

MASTERARBEIT | MASTER'S THESIS

Titel | Title

Behavioral and Context Effects in Online Negotiations: Predicting Satisfaction
and Long-Term Willingness

verfasst von | submitted by

Nevin Aysem Uluköy BSc

angestrebter akademischer Grad | in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science (MSc)

Wien | Vienna, 2026

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt |
Degree programme code as it appears on the
student record sheet:

UA 066 915

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt | Degree
programme as it appears on the student
record sheet:

Masterstudium Betriebswirtschaft

Betreut von | Supervisor:

Assoz. Prof. Dr. Dmitriy Knyazev BSc MA

Abstract

Diese Studie untersucht, wie der Verhandlungskontext Verhaltensmuster während von Online-Verhandlungen beeinflusst und wie diese Verhaltensweisen mit Verhandlungsergebnissen zusammenhängen. Aus einer prozessorientierten Perspektive integriert die Studie Verhandlungskontext, Verhalten und Ergebnisse innerhalb eines gemeinsamen analytischen Rahmens.

Die Analyse basiert auf experimentellen E-Negotiation-Daten von 266 Teilnehmenden, die mit einem standardisierten Computeragenten verhandelten. Die Verhandlungstranskripte wurden systematisch in 19 Verhaltenskategorien kodiert. Zur Untersuchung der Auswirkungen von Verhandlungssetting, Verhandlungsstil und Kommunikationsverfügbarkeit auf die Nutzung bestimmter Verhaltensweisen wurden logistische Regressionsanalysen durchgeführt. Die Zusammenhänge zwischen Verhandlungsverhalten und den Ergebnisvariablen Zufriedenheit sowie Bereitschaft zu einer langfristigen Beziehung wurden mithilfe multipler linearer Regressionsanalysen analysiert.

Die Ergebnisse zeigen, dass das Verhandlungssetting der stärkste Prädiktor für die Nutzung von Verhaltensweisen war, während die Verfügbarkeit von Kommunikation vor allem explorative Problemlösungsprozesse förderte. Ein harter Verhandlungsstil war mit geringeren Ausprägungen positiven Affekts verbunden. Darüber hinaus wies positiver Affekt die stärksten positiven Zusammenhänge sowohl mit der Zufriedenheit als auch mit der Bereitschaft zu einer langfristigen Beziehung auf, während mehrere kompetitive Verhaltensweisen mit weniger günstigen Ergebnissen assoziiert waren. Insgesamt unterstreichen die Ergebnisse die Bedeutung verhaltensbezogener und affektiver Prozesse für die Gestaltung subjektiver und relationaler Ergebnisse in Online-Verhandlungen.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	6
2	Theoretical Background.....	8
2.1	<i>Negotiation as a Process.....</i>	<i>9</i>
2.2	<i>Negotiation Context.....</i>	<i>10</i>
2.2.1	Negotiation Setting (Integrative vs. Distributive)	11
2.2.2	Negotiation Style (Hardline vs. Softline)	13
2.2.3	Communication Availability	14
2.3	<i>Negotiation Behavior</i>	<i>16</i>
2.3.1	Behavioral Coding in Negotiation Research	17
2.3.2	Categories of Negotiation Behavior	19
2.3.3	Cooperative vs. Competitive Behaviors	21
2.4	<i>Negotiation Outcomes</i>	<i>23</i>
2.4.1	Satisfaction with Agreements.....	23
2.4.2	Long-Term Relationship Orientation	24
2.5	<i>Linking Context, Behavior, and Outcomes.....</i>	<i>25</i>
2.6	<i>Hypotheses Development</i>	<i>26</i>
2.6.1	Effects of Negotiation Context on Behavior	27
2.6.2	Effects of Negotiation Behavior on Outcomes.....	28
3	Methodology	29
3.1	<i>Data and Experimental Design.....</i>	<i>30</i>
3.2	<i>Behavioral Coding Procedure</i>	<i>30</i>
3.3	<i>Variables</i>	<i>31</i>
3.3.1	Dependent Variables	31
3.3.2	Independent Variables	31
3.4	<i>Data Preparation</i>	<i>32</i>

3.5	<i>Statistical Analyses</i>	32
3.5.1	Descriptive Analyses	32
3.5.2	Stage 1: Context → Behavior.....	33
3.5.3	Stage 2: Behavior → Outcomes	34
4	Results	35
4.1	<i>Descriptive Overview</i>	35
4.2	<i>Stage 1: Context → Behavior</i>	39
4.2.1	Effects of negotiation style	40
4.2.2	Effects of negotiation setting.....	40
4.2.3	Effects of communication.....	41
4.3	<i>Stage 2: Behavior → Outcomes</i>	42
4.3.1	Long-term willingness	42
4.3.2	Satisfaction	43
5	Discussion	43
5.1	<i>Overview of Key Findings</i>	44
5.1.1	Context → Behavior (Stage 1)	44
5.1.2	Behavior → Outcomes (Stage 2).....	46
5.1.3	Linking Context, Behavior, and Outcomes	47
5.2	<i>Discussion of Findings in Relation to Theory and Previous Research</i>	48
5.3	<i>Practical Implications</i>	52
5.4	<i>Limitations</i>	53
5.5	<i>Future Research</i>	55
6	Conclusion	56
	Use of Artificial Intelligence Tools	58
	References	59

List of Tables

Table 1	Descriptive Statistics of Outcome Variables.....	35
Table 2	Turn-Level Distribution of Negotiation Behaviors.....	36
Table 3	Participant-Level Distribution of Negotiation Behaviors	37
Table 4	Distribution of Experimental Conditions	39
Table 5	Logistic Regression Results Predicting Behavioral Use.....	39
Table 6	Linear Regression Results Predicting Satisfaction and Long-Term Willingness	42

1 Introduction

Negotiation is a fundamental process through which individuals, organizations, and institutions manage conflicting interests, allocate resources, and reach agreements. Because negotiation plays a central role in economic, organizational, and interpersonal decision-making, understanding the factors that influence negotiation processes and outcomes has long been an important topic in both research and practice (Thompson, 2020). While early negotiation research primarily focused on objective outcomes such as agreement quality or economic gains, more recent perspectives increasingly emphasize the importance of understanding how negotiation outcomes emerge through behavioral interaction processes between negotiating parties (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993; Lewicki et al., 2021).

From a process-oriented perspective, negotiation outcomes are not determined solely by structural conditions or individual preferences. Rather than being determined exclusively by situational factors or final agreements, negotiation outcomes are shaped by the ways negotiators communicate, respond to one another, and adjust their behavior during the interaction process (Walton & McKersie, 1991). Negotiators exchange information, make concessions, express emotions, react to counterpart behavior, and employ various strategic and persuasive tactics. These behavioral processes influence not only substantive outcomes but also how negotiators evaluate the negotiation experience and whether they are willing to engage in future interactions (Curhan et al., 2006).

The importance of behavioral interaction becomes particularly evident in online negotiation environments. Advances in digital communication technologies have led to a growing number of negotiations being conducted through computer-mediated platforms rather than traditional face-to-face interactions. Online negotiations often differ from conventional negotiation settings because negotiators have fewer nonverbal cues available, rely more heavily on written communication, and may experience reduced social presence during interaction (Croson, 1999; Morris et al., 2002). As a result, behavioral communication patterns may play an especially important role in shaping how negotiators interpret one another's intentions, manage relationships, and evaluate negotiation outcomes.

Previous research has identified several contextual factors that influence negotiation processes, including negotiation setting, negotiation style, and communication availability (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993; Thompson, 2020). At the same time, a large body of research has

demonstrated that negotiation behaviors such as information sharing, problem solving, emotional expression, and competitive tactics are associated with negotiation outcomes (Van Kleef et al., 2004; Curhan et al., 2006). However, these two streams of research have often developed separately. Many studies focus on how contextual conditions influence negotiation behavior, whereas others examine how behavioral interaction patterns affect negotiation outcomes. Comparatively less attention has been devoted to understanding how contextual conditions, behavioral processes, and subjective negotiation outcomes are connected within a single analytical framework, particularly in online negotiation environments.

