Step 7. Assess the Negotiation Styles and Practices of the Participants

“To jaw-jaw is better than to war-war.”
—Winston Churchill

In this chapter, you will learn...

- Why Deutsch’s theory of cooperation and competition doesn’t tell the whole story about behavior in a conflict.
- How it’s possible to cooperate without being taken advantage of.
- The five negotiation styles.
- The best negotiation styles to use for preserving cooperation.
- The best negotiation styles to use for self-protection.
- The negotiation skills of the best negotiators.
- Some ways of assessing your own preferred negotiation style and those of your clients, associates, team, and other disputant team.
- Tactics that can be used to develop win-win solutions to conflict.

Most interpersonal conflicts are resolved through a process of discussion among the disputants. This includes more than nine out of every ten legal disputes that are filed in court in the United States. Even if a conflict must be resolved in court, or (as in international conflicts) through military intervention, the conflict almost always passes through a period of verbal or written discussion on the way. And virtually all cooperative conflicts are resolved through discussion. A
Negotiation
a dialogue, discussion, or written exchange aimed at resolving a dispute or consummating a transaction.

Negotiation styles and practices determine how each conflict participant will respond to the others. Thus, knowing the nature of prior negotiation behaviors, and of the likely course of future negotiation behavior, lends insight into how the conflict itself is likely to proceed, whether it will escalate or be resolved, how it will be resolved, and whether the resolution is likely to be permanent or fall apart later.

NEGOTIATION THEORY AND DEUTSCH’S MODEL

One way to look at the negotiation behavior of disputants and their agents and advocates is to characterize the behavior as cooperative or competitive—according to Deutsch’s model of conflict. Indeed, for many years, this was the predominant approach to characterizing negotiation.

This approach has some advantages. First, seeing negotiation behavior as either cooperative or competitive seems intuitively correct. Many studies have shown that people observing negotiating behavior tend to see the behavior as either cooperative or competitive (Coltri 1995; van de Vliert & Prein 1989). Additionally, understanding negotiation behavior as either cooperative or competitive can shed light on whether the overall course of conflict is likely to be constructive or destructive, as discussed in detail in Chapter 9.

On the other hand, there are a number of important limitations to applying Deutsch’s theory. First, Deutsch intended the cooperation-competition model to refer to the overall course of conflict, rather than to the behaviors of individual disputants and their representatives. In fact, although the model is an accurate representation of the perception of observers of conflict behavior, it does not accurately describe the self-perceptions of people in conflict. For example, although observers of conflict will often interpret assertive behavior as showing intent to do harm to the other side, self-attribution of the same behavior is likely to be much more complex: disputants explaining their own assertive behavior will attribute motive to a mixture of self-protection, necessary response to an action of the other disputant, and appropriate levels of concern for the other disputant’s welfare (van de Vliert & Prein 1989).

Second, the Deutsch model doesn’t deal with the situation in which each team comes to the bargaining table using different strategies. Cooperation and competition, due to their cyclical nature, refer to the conflict, rather than to any individual disputant. Individual participants often enter a conflict with divergent strategies, and it is the interactions between these approaches that nudge the conflict into either a cooperative or a competitive course.

A third, and critical, limitation of the Deutsch model is the implication that there can be only one form of cooperation. In fact, there are very important differences among cooperative negotiation strategies. One form of cooperation might be deemed the “pushover” strategy: one can bow to the wishes of the other disputant, letting him or her have his or her way. But there is another option, albeit one that people are somewhat less familiar with: one can cooperate and still
protect one’s interests. This latter form of cooperation requires the disputant to treat the conflict as a joint problem to be solved: how to address one’s own interests while meeting the needs and interests of the other disputant.

THE DUAL-CONCERN MODEL

To address the limitations of Deutsch’s model, social and organizational psychologists working in the mid-twentieth century (see Blake & Mouton 1964, 1970) developed a “dual-concern model of negotiation behavior.”

To understand this model of negotiation, it is useful to define two dimensions of concern for disputants. The first dimension is concern for the satisfaction of one’s own interests. Conflict theorists refer to this dimension as “assertiveness,” “concern for self,” or “agency.” The other dimension is concern for the satisfaction of the interests of the other disputant. This dimension is referred to as “cooperativeness,” “concern for other,” “concern for relationships,” or “communion.”

