

Influences of Initial Position on Negotiation Approach in Solving Environmental Cases in Malaysia

Norhayati Rafida, A. R.^a, Jusang Bolong^b, Ezhar Tamam^b, Nizam Osman^b

^aFaculty of Leadership and Management, Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia

^bFaculty of Modern Language and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia

Email: norhayati@usim.edu.my

DOI: 10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i13/3184 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i13/3184>

ABSTRACT

This article examines the influences of initial position on negotiation approach in solving environmental cases in Malaysia. Negotiation is referred as a tool of solving conflict which is due to different of interest or needs between individuals and groups. Since conflict may be complicated at times, a great number of studies make emphases mainly approaches of negotiation, medium of communication and nature of conflicts and specifically influences on the negotiation approach in solving environmental cases in Malaysia. What is the level of initial position possessed by environmental control officers? What is the type of negotiation approaches employed? Is there any relationship between initial position and negotiation approach used in solving the environmental conflict? The analysis wishes to identify which level of initial position that promotes the negotiation approach in solving environmental cases in Malaysia. A quantitative approaches employed using a survey which adopts a set of questionnaire and responses of 186 respondents are analyzed (when is done?). The analysis includes descriptive, Pearson correlation and Chi-Square test. There is a negative significant correlation between the initial position and the approach of negotiation with a weak correlation. It indicates a reverse influence by which the lower level of initial positive, the more tendencies that the integrative approach of negotiation is employed. The initial position determines how the negotiation is managed which leads to the outcome of negotiation either win-win, win lose or lose-lose. An extensive study may revisit the context of study and the elements of negotiation that determines the success of one negotiation.

Keywords: Initial Position • Negotiation • Negotiation Approach • Environmental Case

1. Introduction

Environmental issues are relatively not new anymore. The development of communication technology embraces greater infrastructures, which makes the issues of environment more apparent. Beginning in 1980s, the case of Papan-Bukit Merah (1988) occurred and followed with the dam issues at Bakun, Sarawak (1986), incinerator project at Broga, Selangor in the 2003, and in the 2011, the rare earth project by Lynas Advanced Materials Plants (LAMP) at Gebeng, Pahang. According to Johnson and Cooper (2009), they found that concession is hardly

achieved through computer-mediated communication (CMC) with minimal effect in the negotiation process which in turns, make it difficult for the negotiators to reach consensus in the negotiation (Thompson & Nadler, 2002; Valley, Moag, & Bazerman, 1998). One of the reasons can be due to the way the information is presented, influences human decision making which is strongly related to the layout provided by the electronically supported negotiations (Gettinger, Koeszegi, & Schoop, 2012). Since the environmental conflicts involve more than one party, the negotiation usually becomes complicated and more challenging than it should be (Ybara & Ramon, 2004).

Number of cases such as Papan-Bukit Merah, incinerator project in Broga and Bukit U10 in Shah Alam made attempts into solving the issues via negotiations (CARPA, 1988). Similarly, Lynas project, which was first announced on 29th July 2009 received huge reporting from numerous sites namely malaysiakini.com, malaysiatoday.com, Harakah, Facebook, and <http://stoplynas.org>. Mustafa (2012), in his study on three mainstream newspapers namely, The Star, New Straits Times and Utusan Malaysia (from April 2011 to March 2013), revealed significant remarks about the attentions given by the local newspapers towards the Lynas project (Phua & Velu, 2012).

2. Problem Statement

This article wishes to identify the effect of initial position (independent variable) on the negotiation approach (dependent variable) they employed in solving the environmental cases. According to previous studies, a negotiator's own position, and information about the opponent's position were manipulated in a simulated contract negotiation (Stuhlmacher & Champagne, 2000; Sanson & Bretherton, 2001; Khorana, 2013). It is significant to provide evidences the fact that negotiation approach relies on the initial position they possessed in the negotiation to solve the particular environmental case respectively.

Apparently, the approach that is employed by the conflicting parties is found to be more effective if their initial position is compatible for cooperation and trust to each other. Kellerman (1996) points out that the endurance of power struggle will lead one negotiation to a failure. As the initial positions may contradict, the solution is based on the real picture of the problem, and then identifying the underlying concerns can be overcome through effective listening, openness and equal time needed for the resolution to take place (Jerry Adel & Company, 2006). The position represents the stance of the needs that are influenced by the interests in the subject matter. According to Gatelier (2012), positions are expressed through the communication and the articulation of arguments in the conflict. Not only the needs, but also the opportunities, the constraints and their role in the negotiation setting contribute to the positions that they are taking place.

Thus, as the initial position arises, the intractability of the conflict seems to be greater due to differences of needs and sharing is totally our out the action (Conflict Information Consortium, 2007). As a result, the solution that they are seeking will consider the positions,

but not the extent of legitimacy importance. This situation of the negotiations will result in a win-lose nature. However, in any case that both parties work towards clarification of what they actually need, the interests can be partly compatible which makes the negotiation for solution much easier. Bercovitch and Jackson (2001) found that there is significant amount of research on conflict that focuses on the processes of negotiation of how negotiation begins, why parties choose one approach or the other which apparently has been relatively ignored.

