



Business School

Academy of Management 2026
Professional Development Workshop



OB Division

The Power of Listening Well

A classroom toolkit for teaching listening — companion pages to the AOM 2026 PDW

AUTHORS

[Nathan Meikle](#)

[Elizabeth Campbell](#)

[Avraham N. Kluger](#)

[Kyle Emich](#)

AFFILIATIONS

University of Kansas

University of Minnesota

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

University of Delaware

PUBLISHED

July 3, 2026

These pages are a **teaching companion** to the AOM 2026 PDW *“The Power of Listening Well.”* Each page hands you one classroom-ready exercise.



[Download all exercises \(PDF\)](#)

The exercises are drawn from the listening-focused pedagogy described in Lehmann, Kluger, Cojuharenco, & Itzchakov (2025), and from courses Avi Kluger has developed and taught since 2013.

Who these pages are for

University instructors who teach — or want to teach — listening as part of a leadership, negotiation, teamwork, communication, coaching, or OB course. No prior facilitation experience is assumed.

How to use these pages

- **Each exercise stands alone.** Pick any one. Run them in any order. None depends on another.
- **Every page is built the same way:** *At a glance · Why this exercise · How to run it · Debrief · Teaching adaptations · What the research says · References.*
- **Read the page once before class.** Everything you need to say and do is on it — including timing, room setup, and the words to open with.

 **Note**

The six exercises. Use the sidebar to move between them. Each is self-contained — pick any one.

1. **Accepting Offers** — three short warm-ups that build the container
2. **Inviting Stories** — the cornerstone exercise
3. **Time-Sharing** — equal, uninterrupted turns with a silent listener
4. **Asking Questions** — the questions that open a story, and the ones that kill it
5. **“Yes, and ...”** — accepting offers, in words
6. **Listening Circles** — silence and the talking object

The theoretical frame

These exercises rest on **Episodic Listening Theory** (Kluger & Itzchakov, 2022): listening is not a stable trait but something that happens *between* two people inside a conversation. We define listening as **the extent of one’s devotion to co-exploring the other — with the other and for the other** (Kluger & Mizrahi, 2023). A high-quality listening episode produces creative thinking, goal clarity, psychological well-being, and relational attachment. Each exercise is a way to give students that episode, and then a language for what they just felt.

And the effects are not small. A meta-analytic review based on 664 effect sizes and 400,020 observations found robust associations between perceived listening and a wide range of work outcomes — trust, relationship quality, performance, and well-being (Kluger et al., 2024). Listening is both consequential and trainable; these pages are about the *training*.

References

- Kluger, A. N., & Itzchakov, G. (2022). The power of listening at work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 9, 121–146. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-091013>
- Kluger, A. N., Lehmann, M., Aguinis, H., Itzchakov, G., Gordoni, G., Zyberaj, J., & Bakaç, C. (2024). A meta-analytic systematic review and theory of the effects of perceived listening on work outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 39(2), 295–344. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-023-09897-5>
- Kluger, A. N., & Mizrahi, M. (2023). Defining listening: Can we get rid of the adjectives? *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 52, 101639. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101639>
- Lehmann, M., Kluger, A. N., Cojuharenco, I., & Itzchakov, G. (2025). Cultivating humility in business education: A listening-focused pedagogy for future leaders. *Journal of Business Ethics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-025-06099-2>



Business School

Academy of Management 2026
Professional Development Workshop



OB Division

Accepting Offers

Exercise 1 · Three warm-ups that build the container

💡 At a glance

Time	15–30 minutes total (run one, two, or all three)
Group size	Varies by warm-up. Name with a movement works up to ~25; the defrost walk and mirror scale to hundreds.
Format	Whole group (circle, walk) and pairs (mirror)
Materials	Open floor — push desks and chairs to the walls; a bell or clap for the mirror
You will need to	Move people from stage to stage only when the room has settled

Why this exercise

The phrase comes from improvisational and playback theatre. An **offer** is anything a partner puts into the space — a word, a gesture, a story, a feeling — and to **accept** it is to receive it without deflection or judgment, and build on it. This is the foundational listening move — and it returns in words in Exercise 5, “Yes, and ...”.

