all encompassed in culture and ideology. They are addressed not only to the Centre administrators who have the final responsibility for keeping conflict resolution education alive in the JIBC but to the whole Centre for Conflict Resolution community.

Forms of research that aim to strengthen practical reason [are] necessarily addressed to people who will confront practical questions and must make decisions about what to do. It addresses those actors as persons—knowing subjects—who could make wiser and more prudent decisions in the light of a richer understanding of the situation in which they find themselves (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2000, p. 584)

It is certainly my hope that this narrative might give both administrators and faculty members a richer understanding of the Centre for Conflict Resolution situation and thus enable them to make wise and prudent decisions that will shape the future of the practice of conflict resolution education at the JIBC. It may seem unlikely that a historical study which ends in 1993 can have anything to say about present day realities, never mind future directions. However, one of the major themes emerging from this research was that the Certificate in Conflict Resolution Training had not been successful in implementing substantive changes in some very particular areas. The first, was in the content of the required courses in the Certificate and the underlying theoretical premises on which those courses are based. The second was in the unexamined persistence of particular pedagogical practices and the third was a continuing tension between faculty members and administration and between various faculty groupings. I do not speak to, or about, the myriad improvements, challenges and changes that have occurred in the Centre for Conflict Resolution between 1993 and 2009 that lie outside of those three areas. However, given my assertion that those areas have remained substantially unchanged, I offer recommendations intended to make what I see as necessary changes to the overall

Centre for Conflict resolution practices that sourced specifically in those three areas. It is my hope, and my belief, that they are relevant and useful.

I also make my suggestions well aware of the difficulties of implementing change within a large cost-recovery educational program where the day-to-day work required to keep everything running precludes much extra effort to look either backward or forward, critically or otherwise. The current model of Centre for Conflict Resolution faculty as contractors, whose only contractual responsibility is to teach wherever they may be sent, makes face-to-face gatherings to discuss and explore practice very challenging to mandate. Curriculum development and pedagogical development are time-consuming and expensive. Changes designed by Centre administration without faculty involvement are unlikely to be embraced and even less likely to be implemented in the classroom.

Nonetheless, there are paths available for examination and change and, I believe, an overall openness to future possibilities. The Centre has had since 2001 a Curriculum Review Committee made up of faculty members and administrators where conversations about curriculum content and philosophy take place. The Curriculum Review Committee made a decision in 2005 that a theory course had to be completed by all Certificate participants, an enormous shift from seeing the conflict resolution curriculum as only encompassing skills. Moving conversations about program content and philosophical diversity into pedagogical practice is difficult, but there is at least a vehicle for connection and communication. Technological advances mean that electronic conversations could take place amongst faculty members scattered across B.C., Alberta, and the Yukon. Frozen relational patterns between faculty and administration have thawed considerably since the early 1990s with the introduction of less individualistic,

more consistent, and more transparent processes for course allocation and course payment. The Justice Institute as a whole is very interested in the development of advanced credentials with explicit theory-based content as well as in developing interdisciplinary programs. The Centre for Conflict Resolution is in an excellent position to work with other content areas within the JIBC to tailor conflict resolution content to specific application areas; indeed the JIBC has mandated the inclusion of conflict resolution content in any newly-developed JIBC diploma or degree.

I think it's significant in that at this point it's the only content that's been defined that will be in every degree ... on some level it's a recognition for the discipline ... it's core that every professional working in these fields has skill in conflict resolution. (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007)

Finally, opportunities for questioning deeply held assumptions about how conflict is to be resolved have begun to happen more often within the Centre for Conflict Resolution. One such conversation was initiated by instructors Brian Frank and Gordon White in 2006 examining how the concept of interests has been taught, and indeed, whether the reliance on teaching interests as the road to resolution was still useful and appropriate. I hope many more such critical conversations about theory and practice take place.

Comment: There had been many conversations about interests in other forums involving JI faculty. What was noteworthy about Brian and Gordon's initiatives was that for the first time they were given an adequate forum within the JI structure. (E. Azmier-Stewart, personal communication, February 13, 2009)

Peace educator Randall Braman (1998) says that

[t]eaching peace to adults is key to personal and social change, but requires more than merely training individuals in how to use the prescribed conflict resolution formulae. It requires adults to become more

aware of the assumptions underlying their views of conflict, challenge these assumptions, and consider new ways of thinking. (Braman, 1998, p. 30)

We as conflict resolution educators will not be able to assist other adults to examine their beliefs and practices in conflict very effectively unless we are engaged in ongoing critical examination of our own beliefs. My recommendations focus on opportunities for such examination. Additionally, if my dissertation told a story of Certificate in Conflict Resolution success and solidification, connection and loss, it is not surprising that my recommendations focus on unfreezing, reaching out, taking risks, reconnecting, and affirming purpose.

1. Deal with the past.

It seemed from the stories I heard that some members of the Centre for Conflict Resolution faculty are carrying memories of pain, anger, bitterness, and disappointment related to things that happened many years ago, whether they were personally present at the time of those events or not. The Centre experienced a lot of conflict as it grew and became so successful. In part because of its size and because of the unresolved conflicts, there have not been opportunities to gather together to celebrate the sustained work and progress towards the original Centre visions nor to mourn the failures to fully translate those visions into reality. Rational problem-solving is not going to be helpful in this situation. Some kind of collective acknowledgement of the legacies of disappointment and grief seems important and, equally important, some way of collectively celebrating accomplishments.

2. Cultivate an outward gaze.

The Centre for Conflict Resolution has been isolated and self-referential for far too long. It hires coaches and instructors only from within the pool of program graduates. Curriculum revisions are primarily based on practitioner knowledge generated through the mediation practice of faculty members, which while valuable is not necessarily linked to the broader practice field and certainly not to developments in fields other than mediation.

The Centre could revitalize by taking advantage of demographic realities. Many in the Centre for Conflict Resolution community are already retiring or will be in the next decade. Replacement hiring could take place in ways that ensure not just a younger faculty, not just a much more culturally diverse faculty, but a faculty whose education and conflict experience is located in a number of fields and who bring different perspectives to its resolution. The challenge for the Centre then would become how to create coherence rather than unanimity.

Finding new markets and new ways of packaging the same courses has been a necessary and very useful strategy for keeping the Centre financially viable. It is also time, I think, to add some completely new content and to develop some completely new educational offerings. Former Centre Director Marg Huber suggests that, in her opinion,

the change that needs to occur for the program to have integrity in today's context is not just a minor "tweaking" but something much more fundamental. Personally, I would take it apart and question every part of it, with an enlarged sense of "community" that the program serves in mind. Start afresh, try to come at it with fresh eyes, include some new eyes as part of the process of examination. (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007)

I agree with Marg Huber that unless the Centre curriculum development processes include some new eyes and creativity in conversations about the future, they will necessarily continue only within the limits of current knowledge and current vision. I can think of new credentials such as a Diploma in Dialogue Facilitation or a Certificate in Arts-Based Approaches to Conflict. Perhaps a Summer Institute in Complexity Theory and Conflict for Experienced Practitioners. However, I know my current knowledge is inadequate and my current vision less than expansive. It seems to me that the only way to ensure that genuinely new perspectives are brought to bear on Centre educational offerings is through a design process that places less reliance on insiders and more on broad-based consultation.