This article, therefore, wishes to answer several questions by which the findings may either conform or explain the phenomenon of the action between the initial position and negotiation approach in solving the environmental cases in Malaysia. Which level of initial position they possess in solving the environmental case? What type of negotiation approach they employed in the pursuit of solving the environmental case in Malaysia? Which level of initial position that correlates to the approach of negotiation they employed? In the realm of the above questions, this study is embraced on the objectives; 1) To identify the level of initial position they possess in the attempt to solve the environmental case in Malaysia, 2) To examine the approach of negotiation they employed in solving the environmental case in Malaysia, and 3) To examine the correlation between initial position and the approach of negotiation in solving the environmental conflict.

3. Initial Position

Kellermann (1996) affirms that most of the successful negotiation results in non-violent resolution regardless of any type of conflicts (Fisher & Ury, 1983). Among other factors is the initial position which is viewed as significant - when the initial positions of the conflicting parties are compatible and the relationship is based on cooperation and trust, the interpersonal approach will be more effective as compared to the relationship that is based on competition (Kellermann, 1996).

Beginning with Party A revealing its initial position by saying what they it wants, party B may listen and validates Party A's position and vice versa. Only then, the negotiation begins with the communication that takes place, for instance, the use of "we" instead of "I" (Jerry Adel & Company, 2006). Seeking solutions only focuses on fulfilling their positions one hundred percent. According to Burgess and Burgess (1999), "...they define what they want in all-or-nothing terms...considering the views of the other side as important or legitimate." They added that whenever people focus on one dimension of position between wanted and unwanted, conflicts prone to be unavoidably win-lose as the outcome of the solution.

Initial positions have been found to be significantly related to performance and cognitive growth (Johnson & Johnson, 2012). Initial positions are influenced by two factors namely resources (skills and budgets), visibility (loyalty and brand), propositions value and assets (Zicari, 2011). Deutsch (1973) emphasized that if the conflicting parties have more equal initial positions (where the cooperation and trust exist); the greater the chances that the interpersonal approach will be more effective, as opposed to competition per se. For example,

if the parties remain involved in a power struggle, mediation will surely fail (Kellermann, 1996, Bame-Aldreda & Kida, 2007, Smith & Kida, 1991).

4. Negotiation Approach: Integrative and Distributive

A negotiation is defined as a tool of resolving conflicts, which has been found to be critical and significant in conflict resolution. It is perceived as a process of resolving conflict, which is due to different interests or needs between individuals or groups. It occurs when the differences cannot be satisfactorily dealt with (Taylor, 1999). The negotiation is only possible whenever there is a need and motive to solve the differences among conflict actors (Churchman, 1995). An outcome refers to the ability of minimizing the differences of interests or needs, which may fall into win-win or win-lose situation. The solution is suggested to include behavioral and attitude changes and constructive or destructive outcomes (Bush & Folger, 1994). There are a number of strategies in conflict resolution, namely mediation, negotiation, conciliation and problem solving. Pruitt and Carnavale (1993) agreed that negotiation is the best approach to solving conflicts.

Babcock and Laschever (2003) found that the causes of integrative negotiation do not necessarily result from a desire to maintain close connections with their counterparts. It is argued that the collaborative is simply due to the occurrences of conversation which is more than men. It apparently allows sharing of ideas and creating a more friendly negotiation setting than men do. The more people talk openly, the higher the mutual understanding of each other's will be. They further assert that women tend to use this method of improving the flow of information between the negotiators in achieving the best solution in integrative negotiation. Therefore, it is important to see women who are more oriented towards cooperation as mere appreciate each the actual process of communication and not necessarily because collaboration allows them to make and keep friends.

Negotiators face the dilemma of how much information to share and how quickly that the information can be shared. If the parties know each other well and have negotiated successfully in the past, they may share a level of trust that encourages one or both to share confidential or insider information (e.g., issue importance, reservation price, alternatives) (Butler, 1999). If the parties lack of trust, they may withhold information for fear that the other party will not reciprocate, thereby putting the initiating party at a disadvantage (Roth and Murnighan, 1982; Brodt, 1994; Schweitzer, Hersey, & Bradlow 2006).

As far as this research is concerned, negotiation approach is categorized into two approaches namely integrative and distributive. The way in which the negotiators perceive the negotiations may serve as the rationality that meets the purpose of the particular approach. In other words, various factors influence the approach the negotiators may employ. A poor integrative approach, for instance, is the result of in-depth deliberation and strategic decisions that occur due to fear or mistrust (Ross & Stillinger, 1991). Psychological constraints will deviate the negotiators away from the expectations of the value or the interest respectively.

Negotiation research perceives achievement towards integrative or perhaps value creation will reduce the gap that exists in between the parties, which result in shared interests and joint benefit (Walton & McKersie, 1965; Pruitt & Carnavale, 1993). In short, this study believes that each negotiation is unique in its own ways of understanding where potential of integrative or win-win solutions is inevitably obtainable (e.g. Thompson, 2001). In many cases, the negotiator's perception of the conflict will lead to the approach either distributive or integrative in the negotiation (Kersten, 2001).

