

PSYCHOLOGICAL FEATURES OF THE NEGOTIATION PROCESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Tetiana Aleksieieva¹, Hoang Thi Kieu Trinh²

Abstract. The *aim* of the article is to study psychological characteristics in the context of the negotiation process as one of the mechanisms of diplomacy in the XXI century. Research is based on an understanding of the main psychological factors of the participants and their influence on the results of negotiations. The success of the negotiation process depends on understanding the goal that the participants set for themselves, their general model of behavior, and the technology of negotiation. *Methodology.* The study used the methodology of interdisciplinary science. The authors used methods such as analysis and synthesis. An analysis of information from various sources based on psychological aspects of the negotiation process was conducted. The *results* of the analysis of psychological features of negotiations show that the psychology of participants is one of the integral factors influencing the results of conflict resolution and the negotiation process itself. Negotiators may view negotiations as a means of winning or treat them as a means of analyzing a problem together with a partner and finding ways to solve it. From the psychological point of view, it is very important to take into account the fact that at the preparatory stage of negotiations there are already certain ideas (stereotypes) about partners, connected with cultural and/or ethnic features. Careful preparation for negotiations and the study of the characteristics of the participants in terms of their psychology will allow for a successful conclusion of the negotiation process. Future negotiations can only be successful if the parties carefully analyze the situation. Misunderstandings between the parties can lead to a breakdown in negotiations or an unfavorable result. *Practical implications.* The results of the analysis of the psychology of participants in the negotiation process and identification of their characteristics can be used as a theoretical complement to the research in the context of psychological communication, causes and ways to resolve conflicts through negotiations. *Value/originality.* The study of psychological peculiarities allows us to better understand the partners in negotiations in order to complete them successfully with the most favorable conditions for all participants in the negotiation process.

Key words: psychology, international negotiations, conflicts, mediation, manipulation, stereotypes.

JEL Classification: D91, F51, J52

1. Introduction

One of the defining features of the globalized world in the 21st century is international negotiation, in which diplomacy occupies a special place. A detailed analysis of the negotiation of agreements in the course of diplomatic activity suggests that negotiations between actors are always present even in times of war, at some point even when violent confrontation arises. Representatives of the different sides will try to find a negotiated solution to the confrontation (Iragorri, 2003).

Negotiation, mediation, and the ability to understand potential disputes before they arise to prevent them

are essential skills in this fast-paced and complex global environment (Aquilari, Galluccio, 2008).

Human psychology is an important factor to consider when analyzing the context of international negotiations. Cognitive psychologists emphasize the study of thoughts and beliefs related to emotions, moods, experiences, behaviors, and events in people's lives.

2. Psychological characteristics of negotiators

The effectiveness of modern negotiation communications, including international communications,

Corresponding author:

¹ V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine

E-mail: t.alekseeva@karazin.ua

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9805-5143>

ResearcherID: N-2888-2016

² V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine

E-mail: hoangthikieutrinh21@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9115-2234>



This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0

depends to a large extent on the ability to take into account the psychology of partners. In defending their positions in negotiations, partners constantly influence each other, including those of a psychological nature (Rostetska, 2015).

Various psychological factors act as agreeing factors during the stage of discussing proposals, arguing them, developing solutions and discussing them, determining the final parameters of the agreement, etc. A misinterpretation of the participants' emotional reactions (verbal or nonverbal) can lead to misunderstandings and change the course of the negotiation process (Makeyenko, 2019).

Observing all the participants of the negotiation process, it is necessary to note their uniqueness and individuality. This is manifested in the peculiarities of adaptation to the environment, expression of feelings towards others, mobility, speed of speech, reaction to various life situations, etc. (Kaidalova, Pliaka, 2011).

Successful negotiations, in terms of psychology, sometimes depend on the form of negotiations and the behavior of the participants in a particular situation. Sometimes the results of a one-on-one meeting resolve more important issues than a group discussion. The negotiator must be careful not to fall into the trap of behavior in which he usually feels confident and natural. There is always a risk that the personal point of view of the negotiator will be involved in the negotiation process, and then success becomes a matter of principle, and the principle itself becomes more important than the end result.

The ability to keep one's full attention on certain important objects and resistance to emotional disturbances allows the negotiator to remain calm in a crisis situation. Paying close attention allows the negotiator to be as focused as possible on the main goals of the negotiation without noticing any visual distractions.

