negotiation and conflict management research

Negotiation and Conflict Management Research

Lessons Learned from Working with Roy J. Lewicki

Edward C. Tomlinson,[1,2] Beth Polin,[2] Barbara Gray,[3] and Bruce Barry[4]

1 West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, U.S.A.
2 Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, KY, U.S.A.
3 Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA, U.S.A.
4 Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, U.S.A.

Keywords
conflict, framing, negotiation, pedagogy, trust.

Correspondence
Edward C. Tomlinson, West Virginia University, PO Box 6025, Morgantown, WV, 26506-6025, U.S.A.; e-mail: edward.tomlinson@mail.wvu.edu.

Abstract

This article includes four essays in tribute to our colleague, Roy J. Lewicki, recipient of the International Association for Conflict Management 2013 Lifetime Achievement Award. Although he has made many contributions to the conflict and negotiation literature, we focus in particular on our experiences in collaborating with him on his research on leader influence on subordinate discretionary behavior, interpersonal trust, framing in environmental conflicts, and negotiation pedagogy. Each essay describes key lessons we learned from Roy. The end of the article features a closing commentary by Roy.

We are grateful for the opportunity to write in tribute to the many contributions Roy Lewicki has made to the conflict and negotiation literature. In doing so, we chronicle not only major aspects of his intellectual contributions to research and pedagogy but also the interpersonal contributions he made in enriching our collaborative endeavors. In fact, we believe the key theme that resounds across our individual essays is that each of us learned invaluable lessons on how to thrive in our profession from our partnership with him. When reflecting on how Roy leads by example, mentors doctoral students, sustains research momentum when it otherwise might stall, bridges the theory-practice divide, and creates user-friendly instructional materials, we honor his work in both substance and style. It is truly a pleasure to celebrate the impact of Roy J. Lewicki, recipient of the International Association for Conflict Management (IACM) 2013 Lifetime Achievement Award, on our field and our lives.

Following the Leader—Ed Tomlinson

As one of Roy's former doctoral students (at The Ohio State University from 1999 to 2004), I have been privileged to work with him in multiple areas of research, including trust, negotiation, and leadership. I will focus my remarks in this section on his recent contributions to the leadership literature, specifically in reference to how leaders influence the discretionary behavior of their subordinates. This stream of research has focused on understanding and predicting how the words and actions of leaders affect the

We wish to thank Dr. Michael Gross, Editor, for inviting this opportunity to reflect upon and celebrate the many contributions Roy J. Lewicki has made to the conflict and negotiation literature. We also thank Deborah Cai and Shirli Kopelman for their friendly review, as well as an anonymous reviewer. Finally, we owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to Roy, both for the opportunities to collaborate with him on prior projects and for graciously agreeing to add his perspective to this collection of essays on recipients of the International Association for Conflict Management Lifetime Achievement Award published in the journal of *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*.

Volume 10, Number 2, Pages 126–140

degree to which their subordinates voluntarily engage in behaviors that exceed formal role requirements and abstain from behavior that is harmful to the organization and/or its members. I had a natural interest in this topic and avidly read his prior work (e.g., Lewicki, Poland, Minton, & Sheppard, 1997). I was fortunate to work with him on several papers that fall within this stream of his research. In reflecting back on these experiences, I realized the immense depth and scope of Roy's influence on my thinking. Not only has his work profoundly influenced how I think about leader influence, but my experiences under his direction have indelibly shaped how I approach any research endeavor. Of course, I can't fully express all that I have learned from him within this brief section. Instead, I begin with an example of recent work and then trace its lineage across his earlier work to illustrate how this continuing stream of research has expanded the frontier of knowledge on leader influence. Along the way, I will point to salient lessons I learned from each project that continue to guide my research today (Figure 1).

Recently, Tomlinson, Lewicki, and Ash (2014) studied how managerial integrity predicted subordinate citizenship behaviors. More specifically, we had two central purposes that are relevant to the current discussion. First, we wanted to examine what we saw as two different constructs that some researchers measure singularly. Interpersonal trust researchers are familiar with Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman's (1995) integrative model of trust, which proposed integrity as a key characteristic of a trustee that predicts another's trust in him or her. Integrity in that model is the degree to which the trustee adheres to values the trustor finds acceptable. We referred to this as *moral integrity.* While we appreciate parsimony, we began to suspect that this conceptualization of integrity might actually be encompassing (and conflating) two separate constructs. More recent theory on integrity suggests that it might be more properly understood as word-action alignment (Palanski & Yammarino, 2007; Simons, 2002), which is a narrower

Figure 1. Roy Lewicki and Ed Tomlinson after Ed's Ph.D. graduation (Columbus, Ohio, 2004).

conceptualization; scholars refer to this alignment as *behavioral integrity*. When Mayer et al. (1995) referred to acceptable values in the eyes of the trustor, they appear to have described values congruence, a construct that predated the Mayer et al.'s model (Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989). Tomlinson et al. (2014) theoretically developed and empirically confirmed the distinction between behavioral integrity and values congruence, thus disentangling the moral integrity construct. This example illustrates a principle I learned from Roy that was repeated and reinforced in nearly every research-based conversation we've ever had: Conceptualization of constructs and calibration of their measurement must be preeminent concerns for researchers.

The second contribution of the Tomlinson et al. (2014) paper that I will highlight here is the theoretical and practical significance of separately examining behavioral integrity and values congruence on citizenship. With apologies in advance for the plot-spoiler for those who have not yet read the article, we predicted and found that practicing what you preach (high behavioral integrity) is best when you are preaching to the choir (high values congruence). Specifically, we found that subordinate citizenship behavior is highest when managers exhibit high levels of both constructs. We also found evidence that citizenship is lowest when values congruence is high, but behavioral integrity is low. Our results manifested as an interaction effect between behavioral integrity and values congruence, an effect that could not have been found had we not separated moral integrity into its respective components. But I think an even more important feature of this study is the fact that we demonstrated these effects in two separate samples of surveyed workers. Roy had suggested that we get an additional field sample for this study (and he went out and got one!). Interaction effects are more difficult to find in field settings, and finding support for such hypotheses not once but twice offers compelling evidence. Lesson two for me was to always strive to assemble the most credible and compelling evidence for hypothesized effects. Replication across multiple samples is one means to that end.

