

# Interactive Approach to Negotiating Styles Dependent on Personality Traits

Anna Grabowska<sup>1</sup>, Andrzej Kozina<sup>2</sup>

Submitted: 26.08.2015. Final acceptance: 11.01.2016

## Abstract

**Purpose:** This study was of a theoretical character and aimed at presenting various descriptions of the interactions between all possible pairs of four well-known negotiating styles dependent on personality traits.

**Methodology:** This study was based on analysis of the interactions as well as authors' experiences from their observations and analyses on human behaviors during numerous negotiations and role-play exercises arranged at the courses for practitioners. The stress was put on analyzing the interactions occurring between people representing both different and the same negotiating styles.

**Findings:** The attempt at describing such interactions was successful and promising for farther research. The concept constitutes a useful tool for analyzing human behavioral aspects of different types of business negotiations, within the process of their planning, conduct and evaluation. Nevertheless, the concept will be a subject of subsequent authors' research, focusing on its improvement mainly by searching more precise features of negotiating styles and interactions between them.

**Practical implications:** The concept can be applied to analyze many real negotiation situations as well as within the experiment to be arranged by the authors to examine those interactions within the hundreds of pairs of negotiators solving particular case studies. Thus the description of such interactions can be treated as a specific hypothesis.

**Originality:** In general, the suggestion for solving complex, difficult and essential issues of negotiating styles was presented but was rarely investigated in the literature on negotiations. In particular, an original concept of describing the interactions between those styles was suggested.

**Keywords:** business negotiations, negotiating style, types of negotiating styles, mutual interactions within negotiations

JEL: M191

---

<sup>1</sup> Jagiellonian University, Institute of Applied Psychology.  
Correspondence address: Łojasiewicza 4 St., 30-348 Cracow, Poland, e-mail: anna.grabowska@poczta.fm.

<sup>2</sup> Cracow University of Economics, Management Process Department.  
Correspondence address: Rakowicka 27 St., 31-510 Cracow, Poland, e-mail: kozinaa@uek.krakow.pl.

## Idea and Types of Negotiating Styles

One of the crucial dimensions of negotiations is the subjective and personal one of considering human resources. In particular, that dimension comprises the general manner of conducting negotiations, which is usually called “negotiating style”. It can be defined in two ways (Błaut, 2000, p. 6):

- 1) Predominant style, i.e., preferred cognitive style. It reflects the attitude of a particular person to conflict as well as the most frequently chosen way of behaving, determined by his (her) needs, abilities and perceptions.
- 2) “Kept under one’s hat” style, which is an intentional negotiation strategy acquired through experience and/or training and applied when the predominant style proves to be not efficient enough while dealing with a particular negotiation situation<sup>3</sup>.

It is often stressed that negotiating style depends largely on individual features of a particular person. “Style is what fascinates. It is what is memorable. It is what is left when you walk out of the room. It’s the expression of your essence, as individual as your signature or thumbprint” (Warschow, 1980, p. 11). “How people approach a negotiating experience depends heavily on their individual personalities, psychological makeup self-esteem, long-held views and values about themselves and others” (Albrecht and Albrecht, 1993, p. 54).

Therefore, “flexibility in using individual negotiating style is recommended, since it is only one element within the negotiating game. Experienced negotiators just know how to adjust negotiating style to specific situation or actually disposable resources, relations with supervisors, the stage of negotiations, the party’s personalities and so on” (Mastenbroek, 1996, p. 122). “There is no such thing as an ideal negotiating style. Each kind of situation requires a different approach. Always negotiating in the same way virtually guarantees some good results and some horrendous ones. You must therefore understand your own and other people’s styles and adjust your approach” (Schoonmaker, 1989, p. 179).

Despite their relativity, attempts at modelling negotiating styles are being made. A review of relevant literature on negotiating styles showed that this issue is a classical

---

<sup>3</sup> As far as the definition of negotiations is concerned, the literature mostly deals with interpreting negotiations as a decision making process, method of managing conflict and reaching agreement, mutual dependency of the parties and processes of communicating, interchanging values and creating (Lewicki, Saunders and Barry, 2010, p. 4–25; Rządca, 2003, p. 23–47; Kozina, 2012, p. 21–24).