These three short warm-ups create a visceral experience of being validated by others. As such, they increase psychological safety and help participants move to the verbal exercises with greater openness and curiosity. The mirroring game is likely to create a physical experience of synchronization, which is known to foster cooperation and creativity.¹

Run **at least one** before Inviting Stories. If time is very short, run the Mirror alone.

How to run it

1 · Name with a movement (10–20 min)

Everyone shares a name and a gesture; the whole group echoes it back. This one is **best with up to ~25 people** — beyond that, the go-around takes too long, so split into smaller circles or use it only in smaller classes. (The defrost walk and the mirror, by contrast, work with hundreds.)

1. **Stand in a circle.** Everyone stands, facing the center.
2. **Name + gesture.** One at a time, each person says their name with a movement of the whole body — a wave, a jump, a small dance. Anything goes.
3. **The group echoes.** The whole group repeats the name and the movement exactly, in one voice. Then the next person goes.

2 • The defrost walk (~5 min)

A four-stage walk that gradually opens attention. Move to the next stage only once the room has settled into the current one.

1. **Eyes down.** Walk randomly, eyes on your shoes, unpredictable paths.
2. **Eyes up.** Raise your head, keep moving — don't look at anyone.
3. **Eye contact.** When your eyes meet someone's, acknowledge it with your eyes, and keep walking.
4. **"Thank you."** If you brush against someone by accident, say "thank you," and keep walking.

3 • The mirror (~10 min)

Create pairs. If you ran the defrost walk, you can say "Freeze! Find the person next to you, they are your partner." In pairs, palms facing palms — one leads, one follows, then switch, faster and faster.

- **Setup.** Stand facing your partner. Raise both palms, about 2 inches / 5 cm from your partner's. Decide who is 1 and who is 2. After most have decided on the numbers, say *Number 2 is the leader*. The leader moves — hands up, down, across, high, low — and the follower keeps the gap constant.
- **Two roles for the leader:** be as creative as you can, while not breaking the follower. No tricks, no sudden flips.
- **The switch.** On a signal (a bell, a clap), roles swap.
 - *Phase 1* — switch every 60 seconds
 - *Phase 2* — switch every 20 seconds
 - *Phase 3* — switch every 5 seconds
 - *Phase 4* — no signal; you decide together when to switch

Debrief

These warm-ups are **best debriefed at the end of class**, alongside the other exercises, rather than one at a time — the threads connect more richly once students have the full arc to reflect on.

When you come back to the mirror, invite students to describe what happened as the switches sped up. Listen especially for the pairs who, somewhere around Phase 3 or 4, **lost track of who was leading and who was following** — and yet kept moving as one, producing something neither of them could have choreographed alone.

Name that moment: two people, no one in charge, co-creating a single motion. That leaderless synchronization — a small, shared, unique product — is the felt template for a high-quality listening episode. Good listening is not one person steering the other; it is both partners devoted to the same emerging thing.

Teaching adaptations

- **Large lecture (100+):** Run the **mirror** at every pair of adjacent seats — it needs no open floor. Skip the circle and walk if the room is fixed-seat.
- **Sequencing:** Use these to open the very first session, before any talking-based exercise. They lower the stakes and build the safety the harder exercises draw on.

What the research says

Accepting offers is where listening begins: receiving what the other puts into the space — a word, a gesture, a feeling — rather than deflecting or competing with it. This is the felt core of listening as **the extent of one’s devotion to co-exploring the other, with the other and for the other** (Kluger & Mizrahi, 2023). The warm-ups are the entry point to the listening-focused pedagogy documented in Lehmann, Kluger, Cojuharenco, & Itzchakov (2025), which draws on experiential, improv-based methods to teach listening as something done, not merely described.