One concrete curriculum suggestion I would make is the addition of a required “worldviews and conflict” course to all Centre for Conflict Resolution credentials. The concept of worldview offers an expanded framework for understanding and intervening in conflict that is additive to the existing core curriculum. “Worldviews can be resources for understanding and analyzing conflicts when fundamental differences divide groups of people ... Worldviews, with their embedded meanings, can be the seedbed from which new shared meanings emerge” (LeBaron, 2003b).

An understanding of worldviews would broaden the conceptual framework of the Certificate and give both learners and faculty members language for acknowledging sameness and difference. Such shared language does not currently exist and is one factor in hindering conversations about variations in theoretical and practice perspectives that might lead to the creation of shared meanings. Content on worldviews and conflict

already exists within the Centre for Conflict Resolution and could therefore be fairly easily developed and implemented as a required course.

3. Embrace theory, partiality, and context.

The strength of the JIBC conflict resolution programs has always been the translating of theoretical stances into applications. The early trainers did that in the 80s with communication-based mediation approaches, with game-theory-based negotiation models, with a really vast collection of psychological theories. It was called skills training, and there is no reason why the Centre now cannot take newer approaches to conflict intervention and translate them into practical applications. The problem with the current JIBC curriculum is not its emphasis on “hands-on” rather than theoretical content but the limited number of hands-on approaches offered.

I think that the Centre for Conflict Resolutions very specifically needs to translate theory about intervening in historical and worldview based conflicts into educational programming that teaches much deeper, much less prescriptive, and much more relationally-focused ways of supporting dialogue and reconciliation than does teaching agreement-focused negotiation and mediation competencies. Sutherland (2005) says reconciliation “works to address the root causes of conflict and endeavours to transform relationships from resentment and hostility to co-existence, mutuality and eventually even friendship” (p. 32).

If the Centre wanted to be, and wanted to be seen as, teaching what Regan (2006) calls “authentic peacemaking” (p. 282) in historic and worldview-based conflicts such as those involving Aboriginal peoples and non-Aboriginal Canadians, the Centre would need to learn new ways of creating and delivering programs in relationships of mutuality

with Aboriginal communities and organizations. I believe that this is already beginning to happen in some curriculum development and program delivery partnerships.

However, the Centre has never explicitly or publicly claimed peace-making as one of the purposes of its educational programs, and choosing to do so would mean adopting an expanded identity. As well, truly committing to relationships of mutuality would mean, for those of us in the Centre for Conflict Resolution community who are, as Regan (2006) says, part of the Canadian “Settler” culture, “becoming Indigenous allies in the struggle of decolonization” (p. 282). Such a task would, “draw on our emotional, imaginative, physical and spiritual gifts that assist us in the central human task of getting along” (LeBaron, 2002, p. 10) and would, almost inevitably, lead to personal and organizational transformations. However, a commitment to alliance and mutuality would call into question the myth of conflict resolution practitioner, and conflict resolution educator, neutrality.

Neutrality is a foundational myth in the Centre, and the conflict resolution field’s worldview, and change would be challenging. But I actually see no other viable path forward. Persisting into a new decade of applying an interest-focused approach to the resolution of worldview conflict in the face of both widely-available critical theoretical perspectives as well as practical experiences of failure would be, in my opinion, an abdication of educator ethical responsibility.

I personally also like David Dyck’s (2006) recommendation that

Helping practitioners to develop the conceptual tools to think critically about how to relate what they encounter at any given moment to larger structural issues is the critical aspect of developing a more structurally attuned consciousness and practice. The ground work for such a consciousness must be laid in basic introductory training. (p. 531).

Even more do I like the idea of every faculty member in the Centre being actively engaged in developing, discussing, and even debating conflict resolution theory. There is no one right theory any more than there is one right way to mediate. A Centre for Conflict Resolution curriculum and pedagogy that is coherent, self-critical, and open to change cannot be achieved without engaging in ongoing conversations about differences in theoretical perspectives on both conflict and education. Such conversations need to be, and need to be viewed as, commonplace and valuable rather than difficult and conflictual. This requires acknowledgement and recognition that the practice of conflict resolution education is irredeemably theoretical, inherently practical, and deeply personal at the same time. It also requires acknowledgement and recognition that the perspectives of those outside the Centre would be valuable, indeed, essential in envisioning a contemporary, coherent, and transforming conflict resolution education practice.

4. Engage in classroom-based educational research.

Engagement with some of the critiques of experiential learning and the newer theoretical perspectives on how people learn could add more depth, more clarity, and more conscious choice to the Certificate in Conflict Resolution pedagogical practices. Additionally, the Centre has unparalleled opportunities to initiate classroom-based action research. Conflict resolution faculty members have not seen themselves as educational researchers or as developers of theory about how best to teach conflict resolution content. But why not?

Participatory action research is based on practitioners identifying an issue in their practice, gathering information, designing a plan, testing the plan, and evaluating the results. A group of faculty members could immerse themselves in some current ideas about how people learn—perhaps Fenwick’s (2001) situated cognition or “the enactivist perspective emanating from neuro-science and evolutionary theory” (p. 34). Or Merriam’s (2008) embodied learning, spiritual learning, narrative learning or, not new but still powerful, transformational learning.

They could deliberately and consciously design and teach an introductory conflict resolution course from an embodied learning base, or a spiritual learning base, or a narrative base, then discuss their experiences, evaluate successes and failures, re-design, re-test, and write up their conclusions for publication. It would not only invigorate and improve teaching practice at the JIBC, it could make important and valuable contributions to conflict resolution teaching knowledge overall.

There are conversations taking place in the conflict resolution literature over the last few years about conflict resolution training (Honeyman, Hughes & Schneider, 2003:

Honeyman & Schneider, 2004; Lewicki, 2002; Kressel, 2000). Faculty members at the Centre for Conflict Resolution have a lot of experience and a lot of expertise to contribute to that conversation. Classroom research would allow faculty members a platform for taking what I think is their rightful place in the publishing of conflict resolution educational research.

5. Affirm and reaffirm purpose.

The Certificate in Conflict Resolution at the JIBC started as a purpose and values-driven educational endeavour. That sense of purpose is less clear now partly because of the sheer size and success of the program and the difficulty of organizational conversations that involve everyone. Is the purpose of the Centre to provide conflict resolution skills training to anyone who wants to learn? For faculty, is their connection with the Centre, as member of a professional, and for many, personal community of colleagues and friends enough of a reason to keep on teaching? I don't know. Neither do I know what the purpose for conflict resolution education at the Centre for Conflict Resolution at the JIBC in 2009 should be.

Dale Trimble suggests a re-affirmation and re-articulation of dormant peace and non-violence values.

I think at its core conflict resolution for many people is a spiritual practice ... I'm not trying to give anyone religion, but ... I am saying that a further articulation of how places like the Certificate program are really situated in people's hearts within the peace movement and within a world without violence ... that needs to happen more. (D. Trimble, personal interview, February 16, 2007)

For Joan Balmer, the Centre vision might be an exploration of true global interdependence.

To me our leading edge could be moving into “what does it look like to truly be interdependent?” Not the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer ... We need to move much more into what's really important for me and for you and for the culture? ... opening things up. Where are we really going as a species? (J. Balmer, personal interview, January 26, 2007)

Marg Huber also thinks the JIBC program could, and should, make a contribution internationally.

If we don't really question ourselves and define our deeper beliefs and values—and blind spots—I don't think we are going to be able to make a contribution on a global level. Personally, I think it is time we thought of ourselves in a global context, as part of a global community (M. Huber, personal interview, April 26, 2007)

For Pat Ross one way of implementing a Centre vision might be moving conflict resolution training into every JIBC program.

