THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Negotiation

in a Hurry

Getting a better deal without being a shark

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page

Most bad negotiation advice begins in the room: hold eye contact, speak first, speak last, never split the difference, make them chase you. That is the theatrical part. The larger result is usually decided before the performance begins, by the choices each side has, the information each side controls, the issues on the table and the way agreement will work after everyone leaves.

Negotiation exists when people need one another but do not want exactly the same thing. That combination matters. If one side can dictate, there is no bargaining. If neither side needs the other, there is nothing to bargain about. The interesting middle is interdependence: each side can improve its position through agreement, yet each retains some ability to refuse.

Start with refusal. Your best alternative if no agreement is reached is your BATNA. It is not a slogan about being willing to walk away. It is a real course of action with a value, cost, delay and probability of working. Your reservation value is the worst deal you should accept once those things are counted. The other side has an alternative too. Much of bargaining power comes from changing those outside options rather than sounding powerful at the table.

Next, stop treating the first demand as the problem. A landlord asks for a higher rent. A tenant asks for a break clause. A supplier wants a larger order. A buyer wants a lower unit price. Those are positions. Underneath them sit interests: cash flow, risk, predictability, capacity, precedent, status, timing and control. Once several interests are visible, differences can be traded. A term cheap for you may be valuable to them. That is how value is created before it is divided.

Information therefore has to move, but not carelessly. Total secrecy hides opportunities. Total disclosure exposes your walk-away point and weakens your ability to claim value. Good negotiators ask questions, test assumptions, disclose interests selectively and trade information for information. They learn before they solve.

Offers matter because they do more than state a number. They frame the plausible range, reveal priorities and teach the other side what kind of bargaining will follow. First offers can anchor outcomes, but the useful rule is conditional: open when you understand the range well enough to defend your number, and use packages when several issues are in play.

Process changes substance. Agenda, sequence, deadlines, authority, approval and issue packaging can change the attainable deal. In multi-party negotiations, the agreement across the table may be easier than the agreement behind it, with a board, partner, electorate, family or procurement team.

Finally, a signature is not success. A good deal allocates decisions, risk, information, milestones and remedies clearly enough that performance remains attractive after the excitement has gone. It should beat your alternative and still work when circumstances move.

That is where the subtitle matters. Getting a better deal without being a shark does not mean being soft. It means being firm about your alternatives, standards, interests and limits without relying on humiliation, deception or coercive theatre. The goal is neither victory nor harmony. It is an agreement that is better than no agreement, captures a fair share of the available value, and can survive being implemented.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

A negotiation can change the price of a company, but the same mechanics appear in much smaller places: a salary review, a contractor quote, a lease renewal, a disputed invoice, a holiday plan, a start date, a supplier contract or the division of work between two founders. The stakes differ. The structure repeats.

The reason the skill matters is not that everything should become a bargain. Quite the opposite. Some situations are requests, some are rights, some are rules and some are emergencies. Treating every interaction as negotiable is exhausting and can be unethical. The useful ability is to recognise when there is genuine room for choice, identify what can move and decide whether bargaining is worth the cost.

Most people overestimate the importance of verbal toughness because that is what negotiation looks like from the outside. They underestimate preparation because preparation is invisible. A person who has three credible buyers, a realistic walk-away number and a clear list of tradeable terms often has more power than someone with perfect body language and no alternative. A person who knows the other side's approval process may solve a problem that ten more minutes of haggling cannot.

Negotiation also matters because price is a poor summary of many deals. Suppose a supplier offers £100,000 payable in thirty days, while another offers £104,000 with staged payment, faster delivery and a service guarantee. The cheaper headline can be the more expensive package. The discipline is to compare whole outcomes: money, timing, risk, control, flexibility and the probability that promises will be kept.

The hardest part is that negotiation requires cooperation and competition at the same time. You need enough candour to discover trades, and enough caution not to give away your limit. You need the other side to feel able to say yes, while preserving your ability to say no. You may want a long relationship and still need to claim value today. Advice that chooses only one half produces either needless aggression or expensive niceness.

There is another reason to care. Negotiations are rarely symmetrical. Employers, landlords, governments, dominant customers, investors and platforms can have structural power that no conversational technique erases. Sometimes the better move is to improve your alternatives, bring in representation, use a formal process, assert a legal right or leave. A book that promises to talk you out of a weak position would be selling confidence as leverage.

Nor does one behavioural rule travel unchanged across every culture and context. Expectations about directness, hierarchy, face, deadlines, silence, relationships and authority vary, and individuals vary within cultures. The safest general method is therefore structural: understand alternatives, interests, information, process, authority and implementation, then adapt the communication to the setting.

That makes negotiation less glamorous and more useful. You do not need to become a human lie detector, memorise pressure tricks or cultivate an intimidating persona. You need to understand the decision the other side faces and shape the set of choices so that a good agreement becomes easier to choose than a bad one.

The shark wants the other person to feel beaten. The negotiator wants the comparison to favour the deal, for reasons both sides can explain. That gives you a test for tactics. Ask whether a move improves information, alternatives, terms or implementation, or whether it works mainly by making the other person anxious, confused or ashamed. The first category can be firm bargaining. The second is often theatre with a relationship cost. Once you see the distinction, negotiation stops looking like a personality type and starts looking like a set of decisions that can be prepared.

The Core Ideas

1. Your Walk-Away Is Part of the Deal

The most important negotiation often happens before anybody meets. It is the work of answering one question without bluffing: what will I do if we do not agree?

Your best available answer is your BATNA, the best alternative to a negotiated agreement. It may be another buyer, another job, a repaired relationship, a court claim, an internal workaround or the decision to do nothing. The word is technical; the idea is ancient. A person who can leave has options. A person who cannot leave must find leverage elsewhere.

This changes the usual picture of power. Size, status and confidence can influence a room, but bargaining power depends on alternatives and dependence. A dominant retailer can become weak when a launch date is fixed and only one specialist supplier can deliver. Once another supplier qualifies, the balance changes again.

A BATNA must be real. “I will find another client” is a hope until another client is interested. Litigation is not a clean alternative once cost, delay and uncertainty are included. Staying in a current job may be excellent or poor depending on its security. Estimate the no-deal route honestly, including risk and friction.

From that follows the reservation value, often called the walk-away point. This is the least favourable deal you should accept before choosing your BATNA. In a simple sale it may look like a price. In a real transaction it is usually a bundle. A buyer might pay more for immediate delivery, a warranty and low failure risk. A seller might accept less for cash now, no returns and a quick close. Comparing one number while ignoring the rest produces false precision.

Your target is different. It is the result you have reason to pursue, not the point below which you leave. Confuse the two and you may accept too early or reject a deal superior to your alternative.

When both sides' acceptable ranges overlap, a zone of possible agreement exists. Suppose a buyer would pay up to £12,000 and a seller would accept £9,000. The zone lies between those figures. If the seller needs £13,000, there may be no price-only deal. Another issue might create one: payment timing, maintenance, volume, delivery or a contingent bonus. If nothing can bridge the gap, walking away is not failed negotiation. It is correct diagnosis.

BATNAs can be improved. Get a competing quote, reduce dependence, secure interim finance or build a coalition. The cleanest way to become harder to exploit is to need the deal less.

Estimate the other side's alternatives without pretending you know them. Ask what delay costs, which approvals matter and what substitutes exist. Do not infer urgency from tone. Calm people can be desperate; impatient people can have three offers.

The ethical advantage is substantial. A credible alternative removes the need for fake threats. You can state the consequence plainly: these terms do not beat the other route available to us. That is firmer than aggression because it rests on a choice rather than a performance.

Power begins outside the room. If the no-deal plan is weak, improve it. If it cannot be improved, know the truth before someone else prices it for you.

2. Bargain Over Causes, Not Demands

A position tells you what somebody says must happen. An interest tells you why it matters. Negotiation improves when the conversation travels from the first to the second without pretending positions are meaningless.

Consider a supplier demanding payment in seven days while a buyer insists on sixty. The supplier may need cash for payroll; the buyer may be protecting working capital. An advance, staged invoices or an early-payment discount could address those pressures without either side receiving its opening demand.

Interests include time, certainty, risk, control, status, precedent, fairness, identity and face. A manager may resist an exception because it invites twenty more. A government may reject good terms that look like surrender. A family argument about washing up may concern whether effort is noticed.

The Camp David negotiations of 1978 show the distinction at state scale. Egypt sought the return of Sinai and sovereignty; Israel treated the territory as a security buffer. “Who controls Sinai?” looked indivisible. The framework and treaty separated sovereignty from security through phased withdrawal, force limits, monitoring and commitments. The history was messier than one lesson, but the design stopped treating control and safety as the same issue.

Finding interests is not a trick in which every conflict melts once people share their feelings. Some interests are opposed. Both sides may want the same scarce pound, promotion or piece of land. A landlord's interest in higher rent and a tenant's interest in lower rent remain distributive. The value of asking why is that it reveals which parts are fixed conflicts and which are design problems.