(traditional) one. Therefore, the majority of remarkable works within this field of interest was published in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. The best-known and most frequently quoted concept of their classification was presented in the book by Fisher et al. (2000, p. 39–140). The authors introduced so-called “principled negotiations” as the style recommended (pattern one) to be applied as an alternative to ineffective soft (cooperative) and hard (competitive) negotiating styles.

Comparing numerous concepts of classifying negotiating styles the two groups of those concepts may be distinguished.

- 1) **Multidimensional approaches (usually two-dimensional ones).** They assume that to distinguish negotiation style, it is necessary to include essential features reflecting the negotiation’s nature, especially their complexity (scope, objectives, circumstances, partners’ attitudes and so on). For instance in the Albrecht and Albrecht monograph (1993, p. 61–74) on the basics of the dimensions of openness and compliance, the following styles were described: bulldog, fox, deer and deal builder. D.B. Sparks (1993, pp. 109–113) distinguished four negotiating styles: restrictive, elusive, friendly and confrontative, by applying the dimensions of disregard vs. trust and control vs. deference. The concept by R. Fisher and his collaborators (2000) previously quoted is also a good example of the discussed approach. The other multidimensional concept of negotiating styles is the well-known classical model of conflict resolution strategies (styles) by K. W. Thomas (1976), comprising five of such strategies: competing, compromising, collaborating, accommodating and avoiding.
- 2) **Approaches based on personality (character) traits.** The most important determinants of negotiating style are individual negotiators’ features. Such an approach was represented by T.A. Warschaw (1980, p. 11–82), who presented the following styles: jungle fighters, dictators, silhouettes, big daddies and big mammas, soothers and win-win negotiators. A.N. Schoonmaker (1989, p. 179–209) distinguished three extreme styles: dominant, dependent and detached and four combined styles: dominant-dependent, dominant-detached, dependent-detached and balanced. E.M. Christopher (1996, p. 11–24) described four negotiating styles: innovative, communicative, procedural and energetic. W. Mastenbroek (1996, p. 121) distinguished the following styles: analytical-aggressive, flexible-aggressive, ethical and jovial.

The subject of this study was the classification of negotiating styles by P. Casse and S. Deol (1985, p. 53–81), belonging to the second of the described groups of concepts. The objective of the study was to characterize the interactions (relations) between the

pairs of negotiators representing particular negotiating styles based on personality traits. The reason for selecting this particular concept was its main advantage, i.e. thorough and comprehensive description of negotiating styles, allowing characterization of the features as well as strengths and weaknesses of each style. That constitutes a proper base for analyzing the interactions between those styles. This concept was selected as the result of a careful comparative analysis of about ten models of negotiating styles, including those previously described and some others.

In the next part of the article, those negotiating styles are described, i.e. their features, advantages and disadvantages as well as the possibilities of using them in negotiations. Then from the essential part of the study, the authors' concept of an interactive approach to the considered classifications is next presented, i.e. all possible pairs of negotiators representing the discussed styles are characterized. Two essential issues are included: probable course of negotiations between those pairs and the rules of reaching agreement. The final part of the article contains a summary of the presented concept and points out the directions for further research on negotiation styles, reflecting personal features of negotiators in the context of interactions between those styles.

## Characteristics of Negotiating Styles

In the frame of the presented concept, four negotiation styles were distinguished, which are described in Table 1. It may be noted that they are rather types of negotiators personalities rather than negotiating styles in the strict sense of that category.

As shown in Table 1, each negotiating style has its good and bad sides. Therefore on the basis of their analysis, it is not possible to indicate one recommended or pattern style, like "principled negotiations", mentioned by Fisher et al. (2000, p. 39–140) or that takes place within the majority of multidimensional concepts of negotiating styles as previously described.

Despite that, it can be stated that the first two styles, i.e. factual and intuitive ones, are more effective than the others because they pose a greater and realistic chance of finding effective solutions to negotiated issues. This is possible due to either logic and experience of the factual style or creativity and innovativeness of the intuitive one. Those two styles perfectly complement each other. Potentially, an ideal negotiator could be created as their linkage; however it is rather an impossible or an exceptionally rare combination within one personality. Namely they are opposed to each other, so it would be necessary to "combine fire with water". Normative and analytical styles

should be considered as less effective since neither excessive exposure of one's own values and principles within the relation with a negotiations partner (which is typical for normative style), nor too detailed and comprehensive analysis of negotiations problems (pertaining for analytical style) indicate opportunities for reaching agreement in negotiations.

