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**Teaching Note**

**Arancibia, Inc**

06/2025-7012

Overview

Arancibia, Inc. is a two-party dispute resolution case based on a true story and set in a family firm in Chile’s energy sector. Expanding his family’s traditional battery business, young Cristobal Arancibia initiated a successful solar panel intrapreneurial venture before passing leadership along to a professional manager he recruited. Now his uncle Vito wants to absorb the solar panel business into the larger Arancibia, Inc family firm in preparation for a public IPO. Cristobal is threatening to sue to block the public offering unless he either retains a piece of the solar panel business and decision rights over it, or receives a proportional cash payout to start a new business of his own. Cristobal further believes his uncle defrauded his father Francisco and by extension himself and his siblings out of a fair share of Arancibia, Inc. In contrast, Vito Arancibia believes he acted fairly and in good faith with regard to the division of shares in Arancibia, Inc, in light of Francisco’s non-contribution over decades due to major depression. He further feels that Cristobal has no legitimate moral claim over the intrapreneurial venture, which was fully funded by the parent firm and whose growth occurred mainly under a professional manager after his nephew stepped out.

The role play exercise is designed to capture dynamics of disputes and conflict resolution. These include linked alternatives (the lose-lose outcome of an impasse); interests, legitimacy, and power as negotiation tactics; the lack of shared standards of legitimacy as a source of disputes; building interdependence as a precursor to trust; and means of controlling one’s emotions and other unconditionally constructive behaviors in conflict situations.

Timeline

This advanced case is designed to occupy a full class meeting of about 3 hours in duration.

Suggested timeline:

Setup in class + 10 minutes

transition to meeting rooms

Read role and plan strategy 30 minutes

Negotiate 1 hour

Break 15 minutes

Debrief in class 1 hour to 1 hour and 15 minutes

Participants could be assigned to read their roles in advance, reducing the amount of time allocated to preparation during the class meeting.

If the instructor has a 90-minute course meeting format, the exercise could be carried out in the first meeting and the case debriefed during a second course meeting.

Optionally, the instructor could arrange participants into teams of 3 representing each side (Team Cristobal and Team Vito, respectively). This tends to maximize conflict and increases the chances at least one participant on each side will truly bring the characters and conflict to life. If negotiating in teams, participants could optionally be assigned to not only read their roles but also prepare with their team before coming to class – the course meeting would then only be for the team-on-team negotiation, saving time for the debrief lecture.

Questions Regarding the Negotiation Outcomes

Will Cristobal sue in court to block the absorption of the solar panel business and ruin the public offering of the larger company?

Will the solar panel business be incorporated into the larger business or remain separate? If it remains separate, will Cristobal receive any equity in the solar panel business? If the solar panel business is fully absorbed by Arancibia, Inc, will Cristobal be paid off in cash or equity in the parent firm, and if so how much?

Will Cristobal continue to collaborate with Arancibia, Inc in any way? If yes, in what form? Running the solar panel business as part of the larger parent firm? If so, how will Cristobal and Vito manage decision making authority? Alternatively, will Vito give Cristobal seed money from the family firm to purchase a new clean energy business in a different geography? If yes, what locations do you have in mind? (Vito wants Cristobal as far away as possible).

Did you link Cristobal’s upcoming compensation to the future performance of any business collaborations with Vito? A contingent contract would bridge Cristobal’s confidence in himself with Vito’s skepticism, and allow the younger man to capture fair value from future contributions while limiting the perceived risk for his uncle. Linking their mutual desire to grow businesses in the energy sector would also create interdependence between them.

Or, is Cristobal leaving to start a competing business? In the same geography competing with the family firm, or in a different geography?

Did Vito and Cristobal come to any arrangements regarding Francisco’s share of Arancibia, Inc or Cristobal’s inheritance? Did Cristobal renounce his claim to his inheritance in return for a cash payment or other concessions from his uncle? If yes, in exchange for what?

