**7.1 -Interests at the Negotiation Table**

The Art of Dialogue in Negotiations

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| No course in conflict management is complete without a discussion of communication. This week you look at communication, listening, empathy, and having crucial conversations. How many of you have reflected on prior negotiations and wish you had said something different? Probably most all of us have not negotiated as effectively as we could have because we didn’t listen to the other person, didn’t recognize nonverbal cues, or were either too timid or too aggressive with our communication.  Although these challenges make a manager’s job more difficult, there are strategies to overcome them. Two approaches are direct and indirect communication techniques. Indirect methods are effective when people begin the negotiation by stating their positions or when trust levels are low. Indirect techniques include paraphrasing and summarizing each person’s statement of the problem. When the manager gives the information to the speaker, perceptions of the message are clarified, and the speaker knows the intended message was received.  Conversely, direct methods are suitable when the conflicted parties are open to exploring options. When using direct methods, the manager may acknowledge that finding a resolution that meets everyone’s needs is challenging. However, even when people have conflicting interests, they also share compatible ones. Brainstorming, where a list of ideas is generated quickly and without regard to feasibility, can clarify perceptions and uncover their similar interests. Problems can be solved, relationships can be saved, and everyone feels valued and respected.  Also, notice that Kritek (2002) uses a lot of storytelling to get her point across. She also uses story telling for another important reason. Can you figure out what that reason is?  **Objectives**  By the end of this week you should be able to:   * Explain how communication leads to effective negotiated outcomes * Describe how clarifying perceptions reduces negative conflicts * Explain how negotiating inclusively reduces power imbalances  **Communication – The Heart of Effective Negotiation** Communication is at the heart of all conflict management strategies.  Communication is used to persuade, to solve problems, and to reach decisions. Without good communication skills, we not only fail to accomplish these outcomes, but we may actually exacerbate the conflict. Since the goal of negotiation is to arrive at an outcome that is acceptable to all parties, learning to articulate what we need and listening to the other party’s needs will help us generate options for mutual gain. The good news is that if you would like to improve your communication skills, you can! Three skills Bolton (1979) says will help us change how we dialogue with others and improve our negotiation skills are listening, assertion, and collaborative problem-solving skills.  **Listening** “Listening in dialogue is listening more to meanings than to words. In true listening, we reach behind the words, see through them, to find the person who is being revealed. Listening is a search to find the treasure of the true person as revealed verbally and nonverbally. There is the semantic problem, of course. The words bear a different connotation for you than they do for me. Consequently, I can never tell you what you said, but only what I heard. I will have to rephrase what you have said, and check it out with you to make sure that what left your mind and heart arrived in my mind and heart intact and without distortion.”  ---John Powell, theologian  Listening is more than hearing. However, if you are not a good listener, do not beat yourself up too badly. We are not taught to listen in school. We may be told by our teachers to listen, but with all the talking going on, we learn very quickly to tune out. With practice, we become experts at inattentiveness.  How do you become a good listener? Practice, practice, practice. As people talk, practice leaning in toward the speaker, facing the person, keeping an open posture, and making eye contact. It will also help to engage in constructive dialogue in an environment that is not distracting. In negotiations, you may also use a process called minimal encouragers. As the other party is stating (or demanding) an interest or position, say something like “tell me more about why this is important to you” or “I am not sure I fully understand.” Invite people to talk to you, and if you are a good listener, you will learn a lot.   **Assertion** Just like you can practice listening, you can also practice assertion skills. Many times people confuse assertion with aggression, but they are different. An aggressive person “expresses feelings, needs, and ideas at the expense of others” (Bolton, 1979). That person may be loud, abusive, rude, and sarcastic. This is the person who belittles store clerks and the wait staff at restaurants. Aggressive people use power over, rather than power with, to win, and the prevailing attitude is there is a winner and loser. Since I am the winner, you must be the loser.  However, assertive people reduce people’s fear, make them feel comfortable, and understand that needs can be gained without hurting others or instilling fear in them. Assertion is expressing your rights, without trampling on the rights of anyone else. It involves expressing your feelings, your opinion, and your beliefs.  There is sometimes a need to be assertive without coming off as arrogant, aggressive, and offensive; or ignoring your self-interests and being perceived as timid, submissive, and a doormat. The art of this balance is being confident enough to be assertive of personal rights and boundaries while respectful of others.  Here are some tips for being assertive without being rude:   1. Know the distinction between being assertive versus being aggressive or arrogant. Assertive people promote their rights rather than stepping on those of others. 2. Have clear boundaries when dealing with others. If you are clear where the limits are, then others will know as well. 3. Politely but directly let people know your position. Do not allow your position, point of view, or feelings to be ignored or discounted; your needs are important too. 4. Affirm yourself and your good qualities. Develop self-confidence and positive self-esteem. Who better is there to love you than yourself? 5. Know what you want. There is a time and place to go along with others, but there is also a time to reach for your own dreams. 6. Avoid being timid. While aggressiveness steps on the rights of others, being timid sacrifices your own rights. Do not allow others to roll over you. 7. Be willing to clearly say either yes or no and stand by your answer. Allow yourself to develop opinions and maintain them. Avoid arrogance. Dominance and controlling tendencies impinge on others from being themselves. 8. When opinions are in question, give yourself permission to disclose yours. Let others know your viewpoint and recognize that it is as significant and anyone else’s. 9. Take responsibility for yourself. Do not make excuses and require that others around you also take responsibility for themselves and their actions. Avoid being codependent and be careful not to dominate others with quieter spirits.    **Collaborative Problem-Solving** We negotiate because we are in conflict, do not agree on something, or we need to solve a problem. While there are alternatives to collaborative problem-solving, including denial, avoidance, capitulation, and domination, it is unlikely that these strategies will be effective. There many problem-solving models, and they all have the same basic steps:   * Define the problem * Brainstorm possible solutions * Select the optimal solution * Plan who will do what, when, and where * Implement the plan * Evaluate the process and the solution   Remember to state the problem in terms of needs, not wants. Brainstorm for quantity, not quality. You can evaluate and the quality of the possible solutions and clarify their meaning after the brainstorming is over and the selection process begins. A solution is no better than its implementation, so determine how this will happen. At the end of the session, get a reality check of how the process went. Then, where necessary or if practical, check with the parties to see how the solutions are working (Bolton, 1979).   **Conclusion** In the introduction, it was noted that Kritek (2002) uses a lot of storytelling to get her point across, and that she also uses story telling for another important reason. Did you guess that reason? Storytelling makes us real to the other party. Stories help build trust and appeal to the emotional side of the other party. As a result, they create additional value for the listener.  Next week, you look at traditional approaches to negotiating at an uneven table, including manipulation and maneuvering, and wrap-up with new approaches.   Resources:  Bolton, R. (1979) People Skills:  How to Assert Yourself, Listen to others, and Resolve Conflicts. New York: Simon & Schuster. |