Negotiators may change the approach as they develop either in cooperative or competitive behavior along the negotiation process. Whenever, both parties act in the same way of competitive behavior, they realize that they run the risk of not reaching an agreement, the negotiators will likely switch their approach into the more integrative way, cooperative versus competitive behavior (Walton & McKersie, 1965; Pruitt & Carnavale, 1993; Brett, Shapiro, & Lytle, 1998) .

Negotiation that is carried out among groups and individuals has shown significant differences in terms of integrative and distributive approach as well as the outcomes. Number of studies revealed that the group negotiation is more competitive (distributive) than individuals. The group members tend to be defensive and protective among its members to go against the other group (Wildschut & Insko, 2007; Trötschel, Hüffmeier, & Loschelder, 2010; De Dreu, 2010). Intergroup negotiation has greater tendencies towards distributive because the level of distrust is higher, the level of open-minded and information exchange is low, and the focus emphasizes on winning but not collaborating (De Dreu, Weingart, & Kwon, 2000; Aldering & De Dreu, 2012).

Past research has shown that some individuals would be more selfish as compared to friends or relations that exist at that particular time (Thomas, 1976; Rahim, 1983). Reviews of negotiations have found that individuals are more likely to be distributive (win - loss) than integrative (win -win) or vice versa (Lax & Sebenius, 1986; Nelson & Wheeler, 2004). Therefore, any negotiations will result in different attitudes as a result of the negotiation approaches and behaviors in achieving the expected results.

Putnam (1990) asserts that the understanding of the approach, both integrative and distributive, is a separate task in the negotiation. The beginning of the negotiation determines the approach they have in the strategy. As joint gain increases, there is a greater likelihood of employing integrative approach. Whenever individual gain is maximized, then, the distributive approach is likely to occur. Importantly, whether or not the negotiators employ the integrative approach, it indicates that one of these strategic approaches will dominate the negotiation (Weingart & Olekalns, 2004).

Besides, the negotiation can be viewed through the integrative and distributive strategies as interdependent components (Putnam, 1990; Alavoine, 2011). This is because that

most negotiations have both distributive and integrative in which the attempt for maximizing joint and personal gain (Lax & Sebenius, 1986; Walton & McKersie, 1965) as well as reaching agreement and achieving high-quality outcomes (Hyder, Prietula & Weingart, 2000; Aलोवोине, 2011) actually occurs.

Olekalns and Smith (2000) found that that impasse groups employed higher levels of distributive tactics (contention and positional argument) and lower levels of integrative tactics in which the exchange of information and conciliation are almost absent. It has been found by previous studies that the choice of negotiation approach will lead to similar outcomes (Weingart et al., 1990; Brett et al., 1998; Olekalns & Smith, 2000). Regardless of the trends, the way in which the information is managed and harmonized is clearly shown in the negotiation relationship. (Olekalns & Weingart, 2004).

Environmental Cases in Malaysia

There were several cases of environment that had been delivered and solved both through quite a number of approaches namely mediation, negotiation and third party involvement. Whether or not those cases involved are at regional, national or international level, the cases were handled and monitored by the government which explains how the government actually ruled the country through authoritarian or democratic system respectively. In the realm of the disputes over the environmental cases, the government managed to make decisions before the situation actually turned into worse scenario.

In 1980s, the case of Papan-Bukit Merah (CARPA, 1988), followed with the dam issues at Bakun, Sarawak (1986), incinerator project at Broga, Selangor in the 2003, and in the 2011, the rare earth project by Lynas Advanced Materials Plants (LAMP) at Gebeng, Pahang (Lynas Corporation, 2011), greatly took place in the media (Mohd Zaini & Rosli, 2011). Not only traditional media, the new media have been widely used as a point of references such as websites, blogs, FB, twitters, and WA. Regardless of political or personal reasons, the spread of information is thus amazingly fast and the impact undeniably amazing (Jauhariatul & Jamilah, 2011, www.academia.edu, n.d., Consumer Association of Penang, n.d.).

5. Method

The initial position consists of seven attributes. It represents the desire and the interest as the initial which influences the kind of approach employed in the negotiation. As suggested by Sanson and Bretherton (2001) initial position includes deliberation of opposing positions, discourages any analysis of underlying issues, and discourages the emergence of more creative solutions. They stated that a compromise between each party's initial positions would be the best solution by focusing on the issues or interests underlie the conflict such as needs, wants, fears and concerns respectively.

According to Table 1, ten items measure their initial position in the conflict. The respondents are required to identify their position towards the items during the negotiation that took place in the case (remain confidential) they solved in the past one year. Each items is

measured across five levels namely, 1) position of having the intention to solve the problem (problem to solve); 2) disagreement (disagreement); 3) more challenging position (contest); 4) fighting level of position (fight); and lastly is 5) heading towards intractable type of position (intractable).

Table 1: Constructs of Items Measuring Initial Position (Sanson & Bretherton, 2001)

Variables	No.	Items Measuring Variable
Initial Position	1	Issues (Needs/personal)
	2	Emotions
	3	Orientation
	4	Information
	5	Language
	6	Objective
	7	Outcome

Having the five levels of the initial position in the conflict, the numbers that the respondent may choose will be cumulated in a score form, The scores of the answers is divided into five different levels of initial position, which indicate the extent to which their position eventually become more intractable. As the level is clearly distinguished, instead of using intervals, scores that is less than 19 is categorized as Level One (1). Level two should have scores that is between 20 and 29. As scores that is between 30 and 39 is Level Three (3), scores from 40 to 49 is categorized as Level Four (4). Lastly is the Level five (5) that scores 50, which is the highest scores and the most intractable level of initial position in the conflict.

