

Negotiation Tactics

Assuming a reasonable stance

This strategy is the most common and effective tactic. In other words, be open to compromise, suggestions, and concession. You may not agree with everything said, but listen to the suggestions and take the ideas that you like. In the end, compromise is always the key to a successful negotiating session.

Demanding more in a first offer

At first demanding more than you are really expecting to get is an excellent negotiating strategy. This approach gets the negotiations under way and may force the opponent to make the first serious offer. On the other hand, the demand could be viewed as so outrageous that the demander is seen as not really being interested in negotiating in good faith.

False demand

This is another traditional negotiating tactic. By posing a demand and then taking it back, a delegate convinces others that his or her country is reasonable and sincere in its negotiations. This action also sets an example for others to follow and do the same. A related tactic is to convince an opponent that the current offer is one's bottom-line position.

Negotiating with authority

Using this tactic, a delegate tries to convince others that he/she is the most knowledgeable delegate on a particular issue or subject. The opinion of a delegate who negotiates from a position of strength will be given greater weight in the formulation of resolution. The delegate who appears to be the leader will attract followers and gain support for his or her actions. Of course, having established such a position, being proven wrong can be disastrous.

Playing one opponent off against another

This tactic can enable a delegate to gain the upper hand against a stronger opponent by letting him or her direct his or her energies in the wrong direction. In some cases, an opponent will not take the bait and the delegate may find him or herself in a weaker rather than stronger position.

Anger

A negotiator can use anger to draw attention to a point. Anger can be real or fake. In both cases, it signals the seriousness of a negotiator's position and raises doubts about the reasonableness of an opponent's position. However, this tactic could create an equally angry response.

Aggression

Delegates may use aggression by emphasizing errors and flaws in an opponent's argument. It also weakens an opponent's confidence in the position that they have taken. On the other hand, an aggressive stance might embarrass a fellow delegate in a such a way that he/she becomes more stubborn on the issue.

Surrendering

This tactic can sometimes limit potential damage and let a delegate appeal to his or her opponent's sense of ethics and fairness. However, an opponent may not take pity if this tactic is used too late in the negotiating process; instead, the opponent might "go for the kill."

Dividing the issues

Sometimes, countries appear to be more divided on an issue than they actually are. By identifying points on common agreement, the areas of disagreement can be reduced. When negotiating a resolution, delegates may wish to circle the clauses or phrases with which they don't agree, and focus their energies in resolving these matters with negotiation or compromise.