Maybe ten years from now every police officer, firefighter, and paramedic in the province will have gone through conflict resolution training and maybe that will impact how they do their jobs. It's quite a powerful potential. (P. Ross, personal interview, January 12, 2007)

The questions that I think need to be asked are “Why should the Centre for Conflict Resolution continue to exist? What could the existence of the Centre contribute to the world?” I don't have answers, but I do believe that an articulation of a sense of purpose, or purposes, should in some way refer back to the idealism motivating the founding of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution, as well as to the present necessities and future possibilities of engaging with conflict in transformative ways.

Suggestions for further research

It had been my original intention to trace changes in the curriculum and the pedagogy of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution from its founding in 1986 to the

present. The sheer amount of information involved caused me to narrow my focus to the first decade. However, an in-depth exploration of the outside historical and societal factors and the inside program dynamics that shaped the Certificate in the 1990s and the 2000s would repay investigation. Particularly important and interesting areas to explore would be the intentions, complexities, and effects of the JIBC training in Aboriginal organizations and communities and with government treaty negotiators. The impact of the JIBC program and the growth of non-adversarial conflict resolution approaches generally on B.C. provincial government functioning would likely also provide valuable insights.

Another question to investigate would be how the discourse of conflict resolution as promoting workplace productivity spread into multiple arenas. What were the factors promoting that growth? What were the impacts?

A detailed examination of the process of the adaptation of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution in the 1990s to its institutional and education system credit-granting requirements would add to understandings of the relationship between educational programs, program growth, and institutional and system responses. How did the JIBC and the B.C. post-secondary system legitimize, shape, and perhaps constrain the Certificate in Conflict Resolution?

An exploration of the complex relationship between the JIBC program and the field of mediation practice, particularly in relation to the debates in the field about mediator certification and standards of practice, would provide a specific and useful lens for viewing that decade.

There were also many topics mentioned but not explored in this story of the first decade of the Centre for Conflict Resolution that would be valuable additions to understandings of the development of the field of conflict resolution practice in B.C. and Canada. I suggest, for example, an exploration of the history of the development of family mediation offered through Family Court Counsellors and of the emergence of mediation training through the Law Society's Continuing Legal Education, as well as the detailed stories of mediation/ADR organizations such as the Mediation Development Association of BC, The Network, and Family Mediation Canada. The influence of the volunteer-based community mediation programs such as Westcoast Mediation Services on the field of practice in B.C. and more broadly, the influence of the Mennonite-initiated VORP programs on field development in Canada would provide, I think, extremely useful perspectives on the perhaps unique characteristics of the Canadian field of practice.

Similarly, I would like to see documentation and analysis of peace education initiatives in B. C. What were the linkages between peace educator-teachers in the K-12 system, community-based peace education activists, and the development of peer mediation and other conflict resolution training programs in schools?

However, my strongest and indeed my passionate recommendation is that the overall history of the emergence and development of the conflict resolution field in Canada be documented. I was unable to find any comprehensive accounts of conflict resolution field history in Canada. In this study I interviewed a very small selection of people and only because of their connection to the JIBC program. Broader historical research is needed to fully explore all of the activities and influences that contributed to

field development in all Canadian provinces and territories. Most of the founders of the field are still alive, and an oral history project recording their stories would be not only valuable in itself but would also offer an archival resource for future analyses of the Canadian conflict resolution field. These stories need to be gathered soon.

Closing

As a researcher, I have been extraordinarily fortunate to be part of a community of conflict resolution educational practitioners that provided me with an active, participatory, open, and opinionated audience throughout this whole research process. Not only were past and present JIBC colleagues very willing to share their memories with me, they were interested in what I was hearing, what themes were emerging, what understandings I was contemplating. Many took the time and thought to contribute their comments to my interpretations. Many more will read this dissertation. I am grateful.

Narrative inquiry situates us “in the known and the familiar while it asks us to make the known and the familiar strange and open to new possibility” (Clandinin et al, 2007, p. 33). One of my main research goals was to explore the historical shaping of a conflict resolution educational practice in order to understand that practice differently and to open the practice to more critical self-examination. However, one of the unanticipated results of this research has been the necessity of understanding my own practice as a conflict resolution practitioner and educator differently.

On a very personal level, working on this dissertation has allowed me to make meaning of what has been my work for twenty-five years. I have been able to understand better the sources that shaped the contours of my work as a conflict resolution

practitioner and educator and to see more clearly some of the actual and potential consequences of what I have been doing. Through this inquiry process, I have also come to see how deeply my conflict resolution practice has shaped my beliefs, my sense-making stance in the world. I have developed a renewed appreciation for the creativity and passion of the Centre for Conflict Resolution founders and for all my current colleagues who are engaged in furthering peacemaking in the world. I see this dissertation as a recognition and validation of all the people associated with the Certificate in Conflict Resolution at the JIBC in the last thirty years who have been drawn to the vision of a better way to deal with conflict.

APPENDIX: BIOGRAPHIES OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Elizabeth Azmier-Stewart provided training and consultation in conflict resolution and related skills between 1989 to 2006 for government employees, private companies, colleges, non-profit organizations, and a wide range of professionals. In addition Elizabeth taught throughout the province for the Justice Institute of BC Conflict Resolution Certificate Program, and in Victoria for the Camosun College Leadership Training Program. As a mediator, Elizabeth facilitated conflict resolution in health care, co-operatives, non-profits, family, educational institutions and child welfare. Elizabeth has a Certificate in Conflict Resolution from the Justice Institute of B.C. and a B.A. with distinction, from the University of Victoria.

Joan Balmer, Cert.Con. Res., BA (Adult Education), MA, is a management consultant with over 25 years of experience working with all levels of government, Crown corporations, the private sector, and First Nations communities. She is an instructor with the Justice Institute of BC's Centre for Conflict Resolution and specializes in working to resolve personal, interpersonal or small-group conflict. Her professional experience ranges from corporate boardrooms to prisons, helping individuals and groups find workable solutions. Joan's M.A. is in Humanistic Psychology.

Marje Burdine, M.Ed. was the founder of the Certificate in Conflict Resolution at the Justice Institute of British Columbia and a leader in the development of the mediation field in Canada. After leaving the JIBC in 1993 she continued her private practice as a family and organizational mediator and therapist. She was a Respectful Workplace Advisor with BC Rapid Transit Company (Sky Train) where she was instrumental in developing an anti-bullying program and policy. She has extensive background in workplace conflict resolution and harassment issues and has provided training seminars on Workplace Bullying in both B.C. and Alberta.

Michael Fogel, J.D., LL.B., M.Ed. (Adult Education and Counseling Psychology), Cert. ConRes., has been a mediator (Chartered Mediator), facilitator and negotiation/conflict resolution educator in private practice since 1986. Michael teaches and mediates in a wide range of settings and locations, including New Zealand, the Middle East and East Africa. Before moving to BC in 1985, he practiced law for 16 years and served as a municipal and superior court judge in California.

Mario Govorchin is a member of the Holloway Zaiser Group and much of his work focuses on leadership, team development, change management and conflict resolution. He is an expert in the area of workplace violence prevention and is certified by the Crisis Prevention Institute as a practitioner and trainer. Mario specializes in interventions in organizations experiencing high internal conflict and as a mediator of multi-party

disputes. He maintains a senior trainer role with the Justice Institute of B.C.'s Centre for Conflict Resolution and regularly trains and consults with B.C. Corrections Branch and various B.C. Municipal Police Departments in the area of crisis management.