Having the answers from the respondent, the interpretation is based on which level of their position is. As the position level of the respondents is increasing, their positions become more intractable. As shown in Table 2, it can be seen that the underpinning elements of their position differs across the five levels. The positions are clear cut among the scores which deny the increment of strength of effectiveness level or the behavior. As the answers may vary, thus, the scores are highly required to determine the level of their initial position.

Table 2: Initial Position according to Five Levels

POSITIONS	LEVEL*				
	1	2	3	4	5
Consideration towards the conflict	Most likely to be solved	More likely to be solved	Uncertain	Unlikely to be solved	Most unlikely to be solved
The urge for solution	Real	Real	Resistance	Divest	Unsolved
A control over the conflict	Quickly controlled	Caution	Hesitance	Cold	Mean
Pressures towards the conflict	Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	More Likely	Most Likely
Orientation towards the conflict	Problem-Oriented	Personal-Oriented	Personal-Oriented	Demarcation	Suspicious
Sharing the information of the conflict	Openly shared	Selective	Distortion	Decline	Twisted
Clarity of the information	Excellent	Good	Moderate	Poor	Worst
Focuses on the conflict	Needs	Personal & needs	Personal	Confused	Go Kaput
Expectation of the outcome	Win/win	Win/win	Win/Lose	Lose/Lose	Lose/Lose
The agreement level	Extremely Desirable	Desirable	Moderate	Undesirable	Extremely undesirable

*Note: 1) Problem to solve; 2) Disagreement; 3) Contest; 4) Fight; and 5) Intractable.

According to Lewicki et al. (2003), the negotiation approach is categorized into two namely integrative and distributive. This study observes the negotiation approach as the independent variable that is believed to exert influence on the other variables. As shown in Table 3, Lewicki et al., suggests 13 elements that need to be measured in order to identify the negotiation approach. The items have been developed into statements which results in 18 items altogether measured using four points-scale (1= Extremely False, 2= False, 3= True, 4= Extremely True).

Prior to the survey, the respondents are required to focus on one conflict that had been solved via negotiation in the past one year. The case of the environment, nevertheless, cannot be disclosed due to confidentiality of the cases that should be complied with the term and condition by the Malaysia Department of Environment prior to the data collection.

Table 3: Constructs of Items Measuring Negotiation Approach

Variables	No.	Items Measuring Variable
Negotiation Approach	1	Payoff structure
	2	Goal pursuit
	3	Relationships
	4	Primary motivation
	5	Trust and Openness
	6	Knowledge of needs
	7	Predictability
	8	Aggressiveness
	9	Solution search behavior
	10	Success measures
	11	Evidence of unhealthy extreme
	12	Key attitude
	13	Remedy for breakdown

In order to determine the approach used by negotiators, a four-points scale consisting of 18 items were devised from the literature. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the items reflect their practices of the negotiation. A composite score was created from the 18 items that cover the 13 elements of negotiation approach. The principle works in two explicit approaches. One and two represent the distributive approach while the other two, which are scale three and four, indicate integrative approach of negotiation. In the software of Statistical Procedure of Social Science (SPSS), the categories are translated through the scores of which scores that are between 18 and 53 represents distributive approach whereas integrative approach is represented by scores that is started from 54 to 72.

Unlike other scales, the four points-scales are not distinct but rather a division of two approaches. One (1) and two (2) scales represents distributive while three (3) and four (4) represent the integrative approach. Nevertheless, the scales are significant to recognize which one is actually higher in its mean scores than another within the similar approach. Based on this figures, the study may be able to appreciate the differences and at the same time acknowledging that it is human behavior of making an action of choice in each negotiation.

5.1 Reliability Scores

According to the pre-test, there 30 respondents who were eight from DOE Kuala Terengganu and 22 from DOE Kuantan, Pahang. As shown in Table 4, there are three sections in the questionnaire. The value of Cronbach Alpha (α) of the pre-test and actual study is between 0.702 – 0.989. The reliability of the research instrument is, therefore, acceptable for the research.

Table 4: Reliability Score for Initial Position and Negotiation approach Instruments

Variable	Cronbach Alpha (α)	
	Pre-Test (n=30)	Actual Study (n=186)
Initial Position (10 items)	0.702	0.815
Negotiation Approach (18 items)	0.896	0.876

6. Result and Discussions

Table 5 presents the demographic background of 186 respondents. According to gender distribution, a greater number is shown on male respondents as compared to female respondents. There are 98 males (52.7 percent) and 88 are females (47.3 percent) altogether. It is believed to be due to the nature of work, which requires mobility and technical skills that the interest is likely to be of men’s rather than women’s. As suggested by Henson and Johnston (1985), the location of different types of employment influence the occupational and communicating distance (Crane, 2007).