Will Cristobal apologize to Vito in front of the extended family and vice versa? Vito values an apology much more than Cristobal who cares less about his standing in the family and broader community.

Are any Vitos planning to get even with Cristobal by taking more of Francisco’s shares? How much? All of them?

Any creative aspects of your deals I have not asked about?

Process Questions

***Anger.*** Who felt like strangling each other? The irony is that you were randomly assigned to roles, if you had been assigned the other role you might have felt like strangling yourself for the tactics you just used in this negotiation.

***Legitimacy.*** How did it go persuading each other who was truly responsible for the success of the solar panel business? It could work, but perseverating on this point also risks inflaming the conflict further. Leveraging legitimacy does not work as well in dispute situations because the source of the dispute is often a lack of shared standards of legitimacy.

Regarding compensation for the solar panel business, there are different possible anchors with some supporting legitimacy. Vito can try to anchor compensation for the solar panel business at $0, on the grounds that Cristobal was a salaried employee and the seed capital came from the family firm. Cristobal can argue that he should get 50% of the $5m current stand-alone value of the solar panel business. Vito can argue back that Cristobal should only get 50% of the $1m value when he left because most of the increase in value was under Alberto. Cristobal can argue back that he hired Alberto and deserves half of the $5m. If Vito reveals that the solar business adds $10m in value to the parent firm if absorbed, Cristobal may ask for 50% of the new value created, so $5m to him.

If Vito bought out Cristobal’s inheritance for less than its value in cash, what was your justification? Vito can frame cash now as a stronger value proposition to Cristobal than his inheritance whenever Francisco passing. However, Cristobal will likely still see his uncle as exploiting his greater sensitivity to time to capture value for himself. One framing Vito can use is that this is a liquidity event for Cristobal now, and its hard for him to come up with the cash now (pre-IPO), which is why the offer is less than the value of the shares. But such proposals, even if value maximizing, risk deepening the distrust and sense of exploitation on Cristobal’s side.

In addition to their views regarding this specific situation, there is huge generational differences in values, norms, and thus standards of legitimacy between Vito and Cristobal.

* Vito: local traditionalist, collectivistic, hierarchical (especially respect for elders). Informal family arrangements based on trust. Physical health ailments are taken more seriously than mental health, reducing his sympathy for Francisco’s depression.
* Cristobal: global cosmopolitan, individualistic, non-hierarchically oriented with no automatic respect for elders. Prefers formal legal agreements, and clarity and transparency over trust. Mental health and physical health problems are on equal footing, making it illegitimate to reduce Francisco’s shares due to his depression.

***Interdependence.*** How productive was it to emphasize that you are better off working together, or at least finding a mutually acceptable settlement? Disputes are often best addressed by emphasizing shared interests and negotiating interdependence, a sense of better off togetherness. This is much easier to establish than trust, but is also a precursor to it.

***Transparency.*** What did you reveal to each other and what did you hold back? Not revealing information signals mistrust and could keep you from finding creative win-win solutions. And yet, revealing too much - especially unilaterally - risks being exploited by the other side.

* If Vito reveals that the parent firm is worth 10m less without the solar panel business ($50-$10m = $40m), this could convince Cristobal to let it be absorbed rather than insisting on keeping the solar business independent. However, the $10m value-added from the solar business could become Cristobal’s new anchor, rather than the $5m stand-alone value which is all he is aware of initially, making him more ambitious in his value claims.
* If Vito reveals that the lawsuit would lower the value of the parent company by $20m (from $50m to $30m), this could make Cristobal reluctant to sue and damage the family firm (which his father founded) to such a great extent. However, it could also embolden Cristobal to negotiate for extreme value capture as it is a signal of Vito’s weak alternative to a negotiated agreement.
* If Vito reveals he and the other brothers are already planning to reduce Francisco’s shares to 7%, this could make keeping Francisco’s shares at 10% look better by comparison. But it could also inflame Cristobal’s anger and further erode trust, making it harder to reach a deal.
* If Vito reveals he had a stroke due to all the stress from taking over running the family business from Francisco, this could arise sympathy in Cristobal. Or it could make Vito look weak and possibly unable to handle the stress of a lawsuit.