References

- Kluger, A. N., & Mizrahi, M. (2023). Defining listening: Can we get rid of the adjectives? *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 52, 101639. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101639>
- Lehmann, M., Kluger, A. N., Cojuharenco, I., & Itzchakov, G. (2025). Cultivating humility in business education: A listening-focused pedagogy for future leaders. *Journal of Business Ethics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-025-06099-2>
- Noy, L., Dekel, E., & Alon, U. (2011). The mirror game as a paradigm for studying the dynamics of two people improvising motion together. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(52), 20947–20952. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1108155108>
- Wiltermuth, S. S., & Heath, C. (2009). Synchrony and cooperation. *Psychological Science*, 20(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02253.x>

-
1. The mirror game is Lior Noy’s experimental paradigm for studying two people improvising motion together; players report recurring moments of high synchrony, or “togetherness” (Noy, Dekel, & Alon, 2011). Interpersonal synchrony has, in turn, been shown to foster cooperation (Wiltermuth & Heath, 2009). [↩](#)



Business School

Academy of Management 2026
Professional Development Workshop



OB Division

Inviting Stories

Exercise 2 · The cornerstone exercise

At a glance

Time	50 minutes (40 min practice + 10 min debrief)
Group size	Any. Works in a seminar of 12 or a lecture of 125.
Format	Pairs, rotating (“speed-dating” carousel)
Materials	Chairs that can be moved; a timer; the prompt menu below
You will need to	Call the time and the switches yourself — out loud

Why this exercise

If you run only one exercise from this toolkit, run this one, as it provides a listening experience with minimal instructions and training.

The heart of the exercise is the **invitation to a story**: instead of the usual getting-to-know-you questions, students ask —

“Could you please tell me an interesting story about ...?”

Listening to a story is easier than listening to anything else — easier than to an opinion we disagree with, easier than to a complaint — and stories invite better-than-usual listening (Itzchakov, Castro, & Kluger, 2016). That makes storytelling a comfortable doorway into listening: the listener is drawn in, sometimes moved; and the speaker — sharing a story tied to their identity in front of a good listener — feels validated and may even gain clarity about who they are. Moreover, it seems that inviting stories makes the speaker more charismatic, since charisma is characterized by sharing metaphors and stories — behaviors that are trainable (Antonakis, Fenley, & Liechti, 2011).

How to run it

The two rules

Tell students there are **only two rules**.

1. **Equal stage time.** Half the clock belongs to each partner. If the speaker finishes early, the listener says simply: *“Tell me more.”*
2. **Practice the phrase.** Open with exactly these words: *“Could you please tell me an interesting story about ...”*

Room setup

The format is a carousel, so each round brings a new partner.

- Arrange **two concentric circles of chairs** — the inner ring facing out, the outer ring facing in. Pairs sit knee-to-knee.
- After each prompt, the **outer ring shifts one chair to the right** — a fresh partner each time.
- Keep everyone in pairs; **no triplets**. If the class is odd, you join in.
- In a fixed-seat lecture hall, rotate by asking each **odd-numbered row** to move one chair to the right; the person at the far end leaves their seat and walks around to the other end of their row.

Facilitation script

1. **Set it up (2 min).** State the two rules. Emphasize the opening phrase.
2. **Pick 4–6 prompts** from the menu below.
3. **Run each round.** Announce the prompt. **You — not the speaker — call the switch** at the halfway point (*“switch — listeners, you’re now the speakers”*), and call time at the end.
4. **Rotate.** The outer circle moves one seat. Announce the next prompt. Repeat for your 4–6 rounds.
5. **Stop on a high note**, with energy still in the room.

The menu of prompts

Pick four to six for a single session. Start gently (name stories), then move into more personal territory. Adapt freely to your local culture.

“Could you please tell me an interesting story about ...”

