

Chapter

# 8

## Negotiation and Emotional Intelligence

## CASE STUDY FOR DISCUSSION

---

**Pharmacist:** *How can you wear that cologne? It's giving me a migraine. You're ridiculous.*

**Technician:** *Oh yeah? How would you know what ridiculous is? I can't believe you go out dressed like that!*

**Pharmacist:** *I'm going to the ED. I have a headache and I can't work anymore.*

**Technician:** *You can't leave. You're the only pharmacist on this shift.*

**Pharmacist:** *You should have thought about that before you poured on that perfume and drove me out of here.*

## LEARNING OBJECTIVES

---

After reading this chapter, students should be able to:

- Explain the best alternative to a negotiated agreement.
- Describe the difference between haggling and principled negotiation.
- Identify common fallacies when listening to an argument.
- List the components of emotional intelligence.

## TYPES OF NEGOTIATION

---

Imagine having to contact the administrator on call to explain that the pharmacy has to close because there is no pharmacist working. This story will be all over the hospital tomorrow morning. Could these two have worked out their differences through discussion or negotiation and reached a better conclusion?

Many times negotiation in the workplace is nothing more than haggling. Other times it comes down to a battle of wills. The only solution may be for one contestant to subjugate his or her interests completely, or for both to compromise to the point where no one is happy. An alternative technique known as principled negotiation was developed at the Harvard Negotiation Project in the late 1970s and early 1980s and publicized in the book, *Getting to Yes*, by Roger Fisher and William L. Ury.<sup>1</sup> It is a method of searching for mutual gains that can still be used effectively. The premise is to separate the people from the problem using standards or objectives that are independent of the will of either party.

**Figure 8-1**

Arguments between coworkers often seem ridiculous to outside observers. Employees should work to negotiate reasonable conclusions before things escalate.



The first step to a principled negotiation involves identifying the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (BATNA). In other words, a person needs to determine what the best outcome is if he chooses not to negotiate with the other person or group. This requires thinking about the best alternative for the individual, as well as for his or her adversaries. Once this is understood, a person can begin to negotiate based on getting as close as possible to the BATNA of the other side. The person seeking to negotiate has to plan to give the other side something that is incrementally better than what they would have if they didn't negotiate, or they will have no reason to negotiate.

In the workplace, many conflicts arise because of the diversity of the workforce. Coworkers may simply not understand each other. This may be because of cultural or educational differences, or they may just not like each other. While most individuals can choose to accept a job, they cannot always choose their coworkers. Learning to communicate and negotiate with coworkers is a skill.

An employee's first negotiation may involve accepting the job initially. It is important to set ground rules for the negotiation. If one person feels that the other is not negotiating fairly, he or she may need to discuss that. The idea is to negotiate based on fair, objective, and impartial concepts. This is the goal of principled negotiation. It differs from positional bargaining, in which each person has a position that he or she tries to defend without reason or compromise. Positional bargaining can result in haggling, in which each side randomly chooses numbers, trying to give up as little as possible until the other person gives in. Principled negotiation implies beginning with a reasonable basis for your position.

This might start with research to find out what pharmacy technicians are paid in that area. The applicant can then compare his or her background and experiences to those found in similar jobs. Having objective information will help the applicant to negotiate rather than haggle. It allows both sides to view an answer as reasonable, rather than trying to win an argument. It is important to find out whether the person involved has the authority to negotiate. If only one person is able to make a concession, that is the only person who will concede. This is similar to the experience many people have when buying a car. The potential buyers negotiate with the salesman in good faith. The salesman then takes their best offer back to the manager. Once the manager knows the customers' best offer, he or she can negotiate from there by taking that offer as the floor value, or basis for the next round of negotiation. Obviously this floor is higher than the floor value the buyers began with when entering the car dealership.

The beginning of a negotiation involves finding out something about the problem, as well as the thoughts of the other side. A pharmacy analogy might be that we don't give patients medications without finding out what their symptoms are. We don't have one medication in one dose that fits all diseases and patients. There is not one single answer to most negotiations. According to Fisher and Ury, "the more clearly you understand the other side's concerns, the better able you will be to satisfy them at a minimum cost to yourself."<sup>1</sup>

This means actually listening to the other person. Many people are busy planning a witty retort or rebuttal while the other speaks.<sup>1</sup> A good negotiator will take the time and make the effort to listen instead. This helps the person determine what reply might move him or her closer to agreement. Understanding the motivation of the other person can be a powerful tool. Coming up with an innovative solution beyond the initial expectations of both sides can make everyone happy.

**Figure 8-2**

The best strategy for a negotiation is to know beforehand what makes a reasonable offer, what each person really wants, and whether the parties wish to remain friends after the negotiation.