Questions should move from accusation to diagnosis. “What problem does that term solve?” invites explanation. “Which of price, speed and certainty matters most?” forces priorities into the open. The aim is a map accurate enough for exchange, not a confession.

You must also know your own interests. People arrive defending positions inherited from habit, pride or an earlier email. A procurement team may demand the lowest unit price even though downtime costs far more than the saving. A founder may insist on a valuation number while caring more about control and the investor's ability to help. Unless your priorities are ranked, you cannot trade intelligently.

Interests can also conflict within one side. Finance may value low cost, operations may value reliability, and a leader may value speed. Resolve enough of that conflict before bargaining, or the other side will receive several incompatible definitions of a good deal.

Objective criteria help where interests remain opposed. Market prices, precedent, replacement cost, valuations and legal rules provide reference points. They do not remove bargaining: each side may choose the standard that favours it. Their value is giving the result reasons that survive outside the room.

Positions still matter. They can protect information, establish ambition and make a commitment legible. The mistake is treating them as the whole dispute. A position is a proposed answer. Interests are the conditions any durable answer must satisfy.

3. Differences Are Tradeable Assets

Negotiation contains two jobs that resist being collapsed. The parties can create value by designing a better agreement, and they can claim value by deciding who receives what. Ignore creation and there is less to divide. Ignore claiming and someone else may take the share you helped create.

The simplest bargain is distributive. Once every term except price is fixed, each pound gained by the buyer is lost by the seller. The parties share an interest in trading and oppose each other over the division.

Many negotiations look simple because several issues have been compressed into one number. A contract can contain price, volume, payment, delivery, warranty, exclusivity, intellectual property, renewal and termination. A buyer may prize delivery certainty while a seller values flexible scheduling or publicity. Trading across differences can improve both outcomes.

This is logrolling: giving ground on lower-priority issues in exchange for movement on higher-priority ones. It works because value is subjective. Two people exchange objects because each values what they receive more than what they give. Negotiation extends that principle across terms, time and risk.

Differences are raw material. Different forecasts allow an earn-out or performance fee. Different attitudes to risk allow guarantees or insurance. Different time preferences allow early payment or deferral. Different capabilities let one side perform work more cheaply. The contract can sometimes let the future settle a forecast neither side can prove.

The obstacle is fixed-pie bias: assuming interests oppose each other across every issue. Laboratory studies find that negotiators leave joint gains undiscovered because they expect conflict. Simulations are cleaner than life, but the warning holds: what you assume is a contest shapes what you ask.

Three categories help. Opposing interests create the division problem: both sides prefer the same pound. Compatible interests create effortless gains: one side values publicity that costs the other little. Shared interests create a common objective, such as launching on time, while leaving disagreement over how its gains and costs are divided. Negotiators often notice the first category, assume it describes the whole table and then treat useful questions as weakness. Marking each issue by type shows where firmness is necessary and where conflict is being manufactured by the model rather than the facts.

Package proposals can reveal trades while protecting limits. A consultant might offer a lower fixed fee with a bonus, a higher fee with broad support, or a medium fee with a longer commitment. The client's preference reveals priorities without either side disclosing its limit.

Multiple equivalent simultaneous offers, or MESOs, formalise this approach. The options must be acceptable and materially different. Three cosmetic versions of one demand are theatre.

Value creation has limits. A contingent term becomes a machine for disputes if its metric is vague or controlled by one side. Added issues can hide a bad deal. Every term should solve a problem, allocate risk or enable a trade.

Then comes claiming. The parties still decide how the gains are divided. Alternatives, anchors, standards and concessions matter. This is the negotiator's dilemma: candour helps discover value, while excessive candour exposes how much you might surrender.

Use calibrated openness. Share interests and priorities that can create trades. Protect exact walk-away points and weak alternatives. Test reciprocity. If useful disclosure is answered only by extraction, narrow the channel.

A better deal is not a vague win-win feeling. It is an agreement that leaves both sides above their alternatives while wasting as little available value as possible, followed by a division each side can defend.

4. Learn Before You Solve

Negotiators often prepare arguments when they need a map. An argument explains why your preferred result is reasonable. A map shows what each side values, fears, controls, believes and can approve. The second is more useful because offers cannot be designed around information you never obtained.

Start with known facts and uncertainties. What issues, decision-makers and deadlines matter? What does delay cost? What might the other side do without agreement? Which forecasts differ? Write the questions down before pressure chooses them for you.

Good questions produce usable information and reveal what you missed. “If we could improve only delivery, payment or warranty, which changes the decision?” demands a trade-off. “Who else must approve this?” finds the hidden table. “What failed last time?” reveals risk. “What makes this impossible internally?” finds constraints.

Listening is analytical work. Notice repeated words, sharp reactions, easy issues and avoided questions. None proves a hidden motive; each justifies a test. Summarise the model and invite correction. A correction is information too.

Experiments support perspective-taking: considering the other side's thoughts and constraints often improved discovery and agreement. Emotional empathy did not produce the same consistent bargaining advantage. You need not approve of someone's interests to model them accurately.

Information exchange creates vulnerability, so sequence matters. Begin with lower-risk disclosures that invite reciprocity. Explain priorities before exact limits. State that you are comparing alternatives without inventing offers. Information should move in steps, not as a data dump.

Silence can be legitimate. You are rarely obliged to reveal your reservation value, maximum budget or every competing option. Selective disclosure is different from a false factual claim. Saying “I am not able to share our internal ceiling” preserves a boundary. Saying “The board has forbidden anything above £20,000” when no such instruction exists creates a fictitious constraint. The first manages information. The second corrupts it.

The other side may be an agent with incentives different from the principal: speed, commission, precedent or career safety. Ask about authority early. A person who cannot approve your proposal can still block or carry it badly.

Your side has a hidden table too. A deal that finance, legal, operations or a partner will reject is not progress. Align authority before commitment: who can concede, which terms need approval and how changes will be communicated.

Offers generate information. A package is a question with numbers attached. Preference for a longer term and lower unit price reveals a trade-off. “If we guarantee volume, could you shorten lead time?” tests whether the constraint is risk, capacity or reluctance.

The purpose of information is not surveillance. It is to reduce the number of ways you can be wrong. A negotiation improves when both sides understand enough of the system to propose terms that can work, while each retains the privacy needed to protect a fair share.

5. Offers Teach the Other Side How to Bargain

An offer is an argument compressed into terms. It says what you think the deal is worth, which issues you consider relevant and how ambitious you expect the exchange to be. That is why opening offers receive so much attention. They can influence the range that follows, but the popular rule that you should always make the first offer is too crude.

The anchoring effect is well established. In classic experiments, first offers pulled final settlements towards themselves because the first plausible number changed what negotiators considered and what counteroffers seemed responsive. Later work showed that precision can signal knowledge under some conditions, although false precision can look ridiculous when the underlying value is uncertain.

The useful update is that anchoring has costs as well as benefits. A large 2025 synthesis of first-offer research found that more ambitious openings can improve economic outcomes while also increasing the risk of impasse and reducing subjective value, with negotiation complexity changing the effects. As issues multiply, the simple one-number anchor becomes less dominant because negotiators have more dimensions on which to trade. The practical lesson is to treat a first offer as a strategic choice, not a ritual.

Go first when your information is good enough that you can set a defensible range and explain the basis. Let the other side open when they may know much more, when the value is unusually uncertain, or when their first number is itself valuable information. If they anchor aggressively, do not answer with a small movement from their figure. Re-centre the conversation around your own evidence, package or range.

Ambition still matters. Opening at your reservation value leaves no room to trade and teaches the other side that resistance is rewarded. Opening beyond any credible justification can damage trust or end the discussion. A useful opening is ambitious enough to leave room, plausible enough to defend and connected to standards that survive scrutiny.

With several issues, package offers are often better than haggling term by term. Suppose you could accept either a lower price with immediate payment or a higher price with longer payment and more support. Offering both packages at once tells the other side where your flexibility lies without announcing your private ranking. Research on multiple equivalent simultaneous offers, usually called MESOs, suggests that well-designed alternatives can improve both information discovery and some economic or relational outcomes in the settings studied.

Concessions then communicate. A concession made without explanation can be read as evidence that the previous number was inflated. A concession tied to movement on another issue teaches reciprocity: if delivery moves, payment moves; if volume rises, unit price falls. The size and pace of movement also reveal how much room may remain. That is why repeated equal concessions are dangerous. They create a pattern the other side can extrapolate.

Do not confuse this with performative reluctance. Artificial delays, fake pain and endless tiny movements can make a straightforward deal feel contaminated. The point is to make movement conditional and legible. Each change should have a reason.

The strongest offer is not the one that makes you look fearless. It is the one that improves the final comparison without making agreement needlessly harder to reach.