Referring to ethnic groups, this study has a majority of the Malay respondents, which is 96.8 percent (180 respondents), three are indigenous, two of them are Chinese and only one respondent is Indian. The diversity seems to be greater in Malay respondents, which are due to the nature of government institution and Malay group has been the majority of the population in Malaysia.

Table 5: Demographic Background

Items	f (n=186)	Percent
Gender		
Male	98	52.7
Female	88	47.3
Races		
Malay	180	96.8
Chinese	2	1.1
Indian	1	0.5
Others	3	1.6
Age		
25 – 33 years old	82	44.1
34 – 42 years old	66	35.5
43 – 51 years old	32	17.2
52 – 60 years old	6	3.2
Education Level		
SPM	4	2.2
Diploma/Certificate	102	54.8
Bachelor Degree	68	36.5
Master	12	6.5

As far as this study is concerned, this study focuses on Environmental Control Officers (ECOs). As shown in Table 5, it reveals 44.1 percent of the respondents are at age between 25 and 33-year old, 35.5 percent is between 34 and 42-year old, 17.2 percent is from 43 to 51-year-old respondents and only six (6) persons are at age between 52 and 60-year old. The fact that the majority of the respondents are at age of 25 to 33-year old may be due to the nature of work, which requires site visits, and more often, the decisions have to be made by the upper management level.

Based on 186 respondents, the respondents whose education level is Malaysia Certificate Education (MCE) qualification are four persons only. 102 respondents (54.8 percent) have a Diploma or certificate qualification, 36.5 percent is from Bachelor Degree qualification and only twelve (12) persons have a higher degree of education, which is the master degree qualification.

6.1 Initial Position

Initial position is indicated by five positions namely problem to solve, disagreement, contest, fight and intractable across two approaches of the negotiation. According to the figures in Table 6, there are only four levels involved in this study. Most of the respondents' initial position (45.7 percent) was at disagreement level, which indicates disagreement towards the other party's situation. Having this level, the negotiators (ECOs) had real disagreements where issues were mixed between personal and the needs of organization. Somehow, the negotiators are cautious towards resolution in which the distress is unlikely to be occurred. The ECOs are non-exclusive problem-orientated and very selective of information is shared. The negotiation emphasizes on good clarity and specification of conflict. The desire for solution leads them to agree towards resolutions and collaboration.

The first level of intensity indicates 40.9 percent of the overall respondents, which represents 76 respondents. The first level of intensity is defined as having clear disagreement and organizational needs; the anger is quickly controlled; very unlikely to be distressed; problem oriented; information is openly shared; excellent clarity and specification of issues discussed; solution is highly desired; agreement is highly possible and requires a minimum of one solution is needed.

Nevertheless, the third level is represented by only 12.4 percent, which is 23 respondents. This study suggests that the negotiators resist the resolution; issues were taken as personal; hesitance towards resolution; distress likely to occur; non-exclusive problem orientation; information is not shared; clarity and specification of conflict is moderately explained; moderate desire for solution; and likely to agree towards resolutions and collaboration.

The fourth level is represented by only two respondents who had a fight as their initial position before moving to the negotiation process. The respondents were assumed to refuse

the solution stage, issues were seen isolated and different; extremely hesitance towards resolution; distress occur; non-exclusive problem orientation; information is not shared; clarity and specification of conflict is not explained; no desire for solution; and unlikely to agree towards resolutions and collaboration.

Table 6: Initial Position of the Environmental Control Officers (n=186)

Type of Initial Position	<i>f</i>	Percent
Level One: Problem to Solve	76	40.9
Level Two: Disagreement	85	45.7
Level Three: Contest	23	12.4
Level Four: Fight	2	1.1
Level Five: Intractable	-	-
Total	186	100

6.2 Type of Negotiation Approach

As far as this study is concerned, the type of negotiation is known as distributive and integrative approach. The distributive approach was employed by 44 respondents (23.7 percentages) which signifies greater employment of integrative approach by other 142 respondents (76.3 percent). In order to understand the extent to which this approach is employed, this study executes an analysis of cross tabulation with gender, type of cases and percentage of solved cases that they had in the past one year. Besides, the respondents of this study have more males than females which is believed due to the environmental nature kind of work.

A cross tabulation analysis is carried out between the negotiation approach and the gender. According to Table 7, there is neither significant differences in male nor females for the negotiation approach used to solve the environmental case among ECOs [$\chi^2(1, N=186) = 1.740, p = .187, \phi = .097$]. It indicates the absence of gender effect on the changes in employing both approaches in the negotiation. Since Bear and Babcock (2012) found gender differences in negotiation performance (which depend on the nature of the negotiation topic), the next step of analysis includes a cross tabulation among negotiation approaches, type of environmental cases, number of cases handled in the past one year and the percentage of solved cases in the past one year.

Table7: Cross Tabulation between Type of Negotiation Approach and Gender among Respondents (n=186)

Negotiation Approach	Gender	
	Male (n=98)	Female (n=88)
Distributive (n= 44)	27	17
Integrative (n=142)	71	71

[$\chi^2(1, N=186) = 1.740, p = 0.187, \phi = .097$]

The insignificance of this relationship can be supported by other studies that highlight on the contribution of gender in the negotiation approach. It is found that women have tendencies to define themselves more through their relationships than do men (Boyer, et al., 2009). The negotiation intrinsically, the actions and expression are maintained for longer relationships. While men focuses on end gains, the making of the success of personal preferences and goals become the primary negotiation objective. Barron (2003), concluded that men are more likely to see the outcome whereas women are likely to focus on the 'interpersonal' side, as well as the process.

