Marco Behrmann

Negotiation and Persuasion

The Science and Art of Winning Cooperative Partners

hogrefe

Negotiation and Persuasion

About the Author

Marco Behrmann, PhD, studied industrial and organizational psychology in Mannheim and Hohenheim (Germany) and in Portland, OR (USA), and has a doctorate on the topic of negotiation competence. He was director of personnel assessment with a management consultancy in Stuttgart (Germany) until 2008, and since then has been working as a consultant, trainer, and coach with Cevey Consulting, an international consultancy group with members in Tübingen (Germany) and in Vancouver, BC (Canada). He is also on the faculty of the ZfU International Business School in Zurich (Switzerland). Marco's current emphasis as Senior Consultant is in the areas of negotiation, leadership, sales, customer orientation, team development, and cross-cultural communication and collaboration. He advises organizations and individuals in English or German on areas such as performance orientation and management, leadership appraisal, management audit, assessment centers, potential measurement, personnel selection and development, and individual coaching.

Negotiation and Persuasion

The Science and Art of Winning Cooperative Partners

Marco Behrmann

hogrefe

Peer Commentaries

"Marco Behrmann's book is a concise overview of research on negotiation competence. It gives insights into a new approach that focuses on the interaction of trait, competence, and situational setting. It is a neat example of using scientific findings to underline and focus training and development in business settings."
Bernhard Cevey, PhD, Consultant and Entrepreneur in Human Resources Management, CEO of CEVEYGROUP, Tübingen, Munich, Vancouver, Hongkong

"Marco Behrmann has collated scientific knowledge on negotiation and persuasion for use in organizational practice. Presented in a concise and even entertaining style, this book succeeds in demonstrating how to negotiate successfully and fairly at the same time. A clear recommendation."
Heinz Schuler, PhD, Hohenheim University, Stuttgart, Germany

"Marco Behrmann has written an excellent guide for both individual negotiators and those who manage negotiations for large organizations. He provides not only practical advice but also the theory and concepts behind the negotiation process. He includes excellent, real-world case studies and helpful tools and checklists. This will be the "go-to" book for novices and experienced negotiators alike."
Donald M. Truxillo, Professor, Department of Psychology, Portland State University, OR, USA

"This book successfully bridges theory and practice on negotiation and persuasion, and thus constitutes a long-needed resource. The core principles are explained in an easy-to-read and engaging style and are exemplified with case studies. This is an eye-opening read for all those who negotiate and ideal for students and practitioners alike."
Rainer Greifeneder, PhD, Professor, University of Basel, Switzerland

"Dr. Behrmann does an outstanding job of presenting the theoretical models and research findings in the fields of negotiation and persuasion in a clear and concise format, and in a way that readers can easily apply in real life. Leaders and managers of organizations, professional negotiators, salespeople, customer service professionals, parents, teachers, and people simply seeking to improve their personal relationships with others will find this book helpful. The recommendations and checklists in the appendix are particularly helpful. For students enrolled in a course on negotiation and/or persuasion, this book should be required reading."
Peter D. Bullard, PhD, Founder & Former CEO of American Tescor, Inc., Beaverton, OR, USA

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Heinz Schuler, my advisor during my dissertation on negotiation, for his trust in my work. Special thanks go to Dr. Bernhard Cevey, who supported and initiated many valuable ideas. I would also like to acknowledge the fruitful exchange and work of my team at CEVEYCONSULTING GmbH and CEVEYSYSTEMS GmbH, which had a great impact on the cases in Chapter 5. Finally, I would like to express my thanks to everybody who supported me in the realization of this book. Thanks also to the committed team at Hogrefe Publishing for their effort in publishing the international edition.

Dedication

For my family and friends

Table of Contents

1 Negotiate and Persuade – Definition and Meaning

1.1 Clarifying the Topic

Negotiations are crucial elements of interpersonal communication both in our everyday and in our professional lives. At the same time, negotiating in a persuading manner is one of the greatest challenges of interpersonal communication.

Negotiation is everywhere

The aim of a negotiation is always to reach a personal or a shared objective, to agree to some form of cooperation, or to resolve a conflict (Spieß, 2004). Although we often negotiate or try to persuade people almost subconsciously or casually, in some cases we do so systematically and intentionally. In the latter cases, we are using means of communication (see Lewicki, Saunders, & Barry, 2006).