Fran Grunberg is an Instructor in the Social Service Worker Program at Langara College, where she is sure to teach her students the skills of conflict resolution. She is a Board member of the Society for Children and Youth of BC and the newly created Centre for the Prevention and Reduction of Violence at the Justice Institute. She is a passionate advocate for children's rights.

Wendy Hacking was a family mediator and mediation trainer for most of her 32-year career with the Province of B.C. Ministry of Attorney General. She promoted the development of family mediation as an alternative to litigation and advocated for the establishment of standards and objective certification of those practicing family mediation in Canada. Wendy retired in 2006.

Karen Haddigan Blackburn was a Senior Instructor and curriculum designer for the Centre for Conflict Resolution at the Justice Institute of B.C. between 1985 and 2000 and maintained a private practice in mediation and facilitation. From 1981 to 1993 Karen worked as a project co-ordinator and education program designer in the co-op housing sector. Karen has a Certificate in Conflict Resolution from the JIBC, a Certificate in Counselling Skills from Vancouver Community College, a Chartered Mediator designation from the British Columbia Arbitration and Mediation Institute, and a B.SC. from Columbia Pacific University. She is currently an award-winning real estate agent in Seattle.

Stacey Holloway is one of the senior consultants of the Holloway Zaiser Group and specializes in the development of people and teams as they prepare for, lead and experience change. She conducts seminars in both the public and private sector all over North America and maintains an extensive intervention practice in corporate, government, non-profit, health care and education settings. A graduate of UBC, Stacey is a Senior Trainer at the Justice Institute of B.C. in the Centre for Conflict Resolution.

Marg Huber has been actively involved in the field of conflict resolution and mediation for the past 25 years as an instructor, facilitator, researcher, mediator, senior administrator and director of training. From 1993–2001, she directed the Centre for Conflict Resolution at the Justice Institute of BC. For the past 13 years, she has provided conflict resolution training and program development consultation internationally (Malaysia, Israel, Jordan, South Africa), and for the past 7 has worked in East Africa developing conflict resolution and peacemaking programs and training teams in Uganda, South Sudan and Rwanda.

Carole McKnight has been working with families in the area of separation and divorce since 1984. She worked as a family justice counsellor and local manager of the Burnaby/New Westminster and Tri-Cities Family Justice Centres as well as a program analyst. Carole has worked at the Justice Institute of BC since 1992 as an instructor,

course developer and project manager. She is the past Project Director of the Family Mediation Practicum Project in New Westminster and currently works as a family mediator in the Vancouver area and tutors online mediation courses at the Justice Institute of BC.

Nancy McPhee is an Associate Faculty member with the Centre for Conflict Resolution at the Justice Institute of BC in Vancouver and with the School of Business at Camosun College in Victoria, B.C. Nancy has worked as a facilitator and educator in the private sector, with the provincial and federal governments as well as with schools, non-profit organizations and communities for the past 30 years. She completed her Master's of Arts in Leadership and her thesis explored how the Open Space Technology process could bring people in a community together to speak about their hopes for the future.

Cheryl Picard, B.A., M.S.W., Ph. D, is an educator, mediator, trainer and consultant. She teaches conflict studies in the Law Department at Carleton University Ottawa and founded the Mediation Centre, a teaching, research and service centre at Carleton in 1992, the Graduate Certificate in Conflict Resolution in 1997 and the Centre for Conflict Education and Research in 2003. She is one of the founders of the Neighbourhood Coalition for Conflict Resolution, a former Chair of the Canadian Network for Conflict Resolution and a past board member of the Society for Professionals in Dispute Resolution, the National Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution, the Dispute Resolution Centre for Ottawa-Carleton, and the Canadian Institute for Conflict Resolution. Dr. Picard is currently active locally and internationally with the Coalition for the Protection of Children.

Pat Ross is currently the Vice President, Education at the Justice Institute of British Columbia, She provides educational and administrative leadership to JIBC deans and directors responsible for educational programming and applied research at the Institute, a position she has held for the past five years. She joined the JIBC as the Program Director, Community Programs when the institute was first created, and was promoted to Dean, Educational Services and Interdisciplinary Studies in 1989 and to Vice President, Finance and Institute Services in 1997. Pat has a Master of Science in Business Administration from the University of British Columbia and a Bachelor of Science from the University of Alberta.

Gordon Sloan is an experienced Canadian dispute resolution trainer and intervenor. His interests range from work with individuals to large social units and multiple party disputes. He delivers programs to a wide array of audiences including Federal and Provincial governments, private sector organizations, courts, professional bodies, non-governmental organizations, First Nations, universities and ad hoc groups. Professionally, Gordon is a lawyer with an academic background in Law and Religious Studies. He maintains an ongoing and regular teaching role in several academic programs at the post-graduate level.

Dale Trimble M.A., R.C.C., has been in private practice as a counsellor and consultant since 1979. Dale specializes in "Defusing Hostility," conflict resolution, anger management and the treatment of violent behavior, particularly workplace issues involving violence or abusive behavior and harassment. He has designed courses and taught in the Conflict Resolution Certificate Program at the Justice Institute of B.C. since 1982. Dale has written and produced several training videos including "Defusing Hostility" and "Waking Up To Violence". He has served as a clinical supervisor and field faculty advisor for graduate students in psychology and social work.

Deborah White, Cert. ConRes. B.S.W., M.A. (Applied Behavioral Science), is an organization/management consultant, mediator, facilitator and trainer. She has more than 20 years of experience in both the public and private sectors working with people at all levels. Deborah's practice focuses on process consulting, coaching, workplace mediation, organizational facilitation, skills training and reconstruction of working relationships. Deborah is a Senior Trainer with the Centre for Conflict Resolution.

Dale Zaiser is a senior partner in the Hollaway Zaiser Group specializing in strategic change including facilitation of strategic planning sessions, conducting organizational mediations, climate building within organizations and teaching workshops in change management, leadership skills, team building and conflict management. Dale holds an undergraduate degree in Psychology and a Master's degree in Applied Behavioural Sciences, with a specialty in Organizational Development. Dale is a Senior Trainer in the Centre for Conflict Resolution at the Justice Institute of B.C. as well as a Faculty Advisor in the School of Health Studies at Brandon University.

REFERENCE LIST

- Alberti, R. & Emmons, M. (1970). *Your perfect right: Assertiveness and equality in your life and relationships*. Atascadero, CA: Impact.
- Angrosino, M. & Mays de Perez, K. (2000). Rethinking observation: From method to context. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 673-702). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bower, A. & Bower, G. (1976). *Asserting yourself: A practical guide for positive change*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Archbald, D. & Newmann, F. (1988). *Beyond standardized testing: Assessing authentic academic achievement in the secondary school*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Avruch, K. (1998). Introduction: Culture and conflict resolution. In K. Avruch, P. W. Black & J. A. Scimecca (Eds.), *Conflict resolution: Cross cultural perspectives*. West Port, CT: Praeger
- Avruch, K., Black, P. W. & Scimecca, J. A. (Eds.). (1998). *Conflict resolution: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Bach, G. & Wyden, P. (1970). *The intimate enemy: How to fight fair in love and marriage*. New York, NY: Avon.
- Bandler, R. & Grinder, J. (1981). *Reframing: Neuro-linguistic programming and the transformation of meaning*. Moab, UT: Real People Press.
- Benjamin, L. (2007). *A brief history of modern psychology*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Benne, K. (1964). History of the T group in the laboratory setting. In L. P. Bradford, J. Gibb & K. Benne (Eds.), *T-group theory and laboratory method: Innovation in re-education* (pp. 80-135). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Benne, K., Bradford, L., Gibb, J. & Lippett, R. (Eds.). (1975). *The laboratory method of changing and learning: Theory and application*. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.