Building on this gap in the literature, the present study investigates how contextual negotiation conditions shape behavioral interaction patterns and how these patterns relate to subjective and relational negotiation outcomes. Specifically, the study examines how three contextual factors—negotiation setting, negotiation style, and communication availability—are associated with the use of different negotiation behaviors and how these behaviors are subsequently related to satisfaction with the agreement and willingness to engage in a long-term relationship with the negotiation partner.

To address these objectives, the study investigates the following research questions:

RQ1: How do negotiation context (integrative vs. distributive setting, communication vs. no communication, softline vs. hardline style) influence which behaviors participants use?

RQ2: How do different negotiation behaviors influence satisfaction and willingness for long-term relationships, while controlling for negotiation setting, communication availability, and negotiation style?

To answer these questions, the study analyzes behavioral data derived from experimental online negotiations between human participants and a standardized computer agent. Negotiation transcripts were systematically coded using a behavioral coding framework that captures substantive, strategic, task-oriented, affective, and persuasive forms of negotiation behavior. Statistical analyses were then conducted to examine the relationships between contextual conditions, behavioral interaction patterns, and negotiation outcomes.

By integrating context, behavior, and outcomes within a single analytical framework, this study contributes to negotiation research in several ways. First, it provides a more comprehensive

understanding of how online negotiation processes unfold. Second, it extends existing research by examining a broad range of coded negotiation behaviors rather than focusing on a limited set of interaction patterns. Third, it contributes to the growing literature on e-negotiation by identifying behavioral mechanisms that are associated with subjective and relational outcomes in digitally mediated negotiation environments.

2 Theoretical Background

Negotiation has long been studied as a complex social interaction process shaped by communication, strategic behavior, and interpersonal dynamics between negotiating parties (Walton & McKersie, 1991; Thompson, 2020). While early negotiation research often focused primarily on economic outcomes and agreement efficiency, more recent perspectives increasingly emphasize the importance of understanding how negotiation processes unfold through behavioral interaction (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). From this perspective, negotiation outcomes are not viewed solely as the result of structural conditions or individual preferences, but also as consequences of the communication patterns, strategic choices, and relational dynamics that emerge during negotiation interactions (Lewicki et al., 2021).

Previous research suggests that negotiation processes are influenced by multiple contextual and interpersonal factors, including negotiation setting, negotiation style, communication availability, and behavioral interaction patterns (Fisher et al., 2011; Thompson, 2020). These factors may shape how negotiators exchange information, express emotions, manage conflict, and respond to one another throughout the negotiation process (Van Kleef et al., 2004). Consequently, negotiation behavior has become an increasingly important focus in negotiation research, particularly in studies adopting process-oriented and behavioral perspectives (Adair & Brett, 2005).

The importance of behavioral interaction becomes particularly relevant in online negotiation environments. Compared to face-to-face negotiations, e-negotiations often involve reduced social cues, greater reliance on written communication, and altered interaction dynamics between negotiating parties (Croson, 1999). Under such conditions, behavioral communication patterns may play an especially important role in shaping negotiation processes and relational outcomes (Morris et al., 2002).

Building on these theoretical perspectives, the present chapter reviews the literature relevant to negotiation context, negotiation behavior, and negotiation outcomes. Particular attention is given to how contextual conditions influence behavioral interaction patterns and how different forms of negotiation behavior are associated with subjective and relational negotiation outcomes in online negotiation environments.

2.1 Negotiation as a Process

Negotiation is generally considered to be an activity where parties that have different interests try to arrive at an acceptable consensus (Fisher et al., 2011). However, unlike the decision or transaction in question, negotiation is viewed as an interaction where the parties involved engage in exchanging information and making concessions and adjustments to strategy (Thompson, 2020). For this reason, the phenomenon of negotiation has historically been regarded not just to an end, but as an interactive social behavior process (Walton & McKersie, 1991).

Negotiation research from an early stage stressed the importance of taking into account the process of interaction in order to understand the results of negotiations. According to Walton & McKersie (1991), negotiation involves many behavioral processes that interact with each other in order to achieve a successful outcome. It was noted that negotiation should be analyzed from the point of view of continuous behavioral processes, not only from the economic perspective.

Negotiation scholars emphasized that negotiations entail aspects that are both strategic and interpersonal. As pointed out by Fisher et al. (2011), the process of negotiation entails not only attaining a good outcome, but also communicating effectively, maintaining good relations with the other person, and ensuring that there is an understanding. Negotiation involves the interpretation of the other person's behaviors and utterances, leading the negotiator to change his/her actions. Therefore, negotiation behavior is generated in interactions between parties (Fisher et al., 2011).

Additional studies have also supported the need for embracing the behavioral and process-oriented perspective. According to Thompson (2020), negotiations are considered dynamic processes of exchange, where patterns of communication, expressions of emotions, and behaviors are instrumental in influencing the relational and substantive outcomes of the

negotiation process. Under this approach, negotiation behaviors are not just consequences of the process of negotiation but are fundamental means by which negotiation outcomes are created. The behaviors include exchanging information, making concessions, expressing emotions, issuing threats, or working cooperatively towards finding solutions (Thompson, 2020).

The importance of negotiation processes becomes particularly relevant in online negotiation environments. Compared to face-to-face interactions, e-negotiations often involve reduced social cues, altered communication dynamics, and increased reliance on written exchanges (Thompson, 2020). These characteristics may influence both the types of behaviors negotiators use and the ways in which negotiation partners interpret them. As a result, examining behavioral interaction patterns is especially important for understanding negotiation dynamics in digital contexts (Thompson, 2020).

Drawing upon the process perspective discussed above, this study seeks to study negotiation as an interactive behavior process affected by contextual elements. The study will thus explore the way in which negotiation context affects the occurrence of specific types of negotiation behaviors and how such behaviors impact satisfaction and relational intentions. Through exploring the link between the mentioned variables, the present study provides a process-oriented study of online negotiation interactions.

2.2 Negotiation Context

Negotiation processes do not occur independently from the surrounding negotiation environment. Previous research suggests that contextual conditions play a significant role in shaping negotiators' communication patterns, strategic choices, and behavioral interaction during negotiations (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). Negotiators adapt their behavior based on how they perceive the negotiation situation, the structure of available resources, the level of communication available, and the strategic orientation adopted throughout the interaction process (Thompson, 2020).

Different negotiation contexts create different expectations, incentives, and interaction norms, which may influence how negotiators exchange information, express emotions, manage conflict, and pursue negotiation goals (Lewicki et al., 2021). As a result, contextual conditions

may substantially affect both the behavioral dynamics of negotiation processes and the relational climate that emerges between negotiating parties (Walton & McKersie, 1991).

In online negotiation environments, the role of contextual factors may become even more important due to reduced nonverbal communication cues and greater reliance on written interaction (Croson, 1999). Under such conditions, negotiation setting, negotiation style, and communication availability may strongly shape the ways in which negotiators communicate and respond to one another throughout the negotiation process.

Accordingly, the following sections discuss three contextual dimensions that are particularly relevant to the present study: integrative versus distributive negotiation settings, hardline versus softline negotiation styles, and communication availability during negotiation interactions.

2.2.1 Negotiation Setting (Integrative vs. Distributive)

One of the most fundamental distinctions in negotiation research is the differentiation between integrative and distributive negotiation settings (Walton & McKersie, 1991; Thompson, 2020). These two forms of negotiation reflect different assumptions regarding the nature of resources, the goals of negotiators, and the strategies used throughout the negotiation process (Lewicki et al., 2021). Consequently, negotiation setting has been widely recognized as an important contextual factor influencing negotiation behavior and communication dynamics (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993).

Integrative negotiation refers to situations in which negotiators perceive opportunities for mutual gain and cooperative problem solving (Fisher et al., 2011). In integrative settings, parties are more likely to focus on underlying interests rather than fixed positions, allowing negotiators to identify solutions that benefit both sides (Thompson, 2020). Integrative negotiation settings are typically associated with cooperative interaction patterns, open communication, mutual trust, and a greater willingness to exchange information (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986). Because negotiators perceive the interaction as potentially beneficial for both parties, integrative settings tend to encourage constructive communication and relationship-oriented behavior (Lewicki et al., 2021).