It is simple to imagine situations where negotiations or persuasion are needed in a work environment. For example, a manager is negotiating and persuading when he or she delegates a task to an employee and wants the employee to take on the responsibility for the task with enthusiasm and engagement. Or a sales rep has to be more persuading than the competition in order to win over a major new customer.

Negotiation has many layers

Another negotiation scenario might involve retrospectively agreeing some flexibility in the promises and obligations set out in a cooperation agreement between two companies. A project manager, on the other hand, might need to give a persuading presentation about a project to an important group of stakeholders during a delicate phase of the project and be able to appear persuading when answering critical questions from the stakeholders.

Complaints about a defective product or about the performance of service staff are also situations in which it is important to be persuading and, above all, willing to cooperate in order not to damage the reputation of the product, the manufacturer, the service provider, the sales organization, or, quite simply, customer loyalty.

Whenever we work with other people, differences in opinion can very quickly lead to misunderstandings. These are negotiation situations where it is important to reach a common understanding of what is involved.

Finally, different departments within a company may frequently have conflicting goals that require negotiation – typical topics can be as simple as striking a balance between production costs and a focus on quality, disagreements between marketing and sales departments, or conflicts between the personnel department and the works council.

Classic conflicting goals

Even within teams and in conflict management situations, we often encounter entrenched differences where it is important to apply our knowledge of the situation and of our counterpart to act persuadingly and use communication techniques effectively.

The challenge involved in a systematic consideration of the process of negotiating and persuading lies especially in the *complexity of the subject*.

Negotiation is complex

Quite often, natural differences in frames of reference or variables over which we have no control limit our flexibility in our own negotiations.

Restriction due to parameters

For example, the budget of a buyer in a company may be limited when he or she is negotiating long-term supply agreements with a supplier. In another case, a motivated human resources (HR) manager must demonstrate loyalty to company interests when negotiating an employment contract with a new employee the manager wants to hire. Other limitations due to specific circumstances, such as highly structured and systematized negotiations, such as those in international committee meetings or politics may considerably limit the leeway in negotiations. This also happens when large corporations systematize purchasing negotiations or sales activities. They generally do this to gain advantages through efficiencies, transparency, or profitability.

Process specifications

Skilled use of negotiation techniques

Of course, negotiators differ in terms of their knowledge of and skills in negotiation techniques, as well as in their social skills. In some situations, your skill in negotiation techniques can give you a lead in regard to your power of persuasion compared with the other person.

Attitude matters

Personal attitudes as well as negotiating skills affect the outcome of negotiations. For example, does the negotiation partner want to manipulate the other rather than achieve a fair result for both sides? The way in which one negotiation partner perceives the attitude of the other, and also what this attitude really is, will have a considerable effect on the course of the negotiations and on the result.

Habits are a barrier to improvement

The mutual expectations and the habits of those involved have a great influence on the strategies used and on the actual performance in negotiations. For instance, sales representatives will rely on their previous experience or maintain certain rituals when dealing with their customers, whether old or new. They will do this all the more if the strategy has been successful in the past.

Thus, many negotiations and discussions aimed at persuading someone are based on habit rather than on thoughtful planning. In very few cases do people draw conclusions from difficult meetings and frustrating negotiations. Because of this, potential lessons are usually lost or superseded by chance or the negotiator's own intuition.

Perception and sentiments as influencing factors

Additionally, negotiating effectiveness is often determined by issues such as who is perceived to have power, dependency, specific ethical principles, or personal attitudes. It is easy to imagine that during the negotiations, a nervous job applicant will list different goals and be less persuading than a more self-assured, self-confident candidate. Naturally, personal traits have an influence on the person's behavior and impact during collaboration and meetings. All of these obvious and subtle influencing factors help define how effective a person can and will appear during negotiations.

Influence of personality

Questions on negotiation

What exactly is negotiation? How can you describe and understand negotiation? How can you control negotiation? Are there ways to measure negotiation outcomes? What can you do to optimize your own effectiveness in persuasion and negotiation results? How can an organization, a manager, a salesperson, a purchasing manager, a customer account manager, or an individual maximize effectiveness in terms of appearance and persuasion? To answer these questions, various relevant and applicable topics have been chosen for this book.

The scientific background of negotiation is described in the following chapters. Many scientific results are from a variety of disciplines. Many are

found in the laboratory. They provide potential guidance for improvements, even if the scientific research is rather complex.