	Prompt	Time per side
a	your name (first or last)	2 min
b	previous generations in your family	3 min
c	shoes , or clothing	3 min
d	your idol as a teenager	3 min
e	helping someone — and being helped	4 min

	Prompt	Time per side
f	a figure (real or imaginary) who influenced your life	3 min
g	your hobby , or things you love to do	3 min
h	the first time you thought of your current job	3 min
i	what the person who appreciates you most at work would say about you	3 min
j	food	3 min
k	a tradition in your family	3 min

Two more, always available:

- **A photo on your phone** — “Show me a picture you took on your phone that was meaningful to you. May I see it? What did you feel when you took it? What do you feel toward it now?” (*This can be a good way to start if the class is distracted and on their phones. After this one, you can ask the class to put their phones away.*)
- **Invent your own prompt** — make it reflect identity, and one that can easily lead the speaker to tell a story.

Debrief

Ten to thirty minutes, in plenary. **Do not skip this** — the exercise without the debrief is half the value. This debrief could be done at the end of all exercises.

Ask each participant to complete these stems aloud — one answer each, with no commentary from anyone:

- “*The most annoying thing about these exercises was ...*” — this stem gives you an opportunity to model listening to complaints and diverse opinions; thank the students who dare to show the complexity to the whole class.
- “*Through these exercises I became aware of ...*”
- “*One new thing I am going to do based on these exercises is ...*”

Teaching adaptations

- **Large lecture (100+):** Use turn-to-your-neighbor pairs instead of the carousel; project the prompt on a slide; use a microphone only for the plenary debrief. The exercise scales without losing its effect.
- **Online (synchronous):** Use breakout rooms of two, rotate by reassigning rooms each round, and broadcast the prompt and the switch through the main-room timer.

- **By course type:** In **negotiation**, pair this with prompt (d) on helping and being helped; in **leadership**, use (i), what your greatest admirer would say; in **teams**, use (b) and (k) on family and tradition to surface difference; in **coaching**, slow down and run fewer, longer rounds.
- **As homework:** Ask students to invite three different stories from three different people during the week — “Could you please tell me an interesting story about ...” — keeping the two rules, then write a short reflection on how those conversations differed from their usual ones.

What the research says

Sharing **stories** — as opposed to opinions or descriptions — invites better-than-usual listening (Itzchakov, Castro, & Kluger, 2016) and generates interpersonal closeness (Aron, Melinat, Aron, Vallone, & Bator, 1997). Speakers who share an identity-relevant story with a good listener feel **validated** (Nemec, Spagnolo, & Soydan, 2017) and may gain **clarity about their own identity** (Pasupathi, 2001; Pasupathi & Rich, 2005). The exercise is Exercise #1 in Kluger’s teaching repertoire (Lehmann, Kluger, Cojuharenco, & Itzchakov, 2025, Appendix A).

References

- Antonakis, J., Fenley, M., & Liechti, S. (2011). Can charisma be taught? Tests of two interventions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(3), 374–396. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2010.0012>
- Aron, A., Melinat, E., Aron, E. N., Vallone, R. D., & Bator, R. J. (1997). The experimental generation of interpersonal closeness: A procedure and some preliminary findings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(4), 363–377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167297234003>
- Itzchakov, G., Castro, D. R., & Kluger, A. N. (2016). If you want people to listen to you, tell a story. *International Journal of Listening*, 30(3), 120–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2015.1037445>
- Kluger, A. N., & Itzchakov, G. (2022). The power of listening at work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 9, 121–146. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-091013>
- Lehmann, M., Kluger, A. N., Cojuharenco, I., & Itzchakov, G. (2025). Cultivating humility in business education: A listening-focused pedagogy for future leaders. *Journal of Business Ethics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-025-06099-2>
- Nemec, P. B., Spagnolo, A. C., & Soydan, A. S. (2017). Can you hear me now? Teaching listening skills. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 40(4), 415–417. <https://doi.org/10.1037/prj0000287>
- Pasupathi, M. (2001). The social construction of the personal past and its implications for adult development. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(5), 651–672. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.5.651>
- Pasupathi, M., & Rich, B. (2005). Inattentive listening undermines self-verification in personal storytelling. *Journal of Personality*, 73(4), 1051–1085. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00338.x>