- Bergman, V. (1979). *Justice Institute of British Columbia*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Berkowitz, M., Goldstein, B. & Indik, B. (1964). The state mediator: Background, self-image and attitude. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 17(2), 257-275.
Retrieved December 10, 2007 from JSTOR database.
- Berlak, H., Newmann, F., Adams, E., Archbald, D., Burgess, T., Raven, J. & Romberg, T. (1992). *Toward a new science of educational testing and assessment*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. (1975). An overview of the grid. *Training & Development Journal*, 29(5), 29 - 38.
- Boud, D. (2005). Experiential learning. In L. English (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of adult education* (pp. 243-245). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boulding, K. (1962). *Conflict and defense: A general theory*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bradford, L., Gibb, J. & Benne, K. (Eds.). (1964). *T-group theory and laboratory method: Innovation in re-education*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Braman, O. (1998). Teaching peace to adults: Using critical thinking to improve conflict resolution. *Adult Learning*, 10(2), 30 - 33.
- Brown, G. (1971). *Human teaching for human learning: An introduction to confluent education*. New York: Viking.
- Bunker, B. & Rubin, J. (Eds.). (1995). *Conflict, cooperation and justice: Essays inspired by the work of Morton Deutsch*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Burch, A. (1990). *A review of the Justice Institute of British Columbia prepared for the consideration of Cabinet*. Victoria, BC: Ministry of Advanced Education, Training and Technology.
- Burdine M. (Ed.) (1986). *Conflict Resolution Certificate Program Newsletter-August*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Burdine, M. (1987a). *Mediation skills manual: How to mediate a dispute* (2nd ed.). Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Burdine, M. (Ed.). (1987b). *Conflict Resolution Certificate Program Newsletter , January*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Burdine, M. (Ed.). (1987c). *Conflict Resolution Certificate Program Newsletter, October*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.

- Burdine, M. (Ed.). (1988). *Centre for Conflict Resolution Training Newsletter, Fall*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Burdine, M. (Ed.). (1989a). *Centre for Conflict Resolution Training Newsletter*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Burdine, M. (Ed.). (1989b). *Centre for Conflict Resolution Training Newsletter, Fall*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Burdine, M. (Ed.). (1990-1991). *Centre for Conflict Resolution Training Newsletter, Winter*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Burdine, M. (1991a). *Mediation skills manual* (3rd ed.). Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Burdine, M. (Ed.). (1991b). *Centre for Conflict Resolution Training Newsletter, Spring*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Burdine, M. (Ed.). (1992). *News Update from the Centre for Conflict Resolution Training, October*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Burdine, M. (Ed.). (1993). *Centre for Conflict Resolution Training Newsletter, January*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Burdine, M. & Rengert, L. (Eds.). (1987). *Dealing with anger, resistance and hostility in conflict situations*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Burgess, H. & Burgess, G. M. (1997). *Encyclopedia of conflict resolution*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clío.
- Burton, J. (1996). *Conflict resolution: Its language and processes*. Lanham, MY: Scarecrow Press.
- Bush, R. & Folger, J. (2005). *The promise of mediation: The transformative approach to conflict* (revised ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Campbell, M. (1998). Institutional ethnography and experience as data. *Qualitative Sociology*, 21(1), 55-73.
- Centre for Conflict Resolution Training (1986) *Negotiation skills level one*. Vancouver, BC: Extensions Program, Justice Institute of British Columbia
- Centre for Conflict Resolution Training. (1992). *Critical skills for communicating in conflict*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.

- Cheldelin, S., Druckman, D. & Fast, L. (Eds.). (2003). *Conflict: From analysis to intervention*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (1990). Narrative, experience and the study of curriculum. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 20(3), 241-254.
- Clandinin, D. J. & Huber, J. (2002). Narrative inquiry: Toward understanding life's artistry. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 32(2), 161-169.
- Clandinin, J., Pushor, D. & Murray Orr, A. (2007). Navigating sites for narrative inquiry. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(1), 21-35.
- Clark, C. & Rossiter, M. (2008). Narrative learning in adulthood. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 2008(119), 61-70.
- Colosi, T. (1987). A model for negotiation and mediation. In D. Sandole, & I. Sandole-Staroste (Eds.), *Conflict management and problem-solving: Interpersonal to international applications* (pp. 86-99). London: Harold Pinter.
- Coogler, O. J. (1978). *Structured mediation in divorce settlement: A handbook for marital mediators*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Cormick, G. & Allen, R. (1970). *Board of mediation for community disputes: January 1, 1970 to December 31, 1970*. New York, NY: Board of Mediation for Community Disputes.
- Cornerstone Planning Group. (1974). *Justice Education Centre: Preliminary possibility study of the Dawson-King George school site*. Vancouver, BC: Author.
- Cornford, I. (2005). Competency-based training. In L. English (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of adult education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan
- Coy, P. & Hedeem, T. (2005). A stage model of social movement co-optation: Community mediation in the United States. *Sociological Quarterly*, 46(3), 405-435.
- Cranton, P. (1992). *Working with adult learners*. Toronto: Wall & Emerson.
- Crocker, J. (2006). *Conflict resolution theory: Towards a poststructuralist critique and reconstruction*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.
- Cumming, J. & Maxwell, G. (1999). Contextualising authentic assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 6(2), 177-194.
- Davies, A. & Salem, R. (1984). Dealing with power imbalances in the mediation of interpersonal disputes. *Mediation Quarterly*, 6, 17-26.