From Article at Sullivan University Library on the EbscoHost Database: Glenn, P., & Susskind, L. (2010). [How Talk Works: Studying Negotiation Interaction](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=i3h&AN=64254577&site=ehost-live&user=s8864281&password=password). Negotiation Journal, 26(2), 117-123.

From Article at Sullivan University Library on the EbscoHost Database: Shakun, M. F. (2009). [Connectedness Problem Solving and Negotiation](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=36227751&site=ehost-live&user=s8864281&password=password). Group Decision & Negotiation, 18(2), 89-117.

Week 8

Traditional Approaches to an Uneven Table

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Negotiation is all about problem-solving. While there are many formal problem-solving models available, negotiation has two essential elements—identifying the problem and selecting the best, implementable solution. Pay close attention to the foundation, identifying the problem. It is highly unlikely that the outcome of a negotiation will be successful if the problem is not clearly defined. It is so easy to skip this step and go straight to the creative process of figuring out what to do. However, if you think about it, how can we choose a solution to an unidentified problem?  Now that you are convinced that the problem must first be identified, you are probably thinking that sounds pretty simple. Many people think they already know the problem, and they assume the other person agrees with their assessment. At this point, you are encouraged to refer back to the lectures in Weeks 1 and 7 (communication skills, dialogue, listening, and collaborative problem-solving). What is the current situation? What is the desired situation? What is the gap? These questions will help you define the problem, so you can begin to create solutions for mutual benefit.  But, wait! How do you deal with the inevitable manipulation that may stand between identifying the problem and resolving it? These manipulation strategies become so comfortable to some people they are like a mask they wear. Soon, it conforms to them so well that it becomes difficult to differentiate between the mask and the “real” thing. What masks do you habitually wear? What masks have you seen your negotiation partners wear? Being aware of these masks of manipulation will help you identify them and address them.  **Objectives**  By the end of this week you should be able to:   * Identify problems that require negotiations * Recognize masks of manipulation * Explain the role of divisiveness in negotiations   **Why is the Table Uneven?**  Most negotiations we engage in are relationship based. We negotiate jobs, salaries, work schedules, workloads, and outcomes to a myriad of other problems where the relationship is ongoing. As a result, it is helpful to begin with an exploration of shared meanings, perceptions, experiences, and responses, which will create a solid base for building and sustaining workable solutions.  In contrast, if the parties feel disrespected, or when they believe their voices carry little weight, they tend to believe there will be an inequitable distribution of funds, assets, or possessions, the negotiation table will appear to be uneven to them. When that happens, the negotiation becomes rights-based, and the parties fight for a fair distribution of scarce resources. A break in communication occurs; battle lines are drawn. Their reality is based on a zero-sum mentality—“For us to win, you must lose.” The schism widens, and a fair and equitable negotiated outcome becomes more difficult to attain.  This is particularly apparent in labor/management negotiations. If measures are not taken at this point to resolve the issues, distrust, fear, and paranoia, fueled by discontent and apprehension escalate the disagreement to the next levels—antagonism and hostility. Leaders of the conflicting parties use those emotional concepts as propaganda to widen the schism. In turn, when one party feels threatened by the other, solidarity of the groups is strengthened, and the table becomes even more uneven.    **Wearing Masks and Scripts**  The world is the stage, and as functioning members of society, everyone has scripts. Some are public, while others are hidden. The public ones represent the masks worn by the actors for everyone to see—the scripts society writes—and they do not tell the whole story. In fact, many are characterized by social constructs of politeness or sanitization. For example, public scripts are the propitious, good-hearted faces actors put on to avoid offending anyone or exposing themselves to vulnerability. In negotiations, we wear a mask or cite a script to keep from showing our hand.  