Time-Sharing

Exercise 3 · Equal, uninterrupted turns with a silent listener

At a glance

Time	About 7 minutes: a 1-minute warm-up conversation, then 3 minutes each way
Group size	Pairs
Format	Partners take turns; one speaks while the other listens in silence, then they switch
Materials	A timer
You will need to	Call the 1-minute warm-up and each 3-minute turn, and hold the listener to silence

Why this exercise

Time-sharing is one of the simplest listening protocols: each partner listens, in silence, for an equal amount of time, so the speaker is never interrupted. It is a straightforward operationalization of an often-recommended listening behavior — being silent and not interrupting the speaker (Weis-Rappaport & Kluger, 2024).

Because the listener does not have to plan a reply, their attention is freed for the speaker. And although the listener stays silent, they still signal understanding through *backchannel* cues — nods, facial expressions, and “uh-huh.” In this way a simple, rule-bound protocol can carry the three elements of good listening: attention, comprehension, and a non-judgmental attitude toward the speaker.

The protocol comes from Co-counseling, a reciprocal peer-counseling method in which “time is shared equally” and the person in the listener role does their best to listen: “it is not a discussion; the aim is to support the person ... in a mainly self-directed way” (quoted in Weis-Rappaport & Kluger, 2024).

How to run it

Pairs, taking turns. The study used one minute of warm-up and three minutes per turn.

1. **Warm up.** Ask partners to become acquainted, talking freely for about **one minute**.
2. **Assign roles.** One partner is the **speaker**, the other the **listener**, for a set time (three minutes in the study).
3. **The listener does not talk.** They listen with full presence and indicate listening only through **nods, facial expressions, and “uh-huh”** — no words.
4. **The speaker** may talk or be silent, but **does not ask questions**.
5. **Switch roles** after the set time, for the same duration.

Variations to try

- **Longer turns.** The same protocol extends comfortably to **five minutes per side**.
- **Delayed response.** Ask students to listen to someone for **five to seven minutes without responding** as homework — but to tell the speaker this beforehand, and to promise to reply, if at all, **only the following day**. Suggest they approach someone they typically find hard or annoying to listen to.
- **The deep round (challenging).** A long-form time-sharing of **forty minutes per side**: the listener asks a single question — “*How do you cope with ... in your life?*” — and then listens **without interruption for forty minutes** before switching. In Kluger’s workshops, this reliably produces powerful and surprising experiences.

What the research says

Time-sharing was introduced as an experimental manipulation by Castro, Kluger, and Itzchakov (2016), who tested Rogers’s idea that being listened to lets a speaker experience *psychological safety*. Across six laboratory experiments (plus a field study and a scenario study), listening raised psychological safety on average — but the benefit was smaller the higher the speaker’s **avoidance-attachment style**, placing a boundary on the effect.

In an experiment with 50 pairs, Weis-Rappaport and Kluger (2024) then compared time-sharing with ordinary free conversation and found that its effect depends on the speaker’s personality. Time-sharing **lowered** social anxiety for speakers high in **narcissism**, for whom the uninterrupted stage is a welcome experience, but **raised** it for speakers high in **depression**, for whom the listener’s silence may be read as a lack of caring rather than as respect. Personality did **not** moderate the effect on psychological safety; the difference emerged on social anxiety. The authors conclude that time-sharing is “recommended for narcissistic speakers but not recommended for depressed speakers,” and, more broadly, that “listening without interruption is golden only when it suits the speaker’s ... psychological needs” — a caution against treating any one listening technique as one-size-fits-all.