In fact, we had used multiple samples *at different levels of analysis* in an earlier study on how behavioral integrity relates to citizenship and deviant behavior. In Dineen, Lewicki, and Tomlinson (2006), we found that behavioral integrity and supervisory guidance interact in predicting citizenship behavior and deviance. Essentially, we noted that supervisors can influence their subordinates for better or worse through the explicit guidance they offer on desired versus undesired behavior and through the way they model those standards themselves. Using employee survey data from two separate banks, we found that citizenship behavior was the highest when both behavioral integrity and guidance were high, but it was the lowest when guidance was high and behavioral integrity was low. (The opposite pattern of effects occurred for deviance.) And to reiterate: Our results held across two separate banks. In the first sample, our predicted effects were confirmed at the individual level, and in the second sample, our predicted effects were confirmed at the branch level. An earlier version of this paper was presented at an annual meeting of the Academy of Management, but it took us a few journal submissions to eventually get a "revise and resubmit" at *Journal of Applied Psychology*. And we went through several rounds there to achieve a final acceptance. I still recall research get-togethers to discuss our progress and chart out next steps. Roy was absolutely indispensable in directing our thoughts and energy toward absolute linguistic precision, and I believe this guidance was a major factor that led to our eventual success. I'm sure I speak for others who have also worked with Roy when I describe my third lesson as the emphasis on careful, logical, and precise exposition. Truthfully, I don't remember if it was in reference to this project or another, but I recall a meeting in his office where he said that the wording used to describe arguments in manuscripts is the "soft underbelly" that often makes the difference between victory (publication) and defeat (back to the file drawer). I took that to mean that this is a part of the publishing process that has the potential for enormous vulnerability, so it pays to work hard to get it right.

I'd like to close with a final reflection I've had across all of our work together. I am the father of three boys, and required reading in our household is a book called *The Bike Lesson* (Berenstain & Berenstain, 1964). You may recognize this book as part of the famous collection of Berenstain Bears stories. In this book, Papa Bear gives his son a new bike. The catch is that Small Bear can't ride it until he endures all of

Papa's biking lessons. Unfortunately for Small Bear, the book chronicles seven examples from the hapless Papa on what *not* to do when riding a bike! Fortunately for me (and many others), Roy does not employ Papa Bear's teaching method. It often seems that researchers live in a world where their reputation hinges largely on how the test of time judges their contributions. Some of these scholars appear to be jealous gatekeepers whose egos prompt them to engage in ethically questionable behaviors in an effort to protect their legacy to the literature. Yet I've lost track of how often I've heard Roy tell me to critically evaluate everything I read for a project, even if he wrote it!

Roy doesn't just research effective leadership behavior, he exemplifies it. I believe his example of humility is a necessary prerequisite for behavioral scientists who espouse objective, dispassionate, and rigorous research that yields evidence-based answers for the important questions of our day.

A Mentorship Grounded in Trust—Beth Polin

"Dr. Lewicki?" It was a meek question, not a statement of arrival, that day in 2008 when I knocked for the first time on Roy's office door in the Fisher College of Business at The Ohio State University. I was a 23-year-old, first-year Ph.D. student still learning to navigate the intimidating waters of graduate school and quite in awe when meeting a professor who had accomplished as much as Roy over his career. He greeted me and invited me to take a seat as he finished reading the document in his hands. I tiptoed around piles of papers and boxes of books, and when I finally made it to the chair, I removed a stack of folders before sitting down. I was impressed by the mess, not offended, as Roy—in intellect, demeanor, and office décor—fit the profile of an authentic academician. I peered at the well-known conflict management expert over a cluttered desk and thanked him for meeting with me. I explained how I found his work in the field fascinating and asked him, as any diligent doctoral student would, if there were any projects he was working on that I could join. "What interests you?" he asked. My answer: workplace trust.

I had done my homework on Roy prior to meeting with him that fall day during my first semester. Although he had built a successful career studying microlevel organizational behavior topics for decades, it was not until the 1990s that he began to examine the role of trust and trust repair processes in the workplace. Despite the relative recency of this line of inquiry compared to other subject matter he had investigated, his expertise was evidenced by a staggering repertoire that included close to 50 academic presentations on the topic, nearly 20 book chapters, and a hefty handful of articles in top-tier journals including *Academy of Management Review* (Dirks, Lewicki, & Zaheer, 2009; Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies, 1998), *Business & Professional Ethics Journal* (Lewicki & Stevenson, 1997), *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* (Tomlinson & Lewicki, 2006), *International Journal of Conflict Management* (Tomlinson, Dineen, & Lewicki, 2009), and *Journal of Management* (Lewicki, Tomlinson, & Gillespie, 2006; Tomlinson, Dineen, & Lewicki, 2004). Roy had accomplished the attainment of well-deserved recognition as an authority in an academic discipline that few could claim.

