

ieee-usa eBooks presents



Engineering the Art of Negotiation
Part 1: How to Handle Your Boss

By John G. Shulman

Published and Hosted by IEEE-USA.

Copyright © 2008 by Alignor. All rights reserved.

Edited by Georgia C. Stelluto, IEEE-USA Publishing Manager

Cover design & layout by Greg Hill, Electronic Communications Manager

IEEE-USA eBooks presents this special edition of John Shulman's e-book in collaboration with Alignor.

It is made possible by a special dues assessment of IEEE members residing in the United States.

Copying this material in any form is not permitted without prior written approval from the IEEE-USA Publishing Manager and Alignor; write to g.stelluto@ieee.org.

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
What is Negotiation?.....	5
Different Approaches to Negotiation	5
The Alignor Three-Step Process	6
The Alignor Process Worksheet.....	9
Negotiating With Your Boss: A Case Study	10
Sample Talking Points.....	15
Common Mistakes	18
Summary	19
About the Author	20
About Alignor	21

Introduction

Okay, so handling your boss may seem like a stretch. Let's face it: he or she *is* the boss. And it usually feels like the boss handles you — not the other way around.

But this first installment in a series of e-Books published by IEEE-USA, in partnership with the international negotiation training and consulting firm, Alignor, can help you reverse that dynamic. And it will do so not through *soft*, ill-defined advice better suited to a gossip column, but through a disciplined, process-driven approach you can actually use.

In coming months, you can look forward to books on how to negotiate with your colleagues, how to deal with difficult people, how to negotiate for a new job and how to negotiate better terms in your existing job.

So think about it. *Who gets ahead in your organization?*

People who have good relationships with their bosses!

And those good relationships with bosses do not happen by accident. *So how do people around you build those good relationships with their bosses?*

All right, maybe we don't want to answer that question! But is there a way to handle the boss that builds a good relationship and lets you keep your dignity? You bet there is. That is what this book is about.

This book will share a proven, practical approach to handling your boss that you can feel good about — and it is an approach that builds on the very discipline and logic that have led you to this point in your career in the first place. The approach to negotiation shared in this book is recognized as a global best practice.

IEEE-USA and Alignor hope you enjoy the *Engineering the Art of Negotiation* e-book series. We hope you apply the lessons in these books to make your professional (and your personal) life more rewarding and less stressful!

We also welcome your feedback and suggestions on how we can make this series more useful. In addition to the e-Book series, IEEE-USA and Alignor will be offering webinars, online learning resources and other opportunities for you to apply and improve the key negotiation skills that can make the difference in your career advancement and success.

You can get more information about these resources at www.alignor.com. You can also reach me directly at jshulman@alignor.com. I look forward to hearing from you.

~John G. Shulman

What is Negotiation?

What do we mean by *negotiation*? What exactly is *engineering the art of negotiation*? And isn't negotiation something you are either born good at, or else you are not good at it?

These are key questions. Let's take each in turn.

What do we mean by negotiation?

Negotiation sounds like something done by lawyers, corporate bigwigs, or people in trouble. It is true that all those people negotiate. But so do you. All the time. Yes, you negotiate every day. By *negotiation*, we mean every time you try to persuade a colleague to do something, or every time you try to influence your boss, or every time you try to get your friends or spouse or partner or kids to do something. The truth is, we are negotiating whenever we need or want someone else to do something. So, you can use the techniques and methodologies in this book for all of these negotiations, big and small.

What do we mean by engineering the art of negotiation?

We mean that you can apply a disciplined process to preparing for and implementing negotiations. This process does not mean you can remove the *art* of negotiation altogether — nor should you try to do so. The *art of negotiation* is how you express your own personality, your own individuality, when you negotiate. No matter how disciplined, organized and process-driven you may be, “give-and-take” lies at the heart of real-life negotiations. Conversely, even if you enjoy the art, and the give-and-take of negotiations, you can benefit from discipline, organization and a simple process. That is how we engineer the art of negotiation.