References

- Castro, D. R., Kluger, A. N., & Itzchakov, G. (2016). Does avoidance-attachment style attenuate the benefits of being listened to? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(6), 762–775. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2185>
- Weis-Rappaport, H., & Kluger, A. N. (2024). The effects of listening with “time-sharing” on psychological safety and social anxiety: The moderating role of narcissism and depression. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 164(2), 218–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2022.2161337>



Business School

Academy of Management 2026
Professional Development Workshop



OB Division

Asking Questions

Exercise 4 · The questions that kill a story, and the ones that open it

At a glance

Time	~10 minutes (two paired rounds)
Group size	Any. Works in pairs.
Format	Pairs, two timed rounds
Materials	A timer
You will need to	Call the rounds and the swaps, and hold students to their assigned role

Why this exercise

Good listening includes good questions — but bad listening often *looks* like questions too. The same question can open a wide door for the speaker or cut the thread of their thought. The difference is rarely in the content of the question; it is in the intention behind it and its timing.

Students first practice asking destructive (but technically relevant) questions, then immediately practice asking constructive (but about a boring topic) questions. The contrast lands fast and is hard to forget.

How to run it

Round one (*up to 3 min*) — questions that kill the story

- **Speaker:** Tell the most interesting story you can about your life — a close call, a strange coincidence, or a day that changed you. **Keep trying to tell it, even when interrupted.**
- **Listener:** Fifteen seconds in, start asking relevant questions that **block** the story. *Where exactly? What year? Which airline? What was the weather like? How old were you?* The questions are technically relevant; their effect is to prevent the story from ever arriving.

Tips

- If you see the class is suffering, you can end it after about 2 minutes; participants get the idea.
- You can walk around and bother the speakers too (e.g., “excuse me, do you have the time?”).
- You can swap and repeat, or do it on one side only. If you swap, do it also for Round two.

Round two (3 min per side) — questions that open a story

- **Speaker:** Tell the most **boring** story you can think of — how you brush your teeth, your commute, your laundry routine. Surrender to the questions; do not try to maintain your original topic.
- **Listener:** Pretend it is the most interesting story you have ever heard. **Ask about feelings, not just facts:** “How did you feel in that moment?” “What would the opposite feeling be for you?” “When did you last feel that?” Expand.

Debrief

Ten minutes, in plenary. Ask:

- In round one, **as the speaker**, how did your energy change as the questions piled up?
- In round two, did the “boring” story actually stay boring?
- Which of your own real questions are closer to round one than you’d like to admit?

Teaching adaptations

- **Large lecture (100+):** Both rounds run at adjacent seats with no rotation.
- **Online (synchronous):** Breakout pairs for the two question rounds; two volunteers can model each round first in the main room.
- **By course type:** In **leadership/coaching**, dwell on round two’s feeling questions as the engine of respectful inquiry.

What the research says

Questions are not just information-gathering — they shape the conversation and the relationship. Huang, Yeomans, Brooks, Minson, and Gino (2017) found that asking more questions, and especially **follow-up** questions that build on what the other just said, increases how much they like you and how much they disclose. Van Quaquebeke and Felps (2018) theorize *respectful inquiry* — leading by asking open questions and listening to the answers — as a driver of autonomy, competence, and relatedness at work. Round one shows the shadow side: questions deployed without listening behind them push people away.

References

- Huang, K., Yeomans, M., Brooks, A. W., Minson, J., & Gino, F. (2017). It doesn’t hurt to ask: Question-asking increases liking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113(3), 430–452.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000097>

- Van Quaquebeke, N., & Felps, W. (2018). Respectful inquiry: A motivational account of leading through asking questions and listening. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(1), 5–27. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0537>

“Yes, and ...”

Exercise 5 · A short improv drill — another way to accept offers

💡 At a glance

Time	~6 minutes (two short rounds)
Group size	Any. Works in pairs.
Format	Pairs, same topic, two contrasting rounds
Materials	A timer
You will need to	Hold students to the opening words (“No, but ...” / “Yes, and ...”)

Why this exercise

“Yes, and ...” is another case of **accepting offers** (Exercise 1): you receive what your partner puts into the space and build on it — only now in words rather than gesture. An **offer** is any idea a partner adds; to accept it is to take it in and add to it (“Yes, and”), rather than to block it (“No, but”).