On the other hand in some negotiation situations, each of the four styles may prove to be effective, considering their described advantages, which in favorable circumstances may prevail over their disadvantages.

**Table 1.** Descriptions of Negotiating Styles Based on Personality Traits

Issues\styles	Factual	Intuitive	Normative	Analytical
<b>Basic Assumption</b>	<b>The facts speak for themselves</b>	<b>Imagination can solve any problem</b>	<b>Negotiating is bargaining</b>	<b>Logic leads to the right conclusions</b>
Behavior	Pointing out facts in a neutral (unemotional and detached) way, keeping track of what has been said, reminding people of their statements, knowing most of the details of the discussed issue and sharing them with others, asking them for explanations, relating facts to experience, being low-key in their reactions, looking for proof, tends to documenting the statements, clarifying, defining, classifying and explaining reality.	Making warm and enthusiastic statements, focusing on the entire situation or problem rather than details, pin-pointing essentials, making projections into the future, being imaginative and creative in analyzing the situation, switching from one subject to another, going beyond the facts, coming up with new ideas and concepts all the time, pushing and withdrawing from time to time, putting two and two together quickly, getting their facts a bit wrong sometimes, being deductive.	Judging, assessing and evaluating the facts according to a set of personal principles and values, approving and disapproving, agreeing and disagreeing, using loaded words, offering bargains, proposing rewards, incentives, appealing to people's feelings and emotions to reach a "fair" deal, demanding, requiring, threatening, involving power, using status, authority, where appropriate, correlating, looking for compromise, making effective statements, focusing on people, their reactions, judging, attentive to communication and group processes.	Forming reasons, drawing conclusions and applying them to the case in negotiation, arguing in favor or against one's own or others' position, directing, breaking down, dividing, analyzing each situation for cause and effect, identifying relationships of the parts, putting things into logical order, organizing, weighing the pros and cons thoroughly, making identical statements, using linear reasoning, being inductive.

Key words	Meaning, define, explain, clarify, facts, elaborate	Principles, essential, tomorrow, creative, new, idea.	Right-wrong, good-bad, positive-negative, like-dislike, proper-improper.	Because, if... then, consequently, since, therefore, in order to.
Advantages	Natural disclose of facts and sharing knowledge and experience openly. Taking care of important details. Accuracy, reliability, precision, efficiency and effectiveness in resolving typical negotiation problems.	Intelligence, creativity, initiative, imagination. Involvement and commitment. Openness, positive attitudes and proper using of emotions. The warmth of expressions. Ability of synthesis.	Consistency and fundamentalness of expressions and actions. Obeying rules and principles if it is necessary. Defending and guarding valuable and common values. Taking care of reactions, emotions, communication.	Precise, thorough, reliable and comprehensive analysis of problems. Ability of drawing detailed and precise conclusions. Straightforward supporting of offers and arguments.
Disadvantages	Delayed reactions. Possible scarcity of creativity and not enough emotions. Adopting bad routine. Preferring simple or even trivial and “the best and proved” solutions. Automatism of actions.	Possible detachment from reality, wool-gathering, too much phantasy. Tendency to discourage and boredom, low effectiveness. Isolation, lack of understanding from other people. Making simple mistakes.	Exercising pressure on the partner, threatening other people. Tendency to dominate over others and forcing one’s own values and principles. Such people are usually disliked by the others. Excessive radicalism.	Excessive concentration on mere details and lack of synthesis. Time consuming, nerve-racking, annoying, ineffective if inappropriate to the situation. Lack of understanding from other people.

Source: own elaboration (based on Casse and Deol, 1985, p. 64–65).

These descriptions should be supplemented by pointing out the ways and rules of applying the considered classification of negotiating styles in practice. To do so, two issues should be taken into account in determining the usefulness of those styles:

- 1) Guidelines for negotiating with people representing particular styles;
- 2) Conditions of their usefulness, i.e. identifying the negotiation situations in which those styles are appropriate and helpful as specific negotiation tools.

