

Getting past no – a critique assignment

[Art & Culture](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

This leaves one to conclude that successful negotiation is truly an art in and of itself. I-Jury breaks down this art of successful negotiation into a “ five step breakthrough strategy’ that functionally operates to reach the ultimate goal: an agreement that truly satisfies both parties’ interests. First, one must become accustomed to not reacting and “ going to the balcony’ to keep their eye on the prize. Next, it is vital to disarm the opponent by stepping to their side and acknowledge where they are coming from.

Within the third step, it is time to “ change the game” by reframing the opposing party’s position, which avoids rejecting it completely.

Subsequently, one has to make it easy for their opposition to say yes instead of no, or in Russ words, “ building them a golden bridge. ” The last step builds on its predecessor by making it hard for the other party to say no-?? bringing them to their senses, not their knees. This systematic approach to negotiating is abstract and not traditional, but these strategies can be used in the real world and hold priceless value.

The following paragraphs explore these specific strategies and attest their relevance. I-Jury begins his writing by introducing the tactic of “ going to the balcony,” which he frequently refers back to throughout the entire book. This tool is the foundation to a successful negotiation; the most crucial building block that will lead both parties to a final agreement. What exactly does “ going to the balcony’ mean? In a nutshell, this ideology refers to the avoidance of emotional influence, or in other words deterring oneself from allowing their emotions to create a reaction that prevents the arrival of a final agreement.

When personal emotions get in the way within a negotiation, negative feedback is created that permits the actual AOL of the negotiation to be lost. Isaac Newton's third law of motion states that for every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction, which is not only relevant in physics, but in human behavior as well. But how does one get to the balcony? The two main strategies I-Airy describes are "naming the game" and "buying time to think." The opponent might try to push one's "hot" buttons to spark a reaction that will allow tactic (name the game), which in turn renders it useless.

If this negotiator in fact becomes offended and wants to react in a defensive manner, it is time to start buying the time to think. They might step out of the room, or merely remove themselves from the situation mentally. This method allows them to regroup and recollect their thoughts, which in turn keeps their "eyes on the prize." I-Jury stresses that the balcony must be visited before any decision is made because the worst mistake is making a decision right on the spot. Make the decision on the balcony instead.

Removing oneself makes individual reflection possible, which is necessary to accurately decipher the interests hidden behind their position, and yields the right decision to be made. To recap, "going to the balcony" keeps the negotiation objective and unrushed, prevents quick emotional reactions, controls the behavior on both sides, and allows one to concentrate on getting what both sides want. In my line of work at Chrysler LLC, I find that it is nearly a requirement for me to go to the balcony on a daily basis. It is extremely important that I separate my personal feelings from the duties I am responsible for.

<https://assignbuster.com/getting-past-no-a-critique-assignment/>

Recently, I was in the middle of an email conversation with the CEO of one of my suppliers regarding a tooling reimbursement Chrysler had yet to fulfill. Chrysler had previously required them to put this tooling in place at their facility for an upcoming vehicle program. To receive the balance, their parts and processes needed full approval from a Chrysler Supplier Quality Engineer (me). Even though they completed all of the necessary deliverables, I still could not approve their process for the tooling payment since Chrysler Engineering was not finished with part validation testing.

Chrysler side of the testing was not my supplier's responsibility, so this seemed unfair to me. I started to write an email back to the CEO expressing my concerns in a very emotional way, which included my personal opinions about Chrysler corporate policies. I stopped writing midway through and leaked away from my desk and headed for my balcony to view the situation from a third party stance. It was then that I realized what I had written was inappropriate for a professional business email. When I returned to my desk, started over with my response to the CEO and simply explained the corporate policy to him.

I concluded the note by referring him to my buyer in purchasing who could possibly schedule a non-standard partial tooling payment. This approach satisfied Chrysler policy and my supplier's request without involving any emotion-?? exactly what "going to the balcony" is designed to do. If I did in fact send the email caused by my initial emotional reaction, my job could have been jeopardized. Thanks to past class discussion, I was aware of the effectiveness of going to the balcony and proved that it is worthy to use in real world negotiations such as this one.

<https://assignbuster.com/getting-past-no-a-critique-assignment/>

The next step in Russ five step breakthrough strategy focuses on disarming the opponent, which further deters the effect of behavioral action and emotion within the negotiation. This disarming tactic is best utilized when one reacts to their opponent's actions in unanticipated ways. Simply, it is best to surprise them with the opposite of what they are expecting. Jury suggests starting this process out by listening to them first, while making the effort to acknowledge their points.

Not only will this increase the chance that they will listen in return, but it also will prove to them that their perspectives, among other alternatives, are being considered. Jury notes to paraphrase the opponent's through positive tone and sincere body language. This sincerity establishes trust, which is essential in a successful negotiation and in disarming the opponent. One way to keep building this trust is agreeing with the opposition whenever possible, of course after the listening phase is complete. Jury emphasizes this point because it is extremely hard for the opposition to attack someone who agrees with them.