***Diplomacy.*** Whose counterpart said something that made you feel insulted? Counterparts, did you mean to offend? There can be a big gap between the intention and the impact. Research shows that diplomacy – avoiding irritators, or comments, that might offend the other side if they take them the wrong way – is a hallmark of more effective negotiators.

At the same time, there can be a tension with respecting the counterpart and gifting them too much legitimacy. Vito should show respect for what Cristobal did in founding the solar business – but if he showers too much praise, Cristobal has more legitimacy to argue for higher compensation or even keeping the solar company for himself. For his part, Cristobal should show respect for what Vito has achieved in leading the family firm close to a $50m IPO, but again if he praises too much has less grounds to advocate for restoring Francisco’s shares. You don’t want to come across as a rejectionist that rejects any and all arguments from the counterpart no matter how reasonable.

***Threats.*** Did anyone threaten each other? Who threatened whom and with what? At what point in the negotiation – early, middle, or late? Threats show you have power but further jeopardize the relationship and often lead the other side to respond with their power, resulting in escalation of conflict. Thus, they are best left as a late resort, to bring the other side back to the table or to convince them to make proposals within the ZOPA or Zone of Possible Agreement.

***Walking away.*** Did anyone walk away during the negotiation, or suggest you were about ready to walk away? If you walk away, leave a best offer on the table and leave the door open to further communication. Sun Tzu famously said in The Art of War, give your enemy a golden bridge to retreat across. Let them keep their dignity if they need to come back to you and make more concessions.

***Collaboration.*** How open were you to working with the other person again? Why or why not? There is a difference between a negotiation where you do an exchange and go your separate ways, and a deal where you are partners and collaborators afterwards. You might decide you do not trust each other enough to work together long term, or place negatively utility on having to interact regularly.

***Team negotiations.*** (*If the exercise was done in teams*) How did it go negotiating in a team? Did you become miscoordinated with your teammate at any point? In what way? Teams generally create and claim more value than solo negotiators, but not if they are poorly coordinated. Teams can also adopt an us vs them mentality, escalate conflict, and lead to value destroying impasses when a deal should have happened. Watch out for this, especially when negotiating disputes between groups of negotiators.

A Few Potential Outcomes

***Win win outcome 1: Maximize joint value without future collaboration.*** Here is what high total value for Cristobal and Vito considered jointly might look like, if they choose not to collaborate in the future. The solar panel business is absorbed into the parent firm, which then goes public at a much higher ($50m USD rather than $40m USD) valuation. Cristobal receives fair compensation in cash to start his own business post-graduation in a different geography such that he does not compete with Arancibia, Inc. Cristobal trades his future 2% of the family firm for a figure somewhat but not too far below $1m USD (2% of the $50m USD total value) in cash. This creates value since Cristobal does not expect to receive his future inheritance, arising from him believing that Vito is likely to reduce his father’s share to zero over time. In contrast, Vito does value those shares and should be willing to pay for them in cash now, a strong value proposition for Cristobal who is time sensitive needing capital now to go into business for himself. Cristobal does not file a lawsuit. Cristobal apologizes in front of the whole family for his accusations against Vito, which creates value for the latter.