Previous research suggests that integrative negotiations are characterized by higher levels of cooperation, exploratory problem solving, and positive interpersonal exchange (De Dreu et al., 2007). Information exchange plays a particularly important role in integrative negotiation because negotiators must communicate their preferences, priorities, and interests in order to identify mutually beneficial outcomes (Fisher et al., 2011). In addition, positive emotional expression and relational behaviors may facilitate trust and improve the quality of communication between negotiating parties (Van Kleef et al., 2004).

In contrast, distributive negotiation refers to situations in which negotiators perceive resources as fixed and limited, leading parties to assume that gains for one side necessarily come at the expense of the other side (Walton & McKersie, 1991). Distributive negotiations are therefore commonly described as competitive or zero-sum interactions (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). In such settings, negotiators are more likely to engage in positional bargaining, strategic withholding of information, and defensive communication strategies (Lewicki et al., 2021).

Research has shown that distributive settings are often associated with lower levels of trust and reduced willingness to share information openly (Thompson, 2020). As negotiators focus more strongly on achieving individual gains, communication patterns in distributive settings tend to become increasingly strategic and less focused on maintaining interpersonal relationships (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986). Competitive environments may also reduce positive affective expression and increase cautious or defensive behavioral patterns (Van Kleef et al., 2004).

Previous research suggests that negotiation settings shape the communication patterns and behavioral dynamics that emerge throughout the negotiation process (Walton & McKersie, 1991). Different contextual environments create different expectations, incentives, and interaction norms, which may influence how negotiators communicate, exchange information, and respond to one another during negotiations (Thompson, 2020). As a result, negotiation setting can be understood as a structural condition that influences behavioral choices throughout negotiation interactions.

This distinction becomes particularly relevant in online negotiation environments, where communication often relies heavily on written interaction and where social cues may be reduced compared to face-to-face negotiation (Croson, 1999). In e-negotiation contexts, contextual conditions may therefore exert an even stronger influence on behavioral patterns, emotional expression, and communication dynamics (Thompson, 2020). For online

negotiations, analyzing how different negotiation settings shape behavioral responses can provide important insights into digital interaction processes.

Accordingly, the present study examines how integrative and distributive negotiation settings are associated with differences in negotiation behavior during online negotiation interactions. By adopting a process-oriented perspective, the study seeks to better understand how contextual negotiation environments influence communication patterns, behavioral choices, and negotiation processes in digital settings.

2.2.2 Negotiation Style (Hardline vs. Softline)

In addition to structural negotiation settings, negotiation behavior is also shaped by the strategic orientation adopted by negotiators during the interaction process. Negotiation style refers to the general approach negotiators use when pursuing their goals and managing interpersonal interaction throughout a negotiation (Lewicki et al., 2021). One of the most widely discussed distinctions in negotiation research is the differentiation between hardline and softline negotiation styles (Fisher et al., 2011).

A hardline negotiation style is typically characterized by competitiveness, rigidity, and a strong focus on maximizing individual outcomes (Lewicki et al., 2021). Negotiators adopting a hardline approach are more likely to defend their positions firmly, apply pressure strategically, and prioritize favorable substantive outcomes over relational concerns (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). Hardline negotiators may therefore engage more frequently in competitive behaviors such as rejections, threats, positional bargaining, and strategic withholding of information (Thompson, 2020). Such behaviors are often intended to strengthen bargaining power and improve individual negotiation outcomes.

At the same time, hardline negotiation styles may reduce the likelihood of cooperative and affective behaviors during negotiation interactions (Lewicki et al., 2021). Previous research suggests that highly competitive negotiation orientations can limit openness between negotiators and contribute to less positive interpersonal communication throughout the negotiation process (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986). Furthermore, competitive negotiation strategies may decrease positive emotional expression and increase defensive interaction patterns between negotiation partners (Van Kleef et al., 2004). As a result, hardline approaches may

negatively affect both communication quality and relational dynamics throughout the negotiation process.

In contrast, a softline negotiation style is generally characterized by flexibility, cooperation, and greater concern for maintaining positive interpersonal relationships (Fisher et al., 2011). Softline negotiators are typically more willing to compromise, engage in constructive communication, and consider the interests of the opposing party (Thompson, 2020). Such approaches are commonly associated with cooperative behaviors, relational communication, and positive affective expression (Lewicki et al., 2021). Because softline negotiators place greater emphasis on maintaining collaborative interaction, they may contribute to more positive communication climates during negotiation.

Importantly, negotiation style does not only influence negotiation outcomes directly but may also shape the behavioral processes through which negotiations unfold (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). Different strategic orientations create different communication patterns, behavioral tendencies, and interpersonal dynamics throughout negotiation interactions (Thompson, 2020). Consequently, negotiation style can be understood as an important contextual factor influencing how negotiators communicate, express emotions, and respond to one another during negotiation processes.

The role of negotiation style may become particularly important in online negotiation environments, where communication is often more limited and where behavioral cues are primarily conveyed through written interaction (Croson, 1999). In e-negotiation settings, strategic communication choices and affective expressions may therefore play a central role in shaping both behavioral interaction patterns and relational perceptions between negotiators.

Accordingly, the present study examines how hardline and softline negotiation styles are associated with differences in negotiation behavior during online negotiation interactions. Particular attention is given to how negotiation style relates to competitive, cooperative, and affective behaviors throughout the negotiation process.

2.2.3 Communication Availability

Communication availability represents another important contextual factor influencing negotiation processes and behavioral interaction patterns. In negotiation research,

communication is generally understood as the exchange of information, intentions, preferences, and relational signals between negotiating parties (Thompson, 2020). The extent to which negotiators are able to communicate may substantially affect how negotiation interactions develop, particularly in online negotiation environments where communication channels are often restricted or technologically mediated (Croson, 1999).

Previous research suggests that communication availability can facilitate cooperation, coordination, and mutual understanding during negotiations (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). When negotiators are able to communicate directly, they may exchange information more effectively, clarify misunderstandings, and engage in exploratory discussion regarding possible solutions (Fisher et al., 2011). Communication may therefore support behaviors related to problem solving, information exchange, and relational interaction throughout the negotiation process (Thompson, 2020).

The availability of communication may also influence interpersonal dynamics between negotiators. Studies have shown that communication can increase trust, improve perceptions of fairness, and strengthen relational orientation during negotiation interactions (Morris et al., 2002). In addition, communication enables negotiators to express emotional reactions, respond to counterpart behavior, and provide relational cues that may influence negotiation climate and interaction quality (Van Kleef et al., 2004). As a result, communication availability may contribute not only to task-oriented interaction but also to affective and relational dimensions of negotiation behavior.

At the same time, the effects of communication are not necessarily uniform across all negotiation contexts. In some situations, communication may facilitate cooperation and joint problem solving, whereas in other contexts it may also be used strategically to influence, pressure, or persuade negotiation counterparts (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). Consequently, communication should not be understood as inherently cooperative, but rather as a contextual condition that enables a broader range of behavioral interaction patterns.

The role of communication becomes particularly important in online negotiation environments, where interaction often relies on written or computer-mediated communication channels (Croson, 1999). Compared to face-to-face negotiation, e-negotiation environments may involve fewer nonverbal cues, reduced immediacy, and lower social presence, potentially influencing how negotiators interpret messages and respond to one another (Morris et al.,

2002). Under such conditions, communication availability may play an especially important role in facilitating coordination, clarification, and exploratory interaction between negotiating parties.

Research on computer-mediated negotiation further suggests that online communication environments may substantially influence relational dynamics between negotiators. Naquin and Paulson (2003) found that trust development in online bargaining settings is often more fragile due to reduced interpersonal cues and increased uncertainty during interaction processes. Similarly, Thompson and Nadler (2002) argue that negotiations conducted through information technology may alter how negotiators interpret communication behavior, relational intentions, and cooperation signals. In addition to communication availability itself, the quality of communication may also affect negotiation processes, as clearer and more constructive communication has been associated with more effective negotiation interaction and coordination (Schoop et al., 2010).

