

Negotiation Mastery

1. Introduction to Negotiation Analysis



1. Introduction to Negotiation Analysis

1.1 Simulation: Bridport

1.1.3 Bridport Negotiation

Partner Feedback: Worked Well

Your Response

Submitted

1.5 Bargaining Tactics

1.5.1 Tactical Choices

1.5.1_Turf_Poll_W1_V1

Question

Answer

I prefer a neutral site, where no one has an advantage.

Results

I prefer a neutral site, where no one has an advantage.: 29 % When possible, I negotiate on my own turf.: 28 % It makes no difference to me where I negotiate.: 25 %

1. Introduction to Negotiation Analysis



I like to negotiate wherever the other party will be most comfortable.: 19 %

1.5.1_Outnumber_Poll_W1_V1

Question

Answer

It doesn't matter much if I'm on the bigger team or the smaller one.

Results

It doesn't matter much if I'm on the bigger team or the smaller one.: 40 % I feel at a disadvantage if the other side brings a larger team to the table.: 37 % I often find that being outnumbered actually benefits me.: 22 %

1.5.1 FO Poll W1 V1

Question

In negotiation there's sometimes strength in numbers, especially if different members of your negotiating team have special expertise or they all will play a role in implementation. Bringing an impressive team to the table can also signal your commitment to the deal. And for complex transactions, it's helpful to have colleagues who can coach you during private caucuses.

But with a larger team, you must have a clear plan for managing the process. And it's essential to resolve any internal differences about the deal beforehand. You don't want to invite the other side to play "divide and conquer."

Small, well-prepared teams are usually more agile, provided they have been given the discretion to craft creative solutions. In today's fast-moving world, the ability to respond quickly to new proposals is a definite advantage at the bargaining table.

Now let's turn to the next question.

3. Make the first offer?

You told us whether you would make the first offer in the Bridport negotiation, and we discussed the pros and cons of doing so.

Answer

I try to get the other side to make the first proposal, as they may offer more than I expected.

1. Introduction to Negotiation Analysis



Results

I try to get the other side to make the first proposal, as they may offer more than I expected.: 49 % I like to make the first offer in order to shape the other side's expectations.: 44 % It usually doesn't matter to me who makes the first offer.: 7 %

1.5.1 Approach Poll W1 V1

Question

Street wisdom says never to make the first offer, because doing so signals weakness. Plus, the other side might surprise you by offering you a better deal than you would have asked for.

But there can be good reasons to go first. Studies show that initial demands strongly influence counteroffers. Working from your number is advantageous if you can provide a plausible reason for what you put forth. In short, where you begin often affects where you end up.

Answer

I state my position strongly early on but may become more flexible if my counterpart seems trustworthy.

Results

I like to show at the outset that I'm open-minded and flexible. It helps to bring out the best in other people.: 51 %

I state my position strongly early on but may become more flexible if my counterpart seems trustworthy.: 33 %

I try not to seem too tough, because it might make the other side hostile.: 12 %

I state my position strongly early on, so that my counterpart doesn't think I'm weak.: 4 %

1.5.1_Address_Poll_W1_V1

Question

Often, at the same time you're working out the substantive terms of a deal, you're also implicitly negotiating how to negotiate. Specifically, you're working out whether the interaction be an exercise in joint problem-solving, or a hardball haggle.

You can't unilaterally decide that question. Whoever sits across the table is likely to have opinions about what the issues are and how to handle them. And people's approaches to negotiation differ. Some are collaborative. Others are not. It's always in your interest to elicit constructive behavior if you can. But doing so presents difficult choices. For instance, it's unrealistic to expect other people to be more cooperative than you are—but being open and flexible may be misread as a sign of weakness.

1. Introduction to Negotiation Analysis



Before committing to one relational approach or another, try to get a good read on the other party. Even when you're working under a deadline, take some time to establish a positive atmosphere. Don't jump to conclusions about your counterpart. What looks like hostility might really be defensiveness (or simply a bad day for the other party). Once you both get settled, try making a small concession and see if it is reciprocated. If it is, then you're most likely headed in the right direction. If not, you may need to express yourself more firmly.

Answer

I like to start with the hard issues, because others will be more willing to make concessions early on.

