SELF-ASSESSMENT

**GOAL:** STIMULATE SELF-ANALYSIS AND REFLECTION

- Do you have a “default” tendencies?
- Last week we discussed “difficult people”

Perhaps the difficult person is YOU?

Self-Assessment has 30 questions you should answer quickly – don’t overthink

Once finished tear off last page and score yourself
SELF-ASSESSMENT

- For each 5 modes of handling conflicts the possible scores range from 0 to 12

- Focus on your results for competing, avoiding, accommodating.
  - These are 3 common sub-optimal tendencies

- Just among these 3 which one is highest for you?

  Don’t fight the category - we are all amalgams –this is a dimension of you with some sway

Move to section of room: my right (avoiding)

  center (accommodate)

  my left (competing)
The Five Conflict Handling Modes:

I. COLLABORATING
II. COMPROMISING
III. COMPETING
IV. AVOIDING
V. ACCOMMODATING

Not empathetic → Empathetic

EMPATHY

UNASSERTIVE → ASSERTIVE
AVOIDING

Unassertive and Not Empathetic = “leave well enough alone”

USEFUL WHEN:

• issue is **trivial** compared to cost of conflict

• Conflict may **resolve itself**

• **no chance** or almost no chance to satisfy your concerns (e.g. someone’s personality structure)

• **damage** from confronting conflict **outweighs benefits** of resolution (preserve relationship)
AVOIDING

Downsides:

- Miss beneficial solutions
- Some conflicts get worse with time
- May damage relationship if perceived as unengaged/uncaring
AVOIDING

If HIGH score:

- Do you **not provide enough input** on important issues?
- Are important decisions being made by “default”?

If LOW score:

- Find self hurting people’s feelings or stirring up **hostilities over minor issues**?
- Do you have difficulties setting **priorities** and deciding which issues are important?
ACCOMMODATING

Unassertive and Empathetic

Neglect own concerns, focus on concerns of the other person

IS THIS EVER USEFUL?
ACCOMMODATING

USEFUL WHEN:

- when issue is much more important to other than to you, and you want to maintain a good relationship
- to build social credit for later issues/deals important to you
- When harmony and trust are especially important to you
ACCOMMODATING

Downsides:

- Are your interests being met?
- Are you too worried about being liked?
- Exploitation: What if meet a wolf in sheep clothing?
ACCOMMODATING

IF HIGH score:

• do your ideas and concerns get the attention they deserve?

IF LOW score:

• Do you have trouble building goodwill with others?
• Do others regard you as unreasonable?
• Trouble admitting when you are wrong?
COMPETING

Assertive and not Empathetic

“might makes right”

Is this approach ever useful?
COMPETING

USEFUL WHEN:

--Need to **protect** against people who exploit cooperative behavior

--**Quick decisive** action is vital

--**Unpopular** courses of action is needed, like cost cutting
COMPETING

If you scored HIGH:
• Are you open to listening to others?
• How are your relationships?
• Do you miss collaborative pie-expansion opportunities?
• Are you more focused on beating the other than on getting best outcome for self?

If you scored LOW:
• Are you uncomfortable exercising power?
• Do you have problems taking a firm stand?
• Do you postpone hard decisions?
TYPICAL DYNAMICS

- Compete v. compete: no one is listening, stalemate
- Compete v. avoid: avoider is alienated, withdraws
- Compete v. accommodate: risk of exploitation
- Accommodate v. accommodate: miss mutual gains
- Accommodate v. avoid = risk of both avoiding
- Avoid v. avoid = Let’s avoid this one!

Diagnose difficult interactions by running through these possibilities
COLLABORATING

• Assertive and Empathetic: Attempt to work with other person to find a solution that satisfies both parties’ concerns

Is this approach ever useful?
COLLABORATING

USEFUL FOR:

- finding integrative *win-win* solutions
- gaining commitment of others by incorporating their concerns
- improving and sustaining *relationships*
COLLABORATING

If HIGH:

- Are you spending too much time discussing trivial issues that don’t deserve it?
- Are you overly worried about making decisions and want to diffuse responsibility?

