

ASSIGNMENT 4 - CHAPTER 7

1. List 5 ideas that can be used to avoid a win/lose situation in the negotiation process.

One idea that can be used to avoid a win/lose situation in the negotiation process involves both parties using the accommodation conflict style. If both parties agree to be accommodating to each other during a negotiation, then their situation is more likely to become a win/win solution than it is a win/lose circumstance. This approach gets the parties closer to mutual gain in their situation. Accommodation is a cooperative approach that emphasizes both parties seeking to resolve the matter in an acceptable manner. (Wilmot, 2007, 158) An example where the idea of accommodation can be used to avoid a win/lose situation in the negotiation process can be witnessed in a high school student working with her parents to decide on what college to attend. The student may want to attend an expensive college in a faraway location. Her parents, having saved for her college education, want her to attend a nearby state university so that it will be easier to maintain contact. In order to accommodate her parents' wishes, the young student decides to attend the university closer in proximity. Seeing that their daughter has accepted going to the less expensive choice and that she will be nearby, the parents help her buy a car so that she can get back and forth between home, work, and school.

A second idea that can be used to avoid a win/lose situation in the negotiation process is by using the collaboration conflict style. When two parties decide to collaborate during their negotiation, they can achieve a better result than a win/lose situation. Like accommodation, collaboration is geared toward getting both sides to be cooperative in resolving their issues. By collaborating, both sides take into consideration each other's

wants rather than only expressing concern for what they want. The choice to collaborate can often lead to creative alternatives to resolve a negotiation. (Wilmot, 2007, 263) Both parties could choose to compete with one another. However, they may not achieve the optimum result by doing so. For example, on a marketing team, each coworker has his or her own ideas on how to market a service. They each think that their own idea is the best one to use. With this mindset, they will end up fighting to see that their idea is carried out. Instead, if they work together to create the best idea as a team, the input from everyone will produce a more unified result. The choice to collaborate makes the marketing concept more effective.

Another idea that helps to avoid a win/lose situation in the negotiation process is by moderating conflict. By moderating conflict, both parties can decide to hold their emotions in check and rationally work on resolving the issues. To moderate the conflict, the parties will monitor their discussions to limit the amount of explosive anger that is unleashed. (Wilmot, 2007, 226) If they begin to notice that their emotions are getting the better of them, then they might take a break and regroup. Doing so can help to avoid a win/lose situation. Moderating a conflict also helps to prevent either party from gaining an unfair advantage. The actual moderation of the conflict might be most effectively done by a third party, such as a counselor or mediator. They can keep the parties negotiating to focus on the issues at hand rather than to get side-tracked on emotions. An example of moderating conflict is when a union negotiates with an employer for better benefits and pay. Arbitrators may participate in mediating between the two parties for a beneficial solution for both parties. They will be an objective participant in the negotiation process.

By carefully managing emotions, such as anger and fear, a win/lose situation in the negotiation process can be avoided. Emotions can curtail a negotiation process even as the people involved are close to resolving a

conflict. If both people make an honest effort to manage their individual emotions, it will bode well for avoiding a win/lose situation. Doing so will allow them to concentrate on the issues at hand rather than expressing their frustrations emotionally. In addition, managing emotions can help the parties to avoid lashing out at each other. An example of how managing emotions can avoid a win/lose circumstance is when a husband and wife are arguing about the communication problems. The wife is upset, because she feels that her husband does not listen to her. The husband believes he does listen, but is very busy with work and cannot respond immediately to all of his wife's queries. Without managing their emotions, the couple may express their feelings with much anger. One person may give in, creating a win/lose situation. Alternatively, if they hold back their emotions and think before they speak, they may be able to resolve the problems without expressing anger.

A final idea to be used to avoid a win/lose situation in the negotiation process is to manage the competitive pressures and embrace the collaborative possibilities. In a negotiation, it is easy for both people to want to compete with each other. They both want to achieve their own desired result. If both sides embrace the competitive conflict style, then one person may finally get frustrated and give up, creating a win/lose situation. If they decide to hold back on their competitive tendencies and instead collaborate, they may find that a win/win situation is possible. The idea is for both parties to try to understand each other's perspective. The collaborative conflict style allows the parties to focus on the needs of both sides rather than only considering their own self-interest.

2. List 3 indicators that the person with whom you are negotiating is using competitive negotiation techniques. How could you deal with each of these?