Accordingly, the present study examines how communication availability is associated with differences in negotiation behavior during online negotiation interactions.

2.3 Negotiation Behavior

Negotiation behavior represents a central component of negotiation processes and plays an important role in shaping interaction dynamics and negotiation outcomes (Thompson, 2020). Throughout negotiation interactions, negotiators engage in ongoing communication processes that involve sharing information, reacting to counterpart behavior, expressing emotions, defending positions, and attempting to shape the direction of the negotiation through strategic interaction (Walton & McKersie, 1991). As a result, negotiation outcomes are not determined solely by structural conditions or economic interests, but also by the behavioral interaction patterns that emerge throughout the negotiation process (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993).

A process-oriented perspective on negotiation emphasizes that negotiation behavior unfolds dynamically through ongoing interaction between negotiating parties (Adair & Brett, 2005). Negotiation behavior is often adjusted throughout the interaction as negotiators respond to changing contextual conditions and interpret the actions and communication patterns of their counterparts (Olekalns & Smith, 2000). Consequently, negotiation behavior can be understood

as both strategically motivated and socially embedded within the broader negotiation environment (Lewicki et al., 2021).

Previous research has identified a wide range of negotiation behaviors associated with different functions during negotiation interactions, including substantive bargaining behaviors, strategic influence tactics, task-oriented communication, persuasive argumentation, and affective expression (Weingart et al., 1996; Van Kleef et al., 2004). These behavioral dimensions allow researchers to examine how negotiators manage conflict, exchange information, influence counterparts, and regulate interpersonal relationships throughout negotiations (Thompson, 2020).

The analysis of negotiation behavior becomes particularly important in online negotiation environments, where interaction often relies primarily on written communication and where behavioral cues may be more difficult to interpret compared to face-to-face negotiation settings (Croson, 1999). In e-negotiation contexts, behavioral interaction patterns may therefore play a particularly significant role in shaping communication dynamics, relational perceptions, and negotiation outcomes (Morris et al., 2002).

Accordingly, the present study adopts a behavioral perspective on negotiation by systematically examining the different forms of behavior displayed throughout online negotiation interactions. The following sections discuss behavioral coding approaches, major categories of negotiation behavior, and the distinction between cooperative and competitive behavioral patterns in negotiation research.

2.3.1 Behavioral Coding in Negotiation Research

In negotiation research, behavioral coding is widely used as a method for systematically analyzing how negotiation interactions develop over the course of communication between negotiating parties (Walton & McKersie, 1991). Rather than focusing exclusively on final outcomes, behavioral coding approaches aim to capture the communication patterns, strategic actions, and interpersonal dynamics that emerge throughout negotiation interactions (Weingart et al., 1990). This process-oriented perspective assumes that negotiation outcomes are shaped not only by structural conditions but also by the specific behaviors negotiators display during the interaction process (Thompson, 2020).

In negotiation research, behavioral coding typically involves the systematic classification of verbal statements, communication patterns, and interaction behaviors into predefined behavioral categories (Olekalns et al., 2003). Researchers frequently analyze negotiation transcripts sequentially in order to examine how negotiators react and adapt to each other throughout the progression of the interaction process (Adair & Brett, 2005). Such approaches make it possible to identify recurring behavioral patterns, strategic tendencies, and interaction dynamics that may not be visible when examining negotiation outcomes alone (Weingart et al., 1990).

Communication-based approaches to behavioral coding have also contributed significantly to negotiation research. Putnam and Jones (1982a, 1982b) emphasized the importance of examining communication behavior as a dynamic interaction process in which negotiators continuously respond and adapt to one another throughout bargaining interactions. Similarly, Donohue et al. (1984) proposed coding approaches that distinguish between substantive and relational dimensions of negotiation communication, highlighting that negotiation behaviors may simultaneously serve strategic, informational, and interpersonal functions. These approaches have been particularly influential in studies examining negotiation interaction patterns and communication dynamics.

Behavioral coding approaches have been applied in prior negotiation research to investigate various forms of interaction behavior, such as collaborative problem solving, information-sharing activities, strategic pressure tactics, persuasive communication, and emotional expression (Olekalns & Smith, 2000; Van Kleef et al., 2004). These behavioral categories allow researchers to distinguish between different forms of negotiation interaction and to examine how contextual conditions influence behavioral choices during negotiations (Adair & Brett, 2005). Behavioral coding approaches have therefore become particularly valuable for studying negotiation as a dynamic social interaction process rather than as a purely economic decision-making task (Thompson, 2020).

Behavioral coding is especially relevant in online negotiation research, where communication primarily occurs through written or computer-mediated interaction (Croson, 1999). In e-negotiation environments, negotiators rely heavily on textual communication to express strategic intentions, emotional reactions, and relational signals (Morris et al., 2002). As a result, systematic coding of behavioral interaction patterns provides an important method for analyzing how negotiation processes develop in digital environments.

Building on this research tradition, the present study applies a behavioral coding approach to examine negotiation interactions at the behavioral level. Negotiation transcripts were systematically coded using predefined behavioral categories in order to analyze how contextual conditions relate to behavioral choices and how these behaviors are associated with negotiation outcomes.

2.3.2 Categories of Negotiation Behavior

Negotiation behavior consists of a broad range of communicative, strategic, and interpersonal actions that emerge throughout the interaction process (Thompson, 2020). In order to systematically analyze negotiation interactions, previous research has commonly categorized negotiation behaviors into distinct behavioral dimensions reflecting different functions within the negotiation process (Weingart et al., 1990). Such classifications allow researchers to examine how negotiators communicate, exchange information, manage relationships, and pursue strategic goals during negotiations (Olekalns & Smith, 2000).

The present study builds on this behavioral tradition by distinguishing between substantive, strategic, task-oriented, affective, and persuasive behaviors. These categories capture different aspects of negotiation interaction and provide a structured framework for analyzing behavioral dynamics during online negotiations.

Substantive behaviors refer to actions directly related to offers, concessions, and agreement-related positioning during negotiation (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). In the present study, substantive behaviors include rejections, acceptances, accommodations, and retractions. Such behaviors are closely connected to the substantive content of negotiation and often reflect negotiators' willingness to concede, resist, or modify negotiation positions throughout the interaction process (Lewicki et al., 2021).

Strategic behaviors refer to actions used by negotiators to influence counterpart responses, strengthen bargaining positions, or steer negotiation processes in ways that support desired outcomes (Thompson, 2020). The strategic behavior category in this study includes threats, demands, commitments, and promises. Previous research suggests that these behaviors are frequently used to strengthen negotiation positions, exert pressure, or influence counterpart expectations during bargaining interactions (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986). Strategic behaviors are

therefore commonly associated with competitive negotiation processes and positional bargaining dynamics (Walton & McKersie, 1991).

Task-oriented behaviors refer to behaviors that facilitate coordination, clarification, and information exchange throughout negotiation interactions (Adair & Brett, 2005). In the present study, this category includes providing information, requesting information, providing reactions, requesting reactions, clarification, and exploratory problem solving. Such behaviors support communication flow and may contribute to mutual understanding between negotiating parties (Fisher et al., 2011). In particular, exploratory problem solving has been linked to cooperative negotiation processes and joint solution development (De Dreu et al., 2007).

Affective behaviors capture the emotional and relational dimensions of negotiation interaction (Van Kleef et al., 2004). This category includes positive affect and negative affect. Emotional expressions may influence negotiation climate, perceptions of trust, and interpersonal evaluations between negotiation partners (Thompson, 2020). Previous studies suggest that positive affective expression can facilitate cooperation and improve relational outcomes, whereas negative affect may increase tension and defensive interaction patterns during negotiations (Van Kleef et al., 2004).

Finally, persuasive behaviors refer to argumentative attempts aimed at influencing the beliefs, evaluations, or decisions of the counterpart (Olekalns & Smith, 2000). In the present study, persuasive behaviors include attacking arguments, self-supporting arguments, and other-supporting arguments. Such behaviors are commonly used to justify negotiation positions, challenge counterpart claims, or strengthen persuasive influence during interaction processes (Weingart et al., 1996).