Negotiation is anything but a purely rational phenomenon, which explains why it is investigated in more than one discipline. If the implementation of certain measures or a specific behavior change can increase the effectiveness of negotiations, these measures can have benefits for individuals and organizations. Therefore, there will be a special focus on the application of skills.

Negotiating methods presented in the following chapters are described in a usable way. They are anchored in an economic, social, and neuropsychological framework. These sections are easy to understand. They are described in a clear, concise manner so that they can be used as a learning manual or for a quick reference.

There have been attempts to systematize negotiation management in organizations (Tries & Reinhard, 2008; Voeth & Herbst, 2009). Models and structures are helpful for analyzing negotiations. Some are more general, some are more specific. However, many of them are not very useful (Morley, 2006). Recommendations for behavioral changes and learning objectives must be of a basic nature if they are to be used in different contexts and by different people. This book makes an attempt to follow that request. **Models for description**

At the same time, the type of language used in negotiations is critical. In the broad spectrum of negotiation literature, the topics range from warfare (e.g., Greene, 2006), manipulation techniques (e.g., Edmüller & Wilhelm, 2010), social influence (e.g., Cialdini, 2001), the art of negotiation (Salewski, 2010), and basic principles of cooperative negotiation (e.g., Erbacher, 2005), to books dealing with efficient negotiation (e.g., Knapp & Novak, 2003) to name a few. **Cooperative central theme**

The field of negotiation itself is often comprised of trait, certain mindsets and frames of reference that influence how negotiations are handled. These variables can be included in a description of the subject matter, as negotiation cannot be free of ideology. Moreover, the subject of international and intercultural negotiation is very relevant in our globalized world. Certain variables of negotiation can be taken as universally valid from an intercultural point of view while others most certainly need a certain degree of tact and more careful consideration. This book provides an introduction to the general principles in different areas of the shared domains of negotiation and persuasion. It is first necessary to define the required terms.

1.2   Definitions

1.2.1   Negotiating

While there are many research institutions that study negotiation, there are also many different definitions of negotiation. It is not surprising that the definition of *research* determines the research direction (Carnevale & De Dreu, 2004). Thus, the focus is on different variables of negotiation depending on its definition. For instance, game theorists and mathematicians are concerned with topics associated with social exchange and mathematical prediction of decisions and negotiation results. Similarly, the business economics perspective also **Many scientific directions**

represents an optimization approach in economic terms – usually focusing on the process within time limits. The legal profession and ethnographers look at different variables of justice in studying negotiation. Social psychologists and sociologists focus on human self-perception, conflicts within or between individuals or groups as it affects negotiation situations, and how people deal with dilemma situations. Personality psychologists, personnel psychologists, and, occasionally, cultural psychologists focus on the differences in human attributes in attempting to predict the success of negotiations in different contexts and situations. This selection of different viewpoints illustrates the complexity of negotiation research (Menkel-Meadow, 2009). We have to define certain variables for *negotiation* and *persuasion* in economic and scientific terms.

Variables of negotiation

In personal or professional negotiation, all the myriad circumstances that have anything to do with direct social cooperation and exchange play a role in the outcome of the negotiation. At least five important variables can be identified in the negotiation process (see Voeth & Herbst, 2009).

Several negotiating parties

- *Number of people and organizations:* This means the number of parties involved in the negotiation. Negotiation requires at least two negotiation parties (Spieß, 2004), who may also be representatives of other stakeholders (Pruitt & Carnevale, 2003). For example, a buyer has a meeting with a sales rep or a line manager with one of his employees.

Communication

- Interaction processes: Negotiation itself is a social exchange in which the negotiating parties expect that there will be an exchange of views on the variables being negotiated while they are presenting their positions, interests, and reasoning (see Lewicki et al., 2006). Techniques and perceived leverage are generally used to influence the other party (Frank & Frey, 2002; Schoop, Deller, & Frey, 2005), for instance, or when particular tactics (Carnevale, 2000) or specific strategies are employed (Lewicki, Hiam, & Olander, 1998).

  When a buyer talks with a sales representative and makes demands that pursue a strategic objective and that are fair, he puts himself in a strategic position relative to the sales rep. Similarly, there may be conversation between line managers and employees, such as how certain working conditions are to be structured or tasks fulfilled.