These two issues are characterized in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Principles of Dealing with the Four Negotiating Styles

Style	Guidelines for Negotiating	Conditions of Usefulness
Factual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Be precise in presenting your facts,</li> <li>■ Refer to the past (what has already been tried out, what has worked, what has been shown from past experience, etc.),</li> <li>■ Be inductive (go from the facts to the principles),</li> <li>■ Know your dossier (including the details),</li> <li>■ Document what you say,</li> <li>■ Be carefully prepared to negotiations.</li> </ul>	<p>Routine, standard, well-structured negotiation situations.            Considerable quantity of differentiated data.            The necessity to gather by negotiators knowledge on specific, particular issue.            The need for the confirmation or formalization of negotiations results in relevant documentation.            Activities are designed according to procedures and standards and controlled by them.</p>
Intuitive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Focus on the situation as a whole,</li> <li>■ Project yourself in the future,</li> <li>■ Tap the imagination and creativity of your partner,</li> <li>■ Be quick in reacting (jump from one idea to another),</li> <li>■ Build upon the reaction of the other side,</li> <li>■ Strictly concentrate your attention.</li> </ul>	<p>New, unknown, extremely complex and/or objectively difficult problem to be solved.            Lack of precedents of solving it.            The need for creating big number of potential solutions, not necessarily only real ones.            Abstract, vague or blurred negotiation problem.            The desire of thriving on vision and fast growth.</p>
Normative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Establish a sound relationship at the outset of the negotiation,</li> <li>■ Show your interest in what the other person is saying,</li> <li>■ Identify his or her values and adjust to them accordingly,</li> <li>■ Be ready to compromise,</li> <li>■ Appeal to your partner's feelings,</li> <li>■ Be very polite and accurate.</li> </ul>	<p>Compatibility or coherence of standards and values in particular area (group).            The need for creating impression of emphatic conversation in positive atmosphere or pretending to be correct, right, proper one and so on.            Defending threatened objectively priceless values at any price.            Compromise is highly valued and desired by all parties as the best (sole) solution.</p>
Analytical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Use logic when arguing,</li> <li>■ Look for causes and effects,</li> <li>■ Analyze the relationships between the various elements of the situation or problem at stake,</li> <li>■ Be patient,</li> <li>■ Analyze various options with their respective pros and cons,</li> <li>■ Be precise, accurate and selective.</li> </ul>	<p>Highly complex, complicated, multidimensional problems to be solved.            The necessity of connecting numerous differentiated data, which are apparently not linked with one another.            The situations in which seeking for the reasons and/or effects determines reaching an agreement.            Considerable amount of time at disposal.</p>

Source: own elaboration (based on Casse and Deol, 1985, p. 67–68).

## Characteristic of Interactions Between Negotiating Styles

The most interesting issue from both theoretical and practical points of view seems to be looking into the presented classification of negotiating styles from the perspective of both negotiating parties at the same time, i.e. considering all possible pairs of negotiators representing the four styles previously described. It is easy to calculate that it is necessary to include ten pairs of that kind.

Such an approach, called an “interactive” one, requires studying two key issues.

- 1) **Answering the question:** How to run negotiations between each distinguished pair of partners? Therefore the matter is to present a hypothetical (probable) process of such negotiations.
- 2) **Finding the response to the inquiry:** Whether or not and in what way a particular pair of negotiators is able to reach a mutually satisfying agreement? Therefore it is desired to formulate rules (cues) of searching for the result of negotiations satisfying to both parties.

### Homogeneous Pairs of Negotiators

It seems that it is necessary to distinguish two groups of the discussed pairs of negotiators, i.e. homogeneous and heterogeneous ones. The following four examples of homogeneous pairs of negotiators describe the probable negotiation process and the rules of searching for agreement.

#### Two factual negotiators

Assuming good will to negotiate by both parties in their meeting makes their conversation firmly focused on definitions. Many explanations of numerous issues occur. Otherwise the lack of understanding as to the clarity of ideas and concepts causes an increase in tension and creates an atmosphere full of aggression and anger. That makes it impossible to positively conclude the negotiations. The positive symptom of contact is appealing to negotiators’ experiences (subjective ones) while considering pure facts to support ones’ positions. The interlocutor notes that and paraphrases the other party’s statements. Additionally taking care of details, mutual sharing of the knowledge possessed by negotiators make the reciprocal classification of data easier and relatively uniform. Strict adherence to what has been said and elaborated appears. The deficiency of flexibility and openness to creative solutions takes place.