What was then, and still is today, most impressive is the passion that drives the quality of the contribution Roy has made to our understanding of workplace trust. A conversation about this organizational dynamic with Roy demonstrates the deep level of comprehension he possesses and his continued curiosity for the subject despite years of attention to it. His work has influenced the way academics and practitioners think about the concept of the topic as well as its connections and applications to other organizational behavior constructs and contexts. Roy recognized through much of his work that the theoretical understanding of workplace trust deserved more consideration. He spent time reflecting on highly debated questions such as whether trust really was easier to destroy than to build, ultimately refining a model (the concept of which was originally proposed by Shapiro, Sheppard, & Cheraskin, 1992) of trust development widely recognized today that separates levels of trust into calculus-based, knowledge-based, and identification-based stages (Lewicki & Bunker, 1995, 1996). Acknowledging the complex nature of relationships—particularly those in negotiation—he applied this model to distinguish trust-increasing and trust-decreasing actions (Lewicki & Stevenson, 1997). He further organized the field's understanding of trust by differentiating between behavioral and psychological traditions of the construct, outlining definitions, creating and summarizing measurements, and further explaining trust growth and decline (Lewicki, Stevenson, & Bunker, 1997; Lewicki et al., 2006). He tackled the complexities of distrust just as he had trust, and he emphasized the need for simultaneous management of the two in work environments (Lewicki et al., 1998; Tomlinson & Lewicki, 2006). He also explored the nature of trust congruence to better appreciate relational contexts (Tomlinson et al., 2009). This is a brief list, but one that hopefully demonstrates the breadth and depth of his dedication to the topic (Figure 2).

I was fortunate that Roy's response that day in his office was an invitation onto a project, the first of many that came from our productive academic relationship. In the early 2000s, Roy had expanded his focus from trust development to trust repair, recognizing that trust repair was "a body of work that span[ned] several disciplinary perspectives and levels of analysis," but that, much like trust development years earlier, needed a "unified conceptual foundation" (Dirks et al., 2009, p. 73). He addressed the gap with both theoretical and empirical (e.g., Tomlinson et al., 2004) work, and in the late 2000s, I joined his efforts.

Our first project together was a book chapter with strong academic and practical implications in which we argued that it was "time to step out of the laboratory" and that "much [could] be learned from studying the actual efforts to repair trust in 'real', 'live' trust contexts" (Lewicki & Polin, 2012, p. 95). We proceeded to identify individual components of apologies (i.e., expression of regret, acknowledgment of responsibility, declaration of repentance, offer of repair, explanation of why the violation occurred, and request for forgiveness), and then we chose four "famous" contemporary apologies (i.e., Bernie Madoff, British Petroleum, JetBlue, and Tiger Woods) and analyzed the inclusion of those components outlined.

When we finished this project, Roy turned to me and asked what question piqued my curiosity in this line of inquiry. I responded that I was most interested in discovering if all apologies were equal in

Figure 2. Roy Lewicki, Beth Polin, and Debbie Lewicki (Columbus, Ohio, 2013).

effectiveness and which component, or combination of components, was needed for an apology to actually repair trust. This interest led us to years of data collection with our colleague, Robert Lount, and the conclusion that, indeed, the inclusion of some components over others does lead to more effective apologies (Lewicki, Polin, & Lount, 2016). This finding not only took apology research to a new level of detail, but it also called for validity in the field, as current studies were treating outcomes from various forms of apologies equally. This work with Roy gained international attention and was widely shared by media outlets including *ABC News Radio*, *CBS News*, *Psychology Today*, and *U.S. News and World Report*.

Roy is an influential mentor, which speaks to his collaborative and encouraging nature, characteristics anyone would appreciate but ones for which a graduate student is particularly thankful. I was inferior in both expertise and rank, yet Roy kindly balanced treating me as an equal while still providing much needed guidance. He was the type of mentor whose students performed well because they would feel as though they let him down if they did not produce their best work possible. The articles we have published together in addition to the aforementioned trust repair pieces (e.g., Lewicki & Polin, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c) would have been produced much faster had Roy worked with another experienced colleague, but he instead chose to invest time and energy into my—and many others'—development over the years.

When thinking about impact on the field, it is easy to focus on the published work that has advanced the subject matter. What is often overlooked but equally important is the additional teaching and service contribution: Roy has served on the editorial board of *Journal of Trust Research* and as the Trust Track Co-Chair for both the *European Institute for Applied Studies in Management* and the *European Group and Organizational Studies Conference*; he has been involved in many doctoral programs and on many dissertation committees, including my own; and he has led workshops on workplace trust for students, practitioners, and fellow academics. But what arguably demonstrates his truest dedication to the field is the care he has taken to mentor future generations of trust and conflict management researchers. Roy knows the field has much progress yet to make despite his significant additions, and that will happen because he has taken the time to build a legacy through the training and development of others who will continue the work.

Roy officially retired a few years ago, but I seriously doubt he will ever actually stop searching for an answer to the next workplace trust inquiry. For Roy, it has never been *work*, but honestly a life's passion. In a tribute to Morton Deutsch, Roy's mentor, it was said that "through decades of extraordinary work... [Deutsch] became an internationally renowned social psychologist, widely honored for his scientific and practical contributions and beloved by his students" and that "he led by example and consequently became a great leader of leaders, including... Roy Lewicki...." (Coleman & Deutsch, 2014, p. viii). Roy has earned every bit of this title as leader: He has followed in his mentor's footsteps by producing decades of extraordinary work himself, becoming internationally recognized, being widely honored for scientific and practical contributions, and being beloved by students and colleagues. I am most fortunate to count myself among those who have had the opportunity to work with and learn from this man.

Framing in Environmental Conflicts—Barbara Gray

Roy Lewicki is one of the pillars of the field of negotiation studies. As Beth already detailed, he is probably best known for his research on trust, including his 1995 chapter with Barbara Bunker, in which they elaborated on important distinctions among three types of trust, and his 1998 article making a forceful case for viewing trust and distrust as two distinct constructs (Lewicki et al., 1998). A careful review of his vita, however, reveals a much wider range of contributions. Not only has Roy himself written thoughtfully about negotiations, and, in particular, ethics in negotiation (Lewicki & Robinson, 1998), but, along with Blair Sheppard and Max Bazerman, Roy was instrumental in launching the series, *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, which served to increase the breadth and variety of new research ideas in the negotiation arena. I was twice privileged to benefit from opportunities this outlet provided to try out new lines of inquiry which otherwise might never have been written. Roy has also made countless contributions across his career to enrich the pedagogy of negotiations (e.g., Lewicki, 1986, 1997). I have an exceedingly dog-eared book with a green cover on my shelf that became my go-to book for teaching resources when I was first learning to teach experientially. However, it wasn't until many years later that I realized that Roy was one of the co-editors of that book, *Experiences in Management and Organizational Behavior*. In fact, I expect few of us in the conflict and negotiation field can claim that our teaching hasn't been enhanced by the comprehensive and thoughtful resources Roy and his coeditors compiled and periodically updated over the years in several books such as *Negotiation: Readings, Exercises and Cases*. Roy has also added insights to the organizational justice literature (Lewicki & Sheppard, 1985; Sheppard & Lewicki, 1987) and to our understanding of intractable conflicts. In fact, he's come a long way from his very early work on violence and chicken games (Deutsch & Lewicki, 1970; Kopelman et al., 2015; Lewicki, 1971) although one can imagine how studies of trust building might naturally evolve from that work!