One indicator that the other person is using competitive negotiation techniques is that they make great demands at the beginning of a negotiation. These demands are likely to be outrageous and unacceptable. The demands make the other person seem like they are trying to take advantage of the situation rather than working out a realistic solution. (Wilmot, 2007, 251) If I found myself in a negotiation with a person who is making outrageous demands, I would also present greater demands than what I realistically wanted at first. As the negotiation ensues, I would be willing to scale back certain demands if the other person does as well. When first informed of the other person's requests, I might want to react emotionally. I might feel encouraged to shout that those demands are unfair. Such a response would weaken my position, as it would show the other person that I am unable to maintain my poise throughout the negotiation. By remaining calm and keeping my emotions in check, I would be more likely to realize my ultimatums. Doing so would require a certain amount of self-awareness that would help me navigate through the emotions rather than reacting to them. (Goleman, 1995, 46)

Another indicator that the other person is using competitive negotiation techniques is when they attempt to use threats to realize gains. Threats could be abusive, loud, or sinister in nature, but if they generate the results that the other person wants, they could be considered a successful negotiation strategy. (Wilmot, 2007, 251) Threats can also inspire fear in the mind of one negotiating party, while building confidence for the other party. If I found myself in a negotiation with the other person using threats to try to achieve their ends, I would think carefully about those threats. My goal would be to avoid reacting to the threats no matter how insidious they might be. I would contemplate the worst possible result that the threat would yield. From the feasibility of the worst

possible result, I would make a decision on how to respond. (Carnegie, 1948, 16) Perhaps the optimum strategy for dealing with a threat is to respond in kind. Another method for responding to a threat would be to let the other party wear themselves out. Afterward, I could respond when they are more calm and capable of negotiating rationally. The situation might call for a third party to mediate the negotiation if the threats are unbearable.

A third indicator of competitive negotiation techniques is shown when one person refuses to cooperate or to be persuaded on different issues. The other person may be obstinate and unyielding about their demands. They may think that the negotiation is about winning as much as they can as opposed to working out a rational solution. Such a position in a negotiation can make it linger far longer than it might have had both sides decided to be cooperative. If I found myself in a negotiation where the other party exhibited stubbornness, I might decide to express empathy for their demands. This position doesn't mean that I would concede to their requests. It might encourage the other person to let down their guard and join in working toward a more reasonable solution. As Dale Carnegie wrote in How to Win Friends and Influence People, the best way to deal with another person is to persuade him or her to want to agree with me. (Carnegie, 1936, 18) Threatening them will not work; it will only make the other person more adamant about their wishes. Instead, a more fruitful effort can be made by understanding their position and helping them to see how a potential solution is beneficial for them.

3. Discuss the value of collaborative negotiation.

The value of collaborative negotiation is found in the inherent process that allows two parties to find common ground by realizing that they do not have conflicting demands. Collaborative negotiation helps parties to work through supposed differences to discover the reality of their situation.

(Wilmot, 2007, 251) It leads them to deciding on a solution that is mutually beneficial. Collaborative negotiation can be peaceful and cooperative to the point that it is much more advantageous for resolving issues than the competitive conflict style, for instance. An example of when collaborative negotiation works can be witnessed when a couple is shopping for a birthday present for their nephew together, but have different ideas about what to get him. The aunt wants to get him a train, because the boy very much likes playing with them. The uncle thinks the nephew should get a kite to give him something other than trains. Although the aunt and uncle have different ideas about what to get their nephew, they both have the common ground of giving him a birthday gift. They decide to collaborate on the situation and purchase a kite that has a train on it. The boy will be excited, because the kite has his favorite thing and it will be something new for him to experience. The couple has worked together to resolve the issue rather than letting it become a bigger problem.

4. Why is it important to separate people from problems?

It is important to separate people from problems in order to resolve a negotiation in a timelier manner. By separating the problems, people can work towards a solution rather than resorting to attacking each other.

(Wilmot, 2007, 258) It is human nature to want to blame the other person for causing a problem. People want to advance their own self-interests instead of working for the greater good of a situation. Taking this approach can make the negotiation take much longer than if the parties decided to put their negative feelings for one another aside. Preferably, people who are negotiating or struggling with a situation would do better to separate the problems from themselves. Doing so allows people to become creative with creating an optimum solution. An example of separating the problem from the

people negotiating can be witnessed when unions engage employers in wage and benefit changes. Union bosses will claim that they cannot get the concessions they need from employers, because the employers care more about the bottom line than they do about the welfare of their workers. Employers will contend that the unions' demands are demonstrative of the hard-line tactics that the unions are accustomed to using. Both sides link the problem, appropriate wages and benefits, with people involved in the negotiations. Instead of focusing on the propaganda of demonizing each other, the unions and employers would save precious time by focusing on the problem. Employers need employees and should acknowledge as much, while unions need employers. If they took their negative opinions out of the negotiations, they will likely find it much easier to determine exactly what workers need, whether it is higher wages or more benefits. Also, they will be able to determine what concessions the unions are willing to make.

CHAPTER 8

1. Discuss the benefits and drawbacks of practicing the options for change listed in this chapter. Include in your discussion an explanation of why we typically use the least effective method (changing the other person) and avoid the most effective method (changing ourselves).