A pervasive belief about the nature of conflict is that these two dimensions are polar opposites, as shown in Figure 12.1. Thus, if disputants are concerned about their own well-being, they will be willing to harm the other disputant; if disputants are concerned about the well-being of the other disputant, they will be willing to let the other walk all over them. Thus, in this model of the negotiation process, one can either act in one’s self-interest, tough and nasty, or be cooperative, and risk losing all one has. An adaptation of an Old West expression fits this concept about negotiation: “There’s not enough room in this conflict for the two of us. It’s either you or me.” This either-or proposition reflects the invisible veil, in which self-protective behavior in a conflict must always be competitive, or adversarial.

The leap made by scholars beginning with Blake and Mouton was the realization that these two dimensions do not represent opposites but, instead, independent dimensions of behavior. And disputants’ behaviors can simultaneously reflect varying levels of both concerns. Thus, disputants can evidence high levels of concern for both self and other, or low levels of concern for both self and other, as well as a high level of one concern and low level of the other.

Developing practical meaning from this insight, the dual-concern theorists proposed five basic negotiation styles (also sometimes referred to as “conflict styles”):

1. The avoiding style, which represents a low level of concern for both self and other;
2. The dominating (or competing) style, which represents a high level of concern for self and a low level of concern for other

---

1 The work of social psychologists in the field were presaged by political scientist Mary Parker Follett in the 1920s, who wrote about “constructive conflicts” and the need for integrative approaches (Menkel-Meadow 2000, 7–10).

2 For this discussion, we will assume two disputants negotiating without agents or advocates. Note that the situation is made more complex if there are more than two disputants or if the negotiation involves representatives. A careful conflict diagnostician will consider the complexities.
3. The obliging (or accommodating) style, which represents a low level of concern for self and a high level of concern for other.

4. The integrating (or collaborating or problem-solving) style, which represents a high level of concern for both self and other.

5. The compromising style, which represents a moderate level of concern for self and other.

The Dual-Concern model is summarized in Table 12-1 and diagrammed in Figure 12-2. The dual-concern model is easier to understand when discussed using a concrete example. See the box feature (p. 220) ‘‘The Parable of the Two Sisters and the Orange.’’ The parable contains several truths about interpersonal conflict. First, the avoiding style generally results in the least efficient outcome for all involved, in terms of whether the outcome meets the needs of the disputant. (This negative result may be partially offset, in the real world of legal disputing, by a reduction in the costs of disputing.) Efficient means, in this discussion, that the outcome takes best advantage of differing values placed on the resources of the disputants. If Enid highly values the juice and does not value the rind, whereas the opposite is true of Esther, the most efficient outcome is to allocate the juice to Enid and the rind to Esther. Economists refer to this form of efficiency as Pareto-efficiency.

Second, the most Pareto-efficient style, in terms of meeting everyone’s underlying interests and needs, is integrating. The integrating negotiation style is associated with the most creative, effective, and efficient settlement outcomes.

Third, a free flow of information is required to use the integrating style successfully. Notice that, in order to create the conditions for an integrative resolution of the dispute, the two sisters had to share information about underlying interests. In the Two Sisters Parable, other creative and Pareto-efficient solutions may also exist and may be explored by means of interests analysis and the sharing of information about underlying interests. For example, if Enid needs the whole orange to accomplish some goal of hers—for example, making a cake requiring both juice...
### TABLE 12-1  The Five Negotiation Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiation Style</th>
<th>Concern for Self</th>
<th>Concern for Other</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>In response to concerns raised by Muriel to her workmate, Reginald, about who should take on phone duty in the office, Reginald says nothing and pretends she never spoke to him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obliging, accommodating</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>In response to Muriel’s request to Reginald that he take on phone duty in the office during lunch, Reginald does so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating, competing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>In response to Muriel’s request to Reginald that he take on phone duty in the office during lunch, Reginald refuses and threatens to lodge a complaint against Muriel for dereliction of duty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Muriel and Reginald agree that Muriel will do phone duty on Mondays and Wednesdays, that Reginald will do phone duty on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and that they will alternate Fridays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>In recognition of the fact that, as administrative assistants, both Muriel and Reginald are overqualified to answer phones, they agree to approach their supervisor mutually to ask her to assign phone duty to an employee of lower rank.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 12-2  Dual-Concern Model

Adapted from Psenicka and Rahim 1989.
and rind—whereas Esther needs to bake a cake but knows how to make only orange cake—Enid might agree to help Esther with an equally delicious recipe not requiring an orange, with the result that Esther both meets her immediate needs and learns a new recipe. The possibilities for integrative solutions are limited only by the scope of the interests analysis and the creativity and time available to the negotiators.
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CONSIDERATIONS INVOLVED IN USING THE FIVE NEGOTIATION STYLES

Conflict diagnosticians can gain more insight into the five styles by grouping them in three ways: according to (1) their usefulness in inducing cooperation, (2) their self-protectiveness, and (3) whether they can be used without the consent of the other team.