Importantly, these behavioral categories are not entirely independent from one another. Negotiators often combine multiple behavioral strategies simultaneously, and the same behavior may serve different functions depending on the negotiation context and interaction dynamics (Olekalns et al., 2003). Nevertheless, categorizing negotiation behaviors into broader behavioral dimensions provides a useful framework for systematically examining negotiation interactions and identifying recurring behavioral patterns across negotiation contexts (Olekalns & Smith, 2000).

The categorization of negotiation behavior is particularly relevant in online negotiation environments, where written communication often serves as the primary medium of interaction (Croson, 1999). In e-negotiation settings, behavioral coding allows researchers to analyze how negotiators communicate strategically, exchange information, express emotions, and manage interpersonal relationships through digital interaction processes (Morris et al., 2002).

2.3.3 Cooperative vs. Competitive Behaviors

Negotiation research commonly distinguishes between cooperative and competitive patterns of behavior during negotiation interactions (Deutsch, 1973; Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). Negotiation interactions are not solely shaped by structural conditions or negotiation outcomes, but also by the behavioral strategies negotiators adopt while interacting with one another (Thompson, 2020). As a result, negotiation behaviors are frequently conceptualized along a continuum ranging from cooperative and relationship-oriented interaction to competitive and self-oriented strategic behavior (Lewicki et al., 2021).

Cooperative behaviors are generally characterized by openness, collaboration, information sharing, and efforts to maintain constructive interaction between negotiating parties (Deutsch, 1973). Such behaviors are typically associated with attempts to identify mutually beneficial solutions, facilitate communication, and preserve positive interpersonal relationships throughout the negotiation process (Fisher et al., 2011). Previous research suggests that cooperative negotiation behavior may increase trust, improve communication quality, and contribute to more positive relational outcomes (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986).

Within the present study, several coded behaviors can be conceptually linked to cooperative negotiation processes. Behaviors associated with this category include accommodations, exploratory problem solving, information-sharing behavior, positive affective expression, and other forms of relationship-oriented communication. Exploratory problem solving and information exchange, for example, are often associated with collaborative attempts to identify mutually beneficial outcomes (De Dreu et al., 2007). Similarly, positive affective expression may support trust, reduce interpersonal tension, and facilitate constructive interaction between negotiators (Van Kleef et al., 2004). Accommodative behaviors may likewise reflect flexibility and willingness to adapt negotiation positions in order to maintain progress toward agreement (Lewicki et al., 2021).

In contrast, competitive behaviors are generally characterized by self-interest orientation, positional bargaining, strategic pressure, and efforts to maximize individual outcomes (Deutsch, 1973). Competitive negotiation approaches often emphasize bargaining power, resistance to concessions, and strategic influence over the counterpart (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). These forms of behavior may contribute to more confrontational interaction patterns, limit open communication between negotiators, and negatively affect relational interaction during the negotiation process (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986).

Several behaviors examined in the present study can be associated with competitive negotiation processes. These include rejections, threats, demands, and attacking arguments. Previous research suggests that such behaviors are commonly used to defend negotiation positions, exert pressure on counterparts, or challenge opposing proposals during bargaining interactions (Thompson, 2020). In particular, threats and attacking arguments may contribute to more confrontational interaction patterns and increase defensive responses between negotiators (Van Kleef et al., 2004).

Importantly, the distinction between cooperative and competitive behaviors should not be understood as entirely rigid or mutually exclusive. Different behavioral strategies often occur simultaneously during negotiation interactions, and the interpretation of specific behaviors may differ across negotiation contexts and interaction situations (Olekalns & Smith, 2000). For example, information sharing may support cooperation in some negotiation contexts while serving strategic purposes in others. Similarly, certain strategic behaviors may coexist with cooperative interaction patterns throughout complex negotiation processes (De Dreu et al., 2007).

Nevertheless, distinguishing between cooperative and competitive forms of negotiation behavior provides an important conceptual framework for understanding behavioral variation across negotiation contexts (Olekalns & Smith, 2000). This distinction is particularly relevant for the present study, as the analysis focuses on how contextual conditions influence behavioral choices and how different forms of negotiation behavior relate to satisfaction and long-term relational outcomes in online negotiation environments.

Although a variety of cooperative and competitive behaviors have been documented in negotiation research, existing studies have typically focused on selected behaviors or specific aspects of the negotiation process. As a result, less attention has been given to understanding

how multiple coded behaviors are connected to both negotiation context and subjective negotiation outcomes within a single analytical framework. Examining these relationships may contribute to a more detailed understanding of the behavioral mechanisms through which negotiation processes unfold.

2.4 Negotiation Outcomes

Negotiation research has traditionally evaluated negotiation success not only in terms of objective economic outcomes but also through subjective and relational outcome dimensions (Thompson, 2020). While objective outcomes focus on measurable gains such as profit or agreement value, subjective outcomes capture how negotiators evaluate the negotiation experience itself, including perceptions of fairness, satisfaction, trust, and relationship quality (Curhan et al., 2006). Particularly in ongoing or relational negotiation contexts, subjective evaluations play an important role because they may influence future interaction willingness and long-term cooperation between negotiation partners (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993).

The present study focuses on two subjective outcome variables: satisfaction with the agreement and willingness to engage in a long-term relationship with the negotiation partner. Both variables reflect evaluative and relational dimensions of negotiation outcomes and are therefore particularly relevant for understanding negotiation processes in online interaction environments.

2.4.1 Satisfaction with Agreements

Satisfaction with the agreement refers to the extent to which negotiators positively evaluate the negotiation outcome and the negotiation process itself (Curhan et al., 2006). In negotiation research, satisfaction is commonly understood as a subjective assessment shaped not only by the final agreement reached but also by the interaction experience throughout the negotiation process (Thompson, 2020). As a result, negotiators may evaluate the same objective outcome differently depending on how the negotiation interaction unfolded.

Previous research suggests that communication quality, perceived fairness, emotional expression, and interpersonal treatment can strongly influence satisfaction during negotiations (Curhan et al., 2006). Cooperative interaction patterns, constructive communication, and positive affective expression have often been associated with higher levels of negotiation

satisfaction (Van Kleef et al., 2004). Conversely, strongly competitive communication patterns, confrontational tactics, and interpersonal tension may contribute to less favorable evaluations of the negotiation process (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986).

Satisfaction is particularly important in online negotiation environments, where reduced social cues and technologically mediated communication may influence how negotiators interpret interaction quality and relational treatment (Morris et al., 2002). In e-negotiation settings, behavioral interaction patterns may therefore play a central role in shaping subjective evaluations of the negotiation process and its outcomes.

2.4.2 Long-Term Relationship Orientation

In addition to immediate satisfaction, negotiation research increasingly emphasizes the importance of relational outcomes and future interaction intentions (Curhan et al., 2006). Long-term relationship orientation reflects negotiators' willingness to maintain future cooperation and continued interaction with their negotiation counterpart beyond the current negotiation process (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). This dimension is particularly relevant in negotiations where future collaboration, trust, or repeated interaction may influence long-term success.

Previous studies suggest that relational outcomes are strongly influenced by behavioral and interpersonal dynamics during negotiation interactions (Thompson, 2020). Cooperative behaviors, trust-building communication, information sharing, and positive affective expression may strengthen relational perceptions and increase willingness for future interaction (Van Kleef et al., 2004). In contrast, confrontational and strongly competitive forms of interaction may negatively affect relational perceptions and decrease willingness for future cooperation between negotiators (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986).

Research on online bargaining further indicates that trust development plays an important role in shaping willingness for future interaction between negotiators. Naquin and Paulson (2003) found that reduced social cues in online negotiations may complicate the development of interpersonal trust and influence negotiators' perceptions of future cooperation. Similarly, communication quality and relational interaction patterns may affect whether negotiators perceive continued collaboration as desirable or beneficial in digital negotiation environments (Schoop et al., 2010).