6. Power Lives in Process as Well as Price

By the time two sides argue over terms, many outcomes have already been shaped by process. The agenda determined what was discussed together. The attendance list decided whose interests were visible. The deadline altered patience. The approval route gave some people vetoes. The order of issues created momentum or deadlock. Process looks administrative because its power is indirect.

Begin by asking who needs to be involved and when. Too few people produce agreements that collapse under later review. Too many turn exploration into public positioning. Technical experts may be needed to test feasibility but can drown early talks in detail. Senior leaders may break an impasse but make junior participants afraid to experiment. Design the room for the current task, then change it as the task changes.

Agenda control matters. Negotiating each issue separately encourages positional fights and makes trading difficult. Discussing a package allows movement across priorities. Burying a critical term in a giant bundle can create confusion or manipulation. A useful sequence often begins with shared facts and interests, moves to possible packages, then handles the hardest distributional questions once enough structure exists to trade.

The Cuban Missile Crisis shows process operating under extreme pressure. The public bargain was that Soviet missiles would leave Cuba in return for a United States pledge not to invade. A private assurance accompanied it: American Jupiter missiles in Turkey would be removed later, provided the link remained secret. Backchannels, sequencing and secrecy allowed each government to manage allies and public face. The case does not offer a tidy template for ordinary business. It shows that an acceptable outcome can depend on how commitments are communicated and timed, not only on their substance.

Multiple parties transform the problem. With two sides, each can speak for itself. With five, ten or a hundred, coalitions form, issues link and agreement rules become strategic. A proposal may have majority support yet fail because the required coalition includes a holdout. A weak party can gain influence by becoming the necessary bridge between blocs. A strong party can isolate itself by treating every smaller participant as irrelevant.

Coalitions need their own negotiations. Members must decide what they want, what they will trade and how benefits will be shared. A coalition built only around opposition often fractures once it wins. The common enemy disappears and the internal distribution fight arrives.

Large diplomatic negotiations use texts as process tools. During the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, chairs produced successive negotiating texts to organise hundreds of linked questions into a possible whole. The text did not remove conflict. It gave parties a common object to revise rather than forcing every issue to restart from speeches. Commercial deals use term sheets, issue lists and marked-up drafts for the same reason.

Authority is another process variable. Ask who can make a binding commitment, who can recommend one and who can veto it later. Limited authority can protect a negotiator from pressure, but it can also waste time if every movement requires a call to someone absent. Do not accept “the board will never agree” as a natural law. Ask what the board needs, who will present the proposal and whether a decision-maker should join.

Deadlines deserve suspicion, not dismissal. Some are external: a licence expires, a court hearing begins, a ship leaves. Others are internal targets presented as inevitabilities. A deadline can help by concentrating decisions, or hurt by forcing errors and making delay a weapon. Establish what changes after the date. If nothing changes except one side's impatience, the deadline is pressure rather than fact.

Process can protect ethics. Agreeing how data will be checked, who records decisions, when private sessions are allowed and how conflicts of interest are handled reduces opportunities for convenient memory. In recurring relationships, a fair process can matter as much as a favourable number because people judge whether they were heard, respected and able to explain the result.

Negotiate the process early. Once the room, sequence and clock are fixed, changing them can look like retreat. The person who designs the table often influences the deal without raising their voice.

Power also sets ethical limits. When one side controls housing, immigration status, employment, medical access or another essential dependency, formal consent may coexist with severe practical pressure. Negotiation technique cannot turn coercion into fairness. The appropriate response may be representation, regulation, documentation, enforcement or exit rather than better bargaining language. The same applies to threats, fraud and discrimination. Knowing how to negotiate includes knowing when the problem is not negotiable.

7. A Good Agreement Survives Contact with Reality

An agreement is a forecast written as an obligation. It assumes people will perform, conditions will remain within tolerable bounds and disputes will be handled without destroying the exchange. The negotiation is unfinished until those assumptions have been translated into a working design.

Price receives attention because it is visible. Failure usually arrives through verbs: deliver, approve, inspect, maintain, report, pay, decide, remedy. Who does each one? By when? To what standard? Who can verify it? What happens if the answer is disputed? A sentence that says the parties will “cooperate closely” feels positive and allocates nothing.

Implementation begins with operational clarity. Define milestones, responsibilities, decision rights, dependencies and acceptance tests. Distinguish what must happen from what one side hopes will happen. Name the information each side must provide. In a partnership, decide who controls hiring, spending, product changes and the use of intellectual property. In a family arrangement, decide what “more help” means in observable terms. Ambiguity can preserve goodwill during signing and spend it later.

Then allocate risk. Fixed prices place cost risk differently from cost-plus prices. Guarantees shift performance risk. Deposits and staged payments alter credit risk. Liability caps limit tail exposure. Termination rights price the possibility that the relationship becomes worse than exit. There is no risk-free contract. There is only risk held by one side, shared, insured, monitored or ignored.

Contingent agreements are useful when parties disagree about an uncertain future and neither can prove its forecast. A seller who predicts high growth and a buyer who doubts it can combine an upfront price with an earn-out. A contractor confident in energy savings can tie part of the fee to measured performance. The metric must be observable, hard to manipulate and connected to the disputed belief. Otherwise the bet creates a second negotiation about measurement.

Governance matters where work continues after signing. Set regular reviews, escalation routes and a method for changing the agreement. The first response to a missed milestone should not be litigation or silence. It should be the process the parties designed for learning what happened and deciding what follows. Renegotiation clauses recognise that long agreements meet facts nobody could price perfectly at the start.

The 1998 Good Friday Agreement did far more than record a desire for peace. It built institutions for power-sharing within Northern Ireland, cooperation between north and south, and relationships between the British and Irish governments, while placing constitutional change behind consent. Implementation was difficult, suspensions followed and later agreements were needed. That difficulty proves the design problem rather than diminishing it. A durable settlement had to alter incentives, authority and legitimate routes for disagreement after the ceremony.

Trust helps, but trust without verification loads too much weight onto character. Verification without trust can make every act expensive. Good design combines them. Start with commitments small enough to test, make performance visible, increase exposure as evidence accumulates and preserve remedies for serious failure. The aim is not to assume virtue or bad faith. It is to make cooperation rational and defection costly enough to deter.

A closing process should include a final comparison with the BATNA. New terms may feel attractive because everyone is tired. Ask whether the complete package still beats the no-deal route once risk, delay and implementation cost are included. Then test it from the other side. If they have little reason or ability to perform, their signature is not security.

This completes the loop. Negotiation begins because control is divided and each side can choose agreement or an alternative. A durable deal rearranges those choices. It gives each side enough value, builds performance into incentives and creates a route through future disagreement. If the document fails to do that, the original bargaining problem returns after signing, often with more money trapped inside it.

The shark's favourite outcome is the one-sided victory visible today. The negotiator's outcome is a deal worth keeping tomorrow.

How It Actually Works

Decide whether there is a negotiation

Negotiation begins when the parties have some freedom to choose terms. That freedom can be broad, as in the sale of a company, or narrow, as in asking a hotel to move a booking. It can also be imaginary. A cashier cannot rewrite national tax law, and a junior recruiter may have no authority over a salary band. Before preparing tactics, identify who controls the term and whether the expected gain justifies the time, strain and risk of asking.

Some situations need a request rather than a bargain. A request asks another person to help because the outcome is reasonable, humane or easy to grant. Adding a threat or invented trade can make it worse. Other situations need enforcement. If a company owes a refund under clear terms, the first task is to assert the right and document the facts, not offer to surrender half in exchange for compliance.

Where bargaining exists, decide what can move. Price is rarely alone. Timing, scope, payment, risk, service, control, publicity, renewal and remedies may all be available even when one headline term is fixed. A pay band may be closed while start date, title, bonus, review timing, training budget and remote work remain open.

Decide what the relationship can bear. Asking is not costless, but fear usually exaggerates the cost of a respectful request. A well-prepared proposal gives the other side a reason to consider movement and a clean route to refuse. The danger lies less in asking than in treating every refusal as disrespect or every interaction as a contest.

Build the map before the meeting

Preparation should produce decisions, not a thick folder. Write down the issues, your interests, their likely interests, your BATNA, your reservation value, your target, objective standards, authority limits, unanswered questions and possible trades. Then rank the issues. If everything is marked essential, the ranking has failed.

Put numbers on the package where possible. A lower price with slow payment may be worse than a higher price paid today. A job with a £5,000 salary increase may lose value through commuting cost, pension terms or longer hours. Convert different terms into a common estimate while keeping uncertainty visible. The estimate need not be perfect. It must be good enough to stop one conspicuous number hiding the rest.

Use more than one scenario. Estimate a strong, central and weak outcome for uncertain terms such as demand, completion time or resale value. This prevents a single optimistic forecast from justifying concessions that become painful under ordinary conditions. It also reveals where a contingent term or risk-sharing mechanism may be more sensible than arguing over whose forecast is right.