Usefulness in Inducing Cooperation. It follows from Deutsch’s theory of cooperation and competition that those styles involving a high level of concern for other would be most likely to motivate cooperation in the other disputant. The two styles with the highest levels of concern for other are integrating and obliging, with compromising being moderately cooperative in orientation. These styles are all known as cooperative negotiating styles. Dominating, because its low degree of concern for other is coupled with a high degree of active engagement in the conflict, is least likely to produce a cooperative response in the other disputant.

Self-protectiveness. The styles that are the most obviously protective of a disputant’s own interests are the dominating and integrating styles: each involves a high degree of motivation to promote self-interest. (Compromising is also self-protective, albeit to a lesser extent.) Avoiding and obliging are both styles that do little to protect the interests of the disputant using the style (though there may be times in which these styles protect interests better than any of the others). Although dominating is overtly protective of self-interest, it may produce a competitive response in the other disputant; accordingly, it may be seen as less self-protective than the integrating style.

We can conclude that, of the five styles, the one style that is most protective of self-interest, while promoting a cooperative response in the other disputant, is the integrating style. For this reason, most conflict resolution professionals advocate integrating as the negotiation style of choice when a choice is available. If all other things are equal, this is usually considered the best option.

Why is this so? First, integrating allows the disputants to seek out and take advantage of integrative opportunities in bargaining, those opportunities that address the unique interests of each disputant to maximize creatively the gains of each. This feature of integrating means that “the pie” can be expanded, so that each disputant can get more of the resources that are the most useful to him or her (in other words, the disputants can work at producing a Pareto-efficient settlement). Integrating also builds relationships without self-sacrifice. A disputant can be cooperative without knuckling under. A negotiator can be tough without appearing nasty. Integrating is also generally less harmful than other styles in cases of power imbalance to less powerful disputants because all interests are acknowledged and made important.

Integrating is, therefore, a very useful negotiation style. What is needed to set the stage for integrating? There are several essentials, including an interests analysis, the ability to cognitively multitask, and some cooperation.
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No effort to use an integrating negotiation style can succeed unless each disputant conducts an effective interests analysis. This is because the negotiators need to be able to respond to the actual concerns of both disputants. Without an interests analysis, there is usually insufficient information about the disputants' real interests.

Integrating also requires the negotiators to be able to multitask. By definition, integrating involves the ability to concern oneself simultaneously with one's own interests and with the interests of the other disputant. Moreover, integrating requires the negotiators to abandon a preoccupation with bottom-line demands and to look for novel and creative solutions to the problem of meeting everyone's underlying interests. To meet these mental challenges, the negotiators must be able to retain and manipulate multiple, complex ideas in their minds. Integrating is difficult for people of limited cognitive capacities, such as small children, cognitively impaired persons, and individuals under extreme stress.

Finally, since integrating involves the honest sharing of information about individual interests, a certain degree of cooperativeness is needed. Enough trust between the disputants must exist so that they can share the necessary information. (Note that, for the integrating style to succeed, it is not necessary to reveal either bottom lines or aspirations. Thus, integrating can occur even with mistrustful disputants, assuming that they are able to find a way to safely share information about their interests.)

Mutual and Unilateral Styles. To engage successfully in both integrating and compromising, both disputants and their teams have to consent to using these styles at the same time. Thus, integrating and compromising require mutuality. An expert negotiator is adept at promoting the use of particular styles, such as integrating, to the other negotiator. A good negotiator will judiciously exercise his or her interpersonal power to convince the other negotiator that it is in his or her best interests to adopt a particular style. For example, a negotiator who wants to adopt integrating as a negotiation style, but is faced with a negotiator who wants to use dominating, might show the other that he or she is equally able to use dominating and that this course of conduct will result in personal loss to the other.

Frequently, however, a negotiator does not have a choice about which negotiation style to use. In such a situation, the negotiator is left with the styles that he or she can adopt, regardless of the style adopted by others—dominating and obliging. These styles require no concurrence of the other: they are unilateral styles. (Avoiding is only unilateral up to a point: if one disputant tries to engage another disputant in conflict resolution, the avoidant disputant can often be forced to choose between obliging and a coercive dispute resolution process, such as litigation.) Thus, although it is correct to say that integrating is a preferred style of negotiation overall, it is also correct to say that a negotiator should be fluent in using the unilateral, as well as the mutual, negotiation styles. And, in assessing a disputant's preferences about negotiation style, both the disputant's overall preferred style and the disputant's preferred unilateral style are important. The preferred unilateral style is the fallback style for the disputant if his or her initial efforts to use a preferred mutual style fail. Consider, for example, the following situation:
A mother goes to a therapist, complaining that she is unable to get along with her adolescent daughter. The mother expresses a sincere desire to maintain a cooperative relationship with the girl and is baffled by the fact that they always seem to end up in screaming matches.