Run back-to-back, the two rounds make the difference unmistakable: blocking kills the shared idea, while accepting-and-building lets it grow into something neither partner could have planned alone.

How to run it

Same topic, two versions. **The topic:** plan a celebration for the end of this course together — no budget limits, no constraints. Speakers use only declarative sentences and do not ask questions.

- **Round A (2 min)** — “No, but ...” Every response must begin with these words. “Let’s rent a boat.” — “No, but the weather’s unreliable.” — “No, but a picnic is cheaper.”
- **Round B (3–5 min)** — “Yes, and ...” Same pair, same topic. “Let’s rent a boat.” — “Yes, and we could invite the whole cohort.” — “Yes, and someone should bring music.” Importantly, do not negate your partner with “No,

but,” “Yes, but,” etc. Build on what you just heard.

Alternative. Have each student make a real declarative sentence (e.g., “the light in the corner is flickering,” “I sit on the left side of the class”). Start with one student’s sentence using only “Yes, and ...” — allow yourself to be foolish, but be as fast as possible: say “Yes, and ...,” then give the turn to the other side.

Debrief

A few minutes, in plenary. Ask:

- How did the room **sound and feel** different under “No, but” versus “Yes, and”?
- As the speaker, what happened to your ideas when your partner blocked them? When they built on them?
- Where in your work do you default to “No, but” — and what would “Yes, and” open up?

Teaching adaptations

- **Large lecture (100+):** Runs at adjacent seats with no rotation. The drill is loud and energizing — a good note to end a large session on.
- **Online (synchronous):** Two volunteers can model each round first in the main room, then send everyone to breakout pairs.
- **By course type:** In **negotiation**, debrief “Yes, and” as a route to integrative, expand-the-pie options; in **teams / innovation**, tie it to building on others’ ideas rather than evaluating them first.

What the research says

The “Yes, and / No, but” contrast has been studied directly: Seppänen, Makkonen, and Tiippana (2025) had pairs run “**Yes, and**” (acceptance) versus “**Yes, but**” (rejection) exchanges and measured participants’ physiology and self-reported stress, isolating the effect of that single two-word move. “Yes, and ...” is only one component of a larger improvisational approach, whose broader benefits are better documented: introducing improv techniques to the management classroom (Moshavi, 2001), and links between improv training and divergent thinking, uncertainty tolerance, and well-being (Felsman, Gunawardena, & Seifert, 2020), as well as reduced social anxiety (Felsman, Seifert, & Himle, 2019).

References

- Felsman, P., Gunawardena, S., & Seifert, C. M. (2020). Improv experience promotes divergent thinking, uncertainty tolerance, and affective well-being. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 35, 100632. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100632>
- Felsman, P., Seifert, C. M., & Himle, J. A. (2019). The use of improvisational theater training to reduce social anxiety in adolescents. *The Arts in Psychotherapy*, 63, 111–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aip.2018.12.001>
- Moshavi, D. (2001). “Yes and...”: Introducing improvisational theatre techniques to the management classroom. *Journal of Management Education*, 25(4), 437–449. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105256290102500408>
- Seppänen, S., Makkonen, T., & Tiippana, K. M. (2025). *The psychophysiology of “Yes, and” vs. “Yes, but”: The effect of acceptance, rejection and repetition during improvised dialogue* [Preprint]. OSF. <https://osf.io/fa9dh>



Business School

Academy of Management 2026
Professional Development Workshop



OB Division

Listening Circles

Exercise 6 · Silence, a talking object, and one topic at a time

At a glance

Time	~30 minutes for a full round
Group size	Best at ~10–25, with one or two facilitators. Split a larger class into parallel circles.
Format	One circle; one speaker at a time
Materials	Chairs in a circle (no tables); one talking object — a stick, a stone, a scarf
You will need to	Pose one topic, open and close the circle, and protect the silence

Why this exercise

In the Listening Circle, whoever holds the object speaks; whoever does not, listens. No one responds, summarizes, or cross-references. The next person simply speaks. That constraint is the whole point: it removes the usual machinery of ineffective conversation — the interrupting, the fixing, the one-upping — and leaves only speaking and being heard. Moreover, unlike other exercises, this one fosters better-than-normal listening in a group.