Test the BATNA as if trying to disprove it. Has the alternative been confirmed? How long will it take? What cost or risk is missing? What happens if it fails? Then improve it before the deadline. A seller who contacts three credible buyers has changed the negotiation more than one who spends the same afternoon practising a firm voice.

Set a target supported by evidence. Targets influence persistence, but fantasy creates brittle openings. Use comparables, replacement cost, precedent, budgets, performance data or professional standards. Prepare the argument against your own preferred figure. If you cannot state why an informed counterpart would reject it, you are rehearsing desire rather than judgement.

Map the other side's internal decision. Who benefits from agreement? Who bears the cost? Who can veto it? A deal that makes sense to the person across the table may threaten somebody absent. The IT manager may want the software while procurement fears price precedent and security fears access. Each interest needs a route through the proposal.

Prepare language for the difficult moments. Write the one sentence that rejects an unacceptable term, the question that tests a deadline and the explanation for your opening figure. This is not scripting the whole exchange. It is preventing surprise from replacing judgement at the points where people commonly overreact or concede.

Set the process and open the exchange

An opening should establish purpose, authority and method before the numbers harden. Confirm who is present, how much time is available, what needs to be decided and who must approve the result. Agree whether the discussion will cover the full package or one issue at a time. If one side has sent an agenda, treat it as a proposal rather than scenery.

Tone matters because negotiation contains both joint work and competition. Excessive friendliness can obscure disagreement. Hostility makes information expensive. A useful tone is calm, specific and difficult to provoke. State your aim without declaring victory in advance: you want an agreement that solves the operational problem and works on price, risk and delivery.

Do not rush to fill silence. People often improve an offer, explain a constraint or reveal a priority after a pause. Silence becomes manipulative when used as punishment or contempt. Used briefly, it gives both sides room to think and prevents your anxiety from negotiating against you.

If the other side opens with a demand, do not assume it is a limit. Acknowledge it, ask how it was derived and place it within the wider package. If the number is unsupported, challenge the standard rather than the person. If it is well supported, update your model. Preparation is not a vow to ignore new evidence.

Choose the medium to fit the task. Live conversation is useful for exploring interests, testing reactions and repairing misunderstanding. Written exchange is better for exact packages, calculations and a record of provisional terms. Video preserves more social information than email but can still hide side conversations and weak attention. Complex negotiations often work best by alternating: explore live, propose in writing, clarify live, then document again. Do not let an email chain become the process merely because it started first.

Learn before solving

The discovery phase should find differences, constraints and the shape of authority. Ask questions that require priorities. Which outcome matters most? What creates the deadline? What risk is the warranty meant to cover? Which part would be hardest to approve? What would a successful first six months look like? What failed in the previous arrangement?

Questions alone can feel like extraction. Explain enough of your own interests to make the exchange reciprocal. A buyer might say that service continuity matters more than the lowest unit price. That disclosure invites a supplier to propose support terms without revealing the buyer's maximum budget. A job candidate might say that early responsibility matters more than a decorative title. That helps the employer design a role while preserving room on salary.

Summarise the emerging map and invite correction. This catches false assumptions before they enter an offer. It also shows the other side that their account has been heard, which can reduce the need to repeat positions more loudly. Accuracy is more useful than agreement: you can understand a demand and still reject it.

Watch for missing issues. A party may keep returning to one term because another cannot be discussed openly. A manager asking for a lower fee may need political cover against a budget cut. A founder insisting on a board seat may fear being sidelined after investment. Do not psychoanalyse from one clue. Offer a neutral test: would a reporting right or reserved decision address the concern?

Check statements against behaviour and documents where the stakes justify it. A claimed deadline should appear in the project schedule. A competing offer may remain confidential, but its existence can sometimes be confirmed indirectly. Trust should reduce needless verification, not abolish ordinary diligence.

Generate packages, not fragments

Once the interests are clearer, separate invention from commitment. Create several packages without treating every idea as an offer. This avoids the trap in which mentioning an option becomes a concession that cannot be retrieved.

Packages should trade across differences. If one side values certainty and the other upside, combine a secure base with variable rewards. If one values speed and the other scheduling freedom, exchange priority for a price or volume commitment. If both dispute future performance, make part of the result contingent on a measurable outcome.

Presenting more than one acceptable package can accelerate learning. Each should differ along meaningful dimensions. A supplier might offer a lower price for a twelve-month volume commitment, a higher price with flexibility, or a middle price with faster payment. The buyer's preference reveals the true cost of commitment, flexibility and cash.

Do not overload the table with ten versions. Choice has value until comparison becomes work. Two or three structured packages are usually enough to expose priorities. Explain the logic, then ask what the other side would change rather than which package they “like”.

Check feasibility with the people who will perform. Negotiators can create elegant trades using resources operations does not have. A fast delivery promise is worthless if production capacity is full. An earn-out is dangerous if finance cannot measure the metric. Design gains count only when the organisation can produce them.

Where a provisional agreement has been reached, a post-settlement search can test whether value remains. The original terms stay protected while the parties ask whether another package could improve one side without hurting the other. This works only if reopening cannot be used to seize concessions already granted. The exercise is a joint check for waste, not a disguised second attack.

Claim value without poisoning it

When the bargaining range is understood well enough, make or answer the anchor. State an ambitious, defensible proposal and connect it to standards. Keep the complete package visible. A price concession may be harmless if volume rises; the same concession alone may be expensive.

If their opening is extreme, avoid two mistakes. Do not accept its frame by countering timidly near it. Do not answer insult with insult. Explain why the figure is outside the relevant evidence, introduce your reference points and place a credible counterproposal. Then return to questions that might explain the gap.

Concede slowly enough to learn. A concession should respond to new information, buy a reciprocal term or help close a small remaining distance. Label it: movement on price depends on movement on payment, risk or volume. Unlabelled concessions are often received as corrections to an unreasonable opening rather than gifts requiring a response.

Keep concessions conditional until the package is settled. “We could move to this figure if the warranty remains at twelve months” protects the trade. Finalising each issue in isolation lets the other side bank your movement and reopen theirs. Nothing is agreed until the whole is agreed is a useful working rule, provided it is stated early rather than introduced when convenient.

Fairness arguments deserve examination. Ask fair by which standard, applied to which comparison and with what treatment of risk. People sincerely favour rules that favour them. A neutral calculation, independent valuation or shared dataset can help. Where no standard dominates, admit that distribution remains a bargain rather than dressing preference as justice.

Do not confuse a slow counteroffer with a considered one. Time can be used to create weight around an unchanged position. Judge movement by the terms and reasons, not the pause before them. Equally, do not punish speed. A party that accepts because the package meets its needs has not committed an offence against bargaining theatre.

Handle pressure, tactics and emotion

Common tactics are less frightening once translated into their function. A take-it-or-leave-it offer tries to close exploration. A last-minute nibble seeks one more gain after commitment has formed. Good cop and bad cop manipulate relief. An appeal to higher authority allows one side to retreat from concessions. A false deadline makes your anxiety do their work.

The response is diagnosis. Ask what makes the offer final, what changes after the deadline and whether the absent authority can join. Reopen the package after a nibble: a new request means the settlement is not yet final, so corresponding terms may move too. Name behaviour carefully when necessary, but avoid performing outrage merely because a textbook gave the tactic a label.

Threats should be translated into consequences. Is the threatened action legal, credible, costly and within the speaker's control? What would trigger it, and what would happen next? A threat that harms both sides may still be credible if pride, politics or precedent matters. Do not dismiss it because it looks irrational under your priorities.

Emotion contains information and distortion. Anger may signal a boundary, a threatened identity or a strategy. Experiments show that displayed anger can extract concessions in some settings, especially where the recipient feels weak and treats the display as informative. It can also reduce trust, invite retaliation and damage implementation. Do not imitate anger as a universal tool.

When emotion rises, slow the process. Separate the person from the disputed behaviour. Restate facts, take a break, change the participants or move from speech to a written proposal. If insult or intimidation is the method rather than a lapse, set a boundary and use the BATNA. Staying calm does not require staying present.

Impasse can mean several things: no overlap exists, information is missing, one issue has become symbolic, authority is absent, parties fear appearing weak or the process has exhausted them. Change one variable at a time. Add an issue, change the sequence, seek an independent standard, use a mediator, draft a contingent term or pause while alternatives develop. Do not split a difference that still produces a bad deal.

Negotiate behind the table

Most important negotiations contain people who never attend. A representative must satisfy constituents, colleagues, investors, voters, family members or regulators. Agreement across the table can fail because the negotiator cannot sell it behind the table.

Help without taking over. Ask what objections will arise and what evidence, wording or safeguards would answer them. Give the other side a defensible account of the result. A proposal that requires them to return home and announce humiliation is structurally weak even when the economics are attractive.