If LOW:

- Is it hard for you to see differences as opportunities for joint gain?
- Is it hard for you to get others committed to your decisions/policies?
COMPROMISING

Somewhat empathetic and somewhat assertive:
“splitting the difference” and exchanging concessions.

Is this ever useful?
COMPROMISING

USEFUL WHEN:

- goals **not worth the effort** of full collaboration
- counterparties with equal power are committed to mutually exclusive goals
- expedient solution **under time pressure**

If HIGH: Are you **too focused on getting resolution and overlook principles, values, long term objectives**?

If LOW: Do you find it **hard to make concessions**?
THE RIGHT APPROACH?

- THERE IS NO ONE “RIGHT WAY” TO HANDLE CONFLICT. Each mode is an approach, and a set of social skills, that may be optimal in a given context.

- WE ALL use all of these, but each of us uses some more than others (our “default” mode).

- Goal: Let the situation as opposed to habit drive your strategy. Be conscious of the approach you are taking and strategically choose the appropriate approach for the circumstance.

- In important & complex business negotiations the collaborative approach is typically optimal if both parties collaborate

What do you need to work on? Empathy? Assertion? Engagement?
## Importance of Stakes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Importance of Future Relationship</th>
<th>Low Importance of Future Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Balanced Concerns</td>
<td>II: Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Business partnership, international diplomacy, or prenuptial agreement)</td>
<td>(Friendship or work team “making plans”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(expect accommodate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III: Transactions</td>
<td>IV: Tacit Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(house sale, car purchase, or market transaction)</td>
<td>(Traffic intersection or airplane seating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(expect compete)</td>
<td>(expect avoidance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Richard G. Shell
Standards of Legitimacy

ALL negotiations have a distributive dimension. All pies, no matter how large, must be cut.

To preserve relationships AND protect against exploitation use a Standard of Legitimacy.

What’s a standard of legitimacy?
Standards of Legitimacy

What’s a standard of legitimacy?
A standard that’s EXTERNAL AND INDEPENDENT OF YOUR WILL

- Examples: market value, precedent, industry practice,
- How pick? (relevance to specific case, wide usage, prior dealings) – May become heart of the negotiation
- Why use standards of legitimacy?
Why Use Standards of Legitimacy?

- They are persuasive
- Helps you seem fair, reasonable, honorable EVEN WHILE you are not willing to yield to the other side (great protection against exploitation)
- Preserves/enhances the relationships (using power/threats destroys relationships)
- Preserves/enhances your reputation
- Saves time: Power moves (walkouts, banging on tables) are messy and can take a lot of time
- Are there situations where you should not use standards of legitimacy?
Reasons not to use standards of legitimacy?

- In small stakes negotiations transaction costs of principled agreement may exceed benefit (i.e., it’s faster just to haggle).

- What if you have more power?

Ask yourself: Is the excess amount over the “legitimate standard” amount worth costs to your:

(i) relationship? (ii) reputation? (iii) conscience?
CORE CONCERNS

appreciation, autonomy, status, affiliation,

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

LEVER: To stimulate positive emotions
  e.g., how address core concerns proactively?
CORE CONCERN: AFFILIATION

- **AFFILIATION** = the emotional connection between you and another

- **IF STRONG POSITIVE AFFILIATION:**
  - open to new/fresh ideas
  - TRUST (the ultimate lubricant)
  - share information
  - more likely to honor agreements

HOW CREATE POSITIVE AFFILIATION?
HOW CREATE AFFILIATION?

- STRUCTURAL AFFILIATION: You are both members of a common group (e.g., work at same org, fans of same music)
  - How many use LinkedIn? Why?

- Power of “homophily”: we like people similar to us. **WE ALL HAVE SIMILARITIES** – the key is to **FIND WHAT IS SIMILAR**

- What questions uncover commonalities?
CREATE CONNECTION

• How feel after you find structural affiliation? Better? You are more likely to reach a deal!

• “Mere exposure effect” (dorm study)

• The power of schmooze
  • Start with “safe” topics (weather)
  • Move to affiliation-building topics (family)
  • Then make self a bit vulnerable: share self-doubts, discuss ethical dilemmas.

How to navigate this varies by culture

• The importance of “chemistry” (e.g., hiring interviews study for consulting, investment banks, and law firms)