

CONFLICT AND NEGOTIATION

Negotiation

Fisher & Ury · Raiffa · Malhotra · Voss

PAPER 02 / 02

A Furtherance reference compendium on the intellectual traditions behind organisational design, leadership, execution, and culture.

IN THIS PAPER

The series closes on negotiation – the craft of reaching agreement when interests diverge. This paper covers the principled, the analytic, the strategic and the emotional schools. The question it answers: how do you create and claim value at the table without wrecking the relationship?

Fisher and Ury supply the principled foundation; Raiffa the analytic structure; Malhotra the systematic strategy for hard cases; Voss the emotional, tactical-empathy counterpoint. Together they move negotiation from a contest of wills to a discipline of preparation, value creation and psychology.

Fisher & Ury *Getting to Yes, 1981*

Principled negotiation · Harvard Negotiation Project

CORE THESIS

Negotiate on the **merits**, not by haggling over positions. Principled negotiation rests on four moves, and your real power comes from your **BATNA** – your best alternative to a negotiated agreement.

FRAMEWORK

Principle	Meaning
Separate people from the problem	Attack the issue, not each other
Focus on interests, not positions	Ask why, not just what they demand
Invent options for mutual gain	Expand the pie before dividing it
Insist on objective criteria	Anchor terms to fair, external standards
Know your BATNA	Your walk-away alternative is your leverage

METHODOLOGY

A practitioner synthesis from the Harvard Negotiation Project.

SIGNIFICANCE AND CRITIQUE

The foundational modern negotiation framework; BATNA and interests-over-positions are now canonical. The critique: it can read as idealised, offering less for hard-bargaining, high-power or adversarial situations.

Howard Raiffa *The Art and Science of Negotiation, 1982*

Decision analysis · the analytic structure of bargaining

CORE THESIS

Negotiation has an analysable structure. Bring decision analysis and game theory to bear – then temper the science with art. The central tension is the **negotiator's dilemma**: the moves that *claim* value can destroy the trust needed to *create* it.

FRAMEWORK

Concept	Meaning
Reservation price	Your walk-away number
ZOPA	The zone of possible agreement between the parties' limits
Creating vs claiming	Enlarging the pie vs capturing a share of it
The negotiator's dilemma	Value-claiming tactics undermine value-creating trust

METHODOLOGY

Decision theory and game theory applied to real, asymmetric-information bargaining.

SIGNIFICANCE AND CRITIQUE

Gave the field its analytic vocabulary – reservation price, ZOPA, the create/claim tension. The critique: it assumes careful preparation and a degree of rationality that real negotiations often lack.

Deepak Malhotra *Negotiation Genius, 2007*

Negotiation strategy · Harvard Business School

CORE THESIS

Value is both created and claimed through **systematic strategy** – and even “impossible” negotiations, without leverage, can be moved through framing, process and empathy.

Investigative negotiation means understanding the other side's constraints and interests as deeply as your own.

FRAMEWORK

Lever	What it does
Investigative negotiation	Uncover the why behind their positions and limits
Framing	Shape how the offer is perceived and compared
Process	Manage sequence, pace and expectations deliberately
Dealing with the irrational	Diagnose and defuse deception and hard tactics

METHODOLOGY

Academic research combined with practice, illustrated through detailed cases.

SIGNIFICANCE AND CRITIQUE

A rigorous, practical modern treatment, strong on preparation and hard cases. The critique: it extends and systematises Fisher and Raiffa rather than overturning them.

Chris Voss *Never Split the Difference, 2016*

Tactical empathy · crisis negotiation

CORE THESIS

Drawing on hostage negotiation, Voss argues that people are **emotional, not rational**, so negotiation turns on **tactical empathy** – understanding and naming the other side's feelings and perspective to shift them. A deliberate counter to the rationalism of principled negotiation.

FRAMEWORK

Technique	What it does
Labelling	Name the other's emotion to defuse it
Mirroring	Repeat their last words to draw them out
Calibrated questions	“How am I supposed to do that?” shifts the problem to them
“That's right”	Aim for their agreement that you understand – not “you're right”

METHODOLOGY

A practitioner account derived from a career in FBI crisis and hostage negotiation.

SIGNIFICANCE AND CRITIQUE

A popular, practical corrective that restores emotion and psychology to negotiation. The critique, noted below: it is anecdotal, its framing is somewhat adversarial, and some tactics edge toward manipulation.

A NOTE ON EVIDENCE

A note on stance: these schools sit in tension. Principled negotiation (Fisher & Ury) optimises for value creation and the relationship; the tactical school (Voss) optimises for influence and claiming, and its methods can shade into manipulation. Neither is universal – match approach to stakes, power and how much the ongoing relationship matters, and treat single-context playbooks (a hostage room, a car lot) as needing translation.

Synthesis

Theorist	School	Key idea	Register
Fisher & Ury	Principled	Interests, options, BATNA	Foundational
Raiffa	Analytic	ZOPA; create vs claim	Decision science
Malhotra	Strategic	Investigative negotiation	Academic + practice
Voss	Emotional	Tactical empathy	Practitioner

FOR THE OPERATOR

Negotiation runs from principled, interest-based bargaining anchored on BATNA (Fisher & Ury), through the analytic structure of creating and claiming value (Raiffa), to systematic strategy for hard cases (Malhotra) and the emotional, tactical-empathy school (Voss). For the operator: prepare your BATNA and their interests, create value before claiming it, and remember that even “rational” deals turn on empathy and process. That closes the Conflict and Negotiation series – from managing difference to resolving it at the table.