CLASS 5
P&N ROADMAP

• In past 4 classes we introduced cognitive strategies for:
  • i) getting your piece of the pie,
  • ii) expanding the pie, and
  • iii) navigating the tensions and dilemmas when trying to do both.

• Going forward: COMPLEXITIES
  • Emotions, relationships, trust, culture, multiple parties, cognitive biases, fairness, ethics
HOW RESPOND TO ANGER?

- Common mistakes:
  - Reciprocating. This causes escalation & often impasse
  - Make concessions to appease the angry party
  - Interpreting the anger to mean something about the other side’s RP, and lowering your own AP
  - Immediately abandoning integrative strategies

IF MUTUAL GAINS ARE POSSIBLE → DON’T BE REACTIVE. PROACTIVELY SHIFT THE TONE TO COOPERATION

Does it matter if the anger is tactical or real?
HOW RESPOND TO TACTICAL ANGER?

• If the anger is tactical (not real) the counterparty is attempting to gain power through intimidation. It is not effective to respond with empathy. Instead, **match their power first, then attempt to turn dynamics around**.
  
  • Indicate your *capacity* to be equally angry, to assert your rights, or to make an extreme opening demand
  
  • Indicating capacity to reciprocate is different from reciprocating
  
  • Suggest you prefer to refrain from a shouting match in favor of finding mutually beneficial solutions.
  
  • “We can continue shouting and blaming or we can move forward to finding a solution that meets our interests”
HOW RESPOND TO REAL ANGER?

• If the anger is real try to listen and understand (more on this later)

• How can you tell if real or tactical?
  • Tactical anger is used in early stages to unhinge, real anger is gradual and builds up (e.g., because one feels not listened to)
  • Real anger subsides when you allow venting, listen and acknowledge where they are coming from
  • Real anger escalates if you attempt a power-matching strategy
  • Research the reputation of your counterparty
  • Is the counterparty a lawyer?
DIFFICULT TACTICS

EXAMPLES:
- Intimidation/Anger
- Extreme opening positions (most common)
- Take it or leave it offers
- Good cop/Bad cop
- The Nibble
- Chicken
DEALING WITH DIFFICULT TACTICS

• HOW RESPOND? Avoid: reciprocating, surrendering or quitting. Instead change the game.

Strategy #1: REFRAME by focusing on:
• Interests. Respond as if they are attempting to communicate their interest, and ask further questions
• Option. Treat their position as one among many possible options of meeting your interests
• Standard. Treat their position as suggesting standard of legitimacy and ask why that’s the right one to use (or propose an alternative)

In each case be assertive in your push for a cooperative approach.
DEALING WITH DIFFICULT TACTICS

HOW RESPOND?

--Strategy #2: NAME THEIR GAME AND ITS CONSEQUENCES AND SUGGEST ANOTHER:

“You are essentially saying ‘take it or leave it’ but I can play that game too and we’ll spend all our time posturing. But perhaps there is another approach to figuring out how to work out a deal that works for both of us.”

This shows that you are not “naïve” or intimidated but are suggesting a different approach

--Strategy #3: CHANGE THE PLAYERS/STRUCTURE

--Strategy #4: PLAY THEIR GAME, BUT AS A DELIBERATE CHOICE

--Strategy #5: WALK AWAY
EMOTIONAL OBSTACLES

- Even if both sides strategically understand the benefits of cooperation, they may not get there due to REAL (not tactical) emotions.

- Often you will walk in to a negotiation having made the strategic decision to seek an integrative solution but get derailed by your emotions or your counterpart’s emotions.
The “Don’t Get Emotional” Approach?
- Can’t avoid feelings any more than thoughts
- Even if cognitively distract yourself - emotions will show up:
  - In your body and behavior
  - Color your thoughts (negative thoughts, less creative)

Emotions can be positive or negative

Negative emotions: Obstacles to cooperation
- Divert attention from substance
- Damage relationship
- Make it hard to negotiate cooperatively

BUT Positive Emotions (feeling “in sync”) Facilitate cooperation:
- Share information
- Reduce fear/suspicion
THE SHAPIRO FRAMEWORK

- Emotions are too complex to deal with directly
  - Overwhelming to analyze: what you are feeling? what *they* are feeling? what do to about it?

- Focus on core concerns that typically matter to all negotiators.
  - These all relate to how see self in relation to others

- Core concerns are the most common TRIGGERS of emotions, negative or positive, focus on these to avoid negative and stimulate positive emotions
CORE CONCERNS

appreciation, autonomy, status, affiliation,

LENS: To understand negative emotions
  E.g., why upset? Why hostile response?

LEVER: To stimulate positive emotions

These are the 4 key variables to the emotional tone of negotiations
CORE CONCERN #1: APPRECIATION

Understanding other’s concern AND acknowledging where it’s coming from (NOT mean “agree” or being “grateful”)

Obstacle #1:

• failure to understand (cognitively) other’s point of view. This Requires truly listening to see the world from their perspective:
  • Ask open ended questions
  • Concentrate on their answer and not your response or next question
  • Listen to tone as well as words
  • Look at body language
CORE CONCERN #1: APPRECIATION

Obstacle #2:

- failure to find some **merit** or the **underlying reasons** for their view
  - We only **listen for what’s wrong** with other’s view
  - Separate the need from the strategy for meeting it
- Appreciating **DOES NOT EQUAL** agreeing. It acknowledges the reasons they see the world as they do.
  - Even an ex-spouse who wants “everything”?
  - Even a hostage taker?
CORE CONCERN #1: APPRECIATION

Obstacle #3:

• failure to communicate the real merit or underlying reasons we see
  • The “love lab’s” primary predictor: ratio of appreciation to critical remarks (need 5:1) replicated for organizations
  • Not phony “active listening” with constant nods or “employee appreciation day” but truly appreciating
  • Dilemma: It’s hardest to appreciate when it’s most needed!