*Aren't some people **born** negotiators?* Without doubt, some people seem to be natural born negotiators. And some people seem to be natural engineers. But just as few engineers can reach the level of professionalism required to build a career by just intuitively figuring things out, few negotiators become great without a lot of hard work, discipline and preparation. So, as you will find from applying the lessons in this book, you can learn and develop the skills required of successful negotiators by following simple guidelines and methodologies. And as noted above, you can apply these skills on a daily basis — in all the negotiations you have — at work and at home!

Different Approaches to Negotiation

Before we get into how you should negotiate with your boss, we will cover the basics of negotiation. Consider this *Negotiation 101*.

Fundamentally, there are three ways to think about negotiation. And they are very different.

The first way is to think of negotiation as something scary, unpleasant or boring. In this way of looking at negotiation, you just react to whatever comes your way and hope for the best. Reaction is not the best way to negotiate.

The second way to think of negotiation is as a competitive game. You win; your adversary loses. Or vice-versa. Come to think of it, when your boss is the adversary, you probably lose. So, this competitive approach is also a bad way to negotiate with your boss. In fact, it is a bad way to negotiate with anyone you have an ongoing relationship with, anyone you care about.

Why?

Because if you look at negotiation as a competitive game — one with a winner and a loser — someone gets to win, but someone *has* to lose. And no one wants to be in a long-term relationship when the other person is trying to defeat them.

So what is the third approach to negotiation? Thought you'd never ask!

The third approach to negotiation is also the *preferred* approach to negotiation. The preferred approach recognizes that when both sides in a negotiation feel that they've gotten their needs met, then a greater opportunity to build solid relationships develops that each side can count on over time. You want to develop this kind of relationship with your boss, and with the other people you care about at work and at home.

Some people call this a *win-win* approach to negotiation. I prefer to call it ***interest-based negotiation***, since this approach is about satisfying people's interests, including your own. The basic concept is that people will try to satisfy their own interests in any given situation; so, if you can find ways to satisfy the interests of others through an agreement, then you can leverage that to satisfy your own interests.

In the real world, how do you satisfy your own interests and needs, as well as the interests of other people (their *needs*) with the interest-based approach? Great question!

The most effective way is to use the following three-step process:

THREE-STEP PROCESS

Step One: Who is involved and what do they need?

Step Two: What can we do to meet the needs of others and get what we want?

Step Three: What are the consequences if we do not come to agreement?

When you prepare for a negotiation, you should follow the three-step process. The three steps apply to any and all negotiations, including when you are dealing with your boss. The three steps will keep you on track to satisfy your own needs, and to the extent possible, help satisfy the needs of others.

Let's look at each of the three steps.

Step One: Who is involved and what do they need?

This step is the foundation of effective negotiating. We are talking about understanding the basic information you will need to develop a sound strategy.

The first thing you must do in Step One is figure out who is involved or affected by the situation. These are the *stakeholders*.

Next, you must identify the topics or things those stakeholders care about. We'll call these the *issues*.

Finally, you have to put yourself in each stakeholder's shoes to determine *on each issue* what that stakeholder *needs* (or wants). These are the interests that drive decision-making and behavior.

Once you have mapped this basic information in an Interest Chart (see *The Alignor Process Worksheet* below), you have a solid foundation for proceeding to Step Two of the three-step process, in which you will come up with solutions for satisfying the stakeholder interests you have identified in Step One.

Step Two: What can we do to meet the needs of others and get what we want?

Now that you know who the stakeholders are and what their interests are, it is time to come up with solutions. In Step Two, you want to be both creative and analytical. Divide this step into two parts: brainstorming and evaluation.