Negotiators are empowered in negotiations because this way they can determine which attention of their interlocutor is a priority in the negotiation and adjust their conversation style accordingly. If one negotiator reacts involuntarily and automatically, he or she is usually active and instinctively driven by emotion. On the other hand, the person who does everything slowly and unhurriedly, for the most part, has strong self-control over actions and emotions.

Therefore, when two different personality types meet in a negotiation, the latter must make enough effort to be more active in perceiving the vivid emotional background of his opponent or colleague. Thus, the professional negotiator gets more opportunities for a better understanding with the other party and has a better chance of finding a solution to certain issues (Bajalski, 2017).

3. Behavioral stereotypes

The advantage of negotiation over other means of conflict resolution is that it allows the conflicting parties to reach an agreement that satisfies both parties, while avoiding lengthy court proceedings, the consequences of which are often substantial material costs.

From the psychological point of view, before the beginning of negotiations, the parties have an established opinion about the opponent, several attitudes, a certain stereotypical vision of the problem. A widespread distortion of the parties' perception includes the "halo effect," which consists in attributing positive or negative evaluations and qualities to the opponent that are not observed at the time of negotiations. Another distortion in the perception of the situation and participants in conflict resolution is stereotyping, which is when judgments about a party and actions are based on one's own or someone else's limited experience. Stereotyping simplifies the process of perceiving the other person, but at the same time causes a dispassionate attitude, an inadequate perception (Buchko, 2014).

International business negotiations exhibit different cultural and psychological characteristics. When preparing for such negotiations, it should be taken into account that each nationality, ethnicity, and country has its own specifics of negotiating.

For example, the American national stereotype is characterized by democracy and pragmatism. But Americans act quite straightforwardly, use pressure in the process of agreeing on a joint solution, and are not inclined to strictly follow the stages of negotiations and formalities. They are independent in their decision-making during negotiations. Focusing on the real thing, they strive for material well-being and making money, which explains Americans' interest exclusively in lucrative contracts.

British people are characterized by restraint, a tendency to taciturnity, meticulousness, industriousness, and endurance. Their psychological peculiarities manifest themselves in the fact that they usually avoid categorical statements or objections, and in their conversational speech they avoid personal moments, anything that may seem an intrusion into private life. British representatives in international negotiations are absolutely untouchable in observing all the rules. That is why it is better to negotiate with them "fair game" and not to cheat. The British respond readily to the initiative of the other side. As a result, they pay little attention to negotiation preparation, believing that the best solution will be found due to the position of the partner in the negotiation.

Germans are hardworking, punctual, thrifty, rational, organized, meticulous, skeptical, and serious. Germans prefer those negotiations in which they are solution-oriented. Negotiators usually elaborate their position thoroughly. During negotiations, issues are discussed

sequentially, one by one. Germans take negotiations very seriously and do not allow humor in the process.

The Japanese national character has hard work, discipline, imitation of tradition, devotion to authority, politeness, neatness, thriftiness, and the desire for concerted action. The psychology of the Japanese is difficult to understand, especially for those who are not familiar with the peculiarities of their culture and mentality. For example, a smile or laughter in Japan means different things – it is a sign of sociability, an expression of restraint, an openness of emotion, and a sign of impatience caused by a difficult situation.

Ukrainian national stereotypes are characterized by an emotional perception of the world around, an open soul, a sincere heart, and kindness. An interesting psychological peculiarity is a certain dualism of Ukrainians' behavior: observance of formalities and "keeping distance" in the workplace and warm personal relations outside the office. Therefore, it is not surprising that important negotiations usually end with a joint meal at a restaurant, during which future partners have an opportunity to get acquainted and clarify issues not discussed at the negotiation table (Vahina, 2021).

National and specific features significantly affect the character and psychology of a person, determine the strategy of his behavior, which is especially evident in the field of diplomatic negotiations. We should always remember that every country has its national peculiarities, its culture, and we should be ready for everything, but all these peculiarities are not always inherent in all members of the country, that is why everything should be perceived adequately.

4. Conflict of objectives

A negotiation process is an alternative form of conflict resolution by the parties to a conflict, whereby the parties are able to find a solution to the conflict that meets their common interests and needs. In psychology, the concept of conflict is defined as a lack of agreement between two or more parties – individuals or groups.