One option for change includes trying to change the other person, in what is considered the most natural of options. The benefit of attempting to change the other person can only truly be realized if success is achieved in a negotiation. Although the argument can be made that this strategy also garners attention for one's position in a negotiation, trying to change the other person can backfire. The person being pressured into agreeing with the other party may become frustrated. They may retaliate and push their agenda on the pressuring party. Such an event is a drawback to this approach. Although it may not seem like a benefit, this approach encourages both sides in a negotiation to become passionate about their own causes if they are not

already. Of course, if this passion spills over into a much more heated debate, the consequences may cause serious damage. As this option is the natural choice, people most often use it despite it actually being the least effective method available. At the outset of a negotiation, people are optimistic about their chances. They believe that they will realize most if not all of their desires, because they believe they are right and the other person is wrong. Thus, justice will be served if their position in the negotiation becomes the end choice. Despite the logic behind using the more effective choice of changing ourselves, people still gravitate toward changing the other person. People feel that if they have a chance, they can win the majority of their goals in any negotiation.

Another option for change is attempting to alter the conditions of the conflict. Doing so may encourage both parties to realize that there are enough gains for both sides. If the issue involved is an argument over money, an increase in money can cause both sides to accept a settlement. Such a situation is a benefit accorded to altering the conditions. However, the same situation can yield a drawback if both sides fight over the additional money. The idea is that the scarcity of resources in dispute are significantly improved to entice both people to reconsider their positions. (Wilmot, 2007, 210) Increasing scarce resources carries another drawback. One dispute may be resolved, but a new argument could be created that unnecessarily prolongs the negotiation. For example, if a couple argues over money and comes to an agreement about saving and spending habits, they may realize they have a problem with how much time they spend arguing because of communication issues. Such a realization may cause the relationship great strain. Perhaps both people were unaware of how poorly their communication had been going.

A third option for change is modifying personal communication and perceptions. This option is the easiest to change, as it means a person

changing their behavior rather than trying to force the other person to change. Although this option tends to be the most successful, it is also used far less often than it could be. (Wilmot, 2007, 210) It involves one person humbling themselves to consider the other person's situation. Doing so can push a negotiation closer to conclusion than if both parties try to change each other, which is a benefit. However, if a person tries to alter themselves too much, they may be causing unintended damage to their own position, which is a definite drawback. The end to a negotiation may not be beneficial if one party has given in too much. However, simply changing thoughts about the other person does not necessarily mean giving in too much. It's a matter of changing perception to make the conflict constructive rather than destructive. It may open up the other person to working out a solution instead of holding out for everything they want.

2. What is required for self change?

In order to achieve self change, a person is required to take action in different ways. They must monitor a conflict as it ensues to avoid harmful increases in intensity, prevent attempts at creating unequal power, and steer clear of unproductive behavior. (Wilmot, 2007, 211) Making an effort to change oneself does not have to be a massive one-time effort. Rather, small incremental changes taken deliberately over a period of time can lead an individual to change. By working to improve the conditions of the conflict or negotiation, a person can witness changes in oneself. It takes discipline to monitor one's own behavior. It is a self-conscious effort that does not need to be trumpeted to others. Instead, truly changing oneself requires their mind to fully engage themselves in exacting change. It could also be said that changing oneself is an internal conflict as opposed to a conflict involving another person. A person may struggle for a long time to overcome

mental or emotional blocks that prevent them from making positive changes. Furthermore, to change oneself during a conflict, the individual must care about the other person. (Wilmot, 2007, 212) Without care, the individual will likely not be concerned with changing their own behavior and thoughts.

3. Think of two times you have gotten really angry. What "fear" was your anger linked to?

One time I was really angry was when I moved into an apartment with two friends. The three of us were taking over the apartment for the summer from another friend. We were supposed to share two keys between us, but the fourth friend kept one of the keys without telling us. At the end of the summer, my two friends were planning to move out, while the fourth friend was going to move back in. I became angry, as I felt he had been dishonest about the key. He had not expressed any misgivings about the three of us renting the apartment through him. Eventually, after talking to him, he relinquished the key. Looking back now, I realize that my initial anger was linked to the fear of lacking control of the situation, or being vulnerable to others. As well, some of my fear could be attributed to the sudden realization that I might not be able to trust close friends in certain situations. Realizing how little control an individual has over many things in life is a humbling experience.

Another time I was very angry was when a girl I was dating decided to leave me and go back to her former boyfriend. Being younger and much more naïve, I became very angry, as I was hurt by her actions. I told people things about her that I should not have and thought things about her that later on I felt badly about. My anger was linked to the fear of rejection. Getting dumped by a girlfriend or boyfriend as a teenager can be a very difficult experience. It can cause an individual to lower their self-esteem and act out in ways that they normally would not. Suddenly realizing that I

no longer had relevance to this other person was painful. This anger can also be linked to the fear of loss of control. In a relationship, both people have some control and feel empowered. They know that the other person cares about what they think or feel. The loss of relevance and control can be overpowering fears.