- Dennison, J. & Gallagher, P. (1986). *Canada's community colleges: A critical analysis*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.
- Dennison, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Challenge and opportunity: Canada's community colleges at the crossroads*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.
- Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Deutsch, M. (1987). A theoretical perspective on conflict and conflict resolution. In D. Sandole, & I. Sandole-Staroste (Eds.), *Conflict management and problem-solving: Interpersonal to international applications* (pp. 38-49). London: Harold Pinter.
- Deutsch, M. (2000). Introduction. In M. Deutsch & S. Coleman (Eds.), *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (pp. 1-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- DeVault, M. (2006). Introduction: What is institutional ethnography? *Social Problems*, 53(3), 294-298.
- DeVries, I. (1990). *The Justice Institute of British Columbia: A structural analysis*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.
- Dugan, M. (1987). Intervenor roles and conflict pathologies. In D. Sandole, & I. Sandole-Staroste (Eds.), *Conflict management and problem-solving: Interpersonal to international applications*. (pp. 57-61). London: Harold Pinter.
- Dyck, D. (2006). Reaching toward a structurally responsive training and practice of restorative justice. In D. Sullivan & L. Tift (Eds.), *Handbook of restorative justice: A global perspective* (pp. 527-543). London, UK: Routledge.
- Edgar, E. E. (1908). The settlement of industrial disputes in Canada. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 16(2), 88-93. Retrieved December 10, 2007 from JSTOR database.
- Egan, G. (1976). *Interpersonal living: A skills-contract approach to human-relations training in groups*. Monterey, CA.: Brooks/Cole.
- Ellis, A. (1977). *Anger: How to live with and without it*. New York, NY: Readers Digest Press.
- English, L. (Ed.). (2005). *International encyclopedia of adult education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Evans, A., Evans, R. & Kraybill, R. (2001). *Peace skills*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Fenwick, T. (2000). Expanding conceptions of experiential learning: A review of the five contemporary perspectives on cognition. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 50(4), 243-272.
- Fenwick, T. (2001). *Experiential learning: A theoretical critique from five perspectives*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career and Vocational Education. Retrieved November 7, 2006, from the World Wide Web: http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/17/23/ad.pdf
- Fenwick, T. (2003). *Learning through experience: Troubling orthodoxies and intersecting questions*. Malabar: Krieger.
- Fine, M., Weis, L., Weseen, S. & Wong, L. (2000). For whom? Qualitative research, representation, and social responsibilities. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.
- Fisher, R. & Ury, W. (1981). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. New York: Penguin.
- Flowers, J. V. (1975). Simulation and role playing methods. In F. H. Kanfer & A. Goldstein (Eds.), *Helping people change: A textbook of methods* (pp. 159-194). New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Folberg, J. & Milne, A. (1988). *Divorce mediation: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Folberg, J. & Taylor, A. (1984). *Mediation: A comprehensive guide to resolving conflicts without litigation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Folberg, J., Milne, A. & Salem, P. (Eds.). (2004). *Divorce and family mediation: Models, techniques, and applications*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Fraher, A. (2004). *A history of group study and psychodynamic organizations*. London, UK: Free Association Books.
- Frank, B. (2006). *Applying conflict theory: From awareness to analysis*. New Westminster, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Freedman, A. (1978). Types of process interventions. In J. W. Pfeiffer & J. Jones (Eds.), *Annual handbook for group facilitators* (pp. 163-169). La Jolla, CA: University Associates.
- Gaber, D. (2003). Building a system of autonomous institutions: Coordination and collaboration in British Columbia's community college, university college, and institute system. *Community College Review* 2003, 31, 47-72.

- Gaughan, L. (1987). Divorce and family mediation. In D. Sandole & I. Sandole-Staroste (Eds.), *Conflict management and problem solving: Interpersonal to international applications* (pp. 107-129). London, UK: Frances Pinter.
- Gazda, G., Asbury, F., Balzer, F., Childers, W. & Walters, R. (1984). *Human relations development: A manual for educators*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Goldfried M., & Goldfried, A. (1975). Cognitive change methods. In F. H. Kanfer & A. Goldstein (Eds.), *Helping people change: A textbook of methods* (pp. 89-116). New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Goldstein, A. (1981). *Psychological skill training: The structured learning technique*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Grossman, F., Kruger, L. & Moore, R. (1999) Reflections on a feminist research project: Subjectivity and the wish for intimacy and equality. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 117 -135.
- Haddigan, K., Northcott, T. & Burdine, M. (Eds.). (1991). *Negotiation skills* (5th ed.). Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Harris, I. & Shuster, A. (2006). *Global directory of peace studies programs* (7th ed.). San Francisco, CA: International Peace Research Association.
- Harris, I. (1990). Principles of peace pedagogy. *Peace & Change*, 15(3), 254-271.
- Hart, B. (1984, January 21-22). *Mediation for battered women: Same song second verse - A little bit louder, a little bit worse*. Paper presented at the Conference on Women and Mediation, New York University School of Law, New York, NY.
- Hart, B. (1990). Gentle jeopardy: The further endangerment of battered women and children in custody mediation. *Mediation Quarterly*, 7(4), 317.-330.
- Hergenhahn, B. R. (2001). *An introduction to the history of psychology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Hocker, J. & Wilmot, W. (1985). *Interpersonal conflict* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Hocking, B. (1996). *On dove's wing: Life story narratives of conflict resolution learners from the Justice Institute of British Columbia*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.
- Holloway, S. (1991). *Dealing with anger in conflict situations*. In M. Burdine & D. Zaiser (Eds.), *Dealing with anger in conflict situations* (2nd ed.). Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.

- Holloway, S. (1992). *Asserting yourself under pressure*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Holloway, S. & Burdine, M. (Eds.). (1991). *Conflict resolution: Dynamics, styles and applications* (2nd ed.). Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Honeyman, C., Hughes, S. & Schneider, A. (2003). How can we teach so it takes? *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 20(4), 429-432.
- Honeyman, C. & Schneider, A. (2004). Catching up with the major-general: The need for a “canon of negotiation.” *Marquette Law Review*, 87(4), 637-648.
- Huber, M. Clandinin, D.G. & Huber, J. (2006) Relational responsibilities of narrative inquirers. *Curriculum & Teaching Dialogue*. 8 (1/2), 209-223.
- Introduction to conflict resolution*. (2001). Department of Peace Studies, Bradford University. Retrieved March 21, 2006, from the World Wide Web: www.bradford.ac.uk/acad/confres/dislearn
- Irving, H. & Benjamin, M. (1987). *Family mediation: Theory & practice of dispute resolution*. Toronto, ON: Carswell.
- Jacobs, G. (2001). Clinical applications of the relaxation response and mind–body interventions. *Journal of Alternative & Complementary Medicine*, Vol. 7(Issue 6), 93-101.
- Jarvis, P. (1983). *Adult and continuing education: Theory and practice*. London: Croom Helm.
- JIBC. (1980a). *1980–1985 A plan for the future*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1980b). *Annual report 1979–1980*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1980c). *Calendar: September–December*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1981). *Annual report 1980–1981*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1982a). *Annual report 1981–1982*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1982b). *Community Programs Schedule: January–March*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.

- JIBC. (1983a). *Annual report 1982–1983*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1983b). *Community Program Schedule: April–June*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1984). *Annual report 1983–1984*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1985a). *Annual report 1984–1985*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1985b). *Extension Programs Schedule: January–March*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1985c). *Extension Programs Schedule: April–July*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1985d). *Extension Programs Schedule: September–December*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC (1986a) *Annual Report, 1985-86*. Justice Institute of British Columbia
- JIBC. (1986b). *Extension Programs Schedule: January–March*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1986c). *Extension Programs Schedule: April–July*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1986d). *Extension Programs Schedule: September–December*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1987a). *Extension Programs Schedule: January–March*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1987b). *Extension Programs Schedule: April–July*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1987c). *Extension Programs Schedule: September–December*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1988a). *Extension Programs Schedule: January–April*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1988b). *Extension Programs Schedule: April–July*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.

- JIBC. (1988c). *Summer Institute Schedule: July*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1988d). *Extension Programs Schedule: September–December*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1989a). *Extension Programs Schedule: January–April*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1989b). *Extension Programs Schedule: May–July*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1989c). *Extension Programs Schedule: September–December*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1990a). *Extension Programs Schedule: January–April*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1990b). *Extension Programs Schedule: May–August*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1990c). *Extension Programs Professional Development and Community Education: September–December*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1991a). *Extension Programs Professional Development and Community Education: January–June*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1991b). *Extension Programs Professional Development and Community Education: January–June*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1991c). *Interdisciplinary Studies Fall Calendar: September–December*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1992a). *Interdisciplinary Studies Winter Calendar: January–April*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1992b). *Interdisciplinary Studies Spring/Summer Calendar: May–August*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1992c). *Interdisciplinary Studies Fall Calendar: September–December*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- JIBC. (1993a). *Interdisciplinary Studies Spring/Summer Calendar: May–August*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.