Conflicts of interest, at least in terms of modern democracy, arise when politicians and officials begin to abuse power for their own benefit. This occurs when a representative's private interests diverge from the goals of the state. There will always be those who will automatically and unconditionally serve the goals of the state. But there will also be those who, in the absence of proper control, will give priority to their own interests (Sherengovskii, 2011).

Conflict can be resolved with the cessation of conflict interaction and settlement of conflict relations, and the conflict can be resolved both through psychological training of the participants, and through specially organized negotiations, including the involvement of a third party.

The success of the negotiation process to resolve the conflict in most cases is determined by the ability to understand the opposing party, correctly assess its model of behavior, which must include a psychological component, including the emotional state of the negotiators.

Often constructive conflict resolution depends not only on the ability and skills of effective communication or the ability of the parties to the conflict to master the technology of managing emotions in the negotiation process, but also on their use of special psychological techniques, such as manipulative influence. And manipulative influence on the opponent in communication is nothing else but pressure. But unlike direct, open pressure, manipulative pressure is carried out in a hidden form.

The ability to feel the right moment to end the discussion and the end of the negotiation is very important. If the negotiations were successful, all parties managed to find a real and constructive solution to the problem that satisfies both parties, then a favorable conclusion of communication will confirm the success of the negotiation process. If the outcome of negotiations is unfavorable, then the successful completion of negotiations can smooth out problems and prevent further relations from escalating (Lozhkin, Poviakel, 2006).

If the negotiation process ends with a decision and nothing actually happens, this can be the detonator of subsequent, stronger and longer lasting conflicts or lead to an escalation and transformation of the existing conflict. Negotiations are too difficult. In this case, the involvement of a mediator would be more acceptable (Buchko, 2014).

An example of negotiations that did not lead to the desired results is the participation of representatives of France and Germany as mediators in the settlement of the conflict between Ukraine and Russia. In September 2014, the first meeting of the parties to the conflict took place in Minsk to reach an agreement on a ceasefire. At that time, Germany and France were already mediating. However, a ceasefire was ultimately not reached until the Minsk Summit in February 2015 (Baumann, 2017).

5. Completion of negotiations

Participants in international negotiations must show a willingness to compromise, namely, if a partner's interests diverge, an agreement must be reached step by step. In a compromise solution, an agreement is reached because the partners, after an unsuccessful attempt to agree with each other, partially retreat from their demands (something is abandoned, new proposals are put forward), taking into account new understandings.

During negotiations, each side usually uses conscious psychological influence on the opponent and tries to

convince the other side that its conditions are the most favorable for reaching an agreement between them, each side wants the result to be in its favor. As a rule, the "stronger" opponent, who has compelling arguments or feels more confident than the other, wins, and a compromise is reached as a result.

A compromise agreement is made in cases where it is necessary to achieve a common goal of negotiation, when its failure would have adverse consequences for the partners.

Negotiations take place without a third party, without a mediator, whereas mediation (mediation) involves a mediator, who does not make decisions as parties, but works within the mediation procedure with the interests of the parties, takes into account the balance of power, etc. The result of the mediation procedure is consensus.

What the mediation procedure and the negotiation process have in common is that they are based on communication (dialogue) between the parties in order to reach a mutually beneficial solution. However, while in confrontational negotiations there is confrontation between the parties and victory is achieved "at any cost," and avoidance of victory is considered a defeat, this is not the case in mediation.

Reaching agreement between the parties, mutual agreement in the negotiation process is possible through consensus. It is achieved through the psychological mechanism of alignment of goals and interests. Whatever the scheme of negotiations, they can achieve a result only through the coordination of goals and interests. The degree of agreement reached can vary from full consideration of interests to partial. Under such circumstances, the negotiation is considered a successful consensus.

As a socio-psychological phenomenon, trust is the basis of perception of and attitude toward the other person, the foundation for achieving consensus in the negotiation process. The parties' awareness of the need to solve the problem peacefully, through negotiations, triggers the mechanism of establishing mutual trust. The more stable the trust between the parties, the

greater the chance of a constructive solution to the problem.

Another mechanism for achieving consensus in negotiations is the balance of power and mutual control of the parties. The essence is that during negotiations the parties strive to maintain an initial or complex balance of power and control over the actions of the other party. After a long negotiation, the parties come to an agreement. The main thing at this stage is to reconcile all issues to make sure there are no disagreements left (Gelfand, Brett, 2004).