***Win win outcome 2: Continued collaboration with safeguards.*** If Cristobal and Vito do not place negative utility on working together, another large-pie deal might look as follows. The solar panel business is absorbed into the parent firm, which goes public at a higher valuation ($50m USD rather than $40m USD). Cristobal is either compensated with a cash payment or formal shares in the family company. Arancibia, Inc becomes fully professionalized and institutes a regime of external auditing and written legal contracts, preventing the financial fraud by Vito that Cristobal fears. Vito agrees to let Cristobal run the solar panel business semi-independently but retains the last-resort ability to directly intervene if serious problems occur. Cristobal keeps the expected 2% of the family firm he stands to inherit from his father, and Vito agrees not to reduce Francisco’s share of the overall company any further (as he and his other brothers have secretly been planning). Another collaboration option is for Vito to provide Cristobal with an investment fund from the parent firm to acquire a new solar business and do something creative with it after his MBA. Or, Cristobal could graduate from his MBA program and return to assume a different leadership role in the family firm. Vito and Cristobal might also agree to maximize the sustainability of the family’s battery business via creative options that encourage customers to recycle their batteries, such as e-waste bins and collection drives sponsored by Arancibia, Inc. They could even agree that Cristobal will be mentored by Vito to lead the family firm in the future, eventually becoming the new patriarch of the family. For now, Vito gets his public apology.

***High individual value deal for Cristobal at Vito’s expense:*** The solar panel business stays separate and is not merged into from the parent firm, which goes public at a much lower valuation ($40m rather than $50M USD). In returning for not pursuing legal action, Cristobal secures full decision-making power and majority ownership of the solar business, continuing to grow it independently. Vito buys out Cristobal’s inheritance for full value (2% of the now $40m firm so $800,000 USD, or even higher if Vito agrees to restore some of Francisco’s shares). Cristobal does not apologize to Vito. Cristobal avoids his uncle and builds his own career path, using his money to create a competing firm in the same geography that eats into Arancibia, Inc’s business.

***High individual value deal for Vito at Cristobal’s expense:*** The solar panel business is absorbed into the parent firm with a small token payment to Cristobal for his early contributions. Cristobal drops the threatened lawsuit. Vito receives an apology from Cristobal without having to apologize back. Vito buys out Cristobal’s inheritance for a much lower cash payment since his nephew does not value the shares he stands to receive from Francisco. The company goes public at a high ($50m rather than $40m USD) valuation.

***Lose-lose.*** Lawsuit including financial fraud accusations. The public offering of the larger family firm is ruined, and the solar panel venture is put into legal limbo as well, creating long-term financial and operational instability. The long-term value of Arancibia, Inc drops from $50m to $30m USD. The family’s reputation in the community is damaged and Vito and Cristobal never collaborate again. Cristobal must start from nothing to create a new clean energy business post-MBA, setting his business career back many years. Given his poor health, Vito probably never lives to see the IPO of Arancibia, Inc.

Some Cristobals are optimistic about going to court, thinking they can use their power of attorney to restore Francisco’s shares to 30%. However, Cristobal only got power of attorney from Francisco recently, thus it’s not clear how much of the dilution of shares he could reverse. Also, in weak legal systems the judge will often just decide in favor of whoever is richer and more powerful, which is Vito. And the system can be corrupted as well. In real life, when Cristobal brought up suing, Vito retorted that he would bribe the judge to decide in his favor, and Cristobal’s own lawyer to lose the case. Suing with a seemingly strong on-paper legal case is not the same everywhere in the world.

Another consideration is resources to carry out a legal dispute for over a decade. Vito does not want to go to court, but does have the resources in hand if it comes to it. In real life, Cristobal did not have the resources to go to court for years, but did have the option to offer a lawyer a contingency where she or he gets a large cut of the settlement after an eventual win. This though reduces Cristobal’s future value from a settlement, even if favorable.

All that said, the value destruction from a lawsuit is greater overall for Vito than Cristobal, increasing the younger man’s relative power in the situation.