Your own mandate must remain clear. Keep stakeholders informed before they can feel surprised by a near-final package. Record provisional trades and approval conditions. A negotiating team should decide who leads, who observes, who answers technical questions and who can call a pause. Internal disagreement displayed carelessly becomes free information for the other side.

Use breaks deliberately. A team that never pauses cannot compare notes, update priorities or stop one member conceding a term whose cost another member understands. Private caucuses should improve coordination, not become occasions for inventing a new story about what the other side must be thinking.

In multi-party talks, map interests and blocking power separately. The loudest participant may not be decisive. Build coalitions around specific issues rather than assuming one alliance covers everything. A party can be your ally on timing and your opponent on price. Treating coalitions as permanent camps wastes possible trades.

Close twice

The first close is substantive. Restate the whole package, including what has been withdrawn, made conditional or left unresolved. Check arithmetic, dates, definitions and dependencies. Compare the result with the reservation value and BATNA. Fatigue is not a reason to accept terms you would reject in the morning.

The second close is operational. Decide who drafts, who reviews, who signs and what happens before the formal document is complete. Turn broad promises into duties, measures and dates. Confirm governance, reporting, escalation, remedies, renewal and exit. Assign owners to immediate actions.

Read the final text as an adversary and as an operator. The adversary asks how a term could be exploited. The operator asks whether a normal person can tell what to do on Tuesday. Both readings are necessary. A clause can be legally defensive and operationally useless, or clear in practice and dangerously incomplete.

Check that the written language matches the negotiated meaning. Small drafting words can shift risk: reasonable efforts, best efforts, material breach, sole discretion, promptly. Where such phrases matter, define them or obtain appropriate legal advice. A friendly summary email cannot repair a contract that says something else.

After signing, send a clean record of decisions and begin the first commitments quickly. Early performance creates evidence that the new arrangement is real. Where the relationship matters, schedule a review before trouble forces one. Negotiation does not end when persuasion stops. It ends when the agreement has become behaviour.

Pressure tests before you close

Before closing, test four things. Does the complete package still beat your BATNA? What happens under a bad but plausible future, such as delay, lower demand or a failed dependency? Do the signatories have the authority and approvals needed to bind their side? And where the text uses words such as reasonable, prompt or adequate, can a date, quantity, standard or decision procedure replace the ambiguity?

Then ask: what will we argue about first? The answer often identifies the clause or incentive that needs another ten minutes of work. If both sides suspect a better package may exist, preserve the agreed terms while making one final search for a mutual improvement. The original deal remains unless both prefer the revision.

How we know

Negotiation research combines laboratory bargaining games, classroom simulations, field data and studies of professional or diplomatic settings. That mix is useful and limiting. Controlled experiments isolate mechanisms such as anchoring, fixed-pie assumptions, emotion and perspective-taking, but the participants often face cleaner issues, shorter relationships and lower stakes than real negotiators. A 2023 review of the field argues that many effects once presented as general rules are moderated by context and that more work is needed on negotiation in the wild.

The first-offer literature now illustrates the point. Anchoring is robust, yet a 2025 meta-analytic and experimental synthesis found simultaneous advantages and risks, with complexity changing the effect. The book therefore treats behavioural findings as conditional tools rather than universal commands.

The diplomatic examples are used for structure, not as templates for a salary discussion. Official agreements and government records establish what was negotiated and implemented, while memoirs and later accounts can disagree about motives and causal weight. Ordinary examples in this book are constructed illustrations. They are not reported cases.

What People Get Wrong

"The tougher negotiator wins"

Toughness is usually measured by visible behaviour: high demands, slow concessions, interruptions and a willingness to make the room unpleasant. Those behaviours can extract value when the other side has weak alternatives, poor information or a strong need to finish. That is why the model survives.

It confuses pressure with power. A negotiator who can leave, wait or switch partners may speak softly and remain immovable. One who needs agreement can pound the table and still collapse near the deadline.

Aggression also carries costs. It reduces information exchange, encourages defensive positions, invites retaliation and can produce terms the defeated side later resists implementing.

The useful form of toughness is disciplined rather than theatrical. Prepare the BATNA, set a reservation value, support ambitious proposals, insist on reciprocity and leave when the available deal is inferior. Pair that firmness with respect, accurate listening and a process the other side can defend. The distinction matters because many people choose between being a shark and being a pushover. Competent negotiation rejects both roles. The strongest boundary often sounds ordinary: those terms do not work for us, and this is what would.

"Never make the first offer"

Waiting feels safe because the other side might reveal a number more favourable than yours. That can happen, especially when you know little about the range. The rule became popular because nobody wants to discover that a buyer would have paid twice the asking price.

Research on anchoring shows the other side of the risk. A credible first offer often pulls counteroffers and final outcomes towards it. By waiting automatically, you may hand control of the reference point to someone no better informed than you. You then spend the negotiation escaping their number.

The correct decision depends on information. Open first when you understand the range, can defend the figure and have enough room to concede. Invite their offer when your uncertainty is high and their number is likely to teach you more than your anchor would gain. In either case, prepare a counter-anchor and relevant standards. “Never first” is not caution. It is surrendering a useful choice before the negotiation begins. The danger lies in speaking first without research, not in speaking first as such. A range can be worse than a single number when the other side hears only the favourable end. If you use one, explain what changes across it and why.

"Win-win means meeting in the middle"

The midpoint feels fair because both sides move the same visible distance. It is quick, easy to explain and emotionally tidy. It may also be arbitrary. An extreme opening can move the midpoint without changing the underlying value, which rewards the person who began furthest from reality.

Win-win has a better meaning: both sides prefer the agreement to their alternatives, and the design captures available trades. That may produce uneven movement on price because the parties exchange other terms. One side may receive its preferred delivery date while the other receives volume certainty. A contingent payment may satisfy different forecasts. The final number need not sit halfway between the first two numbers.

Sometimes splitting the difference is efficient. If the opening range was reasonable, the remaining sum is small and further bargaining costs more than it could save, the midpoint can close the matter. It should be a conscious price for settlement, not a moral law. Equal concessions are not the same as equal value, and equal value is not always the relevant goal. Fairness must examine the package and the standards behind it, not the symmetry of the final step.

"Keep your cards close and reveal nothing"

Secrecy protects reservation values, weak alternatives and information the other side could exploit. From that sensible premise comes a destructive habit: disclose nothing, ask everything and call the resulting suspicion strategy.

Value creation requires enough information to discover differences. If neither side reveals that one cares about timing while the other cares about price, they can fight over a single number and miss the trade. Studies of integrative bargaining repeatedly find that negotiators misread interests as fully opposed and leave gains unused.

The answer is selective, reciprocal disclosure. Share priorities, constraints and interests that can improve the package. Protect exact limits and unsupported vulnerabilities. Start with lower-risk information, observe whether the other side responds in kind and widen or narrow the exchange accordingly. You can say that cash flow matters without revealing the day the account runs empty. Keeping every card close does not make you mysterious. It makes the deal designer blind. Information should be invested where it can produce a return, not scattered or buried.

"Deadlines favour whoever can wait"

Patience is valuable. A party with a strong alternative and low cost of delay can resist pressure that forces others into bad terms. The mistake is treating every clock as a simple endurance contest.

Deadlines change both sides' alternatives. A licence expiry, court date, funding round or production slot may destroy value for everyone. A deadline can also hurt the party who appears more patient if the other side secures an alternative first. Some clocks are fixed, some can move and some are invented to make urgency look external.

Ask what happens after the date, who controls it and whether partial agreement preserves value. Build milestones before the final hour. Where time pressure is asymmetric, improve the weaker side's interim options or change the sequence. The lesson is not to wait longest. It is to understand the clock better. Delay is power only when the cost of delay belongs mostly to someone else. Sometimes the best use of time is speed, because completing a good deal before conditions change protects both sides.

"If they say yes, you have won"

A quick yes feels like proof of persuasion. It may mean your offer was generous, the other side misunderstood it, the person lacks authority or performance will be someone else's problem. Agreement is evidence of consent, not of quality.

The result must pass three tests. Does it beat your BATNA? Does it capture the important available value? Can and will both sides perform it? A contract can pass the first two and fail the third because responsibilities, measures or incentives are vague. It can look excellent on price while transferring unacceptable risk.

Subjective value matters too. Research following negotiators beyond the immediate bargain has found that feelings about fairness, treatment and the relationship can affect later willingness to work together. That does not mean everyone must leave delighted. It means humiliation can be an implementation cost.

The correct finish is a double close: settle the package, then design the behaviour that follows. A signature is the beginning of evidence about whether the negotiation worked. The better question after yes is not “Did I beat them?” but “What have both sides now agreed to do, and why will they do it?”