Here is how it works. First, you go issue-by-issue and ask yourself for each stakeholder what actions you can think of that could potentially be done to satisfy the interest of that stakeholder on that issue. You want to brainstorm as many possible actions as you can without evaluating each action at this time. Some of the ideas will be good ideas; some ideas will not. Don't worry about whether they are good or bad — that comes later. If possible, try to get other people to contribute their ideas, too. Just because someone suggests an idea that you can add to your list does not mean you are agreeing to go ahead with the idea.

After you have exhausted the brainstorming process, you should evaluate the actions on your list. As noted above, some ideas will be good; others will not. At this stage, you can evaluate each action to determine whether it satisfies (or harms) each stakeholder's interests. Your purpose in evaluating the actions is to put together a "best case" package of actions that most effectively satisfies your own interests and also satisfies, to the extent possible, the interests of others, such as your boss.

If you find that you do not have actions that satisfy the critical interests of some stakeholders, you can do a "mini-brainstorm" and try to come up with more actions. In this way, the process is both iterative and potentially collaborative, as you seek input from others on ideas that might satisfy identified stakeholder interests.

You can also use your interactions with others to obtain a form of *peer review*. By bouncing ideas off your colleagues, or even your boss, you can validate your analysis and often get buy-in from others to the idea that you are trying to satisfy their needs.

Step Three: What are the consequences if we do not come to agreement?

Step Three is risk analysis. As much as we may want to come to an agreement that works for us and pleases other stakeholders, particularly the boss, we must understand what may happen if we cannot come to agreement. I call Step Three *fighting alternatives* (or FALTs) to remind myself that there are often unpleasant consequences from not coming to agreement — for example, conflict.

In our Step Three analysis, we must figure out what stakeholders *may* do if they are unable to come to agreement. Generally, stakeholders will do two things when they pursue their *fighting alternatives*:

- a) They attempt to satisfy their own interests unilaterally in the absence of an agreement; and
- b) They often attempt to harm the interests of others — they may do so out of anger, or to “soften up” their perceived adversaries.

Of course, Step Three can help you plan for conflict (in case you cannot get to agreement). But it can also help you *avoid* conflict by using *your fighting alternatives* analysis to educate yourself and your negotiation counterparts, including your boss, about the costs of conflict. This analysis can help people be more realistic — and more reasonable — in considering a possible negotiated agreement.

The *Alignor Process Worksheet* on the following page can guide you through the three-step process as you identify stakeholders, issues and interests; brainstorm and evaluate possible actions; and consider *fighting alternatives*.

The Alignor® Process Worksheet

Step 1: Interests Analysis

ISSUES	STAKEHOLDERS		

Step 2: Brainstorm Possible ACTIONS

Step 3: Understand FIGHTING ALTERNATIVES

Implementation

The three-step process is iterative. It provides a framework for sound decision-making. As you learn more, you must update your assumptions on an ongoing basis. The quality of the assumptions in Step One are the key to making the process work. You will not likely find options for satisfying people's interests, if you do not understand their interests. The hard work is putting yourself in other people's shoes (in Step One), and really understanding what their interests are.

Once you have done the hard work in Step One, and made those key assumptions about people's interests, you should validate your assumption. Talk with others; check out online and other resources; and observe how other stakeholders respond to situations in which their needs may be satisfied or harmed. And you should talk directly with others, including your boss, about their interests. You may be surprised at how open they are to a conversation about how you can meet their needs.

As you have conversations with others and consider various options for satisfying your own interests and the interests of others, remain open to and actively solicit more ideas. You should continue attempting to refine, then add to and improve your possible actions, until you feel you have a package that satisfies the interests of all stakeholders as effectively as possible.

Finally, before you conclude that an agreement is not possible (or desirable), be sure you have fully evaluated, and if appropriate, re-evaluated your Step Three *fighting alternatives* analysis to be sure that you have taken into account any new information. You do not want to pursue *fighting alternatives* without considering carefully whether you can develop better negotiation options, and without carefully evaluating all of the costs (and opportunities) posed by not coming to agreement.