- JIBC. (1993b). *Interdisciplinary Studies Winter Calendar: January–April*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Johnson, D., Johnson, R. & Smith, K. (1991). *Active learning: Cooperation in the college classroom*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Jones, T. S. (2004). Conflict resolution education: The field, the findings, and the future. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 22(1), 233-267.
- Keen, M. (1990). Peace studies and the pedagogy of peace. *Peace & Change*, 15(3), 219-223.
- Kelly, T. & Howie, L. (2007). Working with stories in nursing research: Procedures used in narrative analysis. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 16(2), 136-144.
- Kemmis, S. & McTaggart, R. (2000). Participatory action research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 567-606). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kennedy, D. *A history of coaching*. Retrieved December 13, 2007 from <http://www.resultsthatmatter.com/history.htm>
- Kessler, S. (1978). *Creative conflict resolution: Mediation – leader's guide*. Atlanta, GA: National Institute for Professional Training.
- Kilcup, G. (1980). *1980-85: A plan for the future: Report to the Board*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Kilcup, G. (1982). *Justice Institute of British Columbia: Phase III educational 5 year plan, 1981-1986*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Knowles, M. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy (Rev. and updated ed.)*. Chicago: Follett.
- Kressel, K. (2000). Mediation. In M. Deutsch & P. Coleman (Eds.), *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (pp. 522-545). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kriesberg, L. (1991). Conflict resolution applications to peace studies. *Peace & Change*, 16(4), 400-417.
- Kriesberg, L. (1997). The development of the conflict resolution field. In I. W. Zartman & J. L. Rasmussen (Eds.), *Peacemaking in international conflict: Methods and techniques* (pp. 51-73). Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.

- Kriesberg, L. (2003). *Constructive conflicts: From escalation to resolution*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kuttner, T. (2001). Labour mediation. *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved December 11, 2007, from: http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=A1ART_A0004427.
- Lange, E. (2006). Challenging social philosophobia. In T. Fenwick, T. Nesbit & B. Spencer (Eds.), *Contexts of adult education*. Toronto, ON: Thompson Educational Publishing.
- Laue, J. (1987). The emergence and institutionalization of third-party roles in conflict. In D. Sandole, & I. Sandole-Staroste (Eds.), *Conflict management and problem-solving: Interpersonal to international applications* (pp. 17-29). London: Harold Pinter.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1993). From psychological stress to the emotions: A history of changing outlooks. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 44(Issue 1), preceding p1-21.
- LeBaron Duryea, M. (1994). *Conflict analysis and resolution as education: Culturally sensitive processes for conflict resolution*. Victoria, BC: University of Victoria Institute for Dispute Resolution.
- LeBaron Duryea, M. & Grundison, B. (1993). *Conflict and culture: Research in five communities in Vancouver, British Columbia*. Victoria: UVic Institute for Dispute Resolution.
- LeBaron, M. (2002). *Bridging troubled waters: Conflict resolution from the heart*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- LeBaron, M. (2003a). *Bridging cultural conflicts: A new approach for a changing world*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- LeBaron, M. (2003b) Cultural and Worldview Frames. In G. Burgess & H. Burgess (Eds.) *Beyond Intractability*. Boulder : Conflict Research Consortium, University of Colorado. http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/cultural_frames
- Lederach, J. P. (1995). *Preparing for peace: Conflict transformation across cultures*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Lederach, J. P. (2003). *The little book of conflict transformation*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.
- Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Levin, J. (2000). The revised institution: The community college mission at the end of the twentieth century. *Community College Review*, 28(2), 1.
- Levin, J. (2001). *Globalizing the community college: Strategies for change in the twenty-first century*. New York: Palgrave.
- Levin, J. (2003). Organizational paradigm shift and the university colleges of British Columbia. *Higher Education*, 46(4), 447.
- Lewicki, R. (2002). *New directions and issues in the teaching of conflict resolution*. Conflict Management in Higher Education Report. Retrieved December 22, 2008, from: http://www.campus-adr.org/CMHER/ReportArticles/Edition2_2/Lewicki2_2.html
- Lyon, H. (1971). *Learning to feel – feeling to learn: Humanistic education for the whole man*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After virtue: A study in moral theory* (2nd ed.). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- MacKeracher, D. (2004). *Making sense of adult learning* (2nd ed.). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- MacLeod, F. (1990). *Extension programs annual report 1989-1990*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Marlatt, G. & Perry, M. (1975). Modeling methods. In F. H. Kanfer & A. P. Goldstein (Eds.), *Helping people change: A textbook of methods* (pp. 117-158). New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mason, G. H. (2002). Peace studies in the next half-century. *Peace Review*, 14(1), 15-19.
- Mayer, B. (2004). *Beyond neutrality: Confronting the crisis in conflict resolution*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McBee, M. & Barnes, L. (1998). The generalizability of a performance assessment measuring achievement in eighth-grade mathematics. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 11(2), 179-194.
- McCold, P. (2006). The recent history of restorative justice: Mediation, circles and conferencing. In D. Sullivan & L. Tiff (Eds.), *Handbook of restorative justice: A global perspective* (pp. 23-41). London: Routledge.

- Megill, A. (2004). Intellectual history and history. *Rethinking History*, 8(4), 549-557.
- Meichenbaum, D. (1975). Self-instructional methods. In F. H. Kanfer & A. Goldstein (Eds.), *Helping people change: A textbook of methods* (pp. 357-392). New York: Pergamon.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case studies applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. (2008). Adult learning theory for the twenty-first century. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* (119), 93-98.
- Miettinen, R. (2000). The concept of experiential learning and John Dewey's theory of reflective thought and action. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 19(1), 54-72.
- Miller, M., & Linn, R. (2000). Validation of performance-based assessments. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 24(4), 367.
- Miller, W. & Crabtree, B. (2004). Depth interviewing. In S. Nagy Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Approaches to qualitative research: A reader on theory and practice* (pp. 185). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Moen, T. (2006). Reflections on the narrative research approach. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(4), 1-11.
- Moore, C. (1986). *The mediation process: Practical strategies for resolving conflict*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Moore, C. (2003). *The mediation process: Practical strategies for resolving conflict* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Nader, L. (1998). Harmony models and the construction of law. In K. Avruch, P. W. Black & J. A. Scimecca (Eds.), *Conflict resolution: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 41-59). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Nierenberg, G. (1986). *The complete negotiator*. New York: Nierenberg and Zeif Publishers.
- Olesen, V. (2000). Feminism and qualitative research at and into the millenium. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ollagnier, E. (2005). Training. In L. English (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of adult education* (pp. 618-622). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