6. Conclusions

In the 21st century, the psychological component of the negotiation process is characterized by the use of soft "psychological power," which is widely used in negotiations and is especially effective if the use of "intellectual power" is simultaneously envisioned. Such soft power is based on subjective factors during negotiations, and it is one of the biggest problems any professional negotiator can face. It is only feasible for a small fraction of negotiators because it requires extensive professional education, nerves of steel, and patience.

The cultural aspects of human psychology in international negotiations are a very important component on which the results of the negotiation process depend. Therefore, first of all, it is necessary to adhere to the cross-cultural characteristics of the countries when conducting negotiations. If you prepare in advance, the likelihood of misunderstandings during negotiations and failure in general is very small. The result of successful negotiations is an agreement between the parties.

At the heart of the entire negotiation process is constructiveness, a focus not on emotions and resentment, but on reason and rational consideration of the situation. The more reasonable the parties are in the negotiation process, the more likely it is that it will result in sustainable agreements and that the interests of both parties will be taken into account.

References:

- Aquilar, F., & Galluccio, M. (2008). Introduction: Theoretical and Psychological Aspects of International Negotiation. In: *Psychological Processes in International Negotiations*, pp. 138–147.
- Bajalski, B. (2017). Power in the process of negotiations, pp. 1–17. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334260412_power_in_the_process_of_negotiation (accessed 29 October 2021).
- Baumann, G. (2017). Promoting Dialogue and Maintaining Trust Between Participants. *The Russia-Ukraine Conflict in The Context of Geopolitical Changes* (electronic journal), pp. 87–90. Available at: https://www.kas.de/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=1406fad9-206c-005d-7452-ac3d2982b8e5&groupId=252038 (accessed 01 October 2021).
- Buchko, V. B. (2014). Psykhologichna dopomoha u rozviazuvanni konfliktiv shliakhom perehovoriv [Psychological assistance in conflict resolution through negotiations]. *Psykhologhiia: realnist i perspektivy* [Psychology: reality and prospects] (electronic journal), vol. 3, pp. 34–38. Available at: <http://repository.rshu.edu.ua/id/eprint/1322> (accessed 13 November 2021).

- Gelfand, M. J., & Brett, J. M (Eds.) (2004). The handbook of negotiation and culture. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press (electronic book), 479 p. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/2870967/Cultural_differences_and_cognitive_dynamics_Expanding_the_cognitive_perspective_on_negotiation?source=swp_share.
- Iragorri, A. G. (2003). Negotiation in International Relations. *Univer-sidad del norte*, vol. 19, pp. 91–102.
- Kaidalova, L. H., & Pliaka, L. V. (2011). Spilkuvannia ta individualni yakosti osobystosti. Kharkiv: National University of Pharmacy, pp. 70–104. (in Ukrainian)
- Lozhkin, H. H., & Poviakel, N. I. (2006). Psykholohiia konfliktu: teoriia i suchasna praktyka [Psychology of Conflict: Theory and Practice], 416 p.
- Makeyenko, Zh. (2019). Porivnialnyi analiz perehovoriv u derzhavnomu upravlinni z pozytsii harvardskoho metodu ta lean-perehovoriv. [Comparative analysis of negotiations in public administration from the Gatward's method and lean-negotiation positions]. *Ekonomika ta derzhava* (electronic journal), vol. 3 (11), pp. 61–66. Available at: <https://ipk.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/zurnal-3-2019.pdf#page=61> (accessed 10 November 2021).
- Rostetska, S. I. (2015). Psykholohichni pryiony mizhnarodnykh perehovoriv [Psychological methods of international negotiations]. *Politykus* [Politykus] (electronic journal), vol. 1, pp. 44–48. Available at: http://politicus.od.ua/1_2015/11.pdf (accessed 15 November 2021).
- Sherengovskii, D. V. (2011). Poniattia ta sutnist mizhnarodnoho konfliktu v nauksi pro mizhnarodni vidnosyny [The concept and essence of international conflict in the science of international relations]. *Aktualni problemy polityky* [Actual policy issues] (electronic journal), vol. 43, pp. 98–108. Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/11300/1527> (accessed 6 November 2021).
- Vahina, O. M. (2021). Formuvannia natsionalnoho stylu politychnoho spilkuvannia v Ukraini yak vykyk suchasnoi hlobalizatsii [Formation of national style of political communication in Ukraine as a challenge of modern globalization]. *Aktualni problemy filosofii ta sotsiologii* [Actual problems of philosophy and sociology], vol. 30, pp. 78–82.