Negotiating With Your Boss: A Case Study

Let's see how the three-step process works when you have to *negotiate* with your boss. The objective here is to build a healthy, durable relationship with your boss by understanding his or her needs, and by finding effective ways to satisfy those needs. When used diligently, the three-step process can guide you toward not merely handling your boss, but toward building a relationship in which your boss comes to rely on and respect you. In this type of mutually beneficial relationship, your boss will count on you as a valued team member, problem-solver and potential leader.

Mini Case Study: Handling a Key Request from Your Boss

Let's say your boss asks you to take on a major new project at a time when you are already overworked. You have other priorities and projects, and you do not see how you can take on this new project. Your colleagues in the R&D organization could take on some of the workload, but more than a few of them are slackers. Moreover, the boss insists you personally manage this major new project, since it is very high profile and you are known within the organization as a hard worker and strong performer. As much as you want to, you feel you cannot just say, *No*.

The boss senses your reluctance. She does not want to push you. "*Are you okay with this assignment?*" she asks.

What should you say?

You want to say, *No*. But if you do, your relationship with the boss may suffer. And truth be told, you would like the boss to consider you for a year-end bonus, and maybe even a promotion down the line.

On the other hand, if you say, *Yes*, then your personal life and job satisfaction will suffer.

It feels like a no-win situation.

Can you really *negotiate* with your boss?

Isn't that risky? What if the boss thinks you are refusing to help her out, or that you are challenging her authority? Even if you won't lose your job over this situation, it does not feel like you are handling your boss very well, whether you agree to take on the extra work or refuse.

Then, you remember that you can *negotiate* without being difficult or confrontational by trying to satisfy the interests of others, even as you meet your own needs. Yes, you turn to the three-step process!

You start out by asking questions. You ask the boss to share with you her objectives on the new project. She stares at you for a second trying to understand why she should spend her time answering your questions, and then realizes they are good questions. If you better understand her objectives, you can meet her needs more effectively. The boss tells you she has committed to her boss to bring the budget in within budget and on time. She says this project will enhance the visibility of the department at a time when R&D budgets are under scrutiny. Finally, the boss confides that this is her chance to make a name for herself within the organization. She says she won't forget your part in making this project a success.

You are tempted to agree to the boss' request on the spot. But then you think about all the late nights and weekends of extra work this project will require.

You ask the boss if you can get back to her later that day with a plan. She is thrilled.

Okay, so far, so good. You have *negotiated* for a little time to do your three-step analysis. And you have obtained valuable knowledge that you can use to develop your Step One Interest Chart. So let's get to it!

See if you can fill out the blank *Alignor Process Worksheet* above to handle the situation with the boss. When you have done so, take a look at the sample Interest Chart on the page below.

Case Study Step One : The Alignor® Process Worksheet

Step 1: Interests Analysis

ISSUES	STAKEHOLDERS		
	YOU	YOUR BOSS	CO-WORKERS
<i>Timing of Project</i>	REASONABLE	<u>ON TIME</u>	REASONABLE
<i>Budget for Project</i>	SUFFICIENT	<u>NOT EXCEED</u>	SUFFICIENT
<i>Boss' Reputation</i>	LEVERAGE	<u>BUILD</u>	N/A
<i>Workload</i>	<u>REASONABLE</u>	PRODUCTIVITY	<u>MINIMIZE</u>

Step 2: Brainstorm Possible ACTIONS

Step 3: Understand FIGHTING ALTERNATIVES

Okay, so you have done Step One. You have completed the heavy lifting in your three-step analysis! You can compare your analysis to my sample analysis in the Interest Chart above. You will notice that I have underlined the interests that I believe are critical to various stakeholders. You want to pay particular attention to those critical interests — if you can satisfy them, you will likely have a happy stakeholder, such as the boss, on your hands.

Now what do we do? Let's get to Step Two.