Different interests

- *Preference conflict:* The reason that negotiation takes place is because – at least at the beginning of the negotiation process – the negotiating parties do not agree about certain variables or are in conflict with each other (Pruitt & Carnevale, 2003). Usual conflicts are associated with the distribution of something, such as during price negotiations for a product. In such cases, a single negotiation issue is often the focus (in this case, the price; Thomas, 1992). However, the conflict usually exists on several issues and, accordingly, can be considered from different angles (slicing the pie vs. expanding the pie; Thompson, 2005).

  Criteria and issues also concern different prevailing motives (e.g., competition vs. cooperation) in negotiation (Frank & Frey, 2002).

  The buyer and the sales rep will now be able to negotiate certain variables about which they do not agree. These include delivery volumes, deadlines, discounts, prices, agreed purchasing volumes, advertising cost allowances, use of different amounts of the product, switching sources in cases where there are several providers, etc. In discussions

between managers and employees, the respective viewpoints often concern a different strategic relevance. For example, for personal reasons, employees do not represent the company's position when the issues concern their own job. On the other hand, the manager may not know all the details of a certain job.

- *Goal congruence:* Developing a shared viewpoint or agreement in terms of the facts, interests, or variables is in the common interest of both negotiating parties (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 2006). After all, they both want to resolve the conflict (Pruitt & Carnevale, 2003). Thus, the negotiating parties are dependent on each other (Thompson, 2005) and they purposely decide to negotiate a solution that offers at least some of what they want concerning factual outcomes or mutual relationship (Walton & McKersie, 1965).

  Common goal

  In the case of the buyer–sales rep relationship, both sides need to achieve a good outcome and thus must examine different options. In the case of a manager and employee, the shared goal is to have both parties gain what they want concerning job performance and compensation.

- *Zone of possible agreement:* Time constraints, budget restrictions, and other strategic, institutional, ethical–moral, or psychological limitations shape the negotiation outcome (Schoop et al., 2005). In other words, the resolution of the conflict is within this zone, which is why it is important for both parties to determine the negotiation framework with great care. Thus, both negotiating parties will negotiate with each other if, by reaching an agreement, they expect benefits that they could not achieve without negotiation (Tries & Reinhard, 2008).

  Possibility and willingness to agree

  So, in the sales context, the sales rep focuses on the zone of possible agreement together with the buyer. Therefore, the sales rep will qualify the customer's needs by asking relevant questions. The rep can then make a suitable offer that is also a realistic solution that would fulfill the customer's needs. In the manager–employee dialog, the zone of possible agreement could be how both parties find a way of resolving the tasks of a team or working group.

  If there is no shared zone of possible agreement or outcome, there is also generally no reason to negotiate: If the buyer does not want to buy anything, negotiation would then be a waste of time. In the management situation, a lack of zone of possible agreement or solutions would eliminate any incentive for the employee to negotiate (e.g., owing to a lack of motivation or inner resignation on the part of the employee).

Based on the variables that have been described, negotiation can be defined as follows:

> Negotiation is the process of one or more interactions between at least two parties with the aim of achieving a constructive balance between different preferences, interests, positions, or needs. The negotiating parties speak for themselves or as representatives of an organization (see Behrmann, 2007). Issues, criteria, limits, and alternatives for reaching agreement are often not obvious at the beginning of negotiation (Gimpel, 2007). To clarify and resolve the conflict, the negotiating parties participate in social exchange and communication with each other. Negotiation is a cooperative alternative to conflict behavior (Van de Vliert & Janssen, 2001).

Elements of negotiation
(based on Carnevale, 2000)

Negotiation

Generally, the process of negotiating or a specific meeting to negotiate are called negotiation. Depending on the extent and size of the subject being negotiated, a negotiation can involve one or more meetings.

Subject of negotiation

The subject of negotiation is the issue being negotiated. It is the variable or situation in which a proposed exchange, value, or relationship conflict exists. The subject of negotiation is differentiated by the number of issues or dimensions to be negotiated and the other elements of the negotiation.

Negotiation alternatives

Negotiation alternatives are different choices within and outside the negotiation. Within negotiation, the number and types of negotiation variables determine the options for reaching a solution. Negotiation alternatives depend on the size of one's own zone of acceptable outcomes, the negotiation framework, and the expected probability of success. The attractiveness of the alternatives determines the degree of personal need regarding the subject of negotiation.

If there are many attractive alternatives to negotiation for one of the parties, that party will not negotiate in the first place. For example, in the department store there are shelves with many similar products next to each other, which means that the buyer does not negotiate with the seller, but usually chooses an alternative that fulfills the buyer's needs or interests with no need for negotiation.

