Writing assignment for the Conflict Management, Negotiation and Mediation module, PO5002, March 23-26, 2016 (ajz1@nyu.edu)

In a maximum of 1000 words total, answer the following questions:

**1.  What have you learned about yourself and your habitual “default” approaches to situations involving conflict and negotiation?**

Before I began this module I had a preconceived understanding of negotiation. For me, negotiation was about winner takes all, and in the end there would be a winner and a loser. I’ve always considered myself a great listener, but I never understood what exactly I was listening for. My approach to being an effective listener resulted in me building a defensive wall against the other party involved. My habitual default approaches involving conflict and negotiation depended on the situation. For example, I had the habit of withholding information from the other party because I did not want to risk freely giving up information that could be used against me. Another habitual default that I learned about myself was not laying out contingencies in advance and setting up parameters with which we could work with (specifically in the sally swansong case); I realized by not addressing contengencies I would leave room for a conflict to be created. I also learned that I had a habit of approaching a conflict without trying to establish a common ground in the beginning before negotiations started. In the end I learned the importance of identifying key issues of both parties through the concept of establishing a common ground and I also learned the importance of ensuring that I don’t dismiss someone else’s opinion simply because I don’t agree with it. One of the most beneficial methods I learned was not missing an opportunity to address deeper underlying issues and concerns.

**2.  In what specific ways did you incorporate – and/or, in retrospect, fail to incorporate – the ideas offered by the readings, the lectures and Powerpoint presentation, and class discussions into your negotiation of the Sally Swansong, EU Rulemaking and Bamara Border Dispute role plays? (Whenever possible, cite the source of the insight - e.g., the author, title and page number, or the Powerpoint slide number or something said by the instructor or a fellow student - using parentheses in the text at the appropriate point.) What did you learn from the discussions following each of the role plays?**

* **Sally Swansong**
* The more of a graduated scale it is, the less likely it will lead to a dispute.As lyric operas agent, I offered $20k to sally’s agent and also offered to increase the salary. However one of the mistakes I made was not laying out guidelines in advance for what the bonus and raise would include. I did incorporate the negotiators interest beyond the tangible (Lax, Sebenius 74) by ensuring the well being of my counterpart. My intentions were not to take advantage over the other person (lecture slide 12) because I wanted her talent, but I didn’t want to cheat her out of her worth. One of the models I did not incorporate was Lisa’s Assesment of the value of interest or the assessment of what is really important to me by making a point system. Had a incorporated this, it would have a been easier to invent new options for Sally to include bonuses, fringe and in-kind benefits or perhaps even enhancing her career (Lax, Sebenius 84, 85). I didn’t think about sally as much as I thought I did, I was very narrow minded and simply focused on the fact that I needed a singer. In the discussion following this role paly I learned that In the course of negotiation new ideas imerge because boss’s never think about it; so you don’t get trapped by there thoughts, so you can create and add value.

**EU Rulemaking**

* My team organized ourselves My team established a common ground in the beginning with the other team. We incorporated effective listening, we addressed all concerns we even ensured that we correctly understood the other teams concerns by asking questions (slide 45). We also incorporated bottom line, but maintained flexibility. We ensured that everyone was on the same page (slide 29 and slide 30) and always went back to our core issues of concerns when emotions were rising. My team also ensure that we had a process before we started our negotiaton, we made sure to understand some of the possible concerns that might arise from the other party. We followed the stages of a good process so that we could leave room for a re-negotiation (slide 41). We also focused on issues and interests and distinguished the difference based upon our common ground (Lax, Sebenius 91). We did not depend on persuasion in our negotiation. However I did notice the moments when the other team was listening to our team, reemphasized what our team stated and added the words “however, but, I think” to make their point. The discussions following this role play showed me that in public policy controversies, representatives for certain stakeholder groups who may or may not have flexible authorizations; you can have a great agreement, until it is taken to the constinuencies who will change it. I also learned that it’s a good idea to take a break, re-cap and summarize what has been discussed so far.

**Bamara Dispute**

We incorporated Tradeoff (Lax and Sebenius 80) based upon our judgements and interest. We had to understand what we cared more about through our interests, often time it let one team taking more or less than their fair share. Trading the value of heritage and pride versus trading an economic surplus was often hard to negotiate. Looking at the ways to respond to a conflict (Bunker, Rubin 16-18) we incorporated the suggestion of bringing in a third party ( Bunker, Rubin26, 27) to help negotiation process of the disputed land, however, this led to trust issues and did not support the fact that we were returning to pre-colonial methods of which we both agreed to break away from. Before we decided to dive into the border issue we created “ground rules” as mentioned by Allison Bunting in a previous lecture, this was important to establish early in the beginning so that we wouldn’t get off topic in our conversation. We raised “process” questions everytime the other team constantly changed or refused the border dispute. Anytime there is a dispute people will be on one side of a line or the other. Just like the dispute the RiverEnd Environment split between the environmentalists and the advocates of Development (Susskind, Cruiskshank 44) and the example from the Professor of the Development Issue in Denver Colorado we were constantly aware that coming to a solution required both parties participation and not other outside influences to adhere to joint problem solving. This also emphasized the importance of knowing the difference between collaborative and non-collaborative methods. We went back to methods drawn from Sally Swanson case and offered incentives and brainstormed ways to bring benefit to the other party for their perceived “loss” of a land. Instead of focusing on the problem or the issues we focused on ways in which we could minimize issues by creating a union. The discussions following this role play showed me that face to face negotiations are vital to tackling the challenges of disputes. In addition, it was also helpful to talk about the issue over a drink or lunch before talking or going head on to the heart of the matter.

**3.  What differences did you observe between one-on-one negotiation and team negotiation during the course of doing the role plays?**

During the course of role plays, one on one negotiation was more relaxed than team negotiations. With team negotiations there tended to be multiple ideas merging from multiple sources. The key was to get your team on the same page as well as getting the other team on the same page as your team. On the other hand one on one negotiations required you to have a strategy to come to an agreement with the other person. Team negotiations did offer the ability for tactics to be structured, diverse creativity and perspectives and overall shared effort. Team negotiations also provided a sense of forceful back up before a statement or general consensus was made. In one on one negotiations it was easier to manipulate the other person and it was less likely to call out bad behavior or a bluff. One on one negotiation tended to start with a one way recipient mind set. Time to reach an agreement tended to take longer with team negotiations as opposed to one on one negotiations. Questions and concerns that were once settled are also brought back up for discussion more frequently with team negotiations