Take a moment with a blank piece of paper and see how many ideas you can come up with to satisfy the interests of the stakeholders on your Interest Chart. For example, start with the issue of Timing. What can you do to see that the project is done *on time* (to satisfy the boss' interest)? Can you come up with ideas on how the project timing could also be made reasonable (to satisfy your interest and the interest of your co-workers)?

After you have gone through each of the stakeholder interests on each issue and brainstormed actions, take a look at the sample list of actions below:

Case Study Step Two: Sample List of Possible Actions

Timing of Project:

- Do project right away
- Identify priorities for various parts of project
- Do project in phases
- Defer other projects until this one is done

Budget for Project:

- Do project within budget
- Re-evaluate scope of project and budget
- Agree on criteria for funding

Boss' Reputation:

- Clarify to project team importance of the project
- Defer non-essential work to ensure completion
- Agree on talking points to others in organization

Workload:

- Project team gets extra time off after project completed
- Re-arrange team member workloads to equalize burden
- Coordinate scope and sequence of project work with other projects
- Defer all non-essential work until project done

As you can see from the above examples, there are potentially many creative ways to satisfy the interests of the stakeholders we identified in our Interest Chart (Step One). At the same time, not each idea is equally good (or even good at all)! So, after you have brainstormed possible actions, you must evaluate those actions.

The purpose of evaluating actions is to put together a *best case* package of actions that can form a solid action plan. In our case study, we might package the actions as follows:

Sample Best Case Plan

Timing of Project:

- Identify priorities for various parts of project
- Defer other projects until this one is done

Budget for Project:

- Do project within budget
- Agree on criteria for funding

Boss' Reputation:

- Clarify to project team importance of the project
- Defer non-essential work to ensure completion
- Agree on talking points about the project to others in organization

Workload:

- Project team gets extra time off after project completed
- Re-arrange team member workloads to equalize burden
- Defer all non-essential work until project done

The best case plan listed above reflects my judgment about what package of actions the fictional boss in our case study might accept, and also what we would want in that package. The best case plan is a reach, in that it includes some things like, *Project team gets extra time off after project completed* and *Defer all non-essential work until project done*, that the boss will not like. But I have some confidence that the boss will like the *overall* package, since it satisfies her critical interests by not exceeding the project budget, helping her build her reputation, and getting the important parts of the project done on time.

I recommend that you communicate your best case plan in bullet-point form. Keep it simple and to the point. An ideal format for communicating your plan is to start with your objectives (focusing on the boss' critical interests); then list the specific actions you are proposing, and how those actions satisfy your boss' interests; and conclude by expressing an openness to hearing from your boss how you can improve the plan.

Sample Talking Points for Boss

Here is an example of talking points for the boss in our case study:

Objectives

- Ensure that the project is done on time
- Guarantee that the project does not exceed its budget
- Improve productivity from your team
- Protect your reputation

Specific Actions

- Do project within budget
 - *Not Exceed — Budget for Project*
 - *Build — Boss' Reputation*
- Agree on criteria for funding
- Identify priorities for various parts of project
 - *On-Time — Timing of Project*
- Defer all non-essential work until project done
 - *On-Time — Timing of Project*
- Defer other projects until this one is done
 - *On-Time — Timing of Project*
- Clarify to project team importance of the project
 - *Build — Boss' Reputation*
- Agree on talking points to others in organization
 - *Build — Boss' Reputation*
- Rearrange team member workloads to equalize burden
 - *On-Time — Timing of Project*
- Productivity — Workload
- Project team gets extra time off after project completed
 - *Build — Boss' Reputation*

Conclusion

- I believe the above ideas can help achieve your objectives
- I'd like to discuss how we can improve these ideas to meet your objectives

Okay, we have put together our best case plan with talking points demonstrating how the specific actions in the plan satisfy the boss' interests. We are confident that the boss will respond positively.

*But what if the boss is unreasonable? What if she is a bully and wants to push you around? Or what if your co-workers are not on board? In short, **what if you cannot get agreement on your recommended approach?***

We need to complete our three-step process to answer the above questions. So let's get to it.