6.3 Initial Position and Negotiation Approach

In order to integrate the link between initial position and the negotiation approach, a cross tabulation is computed (Table 8). As a result, 13 respondents (7 percent) who adopted the distributive approach are found to have the problem to solve type of initial position. Another 26 respondents had type of disagreement (14 percent) and five persons had the contest for their initial position. Knowing the attributes of the distributive approach for respondents to have at that particular time, this study found that there is none of them has the fight position even though they actually employed the distributive approach towards the case.

On the contrary, 63 of the integrative approach respondents (33.9 percent) are found to have the problem to solve type of initial position, which signifies the action of the integrative itself. It includes the sharing, win-win solution, acknowledgement of others' interest and fairness among the conflicting parties. As the moderate level of initial position shows disagreement and contest type of initial position which revealed 59 (31.7 percent) and 18 (9.7 percent) each for the integrative approaches. Regardless of the integrative approach, two of them are found to have more negative initial position namely fight position, which indicates changes, and differences would have occurred along the negotiation; the percentage is rather small to be significant.

Referring to a Chi-Square test, no significant differences is found between the initial position and the negotiation approach employed by the environmental control officers [$\chi^2(3, N=186) = 4.734, p = .192, \phi = .160$]. In other words, there is no significant relationship, which explains that the relationship between the initial position and negotiation approach is, thus, void. This study views the variable of initial position as indefinite to the approach of negotiation in solving the case of environment by the environmental control officers in Malaysia.

Table 8: Cross Tabulation between Negotiations Approach and Initial Position among Environmental Control Officers (n=186)

Negotiation Approach	Initial position**									
	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%
Distributive	13	17	26	31	5	22	-	-	-	-
Integrative	63	83	59	69	18	78	2	100	-	-
Total	76	100	85	100	23	100	2	100	-	-

** 1) Problem to Solve; 2) Disagreement; 3) Contest; 4) Fight; and 5) Intractable

However, in the analysis of Pearson correlation, there is weak correlation between the initial position and negotiation approach with r value = - 2.40 (Sig. = .001). The strength of correlation is relatively low which explains the influences of initial position on the approach employed for the negotiation in solving the environmental cases in Malaysia. In other words, the lower the level of initial position possessed by the environmental officers, there is likely a likelihood of the integrative approach of negotiation is employed.

7. Conclusion

Having had the above findings, this article reveals greater number of respondents who employed an integrative approach as having positive levels of initial position from one to three. The initial position is seen as a factor that needs to be carefully possessed by the environmental officers in determining the type of approach they will employ to negotiate. Specifically, the study found that when the respondents have a problem to solve level of initial position, they have a greater tendency to employ integrative approach which includes sharing, win-win solution, acknowledgement of others' interest and fairness among the conflicting parties. While there is no significant changes in the level of initial position and type of negotiation approach, this study concludes that the initial positive has no influence towards the negotiation approach in solving the environmental case in Malaysia.

As integrative approach promises a longer relationship among the conflicting parties, further examinations should look at other factors that may affect the negotiation approach in solving the environmental case in Malaysia. Other factors that may be significant is the intensity of the environmental case that the environmental officer is dealing with. While environmental cases may be different in terms of the intensity, the type of approach may also be different prior to the pursuit of the outcomes namely win-win or win-lose resolution. Beside solutions, practically, efficiencies and success of enforcements by the environmental law and regulation can be achieved through effective negotiation and solving techniques among the environmental officers.