"Lying is harmless if nobody catches it"

Negotiation permits privacy, advocacy and selective disclosure. That grey area makes false statements easy to rationalise. A negotiator invents a competing offer, misstates authority or conceals a known defect and tells themselves that everyone expects gamesmanship.

The immediate gain can be real. The wider account is worse. Lies distort the information needed to design a workable agreement. They can create legal exposure, trigger retaliation, damage reputation and make future verification more expensive. Experimental research on violated trust shows that apologies can improve willingness to reconcile, but trust damaged by deception is difficult to restore fully. A promise after exposure is weaker evidence than a record of honest performance.

Ethical firmness does not require revealing everything. Decline to answer, state that information is confidential, describe uncertainty accurately or make a conditional proposal. Do not create fake facts. The distinction matters because negotiation depends on the possibility that statements can guide choices. Once every claim is treated as theatre, only power and enforcement remain. A liar may escape detection in one room while teaching colleagues and counterparts to price mistrust into every later deal.

Use It

Build the no-deal plan first

Before deciding what to say, decide what happens if the answer is no. Name the best alternative, verify that it is real, estimate its full cost and improve it where possible. Then turn it into a reservation value. This is the line a complete package must beat, not a number chosen because it feels tough.

Do the same exercise for the other side. You will not know their answer exactly, but you can ask what they can do instead, what delay costs them and which resources they need from you. Power becomes easier to see when translated into alternatives rather than personality. Consider a freelancer negotiating a renewal with a client worth half their income. A confident opening does little if losing the account would create a cash crisis. Two months earlier, the useful negotiation move may have been finding two smaller clients. By the time price is discussed, the outside option has already changed what can safely be refused.

Turn one demand into a map of issues

When someone says, “I need £50,000,” do not spend the next hour discussing only £50,000. Ask what the number is solving. Cash now? Risk? Status? A precedent? A funding requirement? Then list the other terms that affect value: timing, scope, control, service, guarantees, renewal, publicity, exclusivity and remedies.

This does not guarantee a trade. It makes trades visible. If both sides care about the same issue in opposite directions, that issue must eventually be divided. If they rank issues differently, there may be value to create before division begins. A buyer may care intensely about delivery date and only moderately about payment timing; the supplier may have the reverse priorities. A trade between those differences can improve both positions without pretending the price conflict disappeared.

Ask for priorities, not secrets

You rarely need the other side's confidential reservation value. You do need to understand what matters most, what is constrained and what problem makes a term important. Ask comparative questions: Which matters more, timing or certainty? What would make this easier to approve? Which part of the package creates the most risk for you?

Offer information in layers. Explain the interest that helps them design a solution without casually revealing the point at which you would capitulate. When they share useful information, reciprocate. Negotiation becomes more productive when disclosure is exchanged rather than donated. The distinction matters with sensitive facts. You can say that certainty of payment matters more than headline price without announcing your exact cash position. You can say that approval becomes harder above a threshold without revealing the maximum authority delegated to you. Good questions expose structure without demanding confession.

Make movement conditional

A concession should purchase progress. Replace “I can reduce the price by £2,000” with “If payment moves to completion, I can reduce the price by £2,000.” The sentence turns a giveaway into a trade and tells the other side what the movement costs you.

Keep a concession record in long negotiations. Fatigue makes people forget what has already moved, and memory becomes self-serving under pressure. Recording changes also helps you compare the final package with the one you were prepared to accept at the start. In a long supplier negotiation, ten small concessions can feel harmless because each was justified locally. Written together, they may show that price, payment, warranty and service have all moved in the same direction. The record makes reciprocity visible before fatigue turns it into hindsight.

Negotiate the route to yes

Ask who needs to approve the agreement, what information they require and what objections they are likely to raise. Then work backwards. A proposal that satisfies the person in front of you but cannot survive procurement, a board, a partner or a family conversation is not close to agreement.

The same applies to sequence. Decide which issues to bundle, which to postpone and which need evidence before numbers. Test deadlines. Clarify authority. In multi-party situations, identify coalitions and vetoes without treating people as pieces on a board. Process is part of the bargain because it controls which choices can be made and when. This is especially important with agents. A recruiter, broker, lawyer or procurement manager may be negotiating within instructions they did not create. Pressing them harder cannot create authority they do not possess. Sometimes the useful move is to help them build the case for an exception, change the approving person or redesign the term so it falls inside existing authority.

Give them a defensible yes

A good proposal helps the other side explain agreement to people who were not in the room. Use objective standards where they are credible, record the reasoning behind unusual terms and avoid gratuitous humiliation. Face is not softness. A person who must return to a boss, board, electorate or spouse needs a story about why the deal was responsible.

This is where “without being a shark” becomes operational. Be demanding about value and exact about obligations. Do not require the other side to pretend they lost in order for you to feel you won. Leaving someone a defensible yes can preserve implementation without costing you the substance you care about. The seller who accepts your price may still need to tell a partner why the discount was sensible. The employee who accepts a narrower role may need a title that signals progression. A concession on face can be cheap to you and valuable to them, provided it does not disguise a material disadvantage or require anyone to repeat a fiction.

The limits

Negotiation cannot create an agreement zone where none exists. It cannot compensate for an alternative that is disastrously weak, make a dishonest counterparty reliable or erase legal and structural power. It also does not travel unchanged across cultures, organisations and media. Silence, directness, hierarchy, relationship-building, deadlines and the meaning of an opening offer vary by context.

Behavioural findings deserve the same caution. Many come from simulations that isolate one mechanism. They help you predict pressures, not people. Do not diagnose a counterpart from a single tactic or assume a laboratory effect will dominate a complex relationship.

Some situations should not be bargained. If you are dealing with abuse, fraud, unlawful discrimination, threats or a clear legal entitlement, safety, documentation, representation or enforcement may matter more than mutual problem-solving. A refusal to negotiate can itself be sound judgement. The same is true when the amount at stake is trivial. Spending three hours to save £20 is not negotiation skill. It is failure to value time. Good negotiators choose their battles because attention, goodwill and decision energy are scarce resources too.

The one thing to keep

Keep the comparison.

At every stage, compare choices rather than personalities. Compare the proposed deal with your best alternative. Compare the other side's stated position with the interests that may be causing it. Compare issues to find differences in priority. Compare packages rather than one headline number. Compare the person at the table with the constituency that must approve. Compare the signed promise with the incentives that will exist when performance is due.

That habit makes you harder to bully because you know what no means. It also makes you less likely to bully because you do not need theatre to create leverage. You can be firm without pretending the other person is an enemy.

The better deal is the one that wins the comparison after the meeting is over. That may be a higher price, a lower price, a cleaner exit, a safer contract, a faster answer or no deal at all. The label matters less than the decision quality. If you can explain why the chosen package beats the alternatives for the reasons that matter, without relying on intimidation or self-deception, you have done the essential work.

Terms

Negotiation language can make ordinary judgement look more mysterious than it is. These terms are useful because each names a distinction that changes a decision. Learn the pairs first: position and interest, target and reservation value, creation and claiming, agreement and implementation. The vocabulary then becomes a compact checklist. It also helps when advisers use the same word differently, which they often do. A precise term should shorten an explanation, not replace one. Use the words to think more clearly, never to sound more expert.

Negotiation. A process in which parties with partly shared and partly opposed interests communicate to decide whether, and on what terms, they will cooperate. It can concern one issue or an entire relationship.

Interdependence. The condition that creates negotiation: each side controls something the other values, while neither can obtain the preferred result alone. The degree of dependence may change during talks.

Position. A stated demand or proposed outcome, such as a price, deadline or division of control. It is an answer offered to the dispute, not the reason beneath it.

Interest. A need, concern, preference or constraint that a term must address. Common interests include money, time, certainty, risk, status, fairness, identity, precedent and face.

Issue. One negotiable component of a deal. Price may be an issue alongside payment, delivery, scope, warranty, control, renewal, publicity, information rights and exit.

BATNA. The best alternative to a negotiated agreement. It is the strongest route available if talks fail, assessed after cost, delay, risk, uncertainty and practical friction.

Reservation value. The least favourable complete deal a party should accept before choosing its BATNA. It is often called the walk-away point and may contain several terms.

Target. An ambitious but supportable result pursued within the negotiation. It should sit above the reservation value and be grounded in evidence rather than hope or bravado.

ZOPA. The zone of possible agreement, where the parties' acceptable ranges overlap. No ZOPA means no deal on the current issues, though adding terms may create one.

Distributive bargaining. Bargaining over how a fixed amount of value will be divided. A lower price for one side is an equal monetary loss to the other.

Integrative bargaining. Designing trades that increase joint value by using differences in priorities, forecasts, risk, timing, capability, tax treatment or cost of performance.

Fixed-pie bias. The mistaken assumption that every interest is opposed. It causes negotiators to miss compatible priorities, shared interests and trades that could improve both outcomes.

Anchor. A starting figure or term that influences how later proposals are judged. First offers are common anchors, but deadlines, quantities and contract periods can anchor too.