Long-term relational orientation may become especially relevant in online negotiation environments, where relationship development can be more challenging due to reduced interpersonal cues and limited social presence (Morris et al., 2002). Under such conditions, behavioral interaction patterns may substantially influence whether negotiators perceive future cooperation as desirable or beneficial.

Accordingly, the present study examines how different negotiation behaviors are associated with both satisfaction and willingness to engage in future interaction. While previous research has frequently focused on objective negotiation outcomes such as economic gains or agreement quality, comparatively less attention has been devoted to understanding how specific behavioral interaction patterns relate to subjective and relational outcomes in online negotiation environments.

2.5 Linking Context, Behavior, and Outcomes

Negotiation research increasingly emphasizes that negotiation outcomes cannot be fully understood without considering the interaction processes through which negotiations unfold (Walton & McKersie, 1991; Thompson, 2020). Rather than emerging independently, negotiation outcomes are shaped through the interplay between contextual conditions, behavioral interaction patterns, and interpersonal dynamics during the negotiation process (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). Consequently, understanding negotiation requires an integrated perspective that connects contextual influences, behavioral choices, and negotiation outcomes.

Although previous research has demonstrated that contextual factors influence negotiation behavior and that behavioral interaction patterns are associated with negotiation outcomes, these relationships have often been examined separately. Studies have frequently focused either on contextual determinants of negotiation processes or on the consequences of negotiation behavior for negotiation outcomes. Consequently, there remains limited research that integrates contextual conditions, behavioral interaction patterns, and subjective negotiation outcomes within a single process-oriented framework, particularly in online negotiation environments.

Building on the theoretical perspectives discussed throughout this chapter, the present study adopts an integrated framework linking negotiation context, negotiation behavior, and negotiation outcomes. This framework is grounded in process-oriented negotiation theory, which emphasizes that negotiation outcomes emerge through ongoing behavioral interaction

between negotiating parties rather than solely through structural conditions or final agreements (Walton & McKersie, 1991; Thompson, 2020).

More specifically, this study treats negotiation setting, negotiation style, and communication availability as contextual elements that can influence behavioral interaction patterns during negotiation processes (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). These contextual conditions may shape the likelihood of engaging in cooperative, competitive, affective, strategic, and task-oriented forms of behavior throughout negotiation interactions (Lewicki et al., 2021).

The framework further assumes that negotiation behaviors are associated with subjective and relational negotiation outcomes. Previous research suggests that behavioral interaction patterns may influence satisfaction, trust, relationship quality, and future interaction intentions between negotiation partners (Curhan et al., 2006; Van Kleef et al., 2004). Cooperative and relational behaviors may contribute to more positive evaluations of the negotiation process, whereas highly competitive or confrontational behaviors may negatively affect relational perceptions and negotiation satisfaction (Deutsch, 1973; Pruitt & Rubin, 1986).

Accordingly, the present study adopts a process-oriented perspective in which negotiation outcomes are understood as associated with the interaction between contextual conditions and behavioral dynamics. By integrating contextual influences, behavioral processes, and subjective negotiation outcomes, the study seeks to provide a more comprehensive understanding of online negotiation interactions.

2.6 Hypotheses Development

Building on the theoretical perspectives discussed throughout the previous sections, the present study develops a set of hypotheses linking negotiation context, negotiation behavior, and negotiation outcomes. Consistent with the process-oriented perspective adopted in this thesis, negotiation outcomes are understood as emerging through behavioral interaction processes shaped by contextual negotiation conditions (Walton & McKersie, 1991; Thompson, 2020).

The present study addresses the following research questions:

RQ1: How do negotiation context (integrative vs. distributive setting, communication vs. no communication, softline vs. hardline style) influence which behaviors participants use?

RQ2: How do different negotiation behaviors influence satisfaction and willingness for long-term relationships, while controlling for negotiation setting, communication availability, and negotiation style?

Based on these research questions and the theoretical perspectives discussed throughout the previous chapter, the following hypotheses are developed. The hypotheses are organized into two analytical stages. The first stage examines how contextual negotiation conditions influence the likelihood of specific negotiation behaviors during online negotiation interactions. The second stage examines how different forms of negotiation behavior are associated with subjective and relational negotiation outcomes, specifically satisfaction and willingness for long-term interaction.

2.6.1 Effects of Negotiation Context on Behavior

Existing negotiation literature indicates that contextual conditions may affect negotiators' strategic approaches, communication behavior, and interpersonal interaction throughout negotiation processes (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). Negotiation setting, negotiation style, and communication availability may therefore shape the likelihood of engaging in cooperative, competitive, and affective forms of behavior during negotiation interactions.

Hardline negotiation approaches are generally associated with more competitive and strategically defensive interaction patterns, whereas softline approaches are more frequently linked to cooperation, flexibility, and relational communication (Lewicki et al., 2021). Competitive negotiation orientations may increase the use of behaviors such as rejections and reduce the likelihood of cooperative and affective interaction patterns (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986).

H1: A hardline negotiation style is associated with a higher likelihood of competitive behaviors (e.g., rejections) and a lower likelihood of cooperative and affective behaviors (e.g., accommodations, positive affect).

Similarly, distributive negotiation settings are commonly associated with competition, positional bargaining, and strategic self-interest, whereas integrative settings tend to encourage cooperation, information exchange, and positive interpersonal interaction (Fisher et al., 2011; Walton & McKersie, 1991). As a result, distributive negotiation environments may increase

the likelihood of competitive forms of behavior while reducing cooperative and affective interaction patterns.

H2: Distributive negotiation settings are associated with a higher likelihood of competitive behaviors (e.g., rejections) and a lower likelihood of cooperative and affective behaviors (e.g., accommodations, positive affect).

Communication availability may also shape negotiation behavior by increasing opportunities for information exchange, clarification, and interaction between negotiators (Morris et al., 2002). Particularly in online negotiation environments, communication availability may facilitate greater engagement in information-sharing behavior throughout the negotiation process.

H3: The availability of communication is associated with increased information-sharing behaviors during negotiation processes.

2.6.2 Effects of Negotiation Behavior on Outcomes

In addition to contextual influences, negotiation research suggests that behavioral interaction patterns play an important role in shaping subjective and relational negotiation outcomes (Curhan et al., 2006). Different forms of negotiation behavior may influence satisfaction with the negotiation process as well as willingness to maintain future interaction with negotiation counterparts.

Cooperative negotiation behaviors are generally associated with trust, constructive communication, and positive relational dynamics (Deutsch, 1973). Behaviors such as information sharing, and accommodative interaction may therefore contribute to more favorable evaluations of the negotiation process and strengthen long-term relational orientation between negotiators.

H4: Cooperative behaviors (e.g., information sharing, accommodations) are positively associated with (a) satisfaction and (b) long-term willingness.

Emotional expression may likewise influence negotiation outcomes by shaping interpersonal perceptions and communication climate during negotiations (Van Kleef et al., 2004). Positive affective expression may support relational interaction and increase positive evaluations of the

negotiation process, whereas negative affect may contribute to interpersonal tension and less favorable negotiation experiences.

H5a: Positive affect is positively associated with (a) satisfaction and (b) long-term willingness.

H5b: Negative affect is negatively associated with (a) satisfaction and (b) long-term willingness.

In contrast, competitive negotiation behaviors are often associated with conflict intensity, reduced trust, and more confrontational interaction dynamics (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986). Behaviors such as rejections, threats, and attacking arguments may therefore weaken relational perceptions and reduce positive evaluations of negotiation interactions.

H6: Competitive behaviors (e.g., rejections, threats, attacking arguments) are negatively associated with (a) satisfaction and (b) long-term willingness.

Taken together, these hypotheses reflect the integrated conceptual framework of the present study, which assumes that contextual negotiation conditions shape behavioral interaction patterns and that these behaviors are subsequently associated with subjective and relational negotiation outcomes in online negotiation environments.

3 Methodology

This chapter outlines the methodological approach used to examine the relationships between negotiation context, negotiation behavior, and negotiation outcomes in online negotiation environments. The chapter first describes the experimental design and data collection procedure, followed by the behavioral coding process and the operationalization of the study variables. Subsequently, the procedures for data preparation and statistical analysis are presented. Consistent with the process-oriented perspective adopted throughout this study, the methodology combines qualitative behavioral coding with quantitative statistical analysis in order to examine how contextual negotiation conditions shape behavioral interaction patterns and how these behaviors are associated with negotiation outcomes.

