

## Types of negotiation

**Distributive negotiation is the process of dividing the value pie in the negotiation process.** Distributed negotiating can be thought of as negotiations and distributive bargaining represents a situation where two sides are attempting to split up a set estate, typically in a competitive way. They're going back and forth until there's a final answer for the winner, who claimed the most value, and the loser, who got the least value. That's why this type of negotiation is considered to be a win-loss condition or a zero-sum game. You have to match many victories with the losses or vice versa – an exchange of quotations, usually price quotes, which late Harvard University professor Howard Raiffa dubbed "Negotiation of dance." The most active negotiators in the scattered talks are normally those who devote a lot of time preparing the negotiations. In specific, negotiators should define their best solution to the bargaining arrangement or the BATNA agreement. If they fail to achieve their goals in the current negotiations, what are they going to do? For example, a job seeker can decide to apply for other vacancies. **In short negotiators must also determine their point of booking or point of departure.**

**Integrative negotiation is a mutual bargaining technique in which both parties pursue a win-win approach to dispute resolution.** The goals and objectives of the parties are likely to be merged in this framework in such a manner as to establish a combined benefit for all parties, thus broadening the scale. It underlines the need to achieve mutually beneficial and reasonable outcomes while bearing in mind the desires, wishes, concerns, and priorities of all parties concerned. Commitment and negotiation are normal in inclusive talks, and it could be important for both parties to give up those needs in order to achieve a compromise. **In other words, honesty will also facilitate effective merger negotiations and they can lead to a comprehensive view of the problem and of what each group wants to be pleased with the outcome.**

One of the characters of the delivery agreements is the **soft bridge settlement**, with all sides adopting the strategy of sharing and taking, making compromises, agreeing on certain point, and achieving a practical and reasonable compromise. In general, one side is calling for a far greater benefit than it would want to get, while the other party is proposing less than it wishes to get. And, through talks and agreements, they meet somewhere, and both sides are satisfied. This meeting place is in the negotiating field. This negotiation zone is characterized by the following example: 'A graduate with an MBA degree is negotiating a job offer with a company manager. He thinks he could make \$70,000 a year, but he's happy to spend \$60,000 a year. That was the lowest wage he would have got for his work. The boss tries to pay \$55,000 a year but is able to collect \$65,000 a year. As a result, a minimum value of \$60,000 for graduates and a median manager bid of \$65,000 would create a negotiating zone ranging from \$60,000 to \$65,000. Negotiations are taking place in this area. Similarly, owning a car or a house is a distribution contract for the negotiating region. **While for integrative negotiation bridge solutions are both parties create new ideas to reach a consensus, not the original ideas they proposed.** This method operates with both sides listing their desires and wishes, and so everyone is dreaming about new solutions to suit the needs of each party, which can help both parties feel like they are working together to find a common solution. Consider this example: the marketing department and the IT department are debating what details they would like to share at a conference about their business. Marketing needs to speak about all the latest

milestones they have made, while information technology wants to talk about their growth. In other words both of these techniques are intended to reach agreement in negotiations.

**The information foundation** is the next character for integrative negotiation. These fundamentals entail each group being acquainted with the best solution to a negotiated arrangement or BATNA. This implies that each group must realize and be prepared for solutions if a solution cannot be found. It is important for each side to realize the other approaches that the adversary can use if talks fail. Failing to know the importance and strategy of the other party may put one party in a weakened position. When one side has a greater alternative to the agreed option, the party would be in a good position. It is also important to get as much knowledge as possible about the plans of other parties. **While for distributive negotiation come up with a compelling BATNA.** A successful BATNA or the better solution to an agreed deal should be at the centre of every negotiation. In other words, what are you going to do if you cannot reach your first planned result? The parties to the distribution arrangement typically have ideal final expectations, such as the amount they are able to pay or approve. The best way to develop your BATNA for Distributed Negotiation is to build different alternatives through analysis. For example, if you are in the midst of buying a large number of products from a retailer, it might be beneficial to participate in multiple discussions with various suppliers at once. This places you in a better position to bargain and reaches the best potential deal by leveraging the incentives available and also rebounding the possible option through vendors.

**The foundation of action** is an element of integrative negotiation. It is critical that the parties are not emotional or intimate. They need to focus on problems and priorities and not on positions and positions that need to be improved. The parties should resist making an initial decision and should be able to take an impartial look at the viewpoints of each side. The most important thing in this negotiation is that the results obtained from this negotiation are the best and final. Must be more professional in this type of negotiation so that the main interests of the negotiations can be achieved and also the agreement between the two parties is achieved well. Around the same time as the distributive negotiations, **the distributional negotiations further escalate the dispute.** Distributive agreements are dynamic and enable each group to consider each other as rivals. In distributive deals, each contractor insists on satisfying his or her own needs, irrespective of the damages that could be suffered by the other group. Achieving a benefit or a win-loss situation is the most important thing in this sort of negotiation. Distributive negotiations are better used when you have an advantage and are in a strong position to bid. Manipulating the condition or making the most of things for one's own good. Do everything you need to make a living. In other words, **the benefit is the only issue in this sort of negotiation.**

The last character we can value **in terms of mixed motives. Distributive and integrative negotiations tend to be contradictory**, but, as MIT professor Mary P. Rowe points out, they have some similarities. They are both obsessed with convincing others to change their original position. In addition, they both want us to know as to what can actually be determined, that is the best outcome. In a negotiation ditch, one style can give way to another, as both parties use a combination of both styles depending on the situation. In categorization strategies, distributive solutions are the last resort because, at the final stage of negotiation, it is no longer negative as previous integrative partnerships have developed a constructive negotiating climate. In conclusion, the differences in terms of negotiation motives are very strong in these two types of negotiations each uses means and have different interests.

**But the main purpose of negotiations is to negotiate successfully and get something from it.**

### **Apple and U.S. Book Publishers Scenario.**

On 12 April 2012, the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) sued Apple and five large U.S. publishers for collusion to lift ebook costs. The suit was settled by three publishers; two others and Apple were unable to settle. In January 2010, publishers reached a new business model for ebook pricing with Apple as it was preparing to launch the iPad: in return for a 30 percent sales fee, Apple will allow publishers to set their own rates for ebooks. For publishers, this price model seemed to be a major upgrade over their whole deal with Amazon. Since at least one retailer has threatened to cancel the introduction of its digital editions, Amazon has reluctantly replaced the flat \$9.99 pricing for ebooks with Apple's model, and costs have increased across the market to an average of around \$14.99. The DOJ's case argues that the delegates and lawyers concerned might have failed to consider carefully if their deal will really generate value for consumers—and therefore if it falls under the boundaries of U.S. competition law. In the flushing of an arrangement that seems to provide synergy with those concerned, negotiators often fail to understand how their agreement will work, outsiders may be affected by supervision with ethical and legal consequences.

Another example scenario is the furniture retailer claims the lowest price they'll charge a business for five chairs is \$ 3,000, but the buyer says the most they'll spend is \$ 2,800. The customer persuades the seller to drop the price to \$ 2,900, and both sides agree by giving up their initial price to make a deal.