First offer. The opening substantive proposal. It can shape the bargaining range when informed and credible, or expose ignorance and constrain the offeror when made blindly.

Objective criteria. External standards used to justify terms, including market evidence, precedent, replacement cost, independent valuation, professional rules, performance data and legal principles.

Concession. Movement from a previous proposal. Concessions reveal information, so they should follow new evidence, purchase reciprocity, preserve a trade or reduce bargaining cost.

Reciprocity. The expectation that movement, disclosure or cooperation will be answered in kind. It supports exchange but can be manipulated through unsolicited favours or staged concessions.

Logrolling. Trading across issues by giving ground on lower-priority terms in exchange for gains on higher-priority ones. It depends on differences in value, not equal movement.

Package offer. A proposal containing several linked terms. Packages preserve trades and prevent one visible issue, commonly price, from consuming the negotiation or being settled in isolation.

MESO. Multiple equivalent simultaneous offers: two or more packages of similar value to the offeror, structured differently to reveal the other side's priorities and invite comparison.

Contingent agreement. A term that makes payment or performance depend on a future event. It converts differing forecasts into a bet, provided the measure is reliable and resistant to manipulation.

Authority. The power to commit a party to terms. A representative may influence, recommend, delay or block an agreement without having final authority to approve it.

Principal-agent problem. A conflict between the interests of the person or organisation represented and the representative conducting the negotiation, often caused by different incentives or information.

Coalition. A group of parties coordinating to increase influence or secure a shared result. Coalitions require internal bargaining over goals, strategy, concessions and distribution of gains.

Impasse. A point at which talks cannot progress under the current issues, information, authority or process. It may reflect a real gap or a repairable blockage.

Pareto improvement. A change that makes at least one party better off without making another worse off. It identifies unused value but says nothing about fairness of distribution.

Subjective value. How a negotiator feels about the outcome, process, relationship and self-respect after bargaining, distinct from the measurable economic result or formal contract terms.

Implementation. The conversion of agreed terms into responsibilities, decisions, milestones, information, incentives, verification, remedies, review and continuing behaviour after the signature.

Post-settlement settlement. A voluntary search for an improved package after agreement, with the original deal retained if no alternative makes at least one party better off without harming another.

Go Deeper

Negotiation books divide into inspirational stories, tactical catalogues and serious models. The four below perform different jobs and can be read in sequence. Together they cover the clean framework, the behavioural evidence, the strategic tension and the difficulties introduced by agents, damaged trust and continuing relationships.

For the clean starting model: Roger Fisher, William Ury and Bruce Patton, *Getting to Yes* (third edition, 2011). This is the book that put BATNA, interests and objective criteria into ordinary language. It remains the most useful first read because the framework is compact enough to remember under pressure and broad enough for work, disputes and personal decisions. Its strength is disciplined problem-solving; its weakness is that readers can mistake principled negotiation for an escape from hard value-claiming. Read it first, then add the competitive half from the books below.

For the research: Leigh L. Thompson, *The Mind and Heart of the Negotiator* (seventh edition, 2021). Thompson connects bargaining practice to experimental evidence on preparation, fixed-pie bias, first offers, emotion, trust, teams and cross-cultural negotiation. It is a university textbook, so the structure is systematic and some examples are designed for classroom use rather than narrative pleasure. The compensation is coverage and intellectual hygiene. Use it when you want to test confident advice against the behavioural literature, distinguish a robust mechanism from a slogan and see where context changes the recommendation.

For the full strategic tension: David A. Lax and James K. Sebenius, *The Manager as Negotiator* (1986). This is the clearest account of the negotiator's central problem: cooperation is needed to create value, while competition remains necessary to claim it. The book is older and assumes a managerial audience, but its treatment of interests, alternatives, moves away from the table and deal architecture remains unusually sharp. It also explains why preparation outside the room can dominate performance inside it. Read it after *Getting to Yes* when “win-win” has begun to sound too comfortable.

For difficult deals and disputes: Robert H. Mnookin, Scott R. Peppet and Andrew S. Tulumello, *Beyond Winning* (2000). Written from legal and dispute-resolution practice, it examines the tension between empathy and assertiveness, value creation and distribution, principals and agents. It is especially useful where history, identity, lawyers or damaged trust make a clean commercial model inadequate. The prose is accessible, but the richest chapters reward slower reading and application to a live negotiation. Its lasting value is showing that a technically elegant agreement can fail when the people and institutions needed to carry it are ignored.

Notes and Sources

The Whole Thing in One Page and Why You Should Care

The book's general model follows the distinction between value creation and value claiming developed across Roger Fisher, William Ury and Bruce Patton's *Getting to Yes*, Howard Raiffa's *The Art and Science of Negotiation*, and David Lax and James Sebenius's *The Manager as Negotiator*. BATNA is the term popularised by Fisher and Ury for the best alternative to negotiated agreement. Reservation value, target and zone of possible agreement are standard terms across modern negotiation teaching. The text treats bargaining power as relational because the value of an agreement depends on the alternatives available to each side, the costs of delay and the resources controlled by the other party.

Examples involving salary, leases, suppliers and partnerships are explanatory applications rather than reported cases. They illustrate how multiple terms can change the value of a package. No claim is made that every term is legally negotiable or that every setting permits the same disclosure. Legal duties, consumer rights and employment rules vary by jurisdiction.

Sources for the central model

Alternatives, reservation values and targets. Fisher, Ury and Patton provide the accessible BATNA framework. Raiffa supplies the more analytical treatment of bargaining ranges, reservation values, uncertainty and decision analysis. Lax and Sebenius develop the strategic importance of moves away from the table, including changing alternatives, parties and process before face-to-face bargaining.

Interests and Camp David. The interests-versus-positions distinction is central to *Getting to Yes* and later negotiation literature. The account of Camp David relies on the United States Department of State, Office of the Historian, “Camp David Accords and the Arab-Israeli Peace Process”, together with the 1978 frameworks and the 1979 Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty. Egypt's demand for withdrawal and sovereignty and Israel's security concerns were not the only forces in the negotiation. The example is used narrowly to show how territorial control, withdrawal, force limits, monitoring and security commitments were separated in the resulting design.

Fixed-pie bias. Leigh Thompson and Reid Hastie's 1990 experiments examined how negotiators perceive the structure of interests. Participants commonly assumed that the other side's preferences opposed their own, and more accurate understanding of compatible or differently ranked interests was associated with better joint outcomes. The book avoids quoting a universal percentage because results depend on the simulation, information and participant population.

Packages and MESOs. Geoffrey Leonardelli, Jun Gu, Geordie McRuer, Victoria Husted Medvec and Adam Galinsky tested multiple equivalent simultaneous offers against single-package openings. Their 2019 paper found economic and relational advantages under the studied conditions. The practical recommendation is bounded: packages must be meaningfully different, acceptable to the offeror and simple enough to compare.

Perspective-taking. Adam Galinsky, William Maddux, Debra Gilin and Judith White distinguished cognitive perspective-taking from emotional empathy in a series of experiments. Perspective-taking improved discovery and agreement in their tasks more consistently than empathy. The narrative uses this as a reason to model another party's constraints without claiming that empathy is unimportant to relationships or conflict.

First offers and precision. Galinsky and Thomas Mussweiler's 2001 experiments established a strong first-offer anchoring effect in distributive negotiations and examined mechanisms that reduce it. A 2025 conceptual, meta-analytic and experimental synthesis by Hannes Petrowsky and colleagues confirms that first offers can produce economic advantages while also increasing impasse risk and reducing subjective value, and finds that negotiation complexity moderates the effects. Malia Mason, Alice Lee, Elizabeth Wiley and Daniel Ames later found that precise offers could draw more conciliatory counteroffers because recipients inferred greater knowledge. Precision is treated as a contextual signal, not a reason to attach spurious decimals to uncertain value.

Objective standards and fairness. Linda Babcock and George Loewenstein review experimental and field evidence that parties interpret fairness in self-serving ways, including selective use of information. This supports the warning that objective criteria can improve the argument without eliminating bargaining over which standard applies.

Process and the Cuban Missile Crisis. The public and private elements of the settlement are documented in the United States Department of State's historical account and the *Foreign Relations of the United States* records. The public exchange centred on Soviet missile removal and a United States non-invasion assurance. The Jupiter missiles in Turkey were handled through a private understanding and later removed. The example is used to show how sequencing, channels, allied politics and face can determine whether substantively linked commitments are acceptable.

Law of the Sea negotiating texts. The United Nations Codification Division's records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea document the informal single negotiating text, its revisions and the later composite texts. The text was a process device for organising linked issues across a large conference. It did not produce automatic consensus, and disagreement remained, especially over deep seabed provisions.