The rules of searching for agreement are as follows:

- 1) Mutual focus on data, facts and reality;
- 2) Precise statements;
- 3) Proper and skillful gathering of data and arguments according to selected criteria;
- 4) Final agreement may be reached by summing up partial solutions previously elaborated;
- 5) Mutual searching for evidence within one's experience helps to gather data that creates a new quality of conversation;
- 6) Reciprocal remembering of the other party's statements and shared knowledge constitutes the basis to take actions bringing negotiators nearer to expected solutions;
- 7) Seeking for evidence objectively confirming validity of a final solution;
- 8) Mutual classification of facts leads to homogeneous opinions, compatibility and final agreement.

### **Two intuitive negotiators**

These are negotiations with "high voltage", probably noisy, very vital and full of gestulation in a meeting of two temperamental negotiators. A high level of intelligence determines the efficiency of their actions. Their concentration on crucial issues constitutes the incipience of generating concepts and ideas. A potential observer of such negotiations may be simply intimidated by the creativity induced by the high level of enthusiasm and initiative. A considerable number of offered solutions and suggestions may depart from the possibility of their implementation in reality. The concepts and ideas may reach into the future but cannot be adequate enough for the present situation. Over time, they may be incoherent with reality (facts).

Reaching an agreement is possible when the parties concentrate on substantial and important issues. It is necessary that the process of creating solutions and imagination accompanied by high emotional commitment does not override the need for achieving final effects of negotiations. If changing the subject of discussion is too frequent, reaching an agreement is dependent on adhering to only one issue, which may be a problem. Losing topics by both parties may lead to chaos. Tiredness and discouragement can simply stop the negotiation process.

### **Two normative negotiators**

In the situation when the standards of both parties are coherent to each other, the negotiation process runs rapidly and efficiently. Such a process, based on fair play with

searching for compromise by offering prizes and with approval of the other party's activities, quickly comes to the end. In the opposite situation, i.e., standards incompatibility (to some extent), the art of finding solutions relies on adequate maneuvering between mutual approval and disapproval, intertwined by seeking compromise as to the reward offered to the other party, is worth the proverbial "candle". A coherent view on values guarantees quick and efficient reaching of agreement, while a divergent one results in the lack of it. If one party feels a stronger series of threats, an imposition of a subjective assessment of facts on the other party may follow, which can make it impossible to find a mutually satisfying deal.

Reaching agreement may take place by supporting mutual decisions with promised rewards. It is important that at the very beginning of negotiations, both parties agreed on the principles (standards) they recognize and treat as obligatory. The essential issue for both parties is defining starting positions with regard to following clearly and precisely determined rules. If the standards of the parties are widely divergent, it may be assumed (with high probability) that final agreement satisfying to both parties may not be reached. That may be caused by the tendency to impose on the other one's own system of values. Such cognitive rigidity is a key issue. The lack of flexibility to changes may block one or both of the parties. Additionally showing power and using threats by one party may lead to victory because the party toughens up, does not adapt to changes and stay in a weaker position, from which one cannot exit.

### **Two analytical negotiators**

Primarily, such negotiations mean accuracy and precision in statements, activities, steps taken and decisions made. Very detailed considerations, creating and analyzing endless sequences of causes and effects by both parties, make negotiations substantially longer lasting. However, they are not creative but routine and even boring ones. If the opinions of the parties concerning discussed facts are coherent enough to each other, logical conclusions may be drawn and satisfying effects can occur.

It is likely that during logical thinking, the parties reach final agreement. However, it may take a remarkably long time. It is hard to consider such negotiations as "thrilling" ones. Argumentation of both parties must be reliable and comprehensive enough. On some occasions, an external expert is needed to sum up negotiators' ideas and find a satisfactory deal.

Apparently, it might seem that negotiations conducted by homogeneous pairs of negotiators are integrative ones and more likely to be finished with a win-win result, due to the similarity of personality traits of their participants that in turn creates more chances

for mutual understanding and acceptance. Unfortunately, after careful analysis of homogeneous pairs of negotiators, it appears that the above statement is false.

### **Heterogeneous Pairs of Negotiators**

Within a heterogeneous pair of negotiators, some difficulties may occur concerning reciprocal adjustment, divergences of perceptions and behaviors, or even provoking conflict can happen, caused by disagreement of personalities. Therefore, the following six descriptions of heterogeneous pairs of negotiators are much more difficult to elaborate than of homogeneous ones and they are probably less accurate, in particular with relevance to the possibilities of reaching agreement.