Goal of negotiation

The common goal of negotiation is agreement on how the conflict should be handled. Agreement is determined by the personal goal or task, including the interests, needs, attitudes, moral values, material or personal position, and standards of the negotiator.

Negotiation strategy

A strategy is a general plan of action that determines the behavior in negotiations aimed at attaining an acceptable outcome. General strategies in negotiation can be classified as follows: making concessions and acquiescing, looking for compromises, asserting your position, cooperating and problem solving, or avoiding arguments – due to inaction or withdrawal (Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992).

Negotiation tactic

A negotiation tactic – as opposed to a strategy – is a brief action in pursuit of short-term goals. The strategy is usually the criterion for evaluating the suitability of tactical behavior. Often, questions arise in the tactical situation, such as: How do I regain the trust of my negotiating partner? What can I do to appear credible or powerful in this situation? There are very many different types of tactics and ways in which to use them. Manipulative tactics generally doom long-term cooperation (Thompson, 2005).

Negotiation limits

A negotiation usually has several layers. In addition to the formal content, there are informal and emotional variables (Knapp & Novak, 2003; Reardon, 2004). Both rational and emotional variables limit negotiations. These include limits of the negotiation management, strategy, or psychology.

For example, the degree to which negotiators use particular tactics, affect organizational roles, or protect self-esteem (see Schoop et al., 2005).

Negotiation outcome

The outcome is what emerges at the end of a negotiation. The results of negotiation can be that there is one winner, that a compromise was achieved, that consensus exists (which can also be described as a win–win situation), or that the negotiation ended with no agreement (Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992; Spieß, 2004).

Negotiation management

Regarding variables of business negotiation, the term *negotiation management* has been used in recent literature. The goal of a company is to manage the negotiations with its employees so as to improve the company's profits. Negotiation management elements include the frequency, the formality, the need for the negotiations among those involved, the groups to which the negotiating parties belong, their roles (e.g., procurement, sales, HR, etc.), the number of negotiating parties, and the negotiation channels that are used (e.g., personal, phone, written, etc.; Voeth & Herbst, 2009).

The interaction of these elements with each other and with the characteristics of the negotiating parties, based on Saner (2008), is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. **Elements of negotiation according to Saner (2008)**

In other words, negotiation is not about right or wrong. Rather, the aim for both parties is to agree on what they want, what they believe is right or wrong for the future – and within the realm of reality – so that they can align their behavior and their relationship with this in mind.

1.2.2   Persuading

Persuading as an influencing process to change attitudes or opinions

While there are various ideas about what negotiation is exactly, it is much easier to understand what is meant by *persuading* or *convincing*. It is done in communication with the intent of one person to convince the other, one person to get the other on his or her side, or for one person to change the other person's attitude or opinion. Attitudes are important requirements for the corresponding behavior. This means: In a conversation where the intention is to convince the other party, a clear aim is to achieve an effect, such as gaining an understanding, a binding promise, or a change in attitude. Hence, in communication, persuasion depends on the direction. It usually takes place in the recipient's brain and is triggered by the sender.

Persuading has a clear objective

Persuading is a basic sociopsychological phenomenon (Brehm, Kassin, & Fein, 1999). Individual evaluations and viewpoints can usually change when negotiating with another person. Thus, to convince a dialog partner is also a mutual objective in negotiations and is thus a component of negotiating.

Persuading is an element of negotiations

In terms of persuading, influencing methods can have different effects on different people because in persuasion there are two fundamental routes. On the one hand, the content of the communication plays an important role, and on the other, how a person says something can, under certain circumstances, also be persuasive (the associated model of the two routes is presented in Section 2.6; see Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). In a professional context, the aim should be to achieve long-lasting, inner conviction that is resistant to new influences after the negotiation. Dialog partners are satisfied when they have the impression that a good decision was reached. In other words, in the process of persuasion the awareness of one's decision for or against a certain alternative is already a factor in the sustainability of the resulting attitude. This allows the definition and elements of persuasion to be stated as follows:

Good decision as a recipe for effective persuasion

Definition: Persuading

Persuasion is the process of achieving a change in opinion or attitude in the other party using communication (Brehm et al., 1999). The results of effective persuading are usually changed cognitive or emotional viewpoints or evaluations of a situation, which ultimately have an influence on future behavior (see Wenninger, 2002).