The form is ancient — “the listening circle, or council, is an ancient form of meeting that people used to conduct respectful conversation for thousands of years” (Itzchakov & Kluger, 2017b). The modern practice is documented in Zimmerman and Coyle’s *The Way of Council*. It rests on four invitations: **listen from the heart**, **speak from the heart**, **be respectful** (take the time to talk, but keep in mind that others want to talk too), and **be spontaneous** (do not plan what to say; when you feel that something rises in you, take the talking object and share).

How to run it

The structure

1. **Sit in a circle.** Chairs only — no tables between people. Everyone can see everyone. *If there is a table in the middle, it is not a listening circle; it is a seminar.*
2. **One talking object.** A stick, a stone, a scarf — anything. **Only the holder speaks.**
3. **One topic.** You pose a single topic.
4. **No comments.** No one responds, summarizes, or cross-references. After each speaker, the next person just speaks. Participants who felt moved by fellow participants' sharing can say one word, such as "Amen" (or any word that conveys acknowledgment in their culture). Silence between speakers is welcome.
5. **Participation.** Speaking is not mandatory. Speaking for a second time is possible.
6. **Signaling start and end.** The teacher (convener) announces, "I declare the circle open" and "I declare the circle closed," to indicate the beginning and end of adhering to the rules of the circle.

Prompts for the circle

Pick **one** per round, based on what the session needs. Up to ~2 minutes per speaker; "popcorn" style (whoever feels ready). The teacher (the person who convenes the circle) can be the first to take the talking object and share something that will model the direction of the circle.

Possible topics

- *What I take with me from today's class* (this could serve as a debrief).
- *Something I am really proud of* (this could be useful when there is mistrust in the group, so people do not feel vulnerable).
- *A time I felt inspired.*
- *A time I felt helpless.*

Debrief

Optional: Have all participants in the circle reflect on one clause by a specific participant they heard that stays in their minds (e.g., "Mike: I was mesmerized," "Susan: It is the first time I saw a manager cry," etc.).

Teaching adaptations

- **Large lecture (100+):** Split into parallel circles of ~25–30, each with its own object and the same prompt. You move between them, preferably in separate rooms; a co-facilitator or a briefed student can anchor each circle.
- **As a recurring ritual:** At the end of every class, students stand in a circle, and each says one word summarizing their takeaway from today's class.

What the research says

The circle adapts the ancient **Council** tradition, documented in Zimmerman and Coyle's *The Way of Council* (1996/2009). Itzchakov and Kluger have studied it in organizations. In a field evaluation, simply holding a talking object and speaking in a circle — with no other intervention — improved employees' emotions and cognitions (Itzchakov & Kluger, 2017a). And in a public organization of more than 4,000 employees, the Listening Circle **reduced attitude extremism**: the safe, non-judgmental atmosphere lowered speakers' social anxiety and let them acknowledge the pros *and* cons within themselves, yielding more balanced, less extreme attitudes (Itzchakov & Kluger, 2017b). The circle gives students, in concentrated form,

the high-quality listening episode that Episodic Listening Theory says produces well-being and relational attachment (Kluger & Itzchakov, 2022).

References

- Itzchakov, G., & Kluger, A. N. (2017a). Can holding a stick improve listening at work? The effect of Listening Circles on employees' emotions and cognitions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(5), 663–676. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1351429>
- Itzchakov, G., & Kluger, A. N. (2017b). The Listening Circle: A simple tool to enhance listening and reduce extremism among employees. *Organizational Dynamics*, 46(4), 220–226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.05.005>
- Kluger, A. N., & Itzchakov, G. (2022). The power of listening at work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 9, 121–146. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-091013>
- Zimmerman, J., & Coyle, V. (2009). *The Way of Council* (2nd ed.). Bramble Books. (Original work published 1996)