The therapist assesses the negotiation style of her client in relation to the daughter and discovers that, indeed, she has a cooperative orientation: integrating is her preferred style and compromising is her second choice. Far behind both integrating and compromising, dominating is her number-three negotiation style preference, with avoiding and obliging running behind that. Evidently, the daughter prefers avoiding, and the mother has been unaware of the need to convince the daughter to use either mutual style. Met with her adolescent brick wall, the mother finds herself slipping immediately into a dominating style. The therapist and mother work on teaching the mother how to persuade the daughter of the benefits of integrating, and they work on the patience the mother needs to see this through. The therapist also suggests the daughter participate in a high school peer mediation program to shore up her knowledge and skills in integrating.

What are some situations when integrating isn’t possible? First, and probably most commonly, integrating can’t be used when the other disputant wants to compete and you aren’t powerful enough to persuade the other to use a cooperative method of resolving the conflict. Second, integrating may not be possible when the disputant is disempowered: when he or she doesn’t have enough information to act in his or her own self-interest and has no practical way of getting the information. Of course, in this scenario, there is no way to ensure that one’s interests
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“Getting to Yes”

Probably the best and most widely known description of the integrating style of negotiation is presented in the classic book *Getting to Yes*, by Roger Fisher, William Ury, and Bruce Patton of the Harvard Negotiation Project (2nd Edition, 1991, New York: Penguin Books). The authors of this short, highly readable, and incredibly popular book (it’s occasionally referred to as “the negotiation bible” by aficionados) present a clear, cookbook-style and deceptively simple approach to achieving an integrating style of negotiation. Called “principled negotiation,” the method recommended by the authors consists of just four steps (this list is from their extremely useful Table of Contents):

- **“Separate the people from the problem.”** The authors advocate being “soft on the person, tough on the problem”, making it easy for the other side to save face and feel good about getting an agreement and fighting hard to prevent personal or personality issues from creeping into the decision.
- **“Focus on interests, not positions.”** The authors strongly advocate taking steps to reveal interests on all sides of the conflict.
- **“Invent options for mutual gain.”** The authors recommend brainstorming to create as long a list of potential settlements as possible to avoid disputants having their egos become tangled up with specific proposals.
- **“Insist on using objective criteria.”** When the going gets tough, as it does in most negotiations, the authors recommend tapping resources such as independent guidelines, independent appraisers, mathematical formulae, nonbinding evaluation, and other means by which proposals can be evaluated objectively. Use of objective criteria can help move disputants past impasse and avoid the situation in which a disputant hangs onto a poor proposal out of an aversion to losing face.

*Getting to Yes* is must-reading for anyone studying negotiation or ADR, and provides invaluable assistance to anyone wanting to become a better negotiator.

will be addressed whatever style is appropriated. Third, integrating may not be possible when the disputant is *forced into another mode*, as when a disputant is forced into litigation and can’t persuade the other disputant to try settling using an integrating style. Fourth, integrating is often not an option when there are severe constraints on time or mental energy.

Overall, the very best negotiators are experts in using all five styles, in determining when it is most helpful to use each style, and in persuading other disputants to engage in a cooperative negotiation style, preferably integrating.

**Tactics Used in Integrating**

Expert integrators are familiar with five common tactics that support the integrating style of negotiation (Rubin, Pruitt, & Kim 1994, 173–79):

- Expanding the pie
- Cutting costs
- Nonspecific compensation
- Logrolling
- Bridging
Expanding the Pie. Expanding the pie involves making the resource pool larger. For example, imagine business partners disputing over what percentage of revenues should go to each partner. Partner A accuses Partner B of falling down on his responsibility to market their product; thus, Partner A is claiming that Partner B should not receive the 50 percent they agreed would go to him. The partners agree to resolve the conflict by hiring a marketing expert. Partner B will receive 50 percent of product revenues, from which will be deducted the cost of retaining the marketing expert. If the marketing expert is effective, the revenues will increase overall, providing more resources to pay the marketing expert and both partners.