However, public scripts often conceal true thoughts and feelings, and while they may manifest themselves in obedience or compliance, hidden scripts often simmer under the surface for years. As such, the actor does not speak the hidden scripts or openly rebel for fear of reprisal. Therefore, while many may appear subservient, that is simply a social survival skill. Speaking their public scripts would upset the status quo and throw life into a chaotic tailspin.  In effect, it is not unlike the final act of a play whereby the audience is shocked by the ending because the preceding acts led them to believe the finale would be different. This ruse is a result of hidden scripts and well-worn masks. Although many people operate on the assumption that open, honest communication is valued, and therefore prevalent, in today’s world, hidden scripts and masks block the real message. Hidden scripts are the offstage dialogue that takes place either between members of cohesive groups or internally. While many people operate on the assumption that open, honest communication is valued, and therefore prevalent, in today’s world, hidden scripts block that venue because they represent the inner thoughts, not the outer appearances.    **Be Aware; Be Very Aware**  If you are in a negotiation, and the other person seems extremely agreeable, be aware of the masks and scripts. As the agreeable, less vocal person appears to yield to the position of the more dominant, vocal one, the result may be a false sense of security about the outcome. In fact, the greater the power disparity, the more the public script takes center stage, and the hidden ones take a back seat. The longer the quiet party remains quiet and compliant, the dominant person becomes more arrogant and self-assured.  In a sense, the supporting actor wears a mask of conformity, while the star’s mask is arrogance, which appears as “a flattering self-portrait”(Scott). If either wears the masks too long, they will “eventually find the mask has grown to fit their face”(Scott). At that point, the subordinate group is in danger not having their needs negotiated. However, when the supporting actor removes the mask and defies the star, shock, horror, and disbelief abound.    **Conclusion**  Although some hidden scripts are necessary to survive socially (politeness, manners, discretion), they often act as the marquis or playbill that promotes more conflict than they alleviate. Real power comes from honest, open communicative exchange. On the stage of life, the actors, the aggressive negotiator and the more compliant one, the stars and the supporting actors, would benefit from an unscripted dialogue. Imagine how interesting, creative, and rewarding negotiated outcomes would be, if the dance acknowledged and promoted the win/win solutions that meet the needs of all parties. The paradigm shift requires a collective thought process that puts the ego backstage and the promotion of interconnectedness front and center. Are we up to the challenge?   * Resources:  Scott, J. (2001) *Power*. New York: Wiley.   Week 9  Shifting to Constructive Ways of Being at an Uneven Table   |  | | --- | | This week is all about change. You can learn about negotiation strategies that make you a more skilled negotiator, but if you cannot recognize a need to change the way you negotiate, the information simply becomes (hopefully) interesting words on a page. Kritek (2005) talks about making a paradigm shift as you change your behaviors and become a more confident negotiator who works toward win-win outcomes. Simply put, this means contemplating the current way of doing things and considering what is done well and what needs to be changed. It requires open, honest, self-reflection. The next step is creating a plan for that change. Finally, you will practice implementing the changes you feel are necessary.  Change can be painful. All change, no matter how innocent or beneficial it may seem on its face, costs something. In this case, the costs are giving up old ways of doing things. Resisting change seems to be a universal phenomenon, and it is done even when the change benefits the self-interests of those resisting. Successful change requires thoughtful evolution. Don’t expect overnight, miraculous transformation. Be patient with yourself and reward your small victories. The overarching lesson about change is that if you want it, you can do it. Embracing that thought is the first step on your path to building on your strengths and overcoming your weaknesses as you become a skilled negotiator.  **Objectives**  By the end of this week you should be able to:   * Reflect upon your negotiation strengths and weaknesses * Discuss your personal paradigm shift * Create an action plan for capitalizing on your strengths and overcoming your weaknesses * Learn from skilled facilitators * Analyze the concepts of becoming a skilled negotiator | |