Implementation and the Good Friday Agreement. The description relies on the 1998 Belfast or Good Friday Agreement and official government explanatory material. The Agreement created a power-sharing Assembly and Executive, north-south institutions, and east-west institutions, while making constitutional status depend on consent. Later suspensions and supplementary agreements are included to prevent the false impression that institutional design removed conflict once and for all.

Sources for the operating sequence

The operating sequence synthesises the four Go Deeper works, Raiffa, and the behavioural studies cited above. The fresh audit also uses Erica Boothby, Gus Cooney and Maurice Schweitzer's 2023 review, which emphasises moderators, real-world complexity and the limits of treating negotiation findings as monolithic rules. Preparation categories such as issues, interests, alternatives, reservation value, targets, standards, authority and unknowns are standard across professional negotiation courses. The recommendation to value the complete package reflects decision-analytic practice rather than a claim that every term can be reduced to a precise monetary figure.

The treatment of conditional proposals, contingent agreements and post-settlement settlements follows Fisher, Ury and Patton and Raiffa. Contingent agreements work only where the future event can be defined and measured without giving one side easy control over the result. A post-settlement settlement is safe only where the original agreement remains available if no mutually improving package is found.

The discussion of anger relies on Gerben van Kleef, Carsten De Dreu and Antony Manstead's 2004 experiments. Participants sometimes conceded more to an angry counterpart because they inferred a tougher limit. Van Kleef, De Dreu, Davide Pietroni and Manstead found in 2006 that this effect depended on the recipient's power: lower-power negotiators were more responsive to the counterpart's emotion. Other work also makes information processing, authenticity and context important. The narrative therefore rejects the popular leap from “anger sometimes changes concessions” to “anger is an effective general tactic”.

The account of subjective value draws on Jared Curhan, Hillary Elfenbein and Heng Xu's Subjective Value Inventory and later longitudinal research by Curhan, Elfenbein and Noah Eisenkraft. These works distinguish feelings about instrumental outcomes, self, process and relationship, and connect subjective experience to later behaviour. The book does not treat positive feelings as a substitute for economic value.

What People Get Wrong and Use It

The seven misconceptions were selected because each changes behaviour: aggression confused with power, automatic refusal to open, midpoint bargaining confused with joint gain, total secrecy, simplistic deadline logic, agreement confused with success, and deception treated as harmless gamesmanship.

The discussion of deception and trust relies especially on Maurice Schweitzer, John Hershey and Eric Bradlow's 2006 laboratory study. Trust recovered after some untrustworthy behaviour when later conduct became reliable, but trust harmed by deception did not fully recover under the study's conditions even after apology, promise and trustworthy action. This is directional evidence from a controlled setting, not a fixed prediction for every relationship.

The practical lenses preserve the book's boundary. They concern bargaining mechanics rather than sales prospecting, general persuasion, formal game theory or organisational management. The warning on coercion is deliberate: where threats, abuse, discrimination, fraud or legal rights dominate, negotiation skill may be secondary to protection, enforcement, representation or exit.

Terms and Go Deeper

Definitions follow common usage in negotiation research and teaching. “Pareto improvement” comes from economics and identifies a change that helps at least one side without harming another; it does not establish distributive justice. “Subjective value” follows Curhan and colleagues. “MESO” follows Leonardelli and colleagues. “Post-settlement settlement” is used in the Harvard negotiation tradition for a protected search for mutual improvement after agreement.

The four recommended books were checked against publisher records. *Getting to Yes* is the revised third edition published by Penguin Books in 2011. Thompson's seventh edition was published by Pearson in 2020 with a 2021 copyright date; the bibliography follows the edition's copyright year.

The Manager as Negotiator was published by Free Press in 1986. *Beyond Winning* was published by Belknap Press of Harvard University Press in 2000.

Bibliography

Books

Fisher, Roger, William Ury, and Bruce Patton. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. 3rd ed. Penguin Books, 2011.

Lax, David A., and James K. Sebenius. *The Manager as Negotiator: Bargaining for Cooperation and Competitive Gain*. Free Press, 1986.

Mnookin, Robert H., Scott R. Peppet, and Andrew S. Tulumello. *Beyond Winning: Negotiating to Create Value in Deals and Disputes*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000.

Raiffa, Howard. *The Art and Science of Negotiation*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1982.

Thompson, Leigh L. *The Mind and Heart of the Negotiator*. 7th ed. Pearson, 2021.

Research articles

Babcock, Linda, and George Loewenstein. "Explaining Bargaining Impasse: The Role of Self-Serving Biases." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 11, no. 1 (1997): 109-126. DOI: 10.1257/jep.11.1.109.

Curhan, Jared R., Hillary Anger Elfenbein, and Noah Eisenkraft. "The Objective Value of Subjective Value: A Multi-Round Negotiation Study." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 40, no. 3 (2010): 690-709. DOI: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00593.x.

Curhan, Jared R., Hillary Anger Elfenbein, and Heng Xu. "What Do People Value When They Negotiate? Mapping the Domain of Subjective Value in Negotiation." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 91, no. 3 (2006):

493-512. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.91.3.493.

Galinsky, Adam D., William W. Maddux, Debra Gilin, and Judith B. White. “Why It Pays to Get Inside the Head of Your Opponent: The Differential Effects of Perspective Taking and Empathy in Negotiations.” *Psychological Science* 19, no. 4 (2008): 378-384. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02096.x.

Galinsky, Adam D., and Thomas Mussweiler. “First Offers as Anchors: The Role of Perspective-Taking and Negotiator Focus.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 81, no. 4 (2001): 657-669. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.81.4.657.

Leonardelli, Geoffrey J., Jun Gu, Geordie McRuer, Victoria Husted Medvec, and Adam D. Galinsky. “Multiple Equivalent Simultaneous Offers Reduce the Negotiator Dilemma: How a Choice of First Offers Increases Economic and Relational Outcomes.” *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 152 (2019): 64-83. DOI: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2019.01.007.

Mason, Malia F., Alice J. Lee, Elizabeth A. Wiley, and Daniel R. Ames. “Precise Offers Are Potent Anchors: Conciliatory Counteroffers and Attributions of Knowledge in Negotiations.” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 49, no. 4 (2013): 759-763. DOI: 10.1016/j.jesp.2013.02.012.

Schweitzer, Maurice E., John C. Hershey, and Eric T. Bradlow. “Promises and Lies: Restoring Violated Trust.” *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 101, no. 1 (2006): 1-19. DOI: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.05.005.

Thompson, Leigh, and Reid Hastie. “Social Perception in Negotiation.” *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 47, no. 1 (1990): 98-123. DOI: 10.1016/0749-5978(90)90048-E.

Van Kleef, Gerben A., Carsten K. W. De Dreu, and Antony S. R. Manstead. “The Interpersonal Effects of Anger and Happiness in Negotiations.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 86, no. 1 (2004): 57-76. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.86.1.57.

Van Kleef, Gerben A., Carsten K. W. De Dreu, Davide Pietroni, and Antony S. R. Manstead. “Power and Emotion in Negotiation: Power Moderates the Interpersonal Effects of Anger and Happiness on Concession Making.” *European Journal of Social Psychology* 36, no. 4 (2006): 557-581. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.320.

Boothby, Erica J., Gus Cooney, and Maurice E. Schweitzer. “Embracing Complexity: A Review of Negotiation Research.” *Annual Review of Psychology* 74 (2023): 299-332. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-psych-033020-014116.

Petrowsky, Hannes M., Lea Boecker, Yannik A. Escher, Marie-Lena Frech, Malte Friese, Adam D. Galinsky, Brian Gunia, Alice J. Lee, Michael Schaerer, Martin Schweinsberg, Mei Soliman, Roderick Swaab, Erik S. Troll, Michael Weber, and Daniel D. Loschelder. “The Power and Peril of First Offers in Negotiations: A Conceptual, Meta-Analytic, and Experimental Synthesis.” *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 191 (2025): 104448. DOI: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2025.104448.

Official documents and records

Egypt and Israel. *Framework for Peace in the Middle East Agreed at Camp David* and *Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel*. Camp David, 17 September 1978.

Egypt and Israel. *Treaty of Peace between the State of Israel and the Arab Republic of Egypt*. Washington, 26 March 1979.

Government of the United Kingdom. *The Belfast Agreement*. Belfast, 10 April 1998.

United Nations. *Official Records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea*. United Nations, 1973-1982.

United Nations. *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*. Montego Bay, 10 December 1982.

United States Department of State. *Foreign Relations of the United States,* *1961-1963, Volume XI: Cuban Missile Crisis and Aftermath*. United States Government Printing Office, 1996.

United States Department of State, Office of the Historian. “Camp David Accords and the Arab-Israeli Peace Process.” *Milestones in the History of U.S. Foreign Relations, 1977-1980*.

United States Department of State, Office of the Historian. “The Cuban Missile Crisis, October 1962.” *Milestones in the History of U.S. Foreign Relations, 1961-1968*.