

Book Breakdown: Getting To Yes – Roger Fisher & William Try

Summary

This book is an essential guide to negotiating your way to success. The book covers five main areas: principled vs. positional negotiation, separating people from the problem, focusing on interests not positions, generating options of possibilities before deciding what to and using objective criteria.

Don't Bargain Over Positions

The more you try to convince the other party to your way of thinking the more you are committed to your position (because ego becomes identified with position) which means you have an interest in then “saving face”
Positional bargaining can become a contest of will

There is an alternative:

People - separate people from the problem

Interests - focus on interests not positions

Options - generate a variety of possibilities before deciding what to do

Criteria - insist that the result be based on some objective criteria

You need to attack the problem, not the person.

Instead of trying to come up with solutions under pressure, give yourself the time to think of a wider set of alternatives. Constraint cramps creativity

Pay attention to the people problem People will often draw comments based on unfounded inferences.

Walk a mile in their shoes - people tend to see what they want to see.

They will pick out and focus on the facts that confirm their prior perceptions (what we call Confirmation Bias – [LINK TO WIKIPEDIA](#)).

The ability to see the situation from the other side and point of view is ONE of the most important skills to have in negotiation

Don't deduce their intentions from their fears - often we will assume our fears are what the other side intends to do

Involve them in the agreement. The more alterations the more ownership of the eventual agreement.

“The Angry Rule”

This rule comes from 950s HR Committee - only one person could be angry at a time “That's ok, it's his/her turn”. Breaking the rules implies you have

lost self-control, making you lose face or look weak

Don't destroy your negotiation partner, dance with them instead

One of the best ways is to ensure the other side knows they have been heard. It helps when they know they've been understood (being heard is to be human)

eg. "Would you mind me making sure I've got this right / what you're telling me is / have I got this correct? Is there anything else I am missing?"

Don't attack them by speaking about them. Speak about how you feel and their impact

The best time to handle people problems is before they become problems (L2E lesson: like weeds in a garden, you need to get on top of them early)

When working on interests vs positions it means for every interest there are many possible positions and solutions (never stick to one)

We tend to assume because the other side's positions are opposed to ours they don't share the same interest (L2E Lesson: what is the common interest/common ground here?)

With some examination you will find there are many shared and compatible interests

How do you identify interests:

Ask "Why?" Can you help me understand why do you take this position please"

The most powerful interests are often basic human needs: security, economic well being, a sense of belonging, recognition and control over one's life or destiny.

Make a joint list together and look for overlaps or common ground (make sure you make them specific)

If you want the other side to appreciate your interests, make sure you begin by demonstrating you understand theirs

Create cognitive dissonance ie. positively support their interests in the same way you positively emphasize your problem. Creating inconsistency works psychologically as the other party will often then want to make things consistent and disassociate himself from the problem

Invent Options for Mutual Gain

Always grow the pie rather than fight over the slices ie. Create solutions that are advantageous to both sides

There are usually four obstacles that inhibit an abundance of options:

- premature judgement
- searching for single answers
- the assumption of a fixed pie
- thinking that "solving their problem is their problem"

To create creative options you need to separate the inventing of them from

the act of judging them

Few things facilitate a decision faster than using precedents SJ: due to our commitment and consistency bias

To evaluate an option from the other's point of view consider how they might be criticised by their own stakeholders if they adopted it

Seek to make their decision easy ie "yesable"

Insist on Using Objective Criteria

Don't yield to pressure, yield to principle - right makes might!

eg. "You want a low price, I want a high price, let's define what a fair price might be...we both share the same interest to determine a fair price" (L2E

Lesson Please can you give me some context to how you got to that figure)

BATNA: Best Alternative To a Negotiated Position

Always have a BATNA

A bottom line is almost always too rigid (backing you into a position you dig deeper to defend)

How would you feel walking into a job interview with no offer vs two other offers?

The difference is power

Having a BATNA is the most effective way of dealing with a negotiator who seems to have more power

Address the power balance with a BATNA (options)

Use negotiations jujitsu - ask them "how do you think this addresses the problem at hand?"

Don't defend ideas or actions, invite them to criticise eg "what other concerns would you possibly have with this proposal"

Use questions instead of statements. Statements generate resistance whereas questions generate answers.

Some of the most effective negotiation you'll ever do is when you're not talking

Use criticism and correction to persuade ie. "have I got this wrong/have I been misinformed?"

Recognise and call out or label the tactic - bringing it up will nullify its effect

Bully boys: "I only negotiate on merits. My reputation is not built on responding to threats.

Don't be a victim ie. I want to know the rules of the game we're both playing here.

Are we trying to squeeze/threaten/wear down or are we trying to reach a fair and equitable agreement. We can play the hard game but I'd prefer if we can reach a wise decision quickly and efficiently."