3.1 Data and Experimental Design

The data used in this study originates from an experimental online negotiation study in which human participants negotiated with a standardized computer agent under controlled conditions. The dataset was collected as part of an ongoing doctoral research project examining online negotiation behavior (Garajali, 2025).

In total, the dataset comprises 266 participants and 1395 negotiation rounds. The experimental design followed a between-subjects structure and systematically manipulated three key contextual factors: *negotiation setting* (integrative vs. distributive), *communication availability* (with communication vs. without communication), and *negotiation style* (softline vs. hardline tactics). These manipulations allowed for a controlled investigation of how different negotiation contexts influence behavioral choices and outcomes (Walton & McKersie, 1991; Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993).

Following each negotiation, participants evaluated the interaction by reporting their satisfaction with the agreement and their willingness to engage in a long-term relationship with the negotiation partner. Both outcome variables were measured on continuous scales ranging from 0 to 100.

Although the original negotiation data was collected within a broader research project, the present study focuses on the transformation and analysis of this data. The behavioral coding of the negotiation transcripts, all subsequent data preparation and statistical analyses were carried out as part of this study.

3.2 Behavioral Coding Procedure

To analyze negotiation behavior, all negotiation transcripts were systematically coded using the qualitative data analysis software MAXQDA. The coding procedure followed an established behavioral framework frequently used in negotiation and communication research (Donohue et al., 1984; Putnam & Jones, 1982a).

Each negotiation was coded turn-by-turn, meaning that every individual contribution made by a participant was assigned one or more behavioral categories. This approach allows for a fine-grained analysis of interaction dynamics (Adair & Brett, 2005; Olekalns & Smith, 2000).

The final dataset includes 19 distinct behavioral codes, which are grouped into five overarching categories: *substantive behaviors* (rejections, acceptances, accommodations, retractions), *strategic behaviors* (threats, demands, commitments, promises), *task-oriented behaviors* (providing information, requesting information, providing reactions, requesting reactions, clarification, exploratory problem solving), *affective behaviors* (positive affect, negative affect), and *persuasive behaviors* (attacking arguments, self-supporting arguments, and other-supporting arguments). This coding framework forms the basis for all subsequent analyses, enabling both the examination of individual behaviors and their role within the broader negotiation processes. (Putnam & Jones, 1982a; Donohue et al., 1984).

3.3 Variables

The present study includes both contextual and behavioral variables in order to examine the relationships between negotiation conditions, behavioral interaction patterns, and negotiation outcomes. The variables were operationalized in accordance with the experimental design and the behavioral coding framework described in the previous sections. In line with the analytical structure of the study, variables serve different roles depending on the specific stage of analysis. While contextual variables function primarily as predictors of negotiation behavior in Stage 1, behavioral variables are subsequently used to examine their associations with negotiation outcomes in Stage 2.

3.3.1 Dependent Variables

Two participant-level outcome variables are used to assess negotiation success: satisfaction with the agreement (0–100) and willingness to engage in a long-term relationship (0–100). Both variables are continuous and reflect participants' subjective evaluations of the negotiation outcome.

3.3.2 Independent Variables

The main independent variables consist of both contextual factors and behavioral variables. The contextual variables reflect the experimental conditions and include *negotiation setting* (0 = integrative, 1 = distributive), *communication availability* (0 = no communication, 1 = communication), and *negotiation style* (0 = softline, 1 = hardline). Behavioral variables are derived from the coded negotiation data and indicate whether a participant used a specific

behavior during the negotiation. For the analysis of behavior–outcome relationships, these variables are aggregated at the participant level.

Within the analytical framework of this study, behavioral variables serve a dual role. They are used as dependent variables in the analysis of how context influences behavior (Stage 1) and as independent variables in the analysis of how behavior influences outcomes (Stage 2). This structure enables a process-oriented examination linking negotiation context, behavior, and outcomes.

3.4 Data Preparation

The original behavioral coding was exported from MAXQDA into an Excel dataset, where each row represented a coded behavior and included information such as participant ID, turn number, behavior category, and timestamp.

Subsequently, all data preparation steps were conducted using R. The dataset was cleaned, structured, and transformed to fit the requirements of the different analyses. Given the multi-level nature of the data, different levels of aggregation were applied depending on the analytical purpose. For descriptive analyses, the data was examined at the turn level in order to capture the distribution of behaviors across negotiation interactions. For the regression models, however, behavioral variables were aggregated to the participant level. This aggregation was typically achieved by indicating whether a behavior was used during the negotiation (binary coding). This approach does not capture the frequency or intensity of behaviors.

3.5 Statistical Analyses

To address the research questions, a combination of descriptive and inferential statistical methods was employed.

3.5.1 Descriptive Analyses

First, descriptive statistics were used to provide an overview of the dataset and the main variables included in the analysis. For the outcome variables, summary statistics including means, standard deviations, and value ranges were calculated.

To examine negotiation behavior, descriptive analyses were conducted at both the turn level and the participant level. At the turn level, absolute frequencies and percentages were used to capture how often each behavior occurred across all interaction turns. This captures the distribution of behaviors across interaction turns.

At the participant level, behavioral variables were aggregated to indicate whether a participant exhibited a given behavior at least once during the negotiation. Accordingly, absolute frequencies and percentages were calculated to reflect the proportion of participants who engaged in each behavior. This level of analysis is particularly relevant, as the regression models are conducted at the participant level.

Finally, the distribution of observations across experimental conditions was examined using frequencies and percentages. This step allows for an assessment of the distribution of observations across experimental conditions.

3.5.2 Stage 1: Context → Behavior

To examine how negotiation context influences behavioral choices, a series of logistic regression analyses were conducted. Each model predicted the likelihood of observing a specific negotiation behavior as a binary outcome variable (0 = not used, 1 = used).

Analyses were conducted at the participant level to ensure independence of observations. Because multiple interaction rounds were nested within participants, behavioral data were aggregated such that each participant was coded as having used a given behavior if it occurred at least once across all rounds.

Three contextual variables were included as predictors in all models: negotiation setting (0 = integrative, 1 = distributive), communication availability (0 = no communication, 1 = communication), and negotiation style (0 = softline, 1 = hardline).

To ensure sufficient variability and stable model estimation, analyses were restricted to behaviors observed in at least 70 participants. Behaviors with lower frequencies were excluded, as sparse data can lead to unstable coefficient estimates and inflated standard errors in logistic regression models.

Separate logistic regression models were estimated for each behavior included in the analysis. This approach allows for the identification of behavior-specific associations with contextual factors, rather than assuming uniform effects across different types of negotiation behaviors.

All reported coefficients represent logit estimates. Standard errors are reported for all estimates, and statistical significance was evaluated using two-tailed tests.

3.5.3 Stage 2: Behavior → Outcomes

To examine how negotiation behaviors are associated with negotiation outcomes, a series of multiple linear regression models were estimated. The dependent variables were satisfaction with the agreement and willingness to engage in a long-term relationship, both measured on continuous scales ranging from 0 to 100.

Behavioral variables were included as the primary predictors, while contextual variables (negotiation setting, communication availability, and negotiation style) were entered as control variables. This approach allows for the estimation of the unique contribution of each behavior to the outcome variables while accounting for the influence of contextual factors.

All behavioral predictors were measured at the participant level, consistent with the aggregation procedure applied in Stage 1. This ensures that behavioral indicators reflect whether a participant engaged in each behavior at least once during the interaction, thereby maintaining consistency across analytical stages.

To ensure the validity of the regression estimates, several diagnostic checks were conducted. Multicollinearity was assessed using variance inflation factors (VIF), all of which were well below commonly accepted thresholds, indicating no concerns regarding collinearity among predictors.

Regression assumptions were further evaluated through visual inspection of diagnostic plots. Residuals were approximately normally distributed, with only minor deviations at the tails. No influential outliers were detected, and the assumption of linearity between predictors and outcome variables was reasonably satisfied.