- Osborne, K. (1987). Peace education and the schools: What we can learn from history? In T. Carson & H. Gideonse (Eds.), *Peace education and the task for peace educators* (pp. 10-24). Bloomington, Ind.: World Council for Curriculum and Instruction.
- Peachey, D., Snyder, B. & Teichrob, A. (1983). *Mediation primer: A training guide for mediators in the criminal justice system*. Waterloo, ON: Community Justice Initiatives of Waterloo Region.
- Percival, M. (1989). *An intellectual history of the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, New York, NY.
- Pfeiffer, J. W. (Ed.). (1984-2003) *The annual handbook for human resources development*. San Diego, CA: University Associates.
- Pfeiffer, J. W. & Ballew, A. (Eds.). (1988a). *Using lecturettes, theory, and models in human resource development*. San Diego, CA: University Associates.
- Pfeiffer, J. W. & Ballew, A. (Eds.). (1988b). *Using role plays in human resource development*. San Diego, CA: University Associates.
- Pfeiffer, J. W. & Goodstein, L. (Eds.). (1982-1983). *The annual for facilitators, trainers and consultants*. San Diego, CA: University Associates.
- Pfeiffer, J. W., & Jones, J. (Eds.). (1969). *A handbook of structured experiences for human relations training, vol. 1*. LaJolla, Calif.: University Associates.
- Pfeiffer, J. W. & Jones, J. (Eds.). (1972-1981). *The annual handbook for group facilitators*. San Diego, CA: University Associates.
- Picard, C. (2000). *The many meanings of mediation: A sociological study of mediation in Canada*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON.
- Picard, C. (2002). *Mediating interpersonal and small group conflict*. Ottawa, ON: Golden Dog Press.
- Picard, C. (2004). *The art and science of mediation*. Toronto, ON: Emond Montgomery Publications.
- Plumb, L. (1993). *A critique of the human potential movement*. New York, NY: Garland.
- Polkinghorne, D. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

- Pruitt, D. (1987). Creative approaches to negotiation. In D. Sandole, & I. Sandole-Staroste (Eds.), *Conflict management and problem-solving: Interpersonal to international applications*. (pp. 62-76). London: Harold Pinter.
- Putnam, L. (2006). Definitions and approaches to conflict and communication. In J. G. Oetzel & S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of conflict communication: Integrating theory, research and practice* (pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Quellmalz, E. (1991). Developing criteria for performance assessments: The missing link. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 4(4), 319.
- Regan, P. (2006). *Unsettling the settler within: Canada's peacemaker myth, reconciliation, and transformative pathways to decolonization*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC.
- Rengert, L. (1986). *Anger management for youth*. Vancouver, BC: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Rengert, L. (1987). Section 3: Dealing with anger, hostility and resistance in conflict situations. In M. Burdine, & I. Rengert (Eds.), *Dealing with anger, resistance and hostility in conflict situations* (pp. 1-30). Vancouver: Justice Institute of British Columbia.
- Rogers, C. (1969). *Freedom to learn: A view of what education might become*. Columbus, OH: C.E. Merrill.
- Ross, D. (Winter 2008 Edition),). Game theory. In E. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2008/entries/game-theory/>
- Sandole, D. & Sandole-Staroste, I. (Eds.). (1987). *Conflict management and problem solving: Interpersonal to international applications*. London, UK: Frances Pinter.
- Schellenberg, J. (1982). *The science of conflict*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Schellenberg, J. (1996). *Conflict resolution: Theory, research, and practice*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Schrock-Shenk, C. & Ressler, L. (Eds.). (1999). *Making peace with conflict*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.
- Schur, E. (1976). *The awareness trap: Self absorption instead of social change*. New York, NY: Quadrangle.

- Schwandt, T. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics and social constructionism. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scimecca, J. A. (1987). Conflict resolution: The basis for social control or social change? In D. Sandole, & I. Sandole-Staroste (Eds.), *Conflict management and problem-solving: Interpersonal to international applications* (pp. 30-33). London: Harold Pinter.
- Scimecca, J. A. (1998). Conflict resolution in the United States: The emergence of a profession? In K. Avruch, P. W. Black & J. A. Scimecca (Eds.), *Conflict resolution: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 19-39). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Segers, M., Dochy, F. & Cascallar, E. (Eds.). (2003). *Optimising new modes of assessment: In search of qualities and standards*. Dordrecht, NL: Lluwer Academic Publishers.
- Slaughter, S. (1997). Class, race, and gender and the construction of postsecondary curricula in the United States: Social movement, professionalization and political economic theories of curricular change. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 29(1), 1-30.
- Smit, G., & Van Der Molen, H. (1996). Simulations for the assessment of counselling skills. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 21(4), 335.
- Smith, D. & Carson, T. (1998). *Educating for a peaceful future*. Toronto, ON: Kagan & Woo.
- Smith, D. E. (2001). Texts and the ontology of organizations and institutions. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations & Societies*, 7(2), 159-198.
- Smith, J. & Deemer, D. (2000). The problems of criteria in an age of relativism. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (Second ed.) (pp. 877-896). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Smith, M. (2005). *Kurt Lewin: Groups, experiential learning and action research*. Retrieved March 30, 2006 from <http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-lewin.htm>
- Stewart, S. (1998). *Conflict resolution: A foundation guide*. Winchester: Waterside Press.
- Stonecrest Services Ltd. (1980). *Justice Institute of British Columbia 1980-1985: A plan for the future*. Vancouver, BC: Author.
- Sullivan, D. & Tifft, L. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of restorative justice: A global perspective*. London, UK: Routledge.

- Sutherland, J. (2005). *Worldview skills: Transforming conflict from the inside out*. Sooke, BC: Worldview Strategies Publications.
- Tate, P., Foulkes, J., Neighbour, R., Champion, P., & Field, S. (1999). Assessing physicians' interpersonal skills via videotaped encounters: A new approach for the Royal College of General Practitioners membership examination. *Journal of Health Communication, 4*(2), 143-152.
- Taylor, C. (1985). *Philosophy and the human sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Tedlock, B. (2000). Ethnography and ethnographic representation. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 455-486). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Test Design Project. (1995). *Performance-based assessments: A methodology for use in selecting, training and evaluating mediators*. Washington, DC: National Institute for Dispute Resolution.
- Thomas, K. & Killman, R. (1974). *Thoman-Killman conflict mode instrument*. Tuxedo, NY: Xicom
- Tidwell, A. (1998). *Conflict resolved? A critical assessment of conflict resolution*. London, UK: Pinter.
- Timura, C. T. (2004). *The globalizing expertise of British and American conflict resolution specialists*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, Dearborn, MI.
- Tisdell, E. & Taylor, E. (1999). Adult Education Philosophy Informs Practice. *Adult Learning, 11* (2), 6-11
- Van den Hoonaard, W. (2003). Is anonymity an artifact in ethnographic research? *Journal of Academic Ethics, 1*, 141 – 151.
- Viner, R. (1999). Putting stress in life: Hans Selye and the making of stress theory. *Social Studies of Science, 29*(3), 391-413.
- Volkema, R. & Bergmann, T. (1995). Conflict styles as indicators of behavioral patterns in interpersonal conflicts. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135*(1), 5-15.
- Wahrhaftig, P. (2004). *Community dispute resolution, empowerment and social justice: The origins, history and future of a movement*. Washington, DC: NAFCM Press.
- Walton, R. & McKersie, R. (1991). *A behavioral theory of labor negotiations: An analysis of a social interaction system* (Silver Anniversary ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Wedge, B. (1987). Introduction. In D. Sandole & I. Sandole-Staroste (Eds.), *Conflict management and problem-solving: Interpersonal to international applications* (pp. 1-3). London, UK: Frances Pinter.
- Wilkinson, K. (1996). *Justice Institute of British Columbia Centre for Conflict Resolution Training: 1996 participant survey results*. Vancouver, BC: Keith Wilkinson Consulting.
- Woods, H. D. (1955). Canadian collective bargaining and dispute settlement policy: An appraisal. *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 21(4), 447-465. Retrieved December 10, 2007 from JSTOR database
- Yon, D. A. (2003). Highlights and overview of the history of educational ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 32(1), 411-429.
- Zehr, H. (1990). *Changing lenses: A new focus for crime and justice*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.
- Zehr, H. (2004). Commentary: Restorative justice: Beyond victim-offender mediation. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 22(1), 305-315.