Even if this agreement is only a sliver compared to the rest of the discussed subjects, focusing on it will build the negotiation positively. When it comes time for the opponent to listen, it is important to use "I" statements, which will avoid challenging their opinions and neutrally presents another viewpoint. In short, disarming the opposition is comprised of using the surprise of unexpected acts, stepping to their side by listening and paraphrasing, acknowledging their points and feelings, and anally presenting another position without provoking.

It is truly amazing what disarming an opponent can do in real world conversations, especially when negotiating with others over political issues. Political conversations can be very controversial and sometimes hostile, so controlling emotional backlash when trying to get a point across is very important. My Father and I debate over politics all the time and we both have benefited from disarming each other. Recently, we were discussing the need for unions in the American Automotive Industry since I presently work for Chrysler LLC.

I oppose the unions while my father stands up for them. While I was listening, he made the excellent point that the unions allowed America to grow at extraordinary rates in the years following the Second World War. Soldiers returning home were given the opportunity to make very decent money while partaking in very simple labor oriented tasks. I agreed and acknowledged that his point holds relevance, even though I thought it was outdated. This allowed me to chime in with my own experiences with the unions, all of which were based around the present day manufacturing industry.

I told my Father that today's union workers sometimes take advantage of their guaranteed wages by not putting forth their best efforts. This was a point he agreed with and these small spurts of agreement allowed us to continue the negotiation with no emotional influence. Even though these disarming acts were encompassed in a normal conversation, it still shows that this tactic is applicable in everyday life. After one has successfully disarmed their opponent, it is time to " change the game. Similarly to disarming, changing the game involves doing the opposite of what the <https://assignbuster.com/getting-past-no-a-critique-assignment/>

opponent expects. To do this, I-Jury suggests accepting their side by reframing their points instead of immediately rejecting them. Reframing is the key ingredient in changing the game and can be accomplished by asking the right questions. Obviously the opposing party will claim what they desire most, but they won't necessarily say why. Asking them why will treat their opinion as an opportunity instead of any obstacle and will reveal their true motivator.

Furthermore, it is sometimes possible to airframe by asking the opposition for advice on the situation being discussed-?? a flattering question that reduces tension and allows the focus to be pointed at mutually attaining the end goal. These strategies direct the opponent's opinions against the problem while preventing their opinion from turning into the problem. Changing the game is all about shifting the attention off the end goal and concentrating on how it can be achieved. Asking problem solving reinterpreting them, exposing tricks with clarifying questions, and playing dumb like a fox will accomplish this.

Ultimately, this turns a positional bargaining confrontation into a problem solving negotiation. While at The Beacon Institute of Rivers and Estuaries this past September, this very negotiations class engaged in an exercise that highlighted the use of changing the game. This activity was based around a collective bargaining agreement between a local union and the Adam Baxter Company. The class was split up into group multiple groups, each consisting of two caucuses-?? one being the local union and the other being the Adam Baxter Company's management.

The negotiation was comprised of labor and wage agreements for the workers at a new plant Adam Baxter was building in the town of Dolomite. Using the informative handouts provided, each caucus was to negotiate Hess terms. Within my team, I was placed on the union side, which I found very interesting since I oppose unions in the real world. Once the negotiations began, it became evident that the management and union were in fact listening to each other's desires and opinions. Both caucuses would frequently ask questions and clarify what the other side actually wanted out of the agreement.

This allowed my group to find a way to the end result and prevented getting stuck on a biased view of it. Using these "game changing" tactics allowed my group's negotiation to proceed efficiently and we never lost sight of the finish line. We arrived at an agreement that satisfied both caucuses by the close of the exercise. Using this tactic in a real world collective bargaining negotiation would be more challenging; nevertheless this class exercise supports the claim that this negotiation tactic is effective.

Throughout his writing, Jury emphasizes the importance of the word "yes" within a negotiation, which is what the forth step in his breakthrough strategy explains. Within any negotiation, making it easy for the opposition to say yes will keep things moving along and prevent stalemates. I-Jury says to start by "building a golden bridge" for the opponent, or in other words, giving them the chance to retreat from their own resistance. This acts as an advance towards a better solution-?? a solution the negotiators find together. Building this golden bridge allows the opponent to be included in finding that solution.

<https://assignbuster.com/getting-past-no-a-critique-assignment/>

I-Jury explains that negotiating is more about asking versus telling, so if one asks the opposition for ideas instead of claiming they have already found the solution, both sides can satisfy their unmet interests. Building on that point, it is important to not dismiss the opponent's stances as irrational, but instead provide them with options. Effective options will compromise the needs of both parties to gain a middle ground that will be used in the remainder of the negotiation. Additionally, Jury talks about helping one's opponent "save face," which implies helping the opposition present the agreement to their own constituency as a victory.

Whenever a person changes their position on an issue, or agrees with an opposing party, there is a risk that they will be viewed differently by their peers. Saving face helps lower the chance of this risk and prevents the opposition from backing down. Often times, however, the opponent might feel overwhelmed with how much needs to be done to finish the negotiation. In this situation, one must "go slow to go fast" and build a step by step guide for their opponent to follow. The process should be easy and rushing to the finish must be avoided.