Remember, in Step Three we are looking at *fighting alternatives*, or what each stakeholder *may* do to try to satisfy its interests unilaterally in the absence of an agreement, and what they may do to impose consequences on each other.

Take a moment now and see if you can anticipate what you would do in our case study if you cannot come to agreement with the boss and/or your co-workers on this new project. Be sure to estimate how likely you really are to pursue a given *fighting alternative*. Then go through the same analysis for your boss and your co-workers, since each other stakeholder will pursue its own *fighting alternatives*.

When you are done, take a look at the list of sample *fighting alternatives* on the page below.

Case Study Step Three: Sample Fighting Alternatives

You:	Likelihood
• Agree to do the project, but neglect other work	70%
• Start looking for another job	50%
• Give your all until you burn out	50%
• Refuse to work on the project	30%
• Quit your job	10%
Boss:	
• Look for ways to get you in the future	90%
• Give you a bad annual review	80%
• Force you to do the work anyway	50%
• Badmouth you to other leaders	30%
• Fire you	10%
Co-workers:	
• Agree to help but refuse to give their best	90%
• Badmouth you	70%
• Badmouth the boss	50%
• Sabotage the project	40%
• Refuse to help with the project	20%
• Look for other jobs	20%

As you can see from the sample *fighting alternatives* above, there are many things the stakeholders in our case study *might* do to try to satisfy their interests and/or harm the interests of others, if they do not come to agreement. We say the stakeholders *might* pursue these *fighting alternatives* because, by definition, we cannot know what people may do in the absence of an agreement. We can, however, make assumptions about what we think they will do. And we can put a percentage probability to each *fighting alternative*.

For example, the sample list of *fighting alternatives* above indicates how likely the stakeholders in the case study are to pursue various *fighting alternatives*. You will note that each stakeholder may pursue multiple *fighting alternatives*, and the percentage likelihoods for all of them need not add up to 100 percent.

The key point in Step Three is to understand what conflict may look like. You can use this analysis to adjust your expectations (up or down) for a negotiated agreement in Step Two. You can also use Step Three to educate others, such as your boss, about the risks of not coming to agreement. Finally, you can use Step Three to help you identify new stakeholders, issues or interests (in Step One), or to guide your search for additional possible actions (Step Two).

If you are considering communicating *fighting alternatives* to other stakeholders, particularly your boss, you should be careful in doing so. There are a number of things you should take into account before you communicate *fighting alternatives*.

First, be sure your Step Three analysis is accurate. If it is not accurate, you may be perceived by others, including your boss, as bluffing by threatening *fighting alternatives* that are not real. If you misjudge or bluff, you will look very bad. If you do so with your boss, you may permanently damage the relationship with your boss.

Second, understand that there is a high risk that others will resent you for telling them about the risks of *fighting alternatives* — **even if you are telling the truth**. If you are communicating potential bad news, other stakeholders, such as your boss, may blame the messenger — you.

That leads to the next point. If you have decided that the risk of resentment and retaliation is worth the benefit of talking candidly about the risks of conflict, then you should be sure to communicate information about *fighting alternatives* in an **educational**, and **not a threatening**, manner. You should speak in a conversational, relaxed tone, and acknowledge that this stuff is difficult to talk about.

If we were to use our case study as an example, you might have the following conversation.

Boss: I'm not comfortable giving extra time off just because you get this project done on time. And I don't think we can afford to put off other projects while we do this one. To tell you the truth, I think you people need to suck it up and be more productive.

You: I understand your concerns. I've been thinking about ways to make this work. One thing I was concerned about is if we push everyone on the team too hard, productivity may slip. I don't know if they do it on purpose, or if it's just bad habits, but it seems to happen whenever people think they get pushed too hard. And since this is such an important project for our organization, I don't think we can afford to take that chance.

Boss: I see what you mean. Let me give it some thought.