References

- Alavoine, C. (2011). Ethics in Negotiations: The Confrontation between representation and practices. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 78, 205-210.
- Alfredson, T., & Cungu, A. (2008). *Negotiation theory and practice: A Review of Literature. EASYpol*. Rome, Italy: Food and agriculture organization of the United Nations, FAO. Retrieved Oktober 18, 2013, from http://www.fao.org/docs/up/easypol/550/4-5_negotiation_background_paper_179en.pdf
- Babcock, L., & Sara, L. (2003). *Women Don't Ask: Negotiation and the gender divide*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bame-Aldreda, C. W., & Kida, T. (2007). A comparison of auditor and client initial negotiation positions and tactics. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 32(6), 497-551.
- Barron, L. A. (2003). Ask and you shall receive? Gender differences in negotiators' beliefs about requests for a higher salary. *Human Relations*, 56(6), 635-662.
- Barsness, Z. I. & Bhappu, A. D. 2004. At the crossroads of technology and culture: Social influence, information sharing, and sense-making processes during negotiations. In M.J. Gelfand and J.M. Brett (Eds.). *The Handbook of Negotiation and Culture* (pp. 350-373). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press
- Bazerman, M. H., Curhan, J. R., Moore, D. A., & Valley, K. L. (2000, February). . *Annual review of psychology*, 51, 279 - 314.
- Bazerman, M., & Neale, M. (1992). *Negotiating Rationally*. New York: Free Press.
- Bigoness, W. J. (1984). Distributive versus integrative approaches to negotiation: experiential learning through a negotiation simulation. *Developments in Business Simulation & Experiential Exercises*, 11, 64-67.
- Bilmes, J. (1988). Category and rule in conversatlon analysis. *IPrA Partners in Pragmatics*, 25-59.
- Boyer, M. A., Urlacher, B., Hudson, N. F., Niv-Solomon, A., Janik, L. L., Butler, M. J., . . . Ioannou, A. (2009). Gender and negotiation: Some experimental findings from an international negotiation simulation. *International Studies Quarterly*, 53(1), 23-47.
- Brett, J. M., Shapiro, D. L., & Lytle, A. L. (1998). (1998). Breaking the bonds of reciprocity in negotiations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 410-424.
- Brodt, S. E. (1994). Inside information and negotiator decision behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 58 (2), 172-202.
- Burgess, G., & Burgess, H. (1999, July 20). *Confusing interests (what you really want) with positions (what you say you want)*. Retrieved April 26, 2013, from international online training program on intractable conflict: <http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/peace/problem/intpos-p.htm>
- Bush, R., & Folger, J. (1994). *The Promise of Mediation: Responding to Conflict Through Empowerment and Recognition*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Butler, J. K. (1999). Trust expectations, information sharing, climate of trust, and negotiation effectiveness and efficiency. *Group and Organization Management*, 24(2), 217-238.
- Churchman, D. (1995). *Negotiation: Process, tactics and theory*. Boston: University Press of America.

- Conflict Information Consortium. (2007). *Confusing Interests (what you really want) with positions (what you say you want)*. Retrieved 4 26, 2013, from international online training program on intractable conflict (OTPIC): <http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/peace/problem/intpos-p.htm>
- Consumer Association of Penang. (n.d.). *Chronology of Events in the Bukit Merah Asian Rare Earth Development*. Retrieved (30 October, 2016) website: <http://www.consumer.org.my/index.php/health/454-chronology-of-events-in-the-bukit-merah-asian-rare-earth-developments>
- Coombs, C. H. (1987). The structure of conflict. *American Psychologist*, 42, 355–363.
- De Dreu, C. K. W. (2010). Social value orientation moderates in group love but not outgroup hate in competitive intergroup conflict. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 13(6), 701–713.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Harinck, F., & Van Vianen, A. E. (1999). Conflict and performance in groups and organizations. In C. Cooper, & I. Robertson, *International Review of Industrial And Organizational Psychology* (pp. 369–414). Chichester: Wiley.
- Deutsch, M. (1973). *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Druckman, D. and Zechmeister, K. (1970). Conflict of interest and value dissensus: Propositions in the sociology of conflict. *Human Relations*, 26 (4), 449-466.
- Ertel, D. (2000). Turning negotiation into a corporate capability. In *Harvard Business Review on Negotiation and Conflict Resolution* (pp. 101-127.). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1983). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Gatelier, K. (2012). Giving voice to (rural) populations: A method of participatory research for conflict transformation. *European Science Foundation: In Search of Peace. Dialogue between Theories and Practices*. Norrköping, Sweden: European Science Foundation.
- Gettinger, J., Koeszegi, S. T., & Schoop, M. (2012). Shall we dance? — The effect of information presentations on negotiation processes. *Decision Support Systems*, 53(1), 161 - 174.
- Halpern, D. E (1996). *Thought and Knowledge: An Introduction to Critical Thinking* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Harinck, F., & De Dreu, C. K. (2004). Negotiating interests or values and reaching integrative agreements: the importance of time pressure and temporary impasses. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34(5), 595–611.
- Jauhariatul, A., & Jamilah, A. (2011). Penggunaan facebook oleh badan bukan kerajaan alam sekitar (NGO) dalam menyampaikan mesej alam sekitar. *Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 27(2), 161 – 182.
- Jerry Adel & Company. (2006). A Model for achieving Win/Win. *Conflict Resolution*. Toronto, Canada. Retrieved 3 30, 2013, from <http://www.jerryadel.com/conflictres.pdf>
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2012). Energizing learning: The instructional power of conflict. *Educational Researcher*, 38(1), 37–51. <http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08330540>.