**Why Should We Change**

While it is difficult to embrace change and to transform our way of doing things, it may be the only opportunity for survival. How can we move past fears and insecurities and make the transformation that will keep the ship from sinking? In his book Building the Bridge as You Walk on It, Robert Quinn (2004) provides some insights into creating changes that transform us from the ordinary to the extraordinary.

First, it is acceptable, even smart, to acknowledge that change can be scary. Emotions of fear, hope, and anxiety are not uncommon and recognizing and acknowledging these emotions is the first step to conquering negative self-fulfilling circumstances. For example, when we change our personal behaviors, and we secretly fear the change will damage us, and we may build exit strategies that will minimize the damage.

Second, change is often driven by a vision of the end result—what we want to accomplish. Unfortunately, this vision does not come with a navigation system, so we must build the bridge as we walk on it or, as Quinn (2004) puts it “walk naked into the land of insecurity.” Luckily, we do not have to walk that path alone. If our motives are pure, if we can set aside our ego for the good of the end result, if we are strive to develop our skills, if we continuously seek honest feedback, and if we reflectively move through the transformation process, we can develop a positive approach to change.

**How Can We Change**

The human aspect of change can be challenging and can make the difference between success and failure. For successful and efficient change, we must (adapted from a paper presented by Tony Belak, 2009):

* Establish a need to change. If your negotiation skills or your negotiated outcomes are not getting the results you desire, consider what you can do differently.
* Create a clear and compelling vision that reflects improvement. What is your vision of yourself as a skilled negotiator? Without an appropriate vision, any transformation effort can easily dissolve into a list of confusing, incompatible, and time-consuming projects that go in the wrong direction or nowhere at all.
* Look for true performance results and create early victories. Successful change efforts begin with results that are clear, tangible, and bottom-line and the earlier these occur the better. A major problem with many change initiatives is they lack clarity and off-target goals. Make your action plan clear and specific.
* Practice, practice, practice. Recognize that you will occasionally slip back into old habits, especially in times of stress. You are not defined by your mistakes; you are defined by how you deal with these mistakes. What lessons did you learn?

**Conclusion**

Change means to become different or to be in an altered state, but if you do not create a new vision, you will be stifled by inertia and nothing will be different. If you recognize the importance of changing, take an active, deliberate approach that includes mobilizing reflecting, visioning, changing, and aligning the strategies you have learned with the behaviors you want to exhibit, successful changes will occur, and you will become the skilled negotiator you wish to be.

Resources: Quinn, R.E. (2004) *Building the bridge as you walk on it*. New York: Jossey-Bass.