Interests, Legitimacy, and Power in Arancibia, Inc

Three approaches to resolving disputes include interests, why each party wants what they want, legitimacy, independent standards of fairness, and power, the ability to force someone to do something she or he would not otherwise do voluntarily. In negotiations, power is often a function of each side’s best alternatives to a mutual agreement or BATNAs.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Cristobal** | **Vito** |
| **Legitimacy** | Founded the solar panel business and would have had a reasonable case for an equity share earlier on or at his exit. | The solar panel business was founded with seed money from the family firm, and Cristobal was a salaried employee at the time. |
| **Interests** | Further his career in the energy sector advancing clean energy options, and capture fair value for his hard work and contributions.  | Maximize the value of the family business and maintain his and the family’s reputation and status in the community. |
| **Power** | Take Vito to court and ruin the IPO, substantially reducing the value of the family business and embarrassing Vito in the community. Unbeknownst to Vito, Cristobal has convinced Francisco to sign over power of attorney to him, strengthening his legal position.  | Make Cristobal wait at least a decade to see even a modest financial reward for the success of the solar panel business, setting the younger man’s business career back by many years. Vito could also shut Cristobal out of positions in and funding from Arancibia, Inc.  |

Instructor Script with Key Teaching Points

Our dispute negotiation got quite heated and you all negotiated very passionately. If you did get annoyed by some of your more “passionate” colleagues today you should thank them. The more annoyed and angry you got in class, the more you can learn from this experience. It may have felt uncomfortable at times but this is the kind of experience you won’t forget next time you’re in a situation like this for real.

How can you deal with dispute situations if your own money or company is on the line? First, before you ever sit down at the bargaining table it’s all about preparation. Preparation helps you analyze the situation rationally and determine what you actually want to get out of this. The toughest challenge is to realize that your primary interest is typically not to “defeat” the other party but to gain something that you care about. Once the negotiation starts however it’s almost impossible to keep this in mind without proper preparation. You therefore want to determine your and the other side’s interests, as well as potential options, before you get sucked into the emotional turmoil that typically unfolds in such heated encounters. Second, even with the best preparation things will get messy so you need to be prepared for that. What to do? Take breaks, realign your coalition if relevant, decide on one strategy and execute it. Repeat this until you got a deal that meets your interests.

The case shows how often we get things wrong... most of the time when we’re involved in a conflict situation we believe that things are simple, and that there wouldn’t be a conflict if the other party weren’t so “stupid”...if only they listened to us and our compelling logic, they would soon see how wrong they are, apologize, and give us what we deserve. The problem of course is that the other party thinks exactly the same way about us! The other side in the case were peers you know and respect. They were randomly assigned to be on the other side of this conflict and you could have just as well been in their shoes. If you were frustrated by how uncooperative they were, they were probably just as frustrated by how uncooperative you were.

As difficult as it is, you will only solve such conflicts if you can see the world through the other side’s eyes and find out why they do what they do. The immediate interpretation is that “they” are idiots, stupid, ignorant etcetera. Alternatively, you may accept that they are just as smart as you are so they must be “bad people.” Bad people obviously exist in the world but in the exercise parties were randomly assigned to their roles, so there is literally no statistical difference on any dimension between the people on either side of this conflict. Thus, it’s safe to assume that you would have behaved just like the people on the other side. Think about that for a moment...it shows how difficult it is to resolve such conflicts...you are among the best educated, open¬ minded, people in the world, members of the same community and yet...things got difficult and heated pretty quickly. Thus you’ll have to really step up your game the next time you’re facing a situation like this in the real world.

The case also demonstrates the power of perceived injustice. For many of you it wasn’t just about money anymore at some point and pretty quickly you fought a moral fight for justice. The biggest revolutions and social movements in history always start from a sense of injustice, and it is this injustice that citizens throughout the world have given their lives for. On a smaller scale in everyday life, it is this sense of injustice that makes each party insist on “not giving in”. Giving in is out of the question, since you’re right so giving in would be unjust. Conflicts quickly get stuck when people make it a moral issue and they feel that they have justice on their side. Your counterpart similarly thinks that justice is on their side so no party will be willing to give up anything.