4. Why is it important to realize that anger is a secondary emotion?

It is very important to realize that anger is a secondary emotion for different reasons. Becoming angry is actually a response to a primary emotion, such as fear or frustration. (Wilmot, 2007, 225) People do not just become angry all of a sudden. Rather, they are provoked to anger by an emotion experienced from a situation or thought. It is important to realize that anger is more of a response than an emotion. The reason for the importance of this realization is that an individual can control their anger and prevent themselves from reacting to it. An angry reaction can cause irreparable harm to oneself as well as others. Identifying the possibility of negative consequences can prevent people from experiencing grief. Taking control of one's anger can stop them from hurting the people they care about the most. It can prevent them from losing a negotiation or conflict unnecessarily. Most importantly, understanding that anger is a secondary emotion, can lead an individual to uncovering the truth hiding behind the anger. This point allows a person to resolve the true problem rather than focusing on the symptoms of the problem.

5. Discuss the difference between suppression, ventilation, and responsible expression of anger.

While suppression is a means of withholding anger and preventing it from being expressed externally, ventilation is a method of letting the anger

out. Meanwhile, responsible expression of anger is the middle ground between these three modes of anger management. Suppression of anger allows a person to hold back their responses to anger in the short term. In the long run, however, suppression of anger can lead a person to aggressive behavioral tendencies. It can cause anxiety and physical or mental illness. Anger suppression is the opposite of anger ventilation. Instead of holding back one's angry thoughts, a person venting their anger may do so through verbal or physical means. They may yell when no one is around or they may shout at another person. Even worse, anger ventilation can happen via physical abuse of another person, even if they are family. The debate between venting anger and suppressing it is often about which is the better means for anger management. At one time, it was considered acceptable to vent anger, even encouraged. Indeed, in the past, individuals who sought treatment for their anger management were made to imagine themselves as newborns emerging angrily from their mothers' wombs. (Brody) Such methods of therapy are irrational, as venting anger can likely lead to an individual becoming angrier. Although venting anger may seem more dangerous, suppression of anger can lead to destruction as well. Anger can fester and grow within individuals even as they endeavor to suppress it. It can lead to people expressing their anger against others who are not even the subject of their anger. (Wikipedia) The desired method of anger management is responsible expression of anger. When a person can responsibly express their anger, they are in control of themselves and their emotions. A responsible expression of anger can happen in many forms. An individual may exercise to "burn off" their anger if it is not a deeply-rooted sentiment. An individual may seek out a friend or family member who cares enough to listen to a loved one discuss why they are angry. Another form of responsible expression of anger can be through writing about it in one's own diary. Instead of allowing anger to rule one's life, he or she could channel that anger towards determination in completing a project.

The difference between responsible anger expression and ventilation and suppression is that responsible expression is done so consciously and intelligently rather than irrationally.

6. Give an example of fractionation using a specific conflict

Fractionation is method of breaking a conflict down into more manageable parts to give individuals the perspective necessary to try to resolve a conflict. (Wilmot, 2007, 233) The idea of fractionating a conflict does not mean the subject is marginalized. Rather, the point is to remove the daunting feeling that comes with a seemingly impossible conflict. Fractionation can also help the parties engaged in conflict to understand the underlying problem of the conflict. An example of fractionation is when a couple divorces and must work out the responsibilities of taking care of their children. Instead of seeing the overall problem of who gets the most time with the children and who shoulders the responsibilities, the problem is broken down into segments. One part to be decided is the financial aspect, or child support and medical care. This part of the agreement is worked out separately from the other responsibilities. Another aspect of child care is settling how much of the decision-making is shared. Yes another part of the divorce involves parenting time. In other words, the parents have to work out how much time they each have separately with their children. By fractionating the overall problem down to specific blocks, the parents can more successfully reach an agreement with regard to their children.

References

Wilmot, W. W., & Hocker J. L. (2007). Interpersonal Conflict. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Brody, Jane E. "Venting Anger May Do More Harm Than Good." The New York Times. New York: New York Times, 1983.

<http://www.nytimes.com/1983/03/08/science/venting-anger-may-do-more-harm-than-good.html?sec=health>

"Anger". Wikipedia. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anger>

Goleman, Daniel. (1995). Emotional Intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.

Carnegie, Dale. (1936). How to Win Friends and Influence People. New York: Pocket Books.

Carnegie, Dale. (1948). How to Stop Worrying and Start Living. Suffolk: The Chaucer Press.