Week 10

Constructive Ways of Being at an Uneven Table

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Last week you learned about embracing the paradox of change. Knowing our current negotiation style is not getting our interests met, yet holding on to those behaviors as if our life depends upon it. You reflected on how you might learn to change, and you learned about the attitudes, talents, and attitudes skilled negotiators embrace. Our best interests depend on learning more constructive ways of being, especially when there appears to be a power differential in the process.  And this week, you shall do just that. You are going to be placed in the position of having to decide more closely who you are as a negotiator. You have an opportunity to agree and disagree with your fellow classmates. It will be a true test of your all the skills you have learned in this class. You will also practice negotiating a salary package. This is something most all of us will do at some point in our lives, so the final negotiation scenario is designed to be a practical experience.  The “ways of being” (Kritek, 2002), or guidelines to personal negotiation behaviors, help us learn to be true to ourselves and commit to personal authenticity, to tell our truth and to listen to and support other truth-tellers, to courageously honor integrity even when that is a lonely act, and know when to draw that line in the sand and walk away from the table. Let go of the fears and boundaries that keep us frozen in past actions, and create innovative opportunities by questioning, becoming curious, having fun, and educating ourselves about the process in general and the specific negotiation in particular. Be able to admit your illusions and recognize the interdependence the negotiators share.  And of course, no lesson would be complete without mentioning communication. Create a dialogue; listen to understand; and then, you open the door to create endless opportunities. And finally, when the other person refuses to budge, or when you will be worse off than if you walk away, leave the negotiation table with your dignity in place.  **Objectives**  By the end of this week you should be able to:   * Discuss specific steps for changing your negotiation style * Negotiate most “valuable” ways of being for negotiators * Prepare for final negotiation scenario * Negotiate the final negotiation scenario * Create “training sessions” for essential concepts of negotiation |

* From Negotiating at an Uneven Table text: Chapters 17-27
* From Article: [Negotiating a Salary Package](http://www.state.gov/m/dghr/flo/c21638.htm)
* From Article: [Avoiding These Ten Salary Negotiation Mistakes](http://www.quintcareers.com/salary_negotiation_mistakes.html)
* Watch YouTube video: [2011 Salaries – Salary Tips - Salary Negotiation Ideas](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IPLjN9AKCCI)(Length: 6min 17sec)

Watch YouTube video: [How to Negotiate Your Best Salary Yet](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gORmMpYcuvA)(Length: 10min 52sec)

**Getting To Yes**

Throughout the course, materials from the Harvard Project on Negotiation have been presented. This project started with research by Roger Fisher and William Ury, and the concepts and theories they presented in 1991 are as effective today as they were then. They offer a balanced approach to negotiation that is neither too hard nor too soft, and their method has been a game changer for skilled negotiators. This principled approach to negotiation includes the following concepts:

* Separate the problem from the people
* Focus on the interests, not the positions
* Invent options for mutual gain
* Insist on objective criteria

The first point considers people, not robots, are negotiating. Humans are emotional beings who often have different perceptions of the situation and different ways of communicating. Moreover, you cannot change people, but you can resolve a problem, so why expend a lot of energy on what you cannot change. Focusing on positions aggravates the problem, positions can obscure what you really need, the underlying interests. Yet, some people become so stuck on positions, they give up what they really need. As a result, the negotiated outcome is not satisfying to either party. In an effort to prevent this, it is important to create many options. Getting stuck on one “right” solution can result in a lose-lose outcome. Finally, using objective criteria, such as an expert opinion or market value, moves the negotiation in the direction of a win-win resolution.

**Separate the Problem from the People**

A closer look at Fisher and Ury’s (1991) method indicates that negotiators are people first. It is often easy to dehumanize the “other party,” but remember both parties have deeply held values, emotions, perspectives, and experiences they bring to the table. The human aspect has benefits and challenges. When negotiators have a relationship built on trust and respect, negotiators become more efficient as concerns for the other person, as well as concerns for what others will think about them, make each party sensitive to the other person.

Conversely, when egos and emotions become entangled, and our focus moves from the problem to the person, perceptions become confused with reality. “Misunderstandings can reinforce prejudice and lead to reactions that produce counteractions in a vicious cycle” (Fisher and Ury, 1991). At that point, the goal is scoring points, placing blame, and confirming negative perceptions, and neither party has their interests met.