#### **Factual – intuitive**

The role taken by a factual negotiator is making real the concepts created by intuitive ideas. The domain of an intuitive negotiator is constantly generating ideas and concepts. It is beneficial if a factual one finds himself (or herself) well in the jungle of ideas and starts to arrange, classify and order them so as to draw sound conclusions. Among the many fantastic ideas, the factual negotiator acting as a specific assistant distinguishes and lists sensible alternatives to find the best solution. Such a negotiations process looks like an endless river with dams put at such places that can and should tame the uneasy flow of that river.

A necessary condition to reach final agreement is effective performance of factual negotiators, which systematizes and sums up intuitive ideas and concepts to find and implement a realistic deal. It is the most efficient and effective pair of negotiators, opposed and at the same time complementary ones. The result of their performance is usually of good quality, promising and realistic, assuming that they just play their roles without attempting to influence the other party too much.

#### **Factual – Normative**

The factual one plays the role of coordinator considering the fixed and unchangeable standards of the normative negotiator. His or her duty is to classify order and unify powerful and indisputable arguments of the normative negotiator. The least likely is the situation that a normative negotiator gives up his (her) cognitive rigidity and flexibly adjusts to upcoming changes. The factual negotiator may simply manipulate reality in such a way that the normative negotiator considers it as the only right and true one.

Reaching agreement must be preceded by establishing a coherent attitude to facts, which melt into standards valid in a particular time and place. Factual negotiators

must properly integrate with normative ones. They must perform their tasks properly and effectively. They should create a sort of “proper construction” that will be subjectively evaluated by the normative negotiator. Therefore, one cannot expect creative deals.

### **Factual – Analytical**

The lead role is played by the factual negotiator, who probably starts negotiations. He (she) formulates and orders arguments as well as draws conclusions. It is crucial that in the meantime, the analytical negotiator sticks to a compromise solution while analyzing facts and arguments as accurately as possible. It is not worth it for him (her) to be too radical and concentrate on negative aspects of the discussed issues. Finally the factual negotiator elaborates and presents the negotiations effects.

The background for effective negotiations and reaching a satisfactory final agreement is properly ordered and classified facts and concepts. Precise, reliable and comprehensive analyses must be accurate and adequate to the situation and to some extent routinely occur. Excessive focus on analyzing facts may slow down negotiations and make them ineffective.

### **Intuitive – Normative**

Negotiations are started by the intuitive negotiator, who generates concepts and ideas and then adjusts them to the standards represented by the normative negotiator. However, if he (she) is not successful, hard emotion may dominate in negotiations. The normative negotiator will make a sort of boycott because he (she) probably cannot afford taking more sophisticated and radical steps. Leading negotiations is actually the duty of the intuitive negotiator. If the normative one resists and starts threatening, the intuitive one may emotionally explode, which in turn will induce rigidity in the normative negotiator.

The condition for reaching a satisfactory deal is that the intuitive negotiator should lead negotiations properly, in particular being able to adjust to the standards of the normative one. If this is the case, negotiations are run quickly and efficiently, leading to a mutually accepted agreement. Additionally, the normative negotiator must accept the role of the intuitive one. The lack of necessary flexibility of the normative negotiator may discourage the intuitive one and make him (her) get bored.

### **Intuitive – Analytical**

It is likely that negotiations are started by an enthusiastic intuitive negotiator. He (she) simply feels that positive completion of negotiations is in his (her) hands. This keeps

overwhelming the analytical negotiator with ideas, which with time may become more unreal. If the analytical negotiator starts to deeply analyze causes and effects of the considered ideas, both negotiators will be “sunk” and not find realistic solutions. It is rather the intuitive negotiator than the normative one who will “win”. From the very beginning, the analytical one stands in a weaker position. He (she) should not try to strengthen it by too detailed analyses of problems.

Reaching agreement is based on the concepts and ideas developed by the intuitive negotiator. Among a wide range of those suggestions, the analytical negotiator tries to find links between them necessary to find solutions to negotiated problems. The matter is whether the intuitive negotiator accepts such a course of action. Excessive prolongation of negotiations, analyzing, and spreading issues into prime factors may make intuitive negotiators impatient and even stop negotiations.