Here are some of today’s takeaways:

1. **Listen to learn**. The most important lesson is the following: statistically speaking you were just like the other parties and they behaved very similar to how you would have behaved if you had been in their shoes. What does that mean? You have to do what you wanted them to do. Invariably this boils down to listening more, giving the other party time and room to express themselves and yes, to hear them out. You don’t need to become friends with these people but unless they’re listened to you won’t make any progress towards a deal. Listening is your silver bullet. Top NYPD hostage negotiator D. Misino’s slogan is “Talk to me”. Not “listen to me”, but “talk to me.” People love being listened to, and listening is your silver bullet in conflict resolution. Use it. Realize that you probably don’t have a full picture of the situation, but you believe you do... and that incomplete mental model of the world is why you get upset. Listen to gather information and really try to understand why the other party does what they do. What motivates them? What is it that you don’t know about them that explains their behaviour?
2. **Distinguish Interests, Legitimacy, & Power.** In conflicts you have three sources of influence: power (the ability to coerce someone into doing something you want them to do, often based on stronger alternatives), legitimacy (independent standards that guide right/wrong behaviour) and interests (underlying goals people hope to meet). Your goal is to focus as much of your discussion on interests as possible. Only using power/alternatives doesn’t work because it typically just increases the other party’s resistance (strengthened by a sense of injustice). Legitimacy is similarly tricky because the other side will quickly revert to their rights and alternative legitimate standards and you find yourself in a long and costly argument or even legal battle. Indeed, one of the main causes of disputes is a lack of shared standards of legitimacy. Interests are the best way to get a solution, but only focusing on interests runs to risk of making you look weak. You might therefore briefly allude to your legitimacy and power and then very quickly stress how you wouldn’t want to use them and then chiefly focus the conversation on interests, on hearing the other party, and on trying to really understand what motivates them, to understand their interests.

You will face situations in your life where no matter how much you listen, no matter how much you find out about the other party, the only conclusion you can take away from the encounter is that the other party actually just doesn’t care about you and only cares about himself or herself. There are plenty of self¬-centered, egocentric, and selfish people in the world and you’ll meet some of them at the negotiation table. If you realize that you are dealing with a bully who is threatening you, you can briefly highlight your legitimacy and sources of power (this is what will happen to the other side if there is no deal, i.e., their alternatives are poor) and then you quickly transition back to discussing interests.

1. **Emphasize interdependence, not trust.** People sometimes feel love at first sight. But has anyone ever experienced trust at first sight? Trust must be earned over time. If you are in a conflict, establishing trust is often just too difficult. More feasible is to try to instead develop a sense of interdependence. Interdependence means knowing you will be better off if your work together to resolve your issues than if you keep on fighting or just go your separate ways. If we can quickly establish a sense of interdependency among the parties by framing our negotiations as opportunities to find value or minimize value destruction, the other side will be more likely to work with us, appreciate and respect us. In time, they may even learn to trust us and we trust them—but only if they have earned it. You should be positive, but not naïve about who you are dealing with.
2. **Unconditionally constructive behaviors** are good for the relationship between the parties, but do not hurt you, even if they fail to reciprocate. These are things like letting them preserve their dignity and save face. Research shows that personal attacks are the hallmarks of ineffective negotiators. Highly effective negotiators are only one-fifth as likely to make things personal or irritate the other side. So be constructive, even if they aren’t.
3. **Control your emotions.** ***“Going to the balcony”*** is a strategy to control your own emotions by adopting a third-person perspective, looking down at the situation as if you are a character in a play and you are in the balcony seats watching from above. You try to adopt the perspective of an outside observer on the situation. As you look down from the balcony, ask yourself, am I the hero of this play? Am I proud of what I am doing? Research shows that adopting an outsider perspective leads to less biased judgments. The ***10/10/10 framework*** is a related approach that can help give you some perspective and get your emotions under control. Ask yourself, how will I feel about what I am about to do or say 10 minutes from now, 10 months from now, and 10 years from now? Our worst enemy in resolving conflicts is short term emotions. The 10/10/10 framework can help give you a more objective, long-term perspective.
4. **Walk out the right way.** If you decide to end the discussion, there are ways to do so that won’t be interpreted as a threat or as bullying. One is to avoid arbitrary deadlines, “I want your response in 24 hours.” A 24 hour deadline makes sense if it really is urgent, but not if it isn’t. Then the deadline has no legitimacy. What you can say is, well that’s the best offer I can make. I am going to leave it on the table for X amount of time, just let me know if you’ve had a chance to think more about it or circumstances have changed and you think you can accept. After X amount of time, I may have moved on to my alternative of such-and-such. Then you are leaving an opportunity open for them as a courtesy but letting them know if they wait too long you may have moved on.