Cutting Costs. Cutting costs is the converse of expanding the pie; it relies on cost reduction to increase the net revenues available for distribution. A classic example of a cost-cutting opportunity occurs in divorce negotiations in which the spouses have highly disparate incomes. For example, imagine a young, childless married couple, Spouse A and Spouse B, who are splitting up. Spouse A will be paying Spouse B a sum to equalize the division of property; Spouse A is willing to pay only $80,000 but Spouse B wants $90,000. Further assume Spouse A makes $150,000 a year and Spouse B makes $20,000. If the spouses are able to structure a series of payments that can legally be characterized as alimony, Spouse A will be able to deduct the payments from her income tax. Spouse B will have to claim the payments as income, but, given his much smaller income, he will probably not pay nearly as much in taxes as Spouse A saves. The additional cost savings can be used to sweeten the deal for both disputants. Without characterizing the payments as alimony, there would be no tax consequence of the payments and, accordingly, no opportunity to realize these savings.

Nonspecific Compensation. Nonspecific compensation refers to giving the other disputant “unrelated” compensation for giving up something of value. For example, imagine that Jacob and Maggie are involved in a fender-bender. Maggie has cosmetic damage to her car and demands $2,000 in compensation. For Jacob, money is extremely hard to come by; he is a young and up-and-coming carpenter and it’s off season. Jacob reveals his monetary difficulties to Maggie, and Maggie thereupon reveals that she has some remodeling that she needs to do but doesn’t have the cash to pay a remodeler. They agree to settle the auto accident by having Jacob do thirty hours of free carpentry work for Maggie. Maggie is comfortable with foregoing the repairs to her car, since the damage is cosmetic only. Maggie gets her remodeling done, and Jacob, if he is a good carpenter, gets a reference as well as a cash break.

Logrolling. Logrolling is simply the exchange of items that have values personal to the disputants. For example, Ginger and Brittany are friends who collect

---

5 For purposes of simplification, ignore the likely existence of insurance in this example.
Beanie Babies for fun—and profit. Ginger’s collection is nearly complete and would be worth a lot more if she had a single variety that Brittany has in duplicate. Brittany, on the other hand, lacks a single Beanie Baby that Ginger has in duplicate. Obviously, by each giving up their duplicate Beanie Baby, both can greatly increase the value of their collections.

**Bridging.** Bridging is responding to underlying interests rather than to positions. In essence, every effective integrating negotiation is a bridging process. For example, a husband in divorce mediation entered the process asking that he be given title to the family home immediately, so that he could take advantage of low interest rates to refinance his wife off the mortgage. The wife demanded that her name remain on the home title. In mediation, the wife revealed that she did not wish to own the house, and she knew she would benefit from the husband’s refinancing the mortgage, but she wanted to protect her right to have access to the house. The couple had teenage children, and the spouses’ plan was to have the children stay in the family home, with each parent rotating time with them there. The wife was worried that the husband could use his sole ownership to deny her time with the children when they were at the family home. These mutual interests were addressed by developing a written contract granting to the wife the right to enter the family home for parenting purposes, regardless of how it was titled.

**Limitations on the Usefulness of the Dual-Concern Model**

Three principal limitations constrain the usefulness of the dual-concern model. First, most of the assumptions about the appropriateness of the five styles in responding to particular situations are theoretical: the theory is relatively untested. Research in the field of negotiation is highly complex, and results vary with the specific situation being assessed. Accordingly, it is hard to generalize about the appropriateness of various negotiation styles, and most of the information about the relative merits of the styles is anecdotal. There is, of course, plenty of evidence of the destructiveness of competition as a course of conflict; since the dominating style is competitive, the desirability of avoiding dominating where possible should be regarded as empirically well supported.

Second, the dual-concern model is grounded on the supposition that orientation toward self and other during a negotiation is never negative—that is, a disputant either has a positive regard for the interests of the other disputant or has no concern for the other disputant at all. This supposition ignores the situation, common in escalated conflict, in which the disputant is actually motivated to harm the other disputant (sadism), as well as the less common situation in which the disputant actually wishes harm to self (masochism). If these negative attitudes are incorporated into the model, the result looks like that shown in Figure 12-3.

In effect, the dual-concern model assumes rational behavior: the disputant is either motivated to aid self, motivated to aid other, neither, or both. However,
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in the real world, most of the time disputants in escalated conflict situations perceive the other team as having negative concern for the other—as operating somewhere in the bottom half of Figure 12-3. The dual-concern model would be more effective and useful if updated to include these negative, and apparently irrational, disputant motives.