- Johnson, N. A., & Cooper, R. B. (2009). Media, affect, concession, and agreement in negotiation: IM versus telephone. *Decisions Support System, 46*(3), 673 - 684.
- Kellermann, P. F. (1996). Interpersonal conflict management in group psychotherapy: An Integrative Perspective. *Group Analysis, 29*(2), 257-275.
- Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. (1969). Group problem solving. In G. Lindzey, & E. Aronson, *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 1–101). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Kersten, G. E. (2001). Modelling distributive and integrative negotiations. Review and revised characterization. *Group Decision and Negotiation, 10*(6), 493-514.
- Khorana, S. &. (2013). European Union-India Trade Negotiations: One Step Forward, One Back? . *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies, 51*(4), 684–700.
- Lax, D.A., & Sebenius, J.K. (1986). *The Manager as Negotiator: Bargaining for Cooperation and Competitive Gain*. Free Press, New York.
- Levine, J. M., & Thompson, L. (1996). Conflict in groups. In Higgins, E. T. & Kruglanski, A. W. (Eds.) *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles*. New York: Guilford Press. Pp. 745-776.
- Lewicki, R. J., Barry, B., Saunders, D. M., & Minton, J. W. (2003). *Negotiation*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Malaysian Insider (2011) *Letter from chairman of Lynas Corporation, Nicholas Curtis, to Fuziah Salleh*. June 22, 2011. Retrieved (July 2, 2011) website: <http://fuziahsalleh.my/?cat=7&paged=43>.
- McGinn, K. L., Moag, J., & Bazerman, M. H. (1998). 'A matter of trust': Effects of communication on the efficiency and distribution of outcomes. , *Journal Of Economic Behavior And Organization, 34*(2), 211–238.
- Mohd Zaini, A., & Rosli, A. J. (2011). Lynas patuhi piawaiian Radiasi. Retrieved (June 24, 2012) from *Berita Harian*, Kuala Lumpur: Media Prima Berhad. website:<http://www.bharian.com.my/bharian/articles/Lynaspatuhipiawaiianradiasi/Article/cetak>
- Mustafa, K. A. (2012). Reporting the Environment: Human Rights, Development and Journalism in Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Media Educator, 22*(2), 253–262.
- Nelson, D., & Wheeler, M. (2004) Rocks and hard places: Managing two tensions in negotiation. *Negotiation Journal, 20*(1), 113-128.
- Norhayati Rafida, A. R., & Shazleen, M. (2004). *Introduction to Human Communication*. Shah Alam, Malaysia: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Norhayati Rafida, A. R., Alina, A. R., Hafiz, H. H., & Saifol, B. (2012). Negotiating interests according to islamic approach on halal certifications: Challenges in creating jobs. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 17* (Towards the Traceability of Halal and Thoyyiban Application), 11-16.
- Phua, K.L., & Velu, S. S. (2012). Lynas Corporation Rare Earth Extraction Plant in Gebeng, Malaysia: A case report on the ongoing saga of people power versus state-backed corporate power. *Journal of Environmental Engineering & Ecological Science, 1*(2): 1-5.

- Pomerantz, A. (1984). . Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. Atkinson, & J. Heritage, *Structures Of Social Action*. (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pruitt, D. G., & Carnavale, P. J. (1993). *Negotiation in Social Conflict*. Buckingham, United Kingdom: Open University Press.
- Putnam, L. L. (1990). Reframing integrative and distributive bargaining: A process perspective. In B. H. Sheppard, M. H. Bazerman, & R. J. Lewicki (Eds.), *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*(2, pp. 3-30). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Rahim, M., 1983. A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26 (2), 368-376.
- Rosette, A. S., Brett, J. M., Barsness, Z., & Lytle, A. L. (2011). When Cultures Clash Electronically: The Impact of Email and Social Norms on Negotiation Behaviour and Outcomes. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*,43(4), 628–643.
- Ross, L., & Stillinger, C. (1991). Psychological Barriers to Conflict Resolution. *Negotiation Journal*, 8, 389–440.
- Roth, Alvin E. and Murnighan, J. Keith. (1982). The role of information in bargaining: An experimental study. *Econometrica*. 50(5): 1123-1142.
- Santoi, L. (2002). Conflict Talk: A Discourse Analytical Perspective. *TESOL & applied linguistic*, 2(3), 1-20.
- Schweitzer, M., Hershey, J., & Bradlow, E. (2006). Promises and lies: Restoring violated trust. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 101 (1), 1–19.
- Smith, J., & Kida, T. (1991). Heuristics and biases: Expertise and task realism in auditing. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109 (3), 472 – 489.
- Sobral, A., & Carvalho, F. M. (2003). Negotiating Style of Portuguese Executives: Competition Vs. Collaboration.<http://ssrn.com/abstract=399721> or ht. Melbourne, Australia.: 16th Annual IACM Conference.
- Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Champagne, M. V. (2000). The Impact Of Time Pressure And Information On Negotiation Process And Decisions. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 9(6), 471–491.
- Taylor, G. (1999). *Managing conflict*. London: Directory of Social Change.
- Thomas, K. W. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.). *Handbook of Industrial & Organizational Psychology* (pp. 889-935). Chicago: Rand McNally
- Trotman, K., Wright, A., & Wright, S. (2005). Auditor negotiations: An examination of the efficacy of intervention methods. *The accounting review*, 80(1), 349–367.
- Trötschel, R., Hüffmeier, J., & Loschelder, D. D. (2010). When Yielding Pieces of the Pie is Not a Piece of Cake: Identity-Based Intergroup Effects in Negotiations. . *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*,13(6), 741–763.
- Walton, R. E., & McKersie, R. B. (1965). *A behavioral theory of labor negotiations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ybarra, O., & Ramon, A.-C. (2004). Diagnosing the difficulty of conflict resolution between individuals from the same and different social groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 815-822.

Zicari, R. V. (2011). *From a business idea to a business plan: A conceptual framework for introducing e-services*. Retrieved October 15, 2012, from http://www.dbis.cs.uni-frankfurt.de/downloads/teaching/unibator/2011_wise/Framework_RZ.pdf

Correspondent Author: norhayati@usim.edu.my (Norhayati Rafida, A. R)