

1. To what extent is negotiating an adversarial procedure?

Negotiating can be an adversarial procedure to an extent, especially if the two parties already have a contentious relationship or are natural rivals. An argumentative relationship can make any negotiation seem adversarial. The negotiation could likely intensify, as it would probably take on the attributes of a distributive bargaining negotiation. This type of negotiation means that the parties involved would attempt to get as much as they possibly could out of the negotiation in a zero-sum game. (Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, 32) It's possible that such an adversarial negotiation between parties could take a long time to be resolved. It would be the opposite of an integrative bargaining situation, where the two parties would consider both sides of the argument and seek more of a win-win outcome. (Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, 73)

Another way to describe negotiation as an adversarial procedure is that it is a competition between two parties. They may feel like they need to compete against each other not just to get what they want, but also to humiliate the other party. Over the years, unions and businesses have engaged in negotiations that can be perceived to be adversarial in nature. An obvious sign of this state is when employees go on strike, because they cannot accomplish their goals immediately in negotiation. Another apparent sign of adversarial negotiation is when it ends up in court, such as in the case of Missouri parole officers not receiving a promised pay raise. (Wiese, 2008) Since the parole officers did not initially receive their pay raise, the court system ruled in their favor. Negotiating can become an adversarial procedure for various reasons.

2. What happens to your anxiety level when you see negotiation as a contest?

When negotiation is viewed as a contest, an individual's anxiety level can increase considerably. Their stress level increases, as they may see this "contest" as a test of whether they can win. As the negotiation progresses, participants' may feel more stress to win, which raises their anxiety level. Negotiation in a contest-like manner resembles a distributive bargaining setting as opposed to an integrative bargaining setting. Negotiators may feel that they need to argue for their sides and resort to hardball tactics, such as a bogey, intimidation, or even aggressive behavior. (Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, 73) As their tactics intensify, their anxiety levels increase. If the negotiation happens over the course of weeks or months, the stress added to each negotiator's life can be overwhelming. Anxiety levels can rise especially when a negotiation is personal, such as in the case of divorcing couples. If the marriage is ending bitterly, the anxiety level of each negotiator may rise to the point that other aspects of their life are affected, including work and extended family.

3. Make a list of dumb remarks buyers make.

1. This store should be giving things away.
2. I only buy American products.
3. Everyone should only buy American products.
4. We better buy some of that stock before the price goes any higher.
5. We don't need to make a down payment on the house; we'll borrow the money for it and the mortgage.
6. Let's use our home's equity to buy more houses.
7. I deserve these new shoes, even if my credit card is over its limit.

4. Make a list of dumb remarks sellers make?

1. Shoppers should just accept our higher prices.
2. The federal government should raise taxes on imports to make it easier to sell our cars.
3. Nobody can beat our prices.
4. Let's sell this stock before the price gets any lower.
5. I can sell this computer on eBay for the same price I paid four years ago.
6. I don't care how much we get; let's sell it.

5. Do engineers make dumb remarks? Why or why not?

Anyone can make dumb remarks, including engineers. An engineer may make a racist or sexist statement in the workplace that could either get him fired or reprimanded. He may make a statement about a technical issue that is completely wrong but is unwilling to admit his mistake. Because of his arrogance, he may claim that other people are wrong, not him. The incorrect technical statement has more to do with another factor, such as ignorance or weariness or politics, than being a dumb remark. It's the refusal to admit his fallacy that perpetuates the remark as dumb and makes the engineer's subsequent remarks dumb as well. Although engineers may be highly intelligent, they are not excluded from making dumb remarks.

6. What dumb remarks does the President of a company make?

The President of a company makes dumb remarks that may be unethical, politically incorrect, false, or unintentional. Sometimes those dumb remarks are intended to motivate employees in the form of company slogans, such as "Work smarter not harder." The president may repeat these slogans in various corporate speeches. Employees who are already working hard and in an intelligent manner may think to themselves that if they were smart they would be working elsewhere or running their own business. It may just motivate those employees to leave to pursue new opportunities. The president of a company may become involved in a scandal, and in the course of the scandal, may make remarks that could come back to haunt him. Whether that scandal is financial, sex-related, or unethical in nature, the president is liable to say something that attorneys may advise him to hold back.

7. How do you get the opponent's organization to talk?

Different means exist for getting the opponent's organization to talk in a negotiation. One method might involve offering to exchange information. Each organization could very likely possess crucial information that the other organization very much wants to know. Getting the other organization to talk in this manner is reminiscent of two nations trading intelligence about international affairs. This method of getting the opponent's organization to talk could be very time-consuming. Information exchange could be a piece-for-piece situation, and it may not yield enough data to change the outcome of the negotiation. Another method might be to intimidate the opponent's organization. Doing so may get the information faster, but it might also backfire. This hardball tactic can be used to instill fear in the opponent's organization to get them to talk. (Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, 67) A smaller organization may be susceptible to intimidation, yielding information more readily than a much larger organization. A large organization could easily counter intimidation tactics with intimidation of their own. Alternatively, the larger organization could threaten legal action. Not only would the opponent's organization refuse to talk, but the negotiator's organization could find itself in a worse situation. Additionally, a method to get the opponent's organization to talk would be to simply out-negotiate them. This suggestion may not be as easy to carry out as it is to recommend. Careful analysis of the opponent's organization and the negotiation at hand can help the negotiator to expose lies or mistruths spoken by the opponent. Logical calculated arguments can cause the opponent's organization to talk rather than allow itself to create negative news in the media.

8. How do you keep your own organization from talking too much?

In order to keep an organization from talking too much, particular measures should be taken to ensure people understand the seriousness of the negotiation. The organization members who are involved in the negotiation can be briefed on the matter. They can be made aware of

what information must be kept quiet. Rules can be put in place by the organization to restrict people from talking to the point that they would be seriously reprimanded or fired if they spoke too much. The nature of the negotiation would give the organization reason or not to impose penalties. Oppositely, the organization could provide incentives for maintaining secrecy over certain details. A factor in determining the amount of talking that ensues is the control the organization is able to exert over its negotiation participants.

9. Are people in your organization negotiators?

Some people in my organization may be considered negotiators, while others would not fit that description. Certainly, obvious negotiators are the sales staff, who must negotiate on a daily basis to earn a living. Executives are clearly negotiators, as they must negotiate with many people. They collaborate with executives from other organizations on matters that require negotiation. Executives have to negotiate business deals, in addition to sales staff, and must be skilled in presenting their cases. Managers and supervisors must negotiate frequently with executives and employees. Most of the staff mentioned does not work in the same office as me. Most of the people in my office are technical, such as engineers and scientists. I would not classify them as negotiators, as I have not witnessed them negotiating very often.

10. When does most of the loose talking take place in negotiation?

In negotiation, most of the loose talking takes place in a couple of different times. One time loose talking takes place is before the negotiation actually begins, in that people are talking about the news, weather, or other matters external to the negotiation. This small talk may not have any effect on the actual negotiation. However, it can lead to loose talking about the issues begin discussed. The other time loose talking occurs is when negotiators let their guard down.

People can let their guard down if they have an ongoing relationship with the other negotiators.

They may let information slip due to mental lapse or anger, which can have damaging effects on their attempts to negotiate.

References

Lewicki, R., Barry, B., & Saunders, D. (2010). *Negotiation*. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Wiese, K. (2008, April 11). Missouri circuit court rules for union in pay fight. *Daily Record, The* (Kansas City, MO). Retrieved January 14, 2010, from Regional Business News.