EXERCISES AND CASE STUDY

In this chapter, we have learnt about the basic concepts of distributive negotiation and integrative negotiation and the differences between these two approaches. We have introduced some strategies, such as game theory and some tactics, such as coercion into our discussion about negotiation. In order to get a better understanding, today we will review the previous parts together.

First, we go through the key words together.

Key Words

1. strategy and tactics 策略与战术
2. game theory 博弈论
3. negotiation approaches 谈判方式
4. distributive and integrative approaches 利益分配型谈判和合作型谈判
5. fixed pie 有限的资源，固定的收益
6. win – lose 你多我少，你赢我输，竞争性关系
7. zero-sum game 零和博弈
8. coercion 施加压力
9. strong opening 强势的开局
10. salami 蚕食战术，渐进式战术
11. ZOPA (zone of possible agreement)的缩写，可达成协议的空间
12. reservation point 保留价格
13. bottom line 底线
14. concession 让步
15. dilemma困境，进退两难的境地
16. retribution报应，惩罚，报答
17. fare结局，结果
18. uncertainty不确定性
19. incentive动机
20. optimum最佳的，最有利的
21. sub-optimal次优的
22. tit-for-tat strategy针锋相对，一报还一报
23. dominant占优势的
24. reciprocated回报

True or False Questions

Please read the following sentences and tell whether they are true or false.

1. Negotiators who adopt integrative approaches aim to build a good relation with their counterparts and pay less attention to the results of a particular negotiation. T

采用合作方式谈判的目标是与对手建立良好的关系，而较少关注特定谈判的结果。

1. A strategy is “a careful plan or method, especially for achieving an end.” T

战略是“一个精细规划的计划或方法，特别是为了达到某个目的。”

1. Tactics refers to “the skill of using available means” to reach that end. T

战术指的是为了达成某一目的“运用所能使用的所有手段的技巧”。

1. Integrative negotiation approaches means that negotiation parties make concessions mutually to reach an agreement. F

合作型谈判方式是指谈判各方互相让步，达成协议。这句话不对，无论哪种谈判方式都会有让步，合作型谈判方式的特征是寻求双方互利共赢的解决方案。

1. The method of Coercion tactic takes advantage of the other party, by giving a very small concession to the other side when it can no longer be avoided in order to placate /pləˈkeɪt/ the other side for a little while longer. F

胁迫策略的方法是在无法避免的情况下，对对方做出非常小的让步，以便在一段较长时间内安抚对方，从而达到侵蚀对方利益的目的。这里指的策略应该是salami strategy，即，蚕食策略。

1. ZOPA means Zone of Agreement or Zone of Possible Agreement, e.g. the overlap between the maximum purchase price that the buyer is willing to pay and the minimum sell price that the seller is willing to accept. T

ZOPA是指达成协议的区域或达成协议的可能区域，例如，买方愿意支付的最高购买价格与卖方愿意接受的最低出售价格之间的重叠。

Translation

Please translate the following sentences into Chinese.

1. The totality of available benefits is often represented metaphorically as a ‘pie’. Because negotiators battle over a fixed amount of some good or benefit, negotiators hope to ‘win’ a portion or ‘slice’ of the pie at the expense of a corresponding loss (of pie) by the other.

可获得利益的总和通常被人们比喻成一个“馅饼”。因为谈判者会为某固定数量的好处或利益而争斗，所以谈判者希望以对方相应的损失为代价“赢得”或“分得”一块馅饼。

1. Integrative negotiation approaches seek to use negotiations as a way to enlarge the pie, or in other words, to multiply gains in order to make both parties better off.

合作性谈判方式试图利用谈判来做大馅饼，换句话说，就是为了使双方都能有成倍增加的收益。

1. In any negotiation, each side has a reservation point, sometimes referred to as a ‘bottom line’. It is a point beyond which a person will not go and instead breaks off negotiations. The reservation points of negotiating parties help to frame the likelihood and possible scope of an agreement.