**ARGUING SUCCESSFULLY**

An example of a solution that eliminates the feeling of being out-negotiated is the sealed-bid stamp auction. This is an auction in which people bid exactly what they are willing to pay for a rare stamp. The bids are sealed and secret. The winner, or highest bidder, is able to purchase the stamp at the second highest price. In this case, no one wishes that they had bid higher, but no one feels that they have paid too much. The point of this is to eliminate the morale problem that results when people must compete face to face and someone always ends up losing. When people will be coworkers, or see each other often in the future, it is best that neither feels that he or she was out-haggled and lost the negotiation.<sup>1</sup>

It is unlikely that a sealed-bid auction will decide which person gets to have his or her way at work. One way to get your point across (and get your

way) is to give a good argument for your case. This does not mean to have an emotional confrontation, but rather to use the tools studied by debate societies, politicians, lawyers, and lobbyists to learn how to make their points register with others. The first step in a reasonable argument is to make sure you do your research and have all the correct facts. Next is to state your ideas in a logical order, without resorting to emotional outbursts. Make sure that you have good examples of what you believe is happening (or not happening, but should be). Using inflammatory language such as “they always do this, she never does that” without solid examples will not win you points. If you have information that comes from another source, you need to be able to cite your reference. If you say, “I’ve heard that she gets to take a longer lunch,” without knowing whether it is true or whether your reference is correct, you take the chance of creating a conflict that will not help your case.

## MISLEADING ARGUMENT TECHNIQUES

---

It is also helpful to understand misleading types of arguments, so that you can recognize them (and not use them yourself). The following examples are referred to by Anthony Weston as common fallacies (misleading arguments).<sup>2</sup>

- **“Attacking the man” (*ad hominem*):** This involves attacking the person, rather than the argument he or she is making.
- **Appeal to ignorance (*ad ignorantiam*):** There is no proof that this isn’t true, so I’m going to contend that it is and you can’t argue with me.
- **Everyone’s doing it (*ad populum*):** Used by children around the world, everyone else is doing it, so it must be okay!
- **Begging the question (also called a circular argument):** Using the conclusion to justify itself.
- **Overlooking the alternative (also known as false dilemma):** Implying that there are not a lot of alternatives and you either have to do this or that.
- **Causality (*post hoc, ergo propter hoc*):** Because this happened after that, it was caused by that.
- **Red herring:** Bringing in a point that is known to cause emotions to boil over, thus distracting from the fact that you don’t have a good argument.

The previous examples are what *not* to use to make your point within the workplace. To summarize what should be done:

- Make sure you have your facts straight.
- Try to keep your emotions in check.
- Don't attack the other person.
- *Listen.*
- Explain your position, using real examples.
- Try to come to some agreement that you can live with while continuing to work with the other person.

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

---

The term *emotional intelligence* has been used to describe a person's ability to control his or her own emotions and understand the emotions and reactions of others. Peter Salovey and John D. Mayer<sup>3</sup> define emotional intelligence as "the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions." Four basic components of emotional intelligence can help guide behaviors within social and work environments<sup>4</sup>:

1. Self-awareness: This involves considering your own feelings about a situation and how you behave as a result.
2. Self-management: This involves controlling those emotions and being able to dispassionately make good choices. People who can separate their emotions from their decision-making process, while remaining true to their beliefs may have a high level of self-awareness and self-management.
3. Social awareness: Understanding the underlying reasons for the other person's behavior and how the other person might feel about a particular situation indicates a high level of social awareness.
4. Relationship management: Understanding the situation, the emotions of all parties involved, and the consequences of an action can help an individual determine what action to take.

A person who develops emotional intelligence is able to consider the consequences of a behavior or remark and weigh it against his or her own goals to determine whether the behavior or remark is worth the potential consequences.

## CHAPTER SUMMARY

---

Negotiation is used in many aspects of life, from purchasing a car, to accepting a job, to getting a child to go to bed. Principled negotiation is a method of dealing with differences to enable a reasonable outcome for all involved. The more the participants learn about the situation, its background, and the desired outcomes, the better prepared they will be for successful negotiation. Emotional intelligence describes the ability of a person to understand and control the emotions behind his or her behaviors.

## QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

---

1. Can you give an example of an argument using the fallacies in the chapter (e.g., red herring, false dilemma, appeal to ignorance, circular argument)?
2. How has emotional intelligence affected you?
3. Can you give an example of a boss who did not show emotional intelligence?
4. How did that boss affect the morale of workers?
5. How is buying a car similar to accepting a job?







## REFERENCES

---

1. Fisher R, Ury WL. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement without Giving In*. New York, NY: Penguin Books; 1981 (reissued 1991).
2. Weston A. *A Rulebook for Arguments* (4th ed). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Co.; 2009.
3. Salovey P, Mayer JD. *Emotional Intelligence: Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*. Amityville, NY: Baywood Publishing Co.; 1990.
4. Tipton DJ. *Professionalism, Work, and Clinical Responsibility in Pharmacy*. Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning; 2014.