Since I am not a trust scholar, I will let others further extol the virtues of Roy's insights in this arena. Instead, I would like to reflect on his contributions to the Interuniversity Consortium for Research on the Framing of Intractable Environmental Conflict, which I convened in 1998. The Consortium set out to discover why some conflicts remained intractable long after they began, often despite concerted efforts to intervene in search of common ground among the factions. I invited an interdisciplinary group of six faculty from organizational behavior, organizational communication, and public and environmental policy to work together on this problem. Each faculty member was to identify an intractable conflict and invite one graduate student to join them in studying that conflict. With support from the Hewlett Foundation and from a joint NSF/EPA grant, we collectively engaged in grounded theorizing to understand how the disputants' frames contributed to the intractability of the conflicts (Figure 3).

I specifically invited Roy to join this project because of his focus on trust, justice, ethics, and identity in negotiations—issues that often influence the juggernaut of intractability. I had also been impressed by his clarity in delineating constructs and their interactions. But, as equally important as his knowledge base was the spirit I knew Roy would bring to the project—enthusiastic, theoretically tenacious, and playful as well. Up to that point, we had only interacted through editing, conferences, and service roles

Figure 3. Barbara Gray passing the IACM President's gavel to Roy Lewicki in San Sebastián-Donostia, Spain, in 1999.

in the Academy's Conflict Management Division and IACM, and through a lovely stroll through the Botanical Gardens in Berlin when we both found ourselves with time to kill after the IACM Conference in Bonn, Germany, in 1997. But we had never conducted research together. While not everyone is suited to the type of collaborative theorizing in which we engaged in the Consortium, Roy dug right in and identified an appropriate and fascinating dispute in Ohio as his research site and commenced data collection with his graduate student, Carolyn Wiethoff.

Over the next three years, the Consortium met regularly to advance our research agenda, conducting and analyzing interviews with over 150 disputants involved in eight intractable conflicts dealing with environmental issues. We developed a comprehensive composite of the types of frames that emerged from our data (see Lewicki, Gray, & Elliot, 2003 for details). Roy quickly became one of the thought leaders on this project, and his insights were invaluable throughout the project, but particularly as we developed our composite of frames for coding the data. For example, he helped us flesh out how to identify and classify gain and loss frames and to tease out different kinds of power frames. Here, I must note that during the many consortium meetings we all worked hard and played hard. We also engaged in our share of sparring over the most appropriate theoretical referents and the best way to move from our first order data to second-order classifications of it. In these intellectual wrestling matches, Roy always maintained a level head, helping us capture key distinctions in how our disputants were framing their experiences and guided us toward a robust framework around which we could all find room to incorporate our pet theories. On these occasions and many others during the Consortium's work, I learned over and over again just how valuable Roy is as a teammate and a scholar.

Later in the project when our results were ready for dissemination, we settled on a book format to capture the breadth of the project overall. Given Roy's extensive experience in writing books and handling book projects, I asked him to be lead editor (with myself and Michael Elliott) on *Making Sense of Intractable Environmental Conflict: Concepts and Cases,* which came out in 2003. This book included a compilation of eight cases, grouped into sections by type of dispute (e.g., water, natural resources, toxics, and growth), and summary chapters comparing disputants' framing within each type of dispute. While the book, like the project, truly was a collaborative effort, Roy took first author responsibility for writing the water case summary, in addition to handling all the niggling coordination to pull it all together. Thanks in large measure to his editorial leadership, our book received the best book award from the International Association of Conflict Management in 2003. The book, an award-winning empirical paper in *Communication Monographs* (Brummans et al., 2008), and a subsequent review article on framing (Dewulf et al., 2009) stimulated a steady stream of research on environmental conflict using a framing perspective and yielded important new insights into the dynamics that lead to and may ameliorate intractable conflict. In addition to his intellectual contributions to this work (which were many), I will forever be grateful to Roy for his wholehearted support of the Consortium and for adding levity (sometimes bordering on hilarity) to our work together over those ten years. A key lesson we learned from Roy is just how much fun serious research can be.

A tribute to Roy would be incomplete without also acknowledging his dedication to finding ways to bridge the research–practice gap. This commitment began early in his professional life, as reflected in a 1973 paper coauthored with Clayton Alderfer entitled "Tensions between research and intervention in intergroup conflict" (Lewicki & Alderfer, 1973). This early Alderfer imprinting clearly shaped Roy's thinking and practice. Not only have we learned from him how to do this, but we are all the beneficiaries of Roy's embodiment of this insight, from his founding leadership in launching the journal *Academy of Management Learning and Education,* to his countless tutorials at AOM on "Negotiating Your First Job," to the masterful way he translates research into practical knowledge for his many clients, and to the way he uses real-world problems to shape his research endeavors. His dedication to the field of negotiation studies has been unparalleled. He is a scholar and a gentleman, and he is eminently deserving of this tribute.