You: Okay. I'll think about other ways to address your concerns as well.

As you can see from the above dialogue, you can raise concerns in a non-threatening, productive manner, when you are clear about how potential *fighting alternatives* may harm the interests of other stakeholders, particularly your boss. In fact, when done well, this kind of conversation helps you gain your boss' trust and respect.

Now that we have walked through all three steps using our case study for illustration, let's look at some common mistakes people make when they negotiate.

Common Mistakes

There are a number of common mistakes you can make when negotiating. Four common, avoidable mistakes are:

- 1) Falling back into old habits and merely responding to what others do to you;
- 2) Taking positions, rather than trying to satisfy the underlying interests;
- 3) Misunderstanding either your own interests or the interests of others; and
- 4) Failing to consider a range of options for satisfying everyone's interests.

Let's take a look at how you can avoid or correct these mistakes.

Falling back into old habits. Let's face it. This is easy to do. We do it when we're feeling pressure. We do it when we feel too relaxed. We have to be diligent about learning, applying and improving our negotiation skills.

That is where the discipline of the three-step process comes in. If you remind yourself to use the interest-based negotiation process, you are less likely to fall into old, bad habits, and more likely to build on your successful negotiations.

Taking positions. A position is one way to satisfy an underlying interest. But a position is not necessarily the *best* way to satisfy a given interest. Most often, a position is taken because of habit or ignorance, or just because the position reflects the way things are usually done.

Resist the temptation to communicate positions when you negotiate. Instead, communicate your ideas as options for satisfying identified interests, not as fixed positions.

When you avoid taking positions, you are less likely to find yourself in competitive, adversarial negotiations, and more likely to engage in collaborative problem-solving with your boss and others.

Misunderstanding interests. It is going to happen from time to time. But you have to recognize it when you do not understand people's interests and adjust quickly. How can you avoid dangerous misunderstandings? Simple: **active listening**. Active listening means you confirm during or immediately after a conversation what you understand the interests of other stakeholders, such as your boss, to be. In addition to helping you avoid misunderstandings, this important skill enables you to build strong relationships fast.

Failing to consider a range of options. This mistake is closely related to taking positions. You want to preserve flexibility, so that you can consider a range of options for satisfying the needs of various stakeholders, including yourself and your boss. Invite others to share their ideas for how you can meet their needs. When you receive feedback and ideas from others, you need not commit to doing what they recommend.

Summary

As you apply the methodology and techniques outlined in this book, keep in mind the following:

- Choose the interest-based approach and methodology for negotiation (rather than a passive approach or the competitive/positional approach)
- Use the three-step process to build a strong relationship with your boss
- Start with a stakeholder interests analysis (Step One) and fill out an Interest Chart
- Remember to identify your own interests, as well as the interests of your boss and other stakeholders
- Confirm your understanding of other stakeholders' interests, including your boss' interests
- Then, brainstorm possible options for satisfying the interests of all stakeholders, including yourself and your boss (Step Two)
- Finally, understand the risks (and opportunities) for all stakeholders — you, your boss and others — if you cannot come to agreement (Step Three)
- Put together an optimal package of options as a **Best Case Plan**
- Communicate how your recommendation will satisfy the interests of the other stakeholders, including your boss
- If necessary (and appropriate), discuss the risks of not coming to agreement in a professional, educational, non-threatening manner

Most of all, have fun! And good luck, as you *engineer the art of negotiation!*

About the Author

John G. Shulman is the President and CEO of the negotiation consulting and training firm, Alignor. An experienced attorney and negotiator skilled in the art and science of interest-based negotiation, Mr. Shulman has worked with dozens of large organizations and personally negotiated business deals worth hundreds of millions of dollars across the globe.

With an A.B. in English from Harvard College and a J.D. from Harvard Law School, Mr. Shulman trained with leaders in the negotiation field. He has worked with the Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School on a project in the Middle East addressing conflict over Gaza and the West Bank, and has provided negotiation and conflict resolution training to United Nations personnel at the War Crimes Tribunal for Rwanda. He is currently a Director of the Center for Negotiation and Justice at William Mitchell College of Law in St. Paul, Minnesota.