The third limitation of the dual-concern model relates to the meaning of the term negotiation style. A negotiation style is an overall strategy for negotiating. A strategy is a general orientation. A strategy must be differentiated from a tactic—which is a specific behavior that someone uses to execute a strategy. A conflict diagnostician must take extreme care not to mistake one for the other. Consider the following example from a legal negotiation:

A young, inexperienced attorney was negotiating with her counterpart for a damages settlement of her client’s medical malpractice claim. She wrote opposing counsel with her demand of $50,000 in compensatory damages, payable by the first of the following month by cashier’s check, in exchange for her dismissal of the lawsuit and waiver of the right to ask for the defendant to pay court costs, and she briefly and cogently summarized the points in support of her assertion that her client had a very strong case.

A week later, the attorney was mortified to receive a scathingly hostile letter from opposing counsel. “How dare you” read the first words of the response, and the letter went on from there to accuse the attorney and client of everything from greed to stupidity. It suggested that opposing counsel had seriously considered taking the lawyer to the Attorney Grievance Commission to be professionally disciplined.

The attorney put the letter aside in shock and went home. The next day, in the quiet of early morning (after deciding not to change careers quite yet), she took out the letter again and reread it carefully. After all, she needed to determine whether she would be fired and reprimanded about whatever it was she had done wrong. She was relieved to see no actual...
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substantive accusations of misconduct and surprised to discover that, in between volleys of acrimony, opposing counsel had accepted her offer! In talking to her supervisor later that day, the attorney learned that it is common practice for counsel in legal negotiation to couple an important concession to a show of apparent strength: it allows the lawyer to project a strong image to his or her own client and gives the client some satisfaction during the process of conceding.

In this example, the tactics used by opposing counsel seemed appropriate to a dominating style, yet the overall strategy of opposing counsel was to oblige. It’s important never to mistake a tactic for a strategy.

Measurement of Negotiation Style Preferences

Conflict diagnosticians need accurate ways to assess negotiation styles. What tools are available for assessing negotiation style preference in conflict participants?

A number of psychometric researchers have designed questionnaires, or “inventories,” to assess the negotiation style preferences of individuals. The best questionnaire, in terms of reliability and firm theoretical foundation, is the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory–II, or ROCI–II (Rahim 1983; Weider-Hatfield 1988). See Table 12-1. The questionnaire is designed to measure a disputant’s preferences for using each of the five negotiation styles. For each of the five styles, the questionnaire yields a score, which represents the respondent’s preference when playing a particular role in a negotiation with a particular other disputant. It does not purport to represent a person’s negotiation profile generally.

There are several other negotiation style inventories that purport to measure similar negotiation style preferences (Putnam 1988). These include the Hall Conflict Management Survey, the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict MODE Survey, the Putnam-Wilson Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI), and the Ross-deWine Conflict Management Message Style (CMMS).

However negotiation style is measured, it runs into problems when it is measured outside the business organizations context. In individual interper-

---

The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory–II


---

*A psychometric researcher is a scientist who specializes in measuring psychological features, such as intelligence, attitude, and mental health.*
*TABLE 12-2  The ROCI–II Negotiation Style Inventory*

Think of a person or an organization with whom you are currently having a dispute of concern to you. With this dispute in mind, read each of the following statements and decide how well or how poorly each describes your approach to this conflict. Use the following scale to give your answer:

6 = Describes your approach to the conflict extremely accurately
5 = Describes your approach to the conflict very accurately
4 = Describes your approach to the conflict somewhat accurately
3 = Describes your approach to the conflict somewhat inaccurately
2 = Describes your approach to the conflict very inaccurately
1 = Describes your approach to the conflict extremely inaccurately