Elements of persuasion

Process of persuasion

This is the cognitive process of persuasion, usually with means and via channels of communication. Individual persuasion processes are based on psychological mechanisms. In negotiation, from time to time a strategic approach is added because there is an issue that determines the context (Berkel, 2006).

Conviction

A single conviction is a cognitive or emotional viewpoint or clear attitude, the result of a conscious involvement with a fact, such as the result of negotiation. The conviction is thus relatively stable and immune against renewed attempts at persuasion. It is based on an inner commitment in terms of a decision in favor of the viewpoint if the mental involvement in this was deep. It is then said that it was processed elaborately (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986).

Sender

In the classic communication model, the sender is the person who delivers a message to the recipient via a communication channel. In the context of persuasion, it is the person who wants to convince. Among other things, the sender is responsible for how and if the recipient understands the argument. Important structural variables for the sender include clarity, choosing the right communication channel, and redundancy of the content in different forms of expression, such as text and image (Traut-Matthausch & Frey, 2006). This refers to how many perceptual senses and different cognitive processing routes are addressed during the persuasive dialog.

Recipient

The recipient is the party to be convinced in the persuasion process. How and if the recipient understands the sender's attempts depends on the sender and the nature of the message (e.g., complexity, clarity) as well as the need (e.g., personal concern) and cognitive attributes (e.g., the ability to decode the message) of the recipient (Traut-Matthausch & Frey, 2006).

Message/content

The message and the content are the arguments put forward to convince the other person. This includes also aspects of nonverbal communication. Concerning the basics of communication ("It is not possible to not communicate" and "All communication has a content and a relationships aspect"; Watzlawik, Beavin, & Jackson, 2000, pp. 53–56), both rational and emotional elements of communication are relevant in persuading someone. The effect of the arguments on the recipient depends on how the message is processed (intensive/elaborative or marginal/peripheral). For example, in certain cases a personal recommendation regarding a decision can be sufficient, while in other cases logical and compelling argumentation and detailed conclusions are needed (Lewicki et al., 2006).

1.3 Differences and Similarities Among Related Concepts

1.3.1 Argument, Fight, Conflict

A conflict is an argument with a one-sided view of each party's own situation with the risk that the conflict could escalate. If conflicts such as arguments are not handled properly, the results are often not very constructive. Each party pursues his or her own goals and is unable to integrate them into shared objectives.

In an argument, there is always a loser

Compared with purposeful negotiation, outcomes from arguments generally do not meet the expectations of at least one of the parties involved (Schwarz, 2005). Regnet (2007) gives tips on how to handle conflicts in management and team situations.

Conflict versus negotiation

Similarities to negotiation

- Two or more conflicting parties participate.
- There are different viewpoints regarding a topic or a fact.

- There is a discussion between the conflicting parties. If the situation worsens, contact may be broken off. Avoiding interaction is also a possible response to conflicts.
- Individual parties use means of influence to change the other party's mind.
- Rational and emotional elements are influential in the course of the conflict.

Differences from negotiation

- There is no shared goal.
- The parties may not necessarily want to resolve differences or participate in the discussion.
- The conflicting parties' only concern is to win (or argue/fight).
- There is no focus on mutual interests, just positions.
- Partnership and cooperation are not the basis of the common exchange.
- There exists no shared view of the situation by both parties.
- The result is often not satisfactory by either subjective or objective criteria for one or all parties involved (win–lose, lose–lose).

1.3.2   Mediation, Arbitration

Mediation as an alternative to negotiation

Mediation (see Kals & Ittner, 2008) is a process in which a third party mediates the issues between two or more parties. Resolution is reached when all parties agree. Mediation is considered an alternative to negotiation (Saner, 2008). However, in most cases, perhaps due to limited time or finances, people do not bother with mediation. Many often prefer the much less formal face-to-face negotiation.

There are several types of mediation. One type of mediation is called arbitration. When an arbitrator is used, it is usually the arbitrator who decides the resolution, not the parties. Arbitration is regulated by codes of procedure and formal requirements. It is usually confined to the public sector (Scholz, 2006).

Mediation versus negotiation

Similarities to negotiation

- Two or more conflicting parties participate.
- The parties disagree on facts or opinions.
- There is a discussion between the conflicting parties.
- Individual parties may use different means of influence to change the other party's mind.
- Logic and personal feelings influence the course of the conflict.
- The parties usually share the common goal of ending the conflict constructively.