Negotiation Pedagogy—Bruce Barry

It has been roughly 30 years ago since I first encountered the force of nature that is Roy Lewicki. I can't pinpoint the date or the reason, but I do recall the circumstance. He was Associate Dean of Academic Programs at Duke University's Fuqua School at the time, and I was a fuzzy-headed twenty-something (well before graduate school) in a staff job at Duke. I was probably trying to get him to sign off on something, I can't quite recall. But what I do recall is that I thought he was kind of scary—that gruff demeanor behind a big desk, the trademark baritone voice—this, I thought, is an academic presence to be reckoned with.

Fast forward about 15 years to the late 1990s, by which time fate and happenstance had seen me through a Ph.D. and into a professorial career on a planet in Roy's solar system—which is to say, doing research and teaching in conflict and negotiation. In a move I never saw coming, on a sunny day in Spain (during an IACM conference, appropriately enough), the scary guy with the baritone voice invited me to join the author team for the set of three negotiation books (Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, 2015, 2016; Lewicki, Saunders, & Barry, 2015) that collectively, through 20 editions and numerous translations, have become widely used texts in college and university teaching worldwide. In the many years since I was smart enough to say yes, I have gotten to know Roy much better as a co-author and collaborator, sure, but also as a person. Among the many things, I've learned in my work with Roy (and our third partner in crime David Saunders) on our books I single out three in particular.

First, from my work with Roy, I've learned to always keep in mind that the enterprise of higher education is vast and that genuine educators see themselves as serving the entire profession, not just an elite. Some users of our books share the privilege we enjoy of plying our pedagogical trade with graduate professional students at research institutions, but many more are teaching classes with more diverse student profiles at a wide variety of types of institutions and classroom settings. We often receive inquiries from professors who are challenged by the negotiation classroom—some thrown in to teach a course they have to develop from scratch. Defying that scary Lewicki demeanor I might have initially perceived, the example Roy actually sets is one of utter collegiality and approachability—always (and I do mean always) willing to help any colleague in any situation figure out how to do what we do better.

Second, on a more practical plane, I have to confess that Roy has made me a better negotiator. The process of developing new editions of these books feels at times as much like a commercial activity as an academic one, with the business relationship we maintain with our publisher always in play. I can't count the number of times an impulse (of mine or David's) toward confrontation with our publisher over this or that issue was deftly tamed by Roy into the perfect bargaining message—one that lives the principles of substance and style in conflict management that we impress on our students but may easily overlook in our own affairs.

Third, and most significantly, I have benefitted from a close-up view of the way that Roy personifies the ideal of an integrated scholarly life that triangulates research, teaching, and service. Sure, many of us strive to make contributions in each of these areas, and we all make choices about where to invest our talents and energies. Roy is someone who seemingly for the entire span of his career has treated each as a calling of equivalent importance, giving everything of himself to each domain. I have often told graduate students and young professors that one of the key things successful academics learn as their professional careers unfold is how to say no. I've become convinced that Roy never bothered to learn that, and our entire professional community is the better for it.

So Roy Lewicki has done a lot of things, and we've drawn many lessons from them, as the essays here that precede mine make amply clear. But Roy is not just someone who does, he's someone who creates—who starts things that last and, in doing so, changes our profession and changes peoples' lives.

For instance, he didn't invent the idea of teaching negotiation, but he's certainly one of the progenitors of the art and science of teaching negotiation as we do it today in management and other professional education settings everywhere. Arising from a small conference at Berkeley way back in the spring of 1974, the first issue (vol. 1, no. 1) of a new journal, then called *The Teaching of Organizational Behavior,* included in its *Innovations* section a piece by Roy titled "A course in bargaining and negotiation" (Lewicki, 1975). (That typewritten journal—with annual subscriptions only $5.00!—later became the *Organizational Behavior Teaching Journal,* and eventually the venerable *Journal of Management Education.*) Roy wrote in that piece that it was time to move beyond conflict pedagogy's narrow focus on economic and legal aspects of labor–management relations toward helping students become more effective negotiators in their personal and professional lives. He pioneered the notion, now widely accepted, that teaching and research should reflect an understanding of negotiation "as a central management skill" (Lewicki, 1981, p. 41).

Yes, Roy is someone who starts things. In the 1970s, he participated in creating the Organizational Behavior Teaching Society. In the late 1980s, he was a founding member and the first chair of the Academy of Management's Conflict Management Interest Group, which turned into the division that many of us in this field call our academic home.

And Roy is someone who continued to start things. He agreed to take on the daunting challenge of serving as founding editor of a new Academy of Management journal on pedagogy, *Academy of Management Learning and Education,* which launched in 2002. The mission he charted for this journal, articulated in his editorial essay atop the first issue (another vol. 1, no. 1 appearance), was to "address the teaching and education needs of the Academy," to capture "trends, developments, and shifts that are occurring in educational design and delivery," and to "stimulate debate, critique, and innovation in the field of management education" (Lewicki, 2002; p. 8). Reflecting back years later on AMLE's first decade, Roy wrote that he was especially proud that the journal "has created a marketplace in which many new voices have been heard"—that the journal gives voice to colleagues who are relatively less visible and less involved in society governance (Lewicki, 2013, p. 105). This notion of creating an outlet that has "opened doors to opportunity" is classically Roy, whose very definition of the profession, as I suggested earlier, is so deeply rooted in inclusiveness and approachability.

Sometimes tributes like the one we offer here can be taken to mark the culmination of a lifetime of accomplishment. And well-deserved accolades for Roy's accomplishments as an educator are many: recipient of the Organizational Behavior Teaching Society's Outstanding Educator Award; a Fellow of the Academy of Management and a recipient of its Distinguished Educator Award; a Lifetime Achievement Award from the International Association for Conflict Management; and teaching and research honors that are far too numerous to mention.

But there is no culmination here. Roy has been pestering me lately about revision schedules for the next editions of our books. And remember that article on creating a course in negotiation that I mentioned at the outset—the one that appeared 41 years ago in volume 1, issue 1 of what became the *Journal of Management Education*. Well it doesn't surprise me to discover that Roy has an essay in the most recent issue (Lewicki & Bailey, 2016), this one about strategies that universities and their doctoral programs should pursue to better prepare new Ph.D.s to teach well in business schools. Sure sounds like he's starting something.