Results

I prefer to start with the easier issues in order to build a relationship.: 52 %

I prefer to start with the easier issues in order to build momentum.: 17 %

I like to start with the hard issues so I don't waste time if there isn't any room for agreement.: 16 %

I like to start with the hard issues, because others will be more willing to make concessions early on.: 15 %

1.5.1_Cards_Poll_W1_V1

Question

There are good arguments either way when it comes to whether you should tackle the hardest issues at the beginning of a negotiation or put them off till you've made progress on easier ones.

But keep two important caveats in mind: First, you may not know which issues are going to be hard and which will be easy until you sit down to negotiate. So be prepared for surprises, pleasant and otherwise.

Second, don't fall into the trap of dealing with one issue at a time. Doing so might seem orderly, but it basically sets up a series of win-lose transactions.

Answer

Information is power. I reveal as little as possible about my priorities.

Results

I acknowledge some of my priorities—especially the obvious ones—but also keep some close to the vest since the other side may exploit my needs.: 41 %

I acknowledge some of my priorities—especially the obvious ones—but overstate a few items in order to have bargaining chips to give away later on.: 32 %

Information is power. I reveal as little as possible about my priorities.: 14 %

I usually give the other party a good sense of my priorities so that we can explore mutually beneficial trades.: 13 %

1. Introduction to Negotiation Analysis



1.5.1 HighLow Poll W1 V1

Question

Some people show their cards in negotiation. But others hold them close to the chest. It's understandable why some negotiators are reluctant to reveal their priorities. If one person knows the other's preferences, he or she can both expand the value "pie" and capture most of it. The party in the dark may be left only with crumbs.

People understand this intuitively, which explains why many seemingly simple transactions are protracted. If no one reveals preferences, no one gets exploited. But potential value may be squandered, too. Taking the initiative to share information is usually wise, but do it carefully, step by step, to encourage reciprocity.

Answer

I ask for much more than I expect the other side to give in order to leave room for concessions later on.

Results

I ask for much more than I expect the other side to give in order to leave room for concessions later on.: 49 %

I try to propose a deal that would be fair to both of us.: 36 %

I consider where I would be without a deal and then ask for something better than that.: 8 %

I estimate what the other side can give and ask for a little less than that, so that they are satisfied.: 8 %

1.5.1 Raise Poll W1 V1

Question

When we debriefed the Bridport simulation, we looked at the upside—and the downside—of making bold demands.

Figuring out how much to ask for is like judging your driving speed as you hurry to a meeting. You probably can exceed the posted limit, but not by so much that you're stopped by the police, given a ticket, and forced to reschedule your appointment.

In negotiation, there are two kinds of upper limits. You hit one of them if your demand is taken seriously and the other party walks away. You may try to lure them back, though doing so will make them skeptical about whatever demands you make going forward.

Moreover, a bold offer may provoke an equally aggressive counteroffer. Perhaps both sides can back down by making concessions, inch by inch. But that kind of process can drive out value-creation.





The punch line? It bears repeating: research suggests that the higher your aspirations, the more you're likely to get. That's the good news. The bad news is that you'll also be more likely to walk away empty-handed.

Answer

I rarely do.

Results

I sometimes do.: 52 % I rarely do.: 24 %

I often raise some of my demands during the negotiation process.: 20 %

I never do.: 4 %

1.5.1_Closing_Poll_W1_V1

Question

Raising your demands during a negotiation is straight out of the hard-bargaining playbook.

It's supposed to have two advantages. One, of course, is getting a better outcome on that particular issue. The other is signaling that tomorrow's terms will be even worse if agreement isn't reached today. It's a high-risk move, though, as it forces the other party to relinquish something that they believed they'd already secured. It also undermines trust.

Nevertheless, it's sometimes appropriate. Let's say that you're negotiating a service contract and you've provisionally made certain concessions. If another provider subsequently offers more generous terms, you can reasonably ask the first candidate to match—or top—the competing bid.

Answer

I never do that.

Results

I sometimes do that, depending on the circumstances.: 51 %

I rarely do that.: 28 %

When I've negotiated an agreement on behalf of others, I usually go back and say that my boss won't

approve it unless we get one more concession.: 12 %

I never do that.: 10 %