Differences from negotiation

- The conflict is influenced or resolved by a neutral third party (mediator/arbitrator).
- The mediator does not make decisions regarding the subject of the conflict but is responsible solely for keeping the process constructive.

- Often, there is an asymmetrical power relationship between the parties involved.
- Usually, the exchange between the conflicting parties is very formal. Especially in arbitration, proceedings concern the law.
- In an arbitration procedure, the arbitrator decides the final resolution.
- Mediation often involves long ongoing disputes and increasing time pressures.
- The result is often not satisfactory by subjective or objective aspects for one or all parties involved (win–lose, lose–lose).

1.3.3   Influence, Manipulation

With influence or manipulation the aim is to intentionally lead the other person to change their view in a way that is desired. Usually, the effects on the manipulated party are not considered. To manipulate another person, different kinds of leverage are often used. The leverage used does not have to be real. It is only necessary that the person being manipulated believes it is real. Leverage is how the manipulator takes advantage of another person and is therefore asymmetrical. The leverage is based on official authority (*legitimate power*), on the possibility of being rewarded (*reward power,* also *negotiating power*) or punished (*coercive power*), on personal charisma (*referent power*, e.g., through sympathy, respect, and deference to charisma and surgency), on skills (*expert power*), on knowledge (*information power*), or on the use of persuading arguments (*persuasiveness*; Blickle & Solga, 2006).

Manipulation is wanting to take advantage of the other party

Sources of power

Manipulation versus negotiation

Similarities to negotiation

- Generally, there is an interaction between two parties.
- The aim is to change the attitude or behavior of the other person.
- Both logic and personal feelings influence the course and outcome.
- Sometimes leverage is also used in cooperative negotiation.
- Certain persuasion techniques and tactics are also used in negotiations.

Differences from negotiation

- A conflict does not have to exist.
- Different approaches to resolve the situation: The manipulator accepts that the other party might be damaged.
- There is an asymmetrical relationship between the manipulator and the victim in terms of information, social rank, financial status, etc.
- The goal of the manipulator is to assert his or her own will.
- The influencer uses persuasion, negotiation tactics, and leverage.
- The outcome is often not satisfactory by subjective or objective aspects for the victim even if it produces the desired outcome for the manipulator (win–lose).

Blickle and Solga (2006) list typical tactics of influence that are often used in organizations (see Cialdini, 2001; Mortensen, 2004):

Influencing tactics

1. *Assertiveness:* issuing instructions and regulations, making demands;
2. *Blocking:* threatening, ignoring, ending cooperation, working slower;
3. *Sanctions:* withholding payment for services, changing the other person's role;
4. *Offering an exchange:* offering favors in return for services;
5. *Ingratiation:* praising, being friendly, doing favors, agreeing;
6. *Rationality:* logical arguments, information, delivering conclusions;
7. *Forming coalitions:* obtaining support from others;
8. *Referencing higher entities:* involving supervisors, referring to other high-level executives or entities;
9. *Inspiring appeals:* appealing to emotions, values, and ideals;
10. *Consultation:* asking for suggestions and opinions;
11. *Legitimation:* insisting on one's own authority or processes;
12. *Personal appeal:* appealing to friendship and loyalty; and
13. *Bragging:* self-praise, mentioning personal successes, describing one's skills.

1.3.4   Coaxing, Swaying, Peripheral Persuasion

Coaxing is not the same as persuading

Coaxing differs from persuasion in terms of how one goes about changing the other person's mind. Persuading and coaxing are two different processes. So-called two-process models of persuasion describe how the sender, the message, and the recipient differ in persuasion as opposed to coaxing (see Bohner & Wänke, 2006).

Mere coaxing is one-sided

Coaxing is not based on reason or logic, but on subtle tactics such as flattery and charm. Hence, there is not a conscious "yes" from the other party. In coaxing, the attributes of the influencer and their message style decides on how much impact he or she will have. Consequently, the discussion per se is more of a monolog than a dialog.

Coaxing versus persuading

Similarities to persuading

- Several dialog partners participate.
- There are different views between the parties in terms of facts and needs.
- There is an interaction between the conflicting parties.
- Individual parties use subtle means of influence to change the other party's mind.
- Logic and personal feelings influence the course of the conflict.

Differences from persuading

- Generally, one party does not readily accept the other's arguments.
- The person being coaxed is often less concerned about the outcome than the person doing the coaxing.
- The information that is exchanged is not processed deeply but rather peripherally by the person being coaxed.