Common Theme

After reflecting on this collection of essays, we believe our tributes go beyond simply cataloging Roy's accomplishments and accolades. Our experiences from collaborating with him—whether originating as a Ph.D. student under his direction or as a more seasoned scholar—have yielded invaluable lessons for career success. Ed highlighted some of Roy's general principles on conducting meaningful research. Beth emphasized Roy's infectious passion as well as some insight into his technique for identifying and filling gaps in the literature. Barbara pointed to Roy's broad expertise, insight, and humor that helped her break through logjams in both teaching and research. Bruce articulated an appreciation not just of Roy's uncompromising devotion to pedagogy, but also his abundant contributions to the profession across the domains of teaching, research, and service, yielding enduring lessons for colleagues past, present, and future. We now turn to him for a final word.

Roy's Reflections and Remarks

I was absolutely stunned to learn from Ed Tomlinson that this article was "in the works," and that I was invited to comment on all of their kind comments. It is incredibly humbling to have colleagues comment on their professional relationship with you over the years, and even more humbling to attempt to articulate how I intentionally—or unintentionally—worked with these great friends. My great thanks to Ed, Beth, Barbara, and Bruce for their incredibly kind remarks and observations.

I have been asked to respond to two questions that may help to create the background and perspective for their extensive review of my work and impact on them.

What Were the Most Important Lessons You Learned from Your Mentor, Morton Deutsch? Are There Commonalities Between What You Learned from Him and What We Learned from You?

More than forty-five years after completing my degree, it is difficult to look back and try to identify exactly what lessons I learned from my mentor, Morton Deutsch. Fortunately, fifty years of his doctoral students paid him a tribute in 2015 on his 95th birthday, and listening to the stories of my colleagues helped to crystalize some of the key themes. Let me identify several:

1 Most of you know that Deutsch was one of Kurt Lewin's doctoral students, and deeply committed to perpetuating the Lewinian principle that "there is nothing so practical as a good theory." Deutsch's work with his doctoral students consistently embodied this principle. In seminars, working on research projects, or discussing presentations in seminars and colloquia, we were constantly reminded (and encouraged) to draw the link between theory and practice. Moreover, what was most impressive was that the theory–practice link was encouraged in both inductive and deductive forms. That is, the conversations could start with a theoretical principle and lead to a discussion of how that principle could be tested, or could start with an observation about some pattern of behavior and develop some theoretical principles to explore those ideas. These dynamics were embodied in several ways:

   a Research conversations were not restricted to formal seminars. Deutsch enjoyed going to lunch with doctoral students and other faculty, where some of the most interesting and spontaneous ideas emerged. There was never an "agenda" but always opportunities to test out ideas, reflect on a colloquium presentation, etc. Deutsch had a "passion" for interesting ideas, and was always anxious to pursue them in conversation. He was eminently approachable and generous with his time.

   b My doctoral education was in the mid-late 1960s, in the era of the Civil Rights Movement and the Vietnam War. These national conflicts—embodied locally in antiwar marches down Broadway, massive demonstrations in Washington, D.C., and eventually the occupation of the Columbia University campus in 1968—were constant sources of discussion. Through those conversations, we regularly surfaced how and why then-current conflict theory did not adequately embrace the dynamics of conflict, violent and nonviolent protest, and other more "traditional" approaches to intergroup conflict. In fact, these conversations led to a book (Hornstein, Bunker, Burke, Gindes, & Lewicki, 1971) comparing multiple conflict approaches to social change, from organizational development and survey feedback to nonviolent and violent protest.

   c Deutsch's own work modeled the theory–practice link, and he set the example for both inductive and deductive research. Thus, while he is better known for some of his "classical" theories of cooperation, trust, and justice, he was a pioneer in one of the first major studies of interracial housing on attitude change (Deutsch & Collins, 1951). And his writings constantly stressed the importance of using theory and research to improve practice around important social problems (e.g., Deutsch, 1969).

2 Deutsch always encouraged his students to think broadly about problems, integrating different disciplinary perspectives. We were encouraged to take coursework outside the social psychology program, from outstanding scholars such as Robert Merton in Sociology and William McGuire in Social Psychology. He had diverse interests himself, from research to social activism to a parallel career as a practicing psychoanalyst. And he encouraged his students to follow their own passions, wherever those passions may lead. Our doctoral student reunion brought together academic psychologists, applied psychologists, clinical practitioners, consultants, and international peacemakers, including the chief ombudsman of the United Nations. He also was part of a department at Columbia that represented eclectic interests in applied psychology, from laboratory studies to the earliest development of organizational development practitioners. Doctoral students actively worked with each other to develop each other's ideas and execute collaborative research studies.

3 Not only were we encouraged to consider problems and research broadly, but we were greatly encouraged to "think for ourselves." He would read or listen to lots of ideas, suggest an article or study to read, and nudge you with questions until your ideas were clear and had cross-walked concepts, arguments, measures, and methodology. We lived by phrases like "never apologize for a revision" and "seminars are a good place to get rid of bad ideas." His style of working with students pushed students to believe in themselves and their capabilities, even when they didn't have the same confidence in themselves that he had in them.

What Professional Pointers Can You Offer to Conflict and Negotiation Scholars, Beyond Those That Emerged From the Essays?

1 There is much work left to be done in the conflict and negotiation field—laboratory research, field research, applied practice, and even the teaching field. Liberally explore all of these possibilities and figure out which ones are "fun," exciting and keep you interested. My own career was continually energized by a variety of different kinds of professional activity (research projects, creating teaching materials, starting professional associations, etc.). Variety and change of pace can keep you professionally active for a long time.

2 Many of my most interesting ideas have come from dialogues with students, not reading journals. Listen for questions and applications that haven't been addressed by research or suggest interesting opportunities for future study.