### **Normative – Analytical**

An excessive need for analyzing data, drawing conclusions and attempting to search for causes for almost everything, when confronted with a subjective hierarchy of values, cognitive rigidity and dichotomous views on reality, shows the difficulty of interpersonal contacts within such negotiations. On the one hand within this duo of negotiators, there is a need for deep analysis, penetration, searching and linking facts to formulate conclusions, understanding and suggestions of good solutions. On the other hand, there is an attempt to negotiate through tempting by reward, threatening by punishment, showing approval or disapproval and putting oneself in a “better” position. The main difficulty faced by this pair of negotiators is the lack of flexibility towards changes in different stages of the negotiation process.

Negotiations will be efficient and smart if the facts and findings presented by the analytical negotiator are matched with the only and right standards elaborated by the normative negotiator. Those standards should be presented in such a way that the analytical negotiator can adopt them as one’s own. The same remark applies to the analyses presented by the analytical negotiator to the normative one. Then it is very likely that negotiations can end with a mutually satisfactory deal.

## **Conclusions and Limitations**

Summing up, it is noted that the interactive approach to negotiating styles based on personality traits presented in this study constitutes a useful tool for analyzing and conducting practical negotiations. Thanks to creating descriptions of hypothetical

courses of negotiations between the specified pairs of negotiators, representing the distinguishing styles as well as elaborating the rules for reaching agreement between those pairs, it is possible to effectively plan, conduct and evaluate negotiations.

The meaningful contribution of the authors' concept in the development of theory and methodology of negotiations is providing new, thorough and comprehensive insights into negotiation processes. Unlike a traditional individual one, the interactive approach to negotiating styles much better reflects the actual nature and features of negotiators and is considerably relevant to their perceptions and actions during negotiations.

However, it should be stressed that the characteristics of the distinguished pairs of negotiators were created solely on the basis of the authors' experience and theoretical knowledge on psychology, management and negotiations. Therefore, those characteristics are of a hypothetical character and it is necessary to verify them comprehensively in empirical research. The authors assume that such verification would constitute a sort of experiment, during which hundreds of negotiators would solve in differentiated pairs a case study in the form of role-play, e.g., buyer and seller, principal and subordinate, etc. The pairs would be associated after checking which of the discussed negotiating styles represent all the participants, using relevant self-assessment tests (Casse and Deol, 1985, p. 54–58). The observation of those pairs during negotiations and their reports after completing negotiations would allow verifying their hypothetical descriptions.

Apart from its empirical verification, the presented concept should also be developed in terms of more precise descriptions of all pairs of negotiators representing different negotiating styles, i.e., their features, advantages and disadvantages as well as the rules of searching for agreement. That will allow obtaining a comprehensive methodological framework for analyzing the interactions between partners within different negotiation situations.

## References

- Albrecht, K. and Albrecht, S. (1993). *Added Value Negotiating. The Breakthrough Method for Building Balanced Deals*. Irwin, Homewood: Business One.
- Błaut, R. (2000). *Skuteczne negocjacje*. Warszawa: Centrum Informacji Menedżera.
- Casse, P. and Deol, S. (1985). *Managing Intercultural Negotiations: Guidelines for Trainers and Negotiators*. Washington, DC: International Society for Intercultural Education.
- Christopher, E.M. (1996). *Negotiating Skills for Business*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W. and Patton, B. (2000). *Dochodząc do TAK. Negocjowanie bez poddawania się*. Warszawa: PWE.

- Kozina, A. (2012). *Planowanie negocjacji w przedsiębiorstwie*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie.
- Lewicki, R.J., Saunders, D.M. and Barry, B. (2010). *Essentials of Negotiation*, 5th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.
- Mastenbroek, W. (1996). *Negocjowanie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Rządca, R. (2003). *Negocjacje w interesach*. Warszawa: PWE.
- Schoonmaker, A.N. (1989). *Negotiate to Win. Gaining the Psychological End*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Sparks, D.B. (1993). *The Dynamics of Effective Negotiation. A Win-win Approach To Getting What You Want*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company.
- Thomas, K.W. (1976). Conflict and Conflict Management. In: M.D. Dunette (ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Warschow, T.A. (1980). *Winning by Negotiation*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.