**Interests**

There are two kinds of interest, relationship and substance. Negotiators need their interests met, and they also have an interest in the relationship. Examples of substance could be maintaining integrity of your work, having your coat replaced, inheriting an item that has sentimental value, or earning a respectable salary. Moreover, most negotiations take place in the context of a relationship, such as a colleague, customer, family, or employer.

**Tips on How to Separate the People from the Problem**

Although the substantive and relationship interest seem like conflicting issues, they are not counterintuitive. Deal with both by:

* Clarifying perceptions
* Acknowledging emotions
* Communicating respectfully

Understanding others’ points of view does not mean agreeing with them. Deal with fear, anger, and other emotions so they do not cloud the issues. Look at the world through the other person’s lens, and never make assumptions about what the other person thinks or means. Open, honest, respectful communication is a key to win-win outcomes.

**Focus on Interests, Not Positions**

Fisher and Ury (2001) illustrate the difference in positions and interests with the story of two people who are arguing about opening the window. Once wants it open; the other wants it closed. They quarrel about whether to leave it open a crack, halfway, or all the way. These options are not acceptable to either person. Finally, someone asks “Why do you want it open?” One person says “To get fresh air,” and the other says “To avoid a draft.” The solution—open the window in the next room. This brings in fresh air and avoids a draft.

It would have been impossible to arrive at a solution if the focus was on the positions of wanting the window either open or closed. The interests define the problem, so look for the point at which they intersect. The best way to identify interests is to ask “why” something is important or “why not”…….why have you not considered a particular interest.

Also, remember that each party has multiple interests. Both may not get ALL their interests met, but they can get the ones met that are most important to each of them. The most powerful interests are related to basic human needs, such as security, economic well-being, a sense of belonging, recognition, and control over one’s own life (Fisher and Ury, 1991). As fundamental as these are, they tend to get overlooked in favor of the position. For example, defining the problem as the singular issue of salary is limiting. Underlying interests may be economic well-being, a need to feel psychologically secure, or recognition for skills and abilities. When these needs are met, the amount of money becomes less important.

**Create Options for Mutual Gain**

One common problem in negotiation is “leaving money on the table,” which results in a less than optimal agreement for both parties. To illustrate this, think about two sisters arguing over an orange. They finally decide to cut it in half and each takes one half. The first sister eats the fruit and throws the peel away; the second one tosses the fruit and uses the peel in a cake she is baking. If both had shared their interests, they each would have received the whole of what they needed (all the fruit and all the peel).

In negotiation there are four basic obstacles that keep the parties from creating option for mutual gain—premature judgment, searching for a single answer, thinking that solving their problem is their problem, and assuming the pie is fixed. Don’t assume you know what the other person needs. Be creative as you consider all possibilities for solving the problem. Let go of an either/or attitude. Often, it is possible for all parties to have their needs met (remember the orange?). Brainstorm without criticizing the suggestions, and look for possible solutions that meet shared needs.

**Insist on Using Objective Criteria**

Here is a stark reality. No matter how much conflict resolution specialists want to believe that all interests can be met, sometimes that is impossible. You want to pay $20,000 for the car; the seller needs $25,000. You want the sofa delivered on Monday; the store only delivers in your area on Thursday; you want the office with the window; your colleague also wants this.

In the first case, the objective criteria would be market value, book value, or competitive pricing. With other issues, it may not be so easy to identify objective criteria. In these cases, it will help to frame each issue as a joint search for objective criteria. Have an open mind and ask questions like “what is fair?” or “why is this important to you?”

Also, do not yield to pressure. Pressure can take the form of manipulation (Don’t you trust me?), bribes, threats, or simply refusing to budge. If the other party rigidly stands on position, and there is not a principled reason for accepting their offer, consider what you would gain by accepting their unjustified offer, rather than your best alternative. Sometimes, it is better to walk away.

**Conclusion**

Every negotiation is different, but the principles suggested by Fisher and Ury (1991) provide a solid strategic approach to every situation. The basic elements of negotiation do not change. The principled negotiation approach works with one issue or several; it can be useful with skilled and novice negotiators. And, if the other side learns the strategies, it makes the process easier, not more difficult. This is an example of a win/win for everyone.   
  
Resources:

Fisher, R. and Ury, W. (1991). *Getting to Yes*. New York, NY: Penguin Books