3 Similarly, conflict is all around us. Observe. Read newspapers and magazines. Determine whether what you are seeing matches any "theory" or research, or whether the phenomenon is interesting enough to pursue. While many think it is professionally "safer" to stick to laboratory research and hypothesis testing, great ideas and insights come from getting your feet wet in messy, complex conflict situations and real, unclean data. The work I was privileged to do with Barbara Gray and colleagues on environmental disputes exposed me to both theoretical and methodological approaches that were significantly different from previous research work. Similarly, the work that Beth Polin described, in which we coded actual statements of trust repair taken from media accounts, allowed us to expand the conceptual parameters of trust repair beyond those that had been current in the research literature at the time.

4 Finally, work collegially. While my coauthors have been most gracious in reviewing pieces of my career, almost all of that work was done in collaboration with other faculty and doctoral students and from multiple backgrounds and intellectual traditions. Challenge each other's thinking, refine ideas,

talk about your work with others. Most of our most successful senior colleagues in our field have had a number of "thought partners" along the way.

Conclusion

While our written remarks now come to a close, our appreciation of Roy's many contributions certainly do not. We count it a great honor to have had the privilege of collaborating with him and learning from him, and we look forward to many more opportunities to do so in the coming years.

References

Berenstain, S., & Berenstain, J. (1964). *The bike lesson*. New York, NY: Beginner Books.

Brummans, B. H., Putnam, L. L., Gray, B., Hanke, R., Lewicki, R. J., & Wiethoff, C. (2008). Making sense of intractable multiparty conflict: A study of framing in four environmental disputes. *Communication Monographs*, *75*, 25–51. doi:10.1080/03637750801952735

Coleman, P. T., & Deutsch, M. (2014). *Morton Deutsch: A pioneer in developing peace psychology*. New York, NY: Springer.

Deutsch, M. (1969). Socially relevant science: A reflection on some studies of interpersonal conflict. *American Psychologist*, *24*, 1076–1092. doi:10.1037/h0028993

Deutsch, M., & Collins, M. (1951). *Interracial housing: A psychological evaluation of a social experiment*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Deutsch, M., & Lewicki, R. J. (1970). "Locking-in" effects during a game of chicken. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *14*, 367–378. doi:10.1177/002200277001400308

Dewulf, A., Gray, B., Putnam, L. L., Aarts, N., Lewicki, R. J., Bouwen, R., et al. (2009). Disentangling approaches to framing: A metaparadigmatic perspective. *Human Relations*, *62*, 155–193. doi:10.1177/0018726708100356

Dineen, B. R., Lewicki, R. J., & Tomlinson, E. C. (2006). Supervisory guidance and behavioral integrity: Relationships with employee citizenship and deviant behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 622–635. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.622

Dirks, K. T., Lewicki, R. J., & Zaheer, A. (2009). Repairing relationships within and between organizations: Building a conceptual foundation. *Academy of Management Review*, *34*, 68–84. doi:10.5465/AMR.2009.35713285

Hornstein, H. A., Bunker, B. B., Burke, M., Gindes, M., & Lewicki, R. J. (1971). *Social intervention: A behavioral science approach*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Kopelman, S., Lytle, A. L., Wang, C. S., Lewicki, R. J., Murnighan, J. K., & Bazerman, M. H. (2015). Done but not published: The dissertation journeys of Roy J. Lewicki and J. Keith Murnighan. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *4*, 261–271. doi:10.1111/ncmr.12063

Lewicki, R. J. (1971). Violence as a strategy for social intervention. In H. A. Hornstein, B. B. Bunker, W. Burke, M. Gindes & R. J. Lewicki (Eds.), *Social intervention: A behavioral science approach* (pp. 441–467). New York, NY: Free Press.

Lewicki, R. J. (1975). A course in bargaining and negotiation. *The Teaching of Organizational Behavior*, *1*, 29–31. doi:10.1177/105256297500100110

Lewicki, R. J. (1981). Bargaining and negotiation. *Organizational Behavior Teaching Journal*, *6*, 33–42. doi:10.1177/105256298100600207

Lewicki, R. J. (1986). Challenges of teaching negotiation. *Negotiation Journal*, *2*, 15–27. doi:10.1007/BF00998932

Lewicki, R. J. (1997). Teaching negotiation and dispute resolution in colleges of business: The state of the practice. *Negotiation Journal*, *13*, 253–273. doi:10.1111/j.1571-9979.1997.tb00131.x

Lewicki, R. J. (2002). The time has come: Introducing the academy of management learning and education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *1*, 8–12. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2002.18184190

Lewicki, R. J. (2013). On the impact of AMLE: Reflection on a decade. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *12*, 104–107. doi:10.5485/amle.2012.0142

Lewicki, R. J., & Alderfer, C. P. (1973). The tensions between research and intervention in intergroup conflict. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *9*, 424–449. doi:10.1177/002188637300900403

Lewicki, R. J., & Bailey, J. (2016). A deeper dig: Rejoinder to "Isn't it time we did something about the lack of teaching preparation in business doctoral programs? *Journal of Management Education*, *40*, 516–523. doi:10.1177/1052562916644835

Lewicki, R. J., Barry, B., & Saunders, D. M. (Eds.) (2015). *Negotiation: Readings, exercises, and cases* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill/Irwin.

Lewicki, R. J., Barry, B., & Saunders, D. M. (2016). *Essentials of negotiation* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill/Irwin.

