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Strengths

Two of my strengths are **persuasion** and **interpersonal intelligence**, as described in *Negotiation: Readings, Exercises, Cases* book. Cognitive intelligence helps me comprehend complex ideas and make rational decisions while also understanding people and building relationships with them. Because of this strength, I also tend to excel at persuading other parties see the value of my preposition and “move” toward my direction.

Weaknesses

While I am able to leverage cognitive intelligence and persuasion as strengths, I have noticed I am **quick to agree to others’ creative solutions**, rather than consider my own or other collective solutions. I have recognized this as a pattern in my negotiation experiences. When other parties present unique or creative solutions, I rarely challenge the preposition or make alterations. I would like to improve this weakness by developing a stronger sense of emotional intelligence in order to develop my own creative, innovation solutions. This will not only benefit myself as a negotiator, but also the other parties- it will help me to find ways to accomplish objectives and also meet objectives of other side without giving up much.

Negotiation 1

**Type:** Integrative

**Parties:** Two friends and myself

**Interests:** Collective interest of taking a weekend trip to Traverse City, and varying individual interests of wine tasting, seeing Sleeping Bear Dunes, visiting family members, and seeing fall colors along the way.

**BATNA:** Not go on the trip to Traverse City, and seek other weekend plans.

**Desired Outcome:** Weekend trip to Traverse City with my friends

**Trigger:** The trigger for this negotiation was meeting the friends for lunch (*time*) on Wednesday (*day*) to discuss specific weekend plans.

**Details:**

This week, I was negotiating with a close friend about weekend plans. The plan was for the friend and I to drive up to Traverse City in order to go wine tasting and to Sleeping Bear dunes. He had an additional interest of wanting to visit his family in Traverse City as well. Another party of this negotiation was an international student who wanted to join along, with a main interest of seeing the changing tree colors of northern Michigan. Here, we have **multiple parties** with **multiple interests**. The conflict in this situation is that the friend is scheduled to work Saturday morning, which would give us a very late start to our trip. First, I explained why I thought my friend “deserved” the day- not only has not asked for a day off in the past, but he also recently won a performance award at his company. After I convinced him of this newfound leverage, he considered calling the day off. He then brought up another conflict- that his relatives are visiting his family in Traverse City, which would leave little room for sleeping arrangements. I proposed multiple solutions for this problem. A third issue was brought up by the third friend- we would have to drive back early because two of us have exams early Monday. In the end, I was able to build a strong argument for why the friend should request the day off and solution to sleeping arrangements, however, I was not able to provide a creative solution to this problem. Instead, it was concluded that there are too many difficult aspects of the weekend trip, thus, we would accept our BATNA’s with hopes of rescheduling at a later date.

In this case, it is clear how I accepted the others’ solutions because this negotiation does not appear to have clear, black-or-white solutions. In a previous memo, I requested an extension on a job offer deadline. I also viewed this negotiation as black-or-white, with only two solutions. If I would’ve used EI to develop a creative solution, I could have extended my deadline even further. In both situations, I was quick to adopt others’ creative solutions rather than consider my own or rather a collaborative solution.

Negotiation 2

**Type:** Integrative

**Parties:** Company 1, Company 2, myself

**Interests:** Securing a full-time position, continuing a relationship with both companies, proper job fit, adhering to time deadlines.

**BATNA:** Accept Company 1’s offer

**Desired Outcome:** Secure full-time position with Company 2

**Trigger:** Trigger for this negotiation was three days before Company 1’s deadline.

**Details:**

I believe a job interview is a form of a negotiation. There are typically two parties, company and candidate, yet there are **multiple interests** and many complexities involved. There are often multiple issues, so in this case, the negotiation was integrative. In this case, I was negotiating with two companies/parties. As my deadline for Company 1 was only two days away, Company 2’s representative explained the Program Manager’s interest in hiring me for a full-time position. Through previous interactions, I was aware of the potential interest, however, Company 1’s deadline was fast approaching and I would not decline this without a formal offer from Company 2. Thus, I needed to negotiate with Company 2 to develop a **creative solution** to this conflict. Their initial request of me further extending this deadline was rejected because I did not want to hinder my relationship with Company 1. Then, the Manager explained that if the two interviews went well, which he had expected as the outcome, Company 2 could expedite the process by giving me an informal offer, but not a formal offer until a week later. Here, the concept of **risk averse** behavior comes into play. The risk averse choice would be to wait for potential future negotiations rather than accept the current offer (*Negotiation: Readings, Exercises, Cases* p. 38). The outcome was that I accepted Company 2’s solution and rejected Company 1’s offer.

In this negotiation, I recognize that my strength actually transcended into my weakness; the two are inter-related. Perhaps the reason I was so quick to accept the other party’s creative solution was because of the trust and credibility that was built through a relationship (interpersonal intelligence). Strengthening my emotional intelligence, however, which is a more complex and challenging type of intelligence to develop, will allow me to overcome the barrier of quickly adopting others’ creative strategies.

Improvement Strategy

I identified my strengths as using persuasion and interpersonal intelligence while my weakness is quickly accepting others’ creative solutions rather than developing innovative, creative solutions of my own. Its important to note that identifying this as a weakness does not imply lack thereof, but rather, weakness in developing emotional intelligence. Understanding how my strengths and weaknesses are connected as well as the patterns I display as a negotiator will help to further frame my improvement strategy.

* **Specific**- My strategy for the next negotiation is to develop my own creative, innovative solutions before accepting the other party’s, thereby, taking a step toward developing emotional intelligence.
* **Measurable**- Throughout the negotiation, I will develop 2 creative solutions (before even hearing the other party’s solution, which may create biases)
* **Achievable**- This strategy is achievable and appropriate if I am involved with an integrative negotiation. A fixed-pie perspective, through a distributive negotiation, may inhibit my ability to create these innovative solutions.
* **Realistic**- The strategy is relevant and is set at an adequate level; the strategy is not too low or high.
* **Trigger**- One way I could “trigger” this improvement strategy is to have a blank sheet of paper with me during the negotiation so that I can write my two creative solutions. Furthermore, I will strive for these improvements for every in-class negotiation; precisely, each Thursday morning of this semester.