6 5 4 3 2 1 1. I try to investigate an issue with _____ to find a solution acceptable to us.
6 5 4 3 2 1 2. I generally try to satisfy the needs of _____.
6 5 4 3 2 1 3. I attempt to avoid being “put on the spot” and try to keep my conflict with _____ to myself.
6 5 4 3 2 1 4. I try to integrate my ideas with those of _____ to come up with a decision jointly.
6 5 4 3 2 1 5. I try to work with _____ to find solutions to a problem which satisfy our expectations.
6 5 4 3 2 1 6. I usually avoid open discussions of my differences with _____.
6 5 4 3 2 1 7. I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse.
6 5 4 3 2 1 8. I use my influence to get my ideas accepted.
6 5 4 3 2 1 9. I use my authority to make a decision in my favor.
6 5 4 3 2 1 10. I usually accommodate to the wishes of _____.
6 5 4 3 2 1 11. I give in to the wishes of _____.
6 5 4 3 2 1 12. I exchange accurate information with _____ to solve a problem together.
6 5 4 3 2 1 13. I usually allow concessions to _____.
6 5 4 3 2 1 14. I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.
6 5 4 3 2 1 15. I negotiate with _____ so that a compromise can be reached.
6 5 4 3 2 1 16. I try to stay away from disagreement with _____.
6 5 4 3 2 1 17. I avoid an encounter with _____.
6 5 4 3 2 1 18. I use my expertise to make a decision in my favor.
6 5 4 3 2 1 19. I often go along with the suggestions of _____.
6 5 4 3 2 1 20. I use “give and take” so that a compromise can be made.
6 5 4 3 2 1 21. I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue.
6 5 4 3 2 1 22. I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way.
6 5 4 3 2 1 23. I collaborate with _____ for a proper understanding of a problem.
6 5 4 3 2 1 24. I try to satisfy the expectations of _____.
6 5 4 3 2 1 25. I sometimes use my power to win a competitive situation.
6 5 4 3 2 1 26. I try to keep my disagreements with _____ to myself in order to avoid hard feelings.
6 5 4 3 2 1 27. I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with _____.
6 5 4 3 2 1 28. I try to work with _____ for a proper understanding of a problem.

sonal, nonbusiness contexts, these instruments tend not to be able to confirm the theoretical underpinnings of the dual-concern model, particularly with regard to the meaning of compromising (Hammock, Richardson, Pilkington, & Utley 1990; van de Vliert & Kabanoff 1990).7

Also, if a negotiation style questionnaire is used to assess an observed person, rather than to provide a self-report, it can result in missing the dual-concern aspects of the observed person's behavior. For example, in an unreported study by Coltri (1993), a small sample of ADR faculty members, who were asked to assess the negotiation styles of their mediation clients using the ROCI–II, tended to rate their clients as either displaying high concern for self and low concern for other or as displaying low concern for self and high concern for other, confirming Deutsch’s one-dimensional model as applied to disputant negotiation styles. Other research (van de Vliert & Prein 1989, 51–66) confirms this general finding that, when observing others in conflict, people tend to see cooperation and self-assertion as mutually exclusive, and, since this phenomenon occurs with a variety of questionnaires and other methods used to assess negotiation style, it appears to be a problem with perception rather than with the questionnaires. The big question for conflict resolution researchers is whether this perceptual limitation can be reversed—through education and training, for example.

IMPLICATIONS FOR CONFLICT DIAGNOSTICIANS

A conflict diagnostician must always exercise caution not to confuse self-assertion with competitiveness and cooperativeness with weakness. The dual-concern model teaches us that high levels of concern for self (and, hence, high levels of assertiveness) can co-exist with altruism and a genuine desire to benefit the other disputant in the conflict. Research shows that we are better able to make this distinction when engaged in self-reflection than we are when we observe others. Thus, when a conflict diagnostician, particularly one who is a member of a disputant’s team, is observing individuals from the other team, it is important to consider carefully whether the observations are being biased by oversimplification.

Since the integrating negotiation style has many benefits for disputants in conflict, a useful goal of a conflict diagnostician is to encourage negotiators to integrate. If the conflict diagnostician is a member of a disputant’s team, there are two immediate goals: helping one’s own side develop the skill and preparation needed to use the integrating style and convincing the other team to use integrating. However, since it is not always possible to accomplish either goal, the disputant’s team should also develop the flexibility to use each of the five styles effectively.

---

7 Factor analysis, a statistical process, is used to generate these conclusions.
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EXERCISES, PROJECTS, AND “THOUGHT EXPERIMENTS”

1. Conflict journal.
   a. Take the ROCI–II, choosing the person with whom you have the most troublesome interactions in your conflict as the person “in the blanks.” To score the ROCI–II,
      1. Add your scores for statements 3, 6, 16, 17, 26, and 27. Divide the total by 6. This is your score for avoiding.
      2. Add your scores for statements 2, 10, 11, 13, 19, and 24. Divide the total by 6. This is your score for obliging/accommodating.
      3. Add your scores for statements 7, 14, 15, and 20. Divide the total by 4. This is your score for compromising.
      4. Add your scores for statements 8, 9, 18, 21, and 25. Divide the total by 5. This is your score for dominating/competing.
      5. Add your scores for statements 1, 4, 5, 12, 22, 23, and 28. Divide the total by 7. This is your score for integrating/collaborating/problem-solving.

   b. Interpret the scores.
   c. What was your highest score? What was your lowest score? What are the implications of these scores?
   d. What was your highest unilateral score? Given this score, what do you think you might do if the other disputant is unwilling to engage in the sort of negotiation you would prefer?
   e. Look at the five styles. Do you feel that you are proficient in using each of them?
   f. Given these results, do you see any need for you to work on increasing your proficiency or willingness to use any of the negotiation styles? Why or why not?
   g. Using the knowledge you have gained from this exercise, plan a strategy that you can use to improve your ability to fare well in this conflict.