Lewicki, R. J., & Bunker, B. B. (1995). Trust in relationships: A model of trust development and decline. In B. B. Bunker & J. Z. Rubin (Eds.), *Conflict, cooperation, and justice* (pp. 133–174). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lewicki, R. J., & Bunker, B. B. (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 114–139). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lewicki, R. J., Gray, B., & Elliot, M. (2003). *Making sense of intractable environmental conflicts: Cases and concepts*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*, 438–458. doi:10.5465/AMR.1998.926620

Lewicki, R. J., Poland, T., Minton, J., & Sheppard, B. (1997). Dishonesty as deviance: A typology of workplace dishonesty and contributing factors. In R. J. Lewicki, R. J. Bies & B. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 6, pp. 53–86). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Lewicki, R. J., & Polin, B. (2012). The art of the apology: The structure and effectiveness of apologies in trust repair. In R. M. Kramer & T. L. Pittinsky (Eds.), *Restoring trust in organizations and leaders: Enduring challenges and emerging answers* (pp. 95–128). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lewicki, R. J., & Polin, B. (2013a). Principled negotiation. In E. H. Kessler (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of management theory* (pp. 599–603). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lewicki, R. J., & Polin, B. (2013b). The role of trust in negotiation processes. In R. Bachmann & A. Zaheer (Eds.), *Handbook of advances in trust research* (pp. 29–54). London, U.K.: Edward Elgar.

Lewicki, R. J., & Polin, B. (2013c). Trust and negotiation. In M. Olekalns & W. L. Adair (Eds.), *Handbook of research on negotiation* (pp. 161–190). London, U.K.: Edward Elgar.

Lewicki, R. J., Polin, B., & Lount, R. B., Jr (2016). An exploration of the structure of effective apologies. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *9*, 177–196. doi:10.1111/ncmr.12073

Lewicki, R. J., & Robinson, R. (1998). Ethical and unethical bargaining tactics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *17*, 665–682. doi:10.1023/A:1005719122519

Lewicki, R. J., Saunders, D. M., & Barry, B. (2015). *Negotiation* (7th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Lewicki, R. J., & Sheppard, B. H. (1985). Choosing how to intervene: Factors affecting the use of process and outcome control in third party dispute resolution. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, *6*, 49–64. doi:10.1002/job.4030060105

Lewicki, R. J., & Stevenson, M. A. (1997). Trust development in negotiation: Proposed actions and a research agenda. *Business & Professional Ethics Journal*, *6*, 99–132. doi:10.5840/bpej1997161/2/311

Lewicki, R. J., Stevenson, M. A., & Bunker, B. B. (1997, August). *The three components of interpersonal trust: Instrument development and differences across relationships*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Boston, MA.

Lewicki, R. J., Tomlinson, E. C., & Gillespie, N. (2006). Models of interpersonal trust development: Theoretical approaches, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Journal of Management*, *32*, 991–1022. doi:10.1177/0149206306294405

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*, 709–734. doi:10.5465/AMR.1995.9508080335

Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., & Adkins, C. L. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*, 424–432. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.74.3.424

Palanski, M. E., & Yammarino, F. J. (2007). Integrity and leadership: Clearing the conceptual confusion. *European Management Journal*, *25*, 171–184. doi:10.1016/j.emj.2007.04.006

Shapiro, D. L., Sheppard, B. H., & Cheraskin, L. (1992). Business on a handshake. *Negotiation Journal*, *8*, 365–377. doi:10.1111/j.1571-9979.1992.tb00679.x

Sheppard, B. H., & Lewicki, R. J. (1987). Toward general principles of managerial fairness. *Social Justice Research*, *1*, 161–177. doi:10.1007/BF01048014

Simons, T. (2002). Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' words and deeds as a research focus. *Organization Science*, *13*, 18–35. doi:10.1287/orsc.13.1.18.543

Tomlinson, E. C., Dineen, B. R., & Lewicki, R. J. (2004). The road to reconciliation: Antecedents of victim willingness to reconcile following a broken promise. *Journal of Management*, *30*, 165–187. doi:10.1016/j.jm.2003.01.003

Tomlinson, E. C., Dineen, B. R., & Lewicki, R. J. (2009). Trust congruence among negotiators as a predictor of joint behavioral outcomes in integrative negotiations. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *20*(2), 173–187. doi:10.1108/10444060910949621

Tomlinson, E. C., & Lewicki, R. J. (2006). Managing distrust in intractable conflicts. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, *24*, 219–228. doi:10.1002/crq.170

Tomlinson, E. C., Lewicki, R. J., & Ash, S. R. (2014). Disentangling the moral integrity construct: Values congruence as a moderator of the behavioral integrity-citizenship relationship. *Group & Organization Management*, *39*, 720–743. doi:10.1177/1059601114551023

Edward C. Tomlinson is an Associate Professor of Management at West Virginia University. He received his PhD from the Fisher College of Business at The Ohio State University; Roy was his advisor and dissertation chair. While most of his research deals with interpersonal trust development and repair, he has also published journal articles and book chapters in other areas including negotiation and the impact of leadership on discretionary employee behaviors. Several of these papers were co-authored with Roy.

Beth Polin is an Assistant Professor of Management at Eastern Kentucky University. She received her PhD from the Fisher College of Business at The Ohio State University where she was mentored by Roy. Her research focuses on conflict management (multiple publications with Roy), empowerment, socialization, and leadership. She also has a line of research in pedagogy and recently designed a unique advanced course specific to organizational conflict navigation covering topics such as voice, trust, psychological safety, power, organizational politics, negotiation, and difficult working styles.

Barbara Gray is Professor of Organizational Behavior and Smeal Executive Programs Faculty Fellow Emerita at the Smeal College of Business, Pennsylvania State University. Her research has focused on intractable environmental conflict, framing, joint ventures and cross-sectoral collaboration, field dynamics, and social class inequality. She has published over 100 articles and three books (including one with Roy) and has a new book, *Collaborating for the Future* coming out in 2017.

Bruce Barry is Brownlee O. Currey Jr. Professor of Management at Vanderbilt University. His published work explores ethics, conflict, power, justice, and workplace rights. He is co-author of three books on negotiation (with Roy!) published by McGraw Hill that are used in courses at universities worldwide. He is a past president of the International Association for Conflict Management and is currently editor in chief of *Business Ethics Quarterly*.