Mr. Shulman has employed advanced interest-based strategies on behalf of a wide variety of clients, including 3M, Thomson West, US Bank, Sandoz Pharmaceuticals, AstraZeneca, HealthPartners, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, Grupo Televisa, PanAmSat, Pepsico, General Mills, International Dairy Queen, Schwan's, Northwest Airlines, the CCIM Institute, Xcel Energy, and Imation Corp., which awarded Mr. Shulman its prestigious *Chairman's Business Turning Point Award* in 2002.

Mr. Shulman has been a featured presenter on negotiation and leadership topics at numerous international seminars and conferences. He has conducted seminars and training workshops around the globe for thousands of business managers and leaders, sales professionals, and procurement professionals in interest-based approaches to negotiation, sales, project management, account management, supply chain management, leadership, and conflict resolution.

Along with one of the co-founders of Alignor, Mr. Shulman wrote and directed the award-winning human rights movie *JUSTICE*. He has played professional soccer in Asia, and has traveled to and negotiated in over forty countries around the world.

About Alignor

Alignor is the world leader in performance improvement solutions utilizing the interest-based approach to negotiation and leadership development. Alignor was founded by Harvard graduates and expert negotiators who developed a streamlined, effective process for managing key negotiations, handling business challenges, and resolving high-stakes disputes. Alignor helps its clients achieve their business objectives through a wide array of products and services, including customized training, expert coaching and consulting, evaluation tools, blended learning and e-learning, online interactive negotiation games, and customized job aids and tools.

Clients in numerous industries have embraced the Alignor approach to negotiation and leadership development as a “best practice” for numerous core activities, including sales, project management, supply chain management, account management, contract negotiations, mergers and acquisitions, strategic decisions, conflict resolution, and improving organizational alignment.

Organizations implementing Alignor’s approach to negotiation have documented reduced costs, substantial revenue increases, faster closing time for deals, and stronger relationships (internal and external) that they attribute to their work with Alignor.

Alignor has trained and worked with thousands of business professionals from organizations throughout the United States and the world, including 3M, Northwest Airlines, Grupo Televisa, Sandoz Pharmaceuticals, AstraZeneca, HealthPartners, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, PanAmSat, Xcel Energy, U.S. Bank, Thomson Reuters, General Mills, PepsiCo, Schwan’s, Supervalu, International Dairy Queen, Petters Group Worldwide, Imation Corp, and the U.S. Department of State.

Alignor works with clients on negotiation and leadership strategy and implementation, and has negotiated agreements in the health care, transportation, food, manufacturing, commercial real estate, hi tech, financial services, legal services, and entertainment industries, among others.

Alignor has partnered with IEEE-USA to bring world-class negotiation strategies and methodologies to the electrical engineering profession. Alignor has also partnered with the CCIM Institute, part of the National Association of Realtors, to bring Alignor’s process and methodologies to the commercial real estate industry. Alignor has also set up a Center for Negotiation and Justice at William Mitchell College of Law in St. Paul, Minnesota and has established a cooperative relationship with NALSAR National Law University, Hyderabad in India.

Alignor’s public interest work includes partnering with the Harvard Program on Negotiation to facilitate dialogue among Israeli leaders over withdrawal of settlements from Gaza and the West Bank. Alignor has provided negotiation and conflict resolution training for United Nations personnel at the War Crimes Tribunal for Rwanda. Alignor also trains lawyers, judges, community advocates and leaders in the United States, Africa and Asia in negotiation, empowerment, and conflict resolution strategies.

You can access more information about Alignor and its pioneering work at www.alignor.com.



1828 L Street, NW, Suite 1202

Washington, D.C. 20036

+1 202 785 0017

www.ieeeusa.org