I know this meeting’s exercise was exhausting but it’s a good preview of what you’ll face in your next real life conflict. I hope the strategies described here serve you well in managing conflicts in the future.
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Optional Practitioner Links on Dispute Resolution

Dealing with Difficult Situations and Behaviors

Heath, D., & Heath, C. (2013). The 10/10/10 rule for tough decisions. *Fast Company*. Available at: <https://www.fastcompany.com/3007613/10-10-10-rule-tough-decisions>

Horacio Falcao on “Negotiating Your Way Out of Workplace Conflict” <https://knowledge.insead.edu/leadership-organisations/negotiating-your-way-out-of-workplace-conflict-4263#GFGUgeWwJUH7e2wQ.99>

Discussing The Un-discussable – How To Stay Sane At Work <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/20130510135634-36052017-discussing-the-un-discussable-how-to-stay-sane-at-work>

“When a Negotiating Partner Gets Cold Feet” <http://knowledge.insead.edu/blog/insead-blog/when-a-negotiating-partner-gets-cold-feet-3530>

Be direct and low-key to defuse discord at the office <http://mobile.nytimes.com/2015/05/10/business/be-direct-and-low-key-to-defuse-discord-at-the-office.html?smid=tw-share&_r=0&referrer=>

Unless you are spock, irrelevant things matter in economic behavior <http://mobile.nytimes.com/2015/05/10/upshot/unless-you-are-spock-irrelevant-things-matter-in-economic-behavior.html?referrer=>

Recommended book: “Difficult conversations”

<http://www.amazon.com/Difficult-Conversations-Discuss-What-Matters/dp/0143118447>

Power and Negotiation

Michael Schaerer on “Negotiating Deals From a Position of Powerlessness”

<http://knowledge.insead.edu/organisational-behaviour/negotiating-deals-from-a-position-of-powerlessness-3745>

The Purpose of Power

<http://blogs.wsj.com/management/2011/05/11/the-purpose-of-power/>

3 brilliant negotiation tips I learned from Steve Jobs

<http://www.inc.com/peter-cohan/3-brilliant-negotiatiing-tips-i-learned-from-steve-jobs.html>

The power of vulnerability

<http://www.ted.com/talks/brene_brown_on_vulnerability>

Conflict Situations

Filip Hron on “Negotiating the Sydney Siege”

<http://knowledge.insead.edu/blog/insead-blog/negotiating-the-sydney-siege-3749>

Police Negotiation Techniques and Negotiation Skills from the New York City Police Department Hostage Negotiations Team

<http://www.pon.harvard.edu/?p=42014/?mqsc=NI100120143779926&utm_source=WhatCountsEmail&utm_medium=PON%20Harvard+Negotiation%20Insider%20Tuesday&utm_campaign=Negotiation_Insider_10012014>

Crisis negotiation, deadlines and complexity

<http://negotiationevolved.com/2014/04/10/crisis-negotiation-in-ukraine/>

Don't let emotions screw up your decisions

<https://hbr.org/2015/05/dont-let-emotions-screw-up-your-decisions>

Negotiating Without a Net: A Conversation with the NYPD’s Dominick J. Misino

<https://hbr.org/2002/10/negotiating-without-a-net-a-conversation-with-the-nypds-dominick-j-misino>