2. The text states, “[T]he text states, “[T]he theory of cooperation and competition that those styles involving a high level of concern for other would be most likely to motivate cooperation in the other disputant.” Why is this so? Write a logical argument in support of this statement.

3. Spend an evening watching your favorite TV shows (fictional, not news or magazine shows). Keep a pad of paper and pencil on your lap. Divide the paper into five sections corresponding to the five negotiation styles. Each time you see an example of one of the five negotiation styles occurring in a show, under the appropriate section of the paper write down the name of the show, the characters involved, a brief description of the tactic the character used, the negotiation style you think the character was trying to use, and the
effectiveness of the tactic. (Incidents of physical violence should be placed under dominating/competing.) Reviewing the results of your investigation, what tactics and strategies predominated? Are you surprised? Which tactics and strategies appeared to be most effective? Did what you saw seem realistic? What macrosystem blueprints (Chapter 3) for resolving conflict were portrayed?

4. Repeat exercise 2 with a novel. Does this longer medium portray different conflict-handling blueprints?

5. Write about, discuss, or debate the merits of the following statement: “Negotiation style theory and skills should be taught to all students before they graduate from high school.”

6. Identify each of the following statements of negotiators as more likely to represent efforts to use obliging/accommodating, avoiding, dominating/competing, integrating/collaborating/problem-solving, or compromising and justify your opinion. There may be more than one reasonable answer.
   a. A negotiator whose goal is to get $5,000 for medical expenses opens the negotiation saying, “I won’t take a penny less than $100,000.”
   b. A negotiator whose goal is to get $5,000 for medical expenses opens the negotiation saying, “I want $5,000 for my medical expenses.”
   c. A negotiator whose goal is to get $5,000 for medical expenses opens the negotiation saying, “I won’t take a penny less than $20,000.” Then, after the other negotiator makes $100 her final offer, the first negotiator says, “I would consider settling at $12,000 just to get this case settled fast.”
   d. A negotiator whose goal is to get $5,000 for medical expenses is told by the other party that he won’t pay a penny. In response, the negotiator says, “If your position is based on reasons we can agree on, I’ll say yes. Tell me the basis for that position.”
   e. A negotiator who doesn’t care when payment is made, within reason, says, “It’s vitally important that I get paid immediately.”
   f. A negotiator who doesn’t care when payment is made says, “I care very much about the size of the payment, but I am not as concerned about when it is made.”
   g. A negotiator threatens to walk out of the negotiation but, in fact, has no intention of doing so.
   h. In response to a request by the other disputant to engage in a negotiation session, a negotiator says, “My calendar is full. Let me get back to you on this next month.” The negotiator has no firm plans to respond to the request and six weeks later has not yet called back.
   i. Same as situation h, except that the negotiator who is telephoned knows that the other disputant is desperate to get the case settled fast and wants to use the delay to get a better concession.
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j. A negotiator threatens to walk out of the negotiation unless the other party becomes more willing to explain her reasons for taking a position.

k. A negotiator makes an important concession without any reason to expect a return.

l. A negotiator asserts that the other side's case is weak and says, “If I walked out right now, I'd win twice as much in court.”

m. A negotiator makes an offer, which the other negotiator angrily rejects. The first negotiator expresses shock and comments that he could easily do better in court; however, then he immediately makes a more palatable offer. Assess the strategy of the first negotiator.

n. There are two negotiators on each side of a dispute. When the defendant makes an offer, one of the plaintiff's negotiators turns beet-red, shouts embarrassing words at the defendant, and storms out of the room, slamming the door behind her. The other negotiator for the plaintiff shrugs her shoulders and gently says, “Well, what can I do? I'm stuck with her.” Assess the likely strategy of the plaintiff team.

o. In negotiation over the sale of an item in which price is an issue, a negotiator suggests submitting the issue of price to an independent appraiser selected by both parties' counsel.

p. A negotiator insists on the other negotiator stating his “bottom-line offer,” commenting that it would be impossible for the case to settle unless the offers were out on the table. Assess the likely strategy of the first negotiator.
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