Taking it one step at a time ensures apart at the last minute. Once this deal is met, I-Jury states it is a good idea to take a moment and have a concluding summary of the entire agreement. If there are no confusions, a final commitment can be made and the bridge can be crossed. Building a golden bridge for the opposition requires observation, compromise, and the supporting of others. At Chrysler, I have dealt with many situations that encompass such actions; situations that sometimes involve a Chrysler

supplier and a Chrysler assembly plant bickering at each other over a part unconfirmable issue.

As a Supplier Quality Engineer, it is my Job to assist the supplier in finding the root cause that created the unconfirmable at the assembly plant. The supplier's part could have been damaged during the actual assembly process at Chrysler plant, but that won't stop the plant personnel from starting the blame game with the supplier. I advocate for the supplier when this situation presents itself, or I work with them to fix the issue if they created it. Either way, I mitigate in between the supplier and the plant to figure out where the problem occurred first.

I listen to what the plant has to say and I listen to what my supplier has to say. After I analyze the information provided, all teams work to satisfy the unmet interests at both manufacturing locations. The official process is encompassed in an eight step corrective action plan that both the plant and supplier partake in completing. The first seven steps determine root cause, correctively solve, and verify the solution to the problem, with step eight being the final review. Submitting this document is just like "crossing the bridge," since the unconfirmable is solved all parties said "yes" to all eight steps.

As I-Jury stated, saying yes is one of the most important words in any negotiation. The final step in Saris breakthrough strategy is a reaction plan to be used in case step four is not achievable. I-Jury realizes that building a golden bridge for the opponent does not always work, so in these situations it is very important to make it as hard as possible for them to say no. Using

power to educate can benefit here, but only if it is used in a instructive-?? not destructive-?? manner. This is another route to take in building the trust between oneself and their opponent.

A lot of times, the opponent does not agree with the offered terms because they believe their Best Alternative To Negotiation Agreement (BATAAN) is superior to that of the golden bridge offered to them. I-Jury explains it is best to educate the opposition by giving them a reality check and asking them reality-testing questions. The goal is to make them question what will really happen if an agreement is not met, especially since Batman's are not guaranteed to work as perceived. This makes reality the true teacher instead of both negotiators.

This also assists in bringing the opponent to their senses, and not to their knees. Once the opponent gathers their senses, a mutual satisfaction is more attainable, which is what this step is designed to obtain. This strategy also helps avoid individual victory, which is a result that would render the negotiation unsuccessful. I have had few personal experiences where I needed to prevent my opposition from saying no. I consider myself fortunate since this step in Russ breakthrough process seems to be a last resort to repairing a negotiation that is early in shambles.

Regardless, I have dealt with this strategy in the past when looking for a house to rent with my current roommate. We decided to use a realtor to help us look for a house, and after a couple weeks, the realtor began to pressure us while my current roommate seemed to be completely satisfied. I expressed my skeptics to my roommate and pointed out that I had found a

more attractive house on my own time. He initially insisted that we should take the house the realtor had found for us since the rental market was so competitive. I then reasoned with him using reality based questioning.

The house the realtor found had four bedrooms, one bathroom, and a very rickety garage. It was nice enough for two young urban professionals, but not appropriate. My roommate then agreed to view the other house I found, which is the current house we live in today. It is much smaller and has two and a half bathrooms for our convenience. The location is better as well, which my roommate immediately realized. We closed on that house the very day we viewed it. If I hadn't had my roommate take a reality check before jumping into the other house, we wouldn't have had the chance to take advantage of the residence we live in currently.

To tie this all together, William I-Jury book, *Getting Past No*, is filled with a large amount of useful negotiating wisdom. The tactics he describes in his five step breakthrough strategy are useful in so many different real world situations, but this does not mean every single one is appropriate 100% of the time. The first and foremost negotiation tool I-Jury explained was "going to the balcony," which includes resisting the temptation to react, buying time to think, and naming the opponent's game.

Next, as a negotiator, one must disarm their opponent by stepping to their side, agreeing with them whenever possible, and acknowledging their points. Changing the game follows, which entails reframing the opponents claims and not rejecting them by going around their tactics. The fourth strategy involves making it easy for the opponent to say yes, accomplished by

building them a golden bridge to cross. This draws them in one's desired direction and allows them to take things slow to ensure full understanding. If the opponent does not say yes, it is time to deter them away from saying no.

Let them know that mutual satisfaction is the ultimate goal and personal victory is not. Also be sure to perform a reality check and bring them to their senses, not their knees. What makes this breakthrough strategy so abstract? It requires humans to defy human nature, which is nearly as hard as defying gravity. The tools I-Airy emphasizes allow negotiators to knock down barriers and concentrate on reaching a mutual agreement that fulfills unmet interests on both sides. I-Jury is able to turn positional bargaining into problem solving negotiation, which is a craft utilized by all successful negotiators.