在任何谈判中，双方都有一个“预留点”，有时也被称为“底线”。超过这个限度，一个人就不会继续而是中断谈判。谈判各方的保留点有助于确定一项协议的可能性和可能的范围。

1. Integrative approaches use objective criteria, look to create conditions of mutual gain, and emphasize the importance of exchanging information between parties and group problem-solving.

合作性谈判使用客观标准，寻求创造互利的条件，并强调各方之间交换信息和群体解决问题的重要性。

Case Study

Please read the following two cases about negotiation strategies and answer the related questions.

Case One:

In one negotiation in the early 1980s, a Chinese manufacturer was locked in a dispute with an American importer over how many models of the bicycle his company would produce. The American importer wanted four different models to give its customers greater selection. The Chinese company wanted to produce only two models, to keep tooling, inventory, and other manufacturing costs down. The position of the Chinese company was that it would produce only two models, while the underlying interest was to keep manufacturing costs down. The position of the American importer was that it wanted four models, while its underlying interest was to increase its profits by selling more bicycles. As long as the negotiators focused on these position, the dispute could be resolved only through concessions by one or both sides. But an interest-oriented examination of the dispute leads to the question: how can the higher cost of manufacturing four models be allocated between the American importer and the Chinese manufacturer? In this example, the parties were able to devise a formula that increased the unit cost of the different models to reflect the Chinese manufacturer’s increased manufacturing cost. The interests of the Chinese manufacturer were achieved by the solution –profit per unit remained constant. The interests of the American importer were also met –it sold more units at higher prices, which more than offset the increased manufacturing costs.

Questions:

1. What type of negotiation approach was applied to the negotiation?

In this case, the two parties definitely used integrative negotiation approach to reach an agreement. They focused on underlying interests rather than positions. They collaborated on bring more benefits to both parties, that is, increasing sales for the importer and cutting costs for the exporter. They realized a win-win solution.

1. Can you analyze the process of solving the conflict between the Chinese manufacturer and the American importer?

At first, when the Chinese manufacturer and the American importer focus on their positions (4 models of bicycles vs. 2 models of bicycles), they came to a deadlock. Then they realized the underlying interest behind their positions (the American importer wants to provide the customers more choices and increase the sales; the Chinese exporter wants to keep their production costs down). At last, they realized their underlying interests——the exporter produces four models of bicycles whereas the importer is allocated a part of the production costs.

Case Two:

You are an incredibly busy person whose demanding jobs keep you from spending as much time as you’d like with your families. You often get home late, travel on business a lot and regularly work weekends. You are determined to make it up to your seven-year-old son by buying him the toy he’s been talking about for months –a limited-edition action figure of his favourite comic-book superhero for his birthday.

But, unfortunately, by the time you finally get a free afternoon to go shopping, it’s on the very day and you discover that all the toy stores have completely sold out! In desperation, you drive 50 kilometers out of town to the biggest toy store and arrive just minutes before it closes. Pushing through the crowds of shoppers, you see that there is just one left on the shelves! A sticker on it says “LAST ONE IN STOCK!” But, as you reach for it, somebody else appears beside you and grabs the box at the same time …

At that moment, you realized that you knew that person! And you have known each other since school. You used to meet up regularly and your kids got on really well. But he was transferred abroad three years ago and somehow you gradually lost touch with each other. You’ve missed them quite a bit and can’t believe they’re back in town!

Questions:

1. How many choices can you have in such situation?
2. What would be the outcome of each of the choices?

Choice 1: This is an example of a single-issue negotiation and, in this case, the single issue was the toy. You really want to get what you wanted. This made it what’s known as a zero-sum game, one in which only one side can win –either you got the toy or your opponent did. You had no choice but to go head to head with them, to fight it out, and you probably reached a deadlock where you simply couldn’t agree.

Choice 2: you had a relationship you wanted to renew and maintain. This was no longer just a one-off deal with a total stranger, so the idea that one of you must lose was no longer an option. You two can collaborate to come up with a creative solution to your dilemma. Working together more collaboratively brought you closer to a compromise.