All coefficients are reported as unstandardized estimates. Standard errors are provided for all predictors, and statistical significance was evaluated using two-tailed tests.

4 Results

This chapter presents the empirical findings of the study. It begins with a descriptive overview of the dataset and the main variables. Subsequently, the results of the logistic regression analyses examining the effects of negotiation context on behavior use are reported. This is followed by the multiple regression analyses predicting satisfaction with the agreement and willingness to engage in a long-term relationship. Finally, the results of the exploratory sequence analyses are presented.

The dataset consists of coded negotiation behaviors derived from experimental e-negotiations between human participants and a standardized computer agent. Behavioral data were initially recorded at the turn level and subsequently aggregated to the participant level to align with the unit of analysis used in the regression models. The main outcome variables are satisfaction with the agreement and willingness to engage in a long-term relationship with the negotiation partner.

4.1 Descriptive Overview

This section provides a descriptive overview of the dataset and the main variables used in the analysis. First, descriptive statistics for the outcome variables are presented. This is followed by an examination of the distribution of negotiation behaviors at both the turn level and the participant level. Finally, the distribution of observations across experimental conditions is reported.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Outcome Variables

Variable	M	SD	Min	Max
Satisfaction	51.05	27.33	0	100
Long-term willingness	53.71	27.25	0	100

Note. $N = 266$

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for the outcome variables. Satisfaction showed a mean of 51.05 ($SD = 27.33$), indicating that participants' satisfaction was around the midpoint of the scale on average, with substantial variation across observations. Long-term willingness showed a slightly higher mean of 53.71 ($SD = 27.25$), suggesting that participants reported moderately

positive willingness to maintain or continue the relationship. Both variables ranged from 0 to 100, indicating that the full-scale range was observed in the data.

Table 2

Turn-Level Distribution of Negotiation Behaviors

Behavior	n turns	% turns
Substantive Behaviors > Accommodations	582	41.7
Task Behaviors > Exploratory Problem Solving	457	32.8
Substantive Behaviors > Rejections	289	20.7
Affective Behaviors > Positive Affect	235	16.8
Task Behaviors > Provides Information	169	12.1
Strategic Behaviors > Demands	162	11.6
Task Behaviors > Requests Reaction	159	11.4
Strategic Behaviors > Commitments	130	9.3
Task Behaviors > Provides Reaction	124	8.9
Task Behaviors > Requests Information	117	8.4
Strategic Behaviors > Promises	100	7.2
Persuasive Behaviors > Self-supporting Arguments	97	7.0
Persuasive Behaviors > Attacking Arguments	32	2.3
Strategic Behaviors > Threats	31	2.2
Substantive Behaviors > Acceptances	29	2.1
Substantive Behaviors > Retractions	23	1.6
Affective Behaviors > Negative Affect	20	1.4
Persuasive Behaviors > Other-supporting Arguments	6	0.4
Task Behaviors > Clarification	2	0.1

Table 2 presents the turn-level distribution of coded negotiation behaviors, indicating how frequently each behavior occurred across all interaction turns. The most frequently observed behavior was accommodations, occurring in 41.7% of all turns, suggesting that concession-making played a central role in the negotiation interactions. This was followed by exploratory problem solving (32.8%) and rejections (20.7%), indicating that both collaborative and competitive behaviors were common throughout the negotiations.

Several behaviors appeared with moderate frequency, including positive affect (16.8%), information provision (12.1%), demands (11.6%), and requests for reaction (11.4%). These findings suggest that emotional expression, information exchange, and strategic positioning were regularly integrated into the negotiation process.

Less frequently observed behaviors included commitments (9.3%), providing reactions (8.9%), and requests for information (8.4%), indicating that while present, these behaviors played a more limited role in the overall interaction dynamics.

Several behaviors occurred only rarely, such as attacking arguments (2.3%), threats (2.2%), and acceptances (2.1%). The least frequent behaviors were negative affect (1.4%), other-supporting arguments (0.4%), and clarification (0.1%).

Percentages do not sum to 100% because multiple behaviors could be coded within a single turn.

Table 3
Participant-Level Distribution of Negotiation Behaviors

Behavior	n participants	% participants
Substantive Behaviors > Accommodations	215	80.8
Task Behaviors > Exploratory Problem Solving	167	62.8
Substantive Behaviors > Rejections	163	61.3
Affective Behaviors > Positive Affect	140	52.6
Task Behaviors > Provides Information	119	44.7
Strategic Behaviors > Demands	100	37.6
Task Behaviors > Requests Reaction	100	37.6
Strategic Behaviors > Commitments	90	33.8
Task Behaviors > Provides Reaction	87	32.7
Strategic Behaviors > Promises	78	29.3
Persuasive Behaviors > Self-supporting Arguments	78	29.3
Task Behaviors > Requests Information	72	27.1
Strategic Behaviors > Threats	26	9.8
Substantive Behaviors > Acceptances	24	9.0
Persuasive Behaviors > Attacking Arguments	23	8.6
Substantive Behaviors > Retractions	20	7.5

Behavior	n participants	% participants
Affective Behaviors > Negative Affect	15	5.6
Persuasive Behaviors > Other-supporting Arguments	6	2.3
Task Behaviors > Clarification	2	0.8

While the distribution of behaviors at the turn level provides insights into overall interaction patterns, the regression analyses are conducted at the participant level. Therefore, it is important to also report how frequently participants engaged in each behavior.

Table 3 presents the participant-level distribution of coded negotiation behaviors, indicating the proportion of participants who exhibited each behavior at least once during the negotiation. These proportions reflect the prevalence of behaviors across participants rather than their frequency or intensity of use.

The most prevalent behavior was accommodations, which was exhibited by 80.8% of participants, indicating that the majority of participants engaged in concession-making at least once during the interaction.

This was followed by exploratory problem solving (62.8%) and rejections (61.3%), suggesting that both collaborative and opposing interaction patterns were common across participants.

Several behaviors were moderately prevalent, including positive affect (52.6%), information provision (44.7%), and demands (37.6%), indicating that emotional expression, information exchange, and strategic positioning were present in a substantial proportion of participants.

Adversarial behaviors such as threats were relatively uncommon (9.8%). Similarly, acceptances were observed infrequently (9.0%).

Overall, the results indicate that while a core set of behaviors is widely shared among participants, a number of behaviors are only used by a small subset, suggesting heterogeneity in negotiation strategies.

As this analysis is based on participant-level presence, the results reflect whether a behavior occurred at least once per participant, rather than its frequency within interactions.

Table 4
Distribution of Experimental Conditions

Condition	n	%
HLNC	40	15.0
SLC	39	14.7
ISLC	36	13.5
ISLNC	35	13.2
IHLC	32	12.0
IHLNC	30	11.3
HLC	29	10.9
SLNC	25	9.4

Table 4 presents the distribution of observations across experimental conditions. The distribution appears relatively balanced, with proportions ranging from 9.4% to 15.0% across conditions. The most frequent conditions were HLNC (15.0%) and SLC (14.7%), whereas SLNC (9.4%) and HLC (10.9%) were somewhat less represented. Overall, no single condition dominates the dataset, suggesting that the experimental design achieved a reasonably even allocation across conditions. This balanced distribution supports the comparability of conditions in subsequent analyses.

4.2 Stage 1: Context → Behavior

To examine whether negotiation context influences behavioral choices, a series of logistic regression analyses were conducted at the participant level. Each model predicted the likelihood of observing a specific behavior (0 = not used, 1 = used) as a function of negotiation setting, communication availability, and negotiation style. Only behaviors observed in at least 70 participants were included to ensure sufficient variability and stable model estimation.

Table 5
Logistic Regression Results Predicting Behavioral Use

Behavior	Predictor	B	SE	p
Task Behaviors > Exploratory Problem Solving	Setting	1.816	0.292	< .001
Strategic Behaviors > Demands	Setting	-1.676	0.283	< .001
Affective Behaviors > Positive Affect	Setting	-1.523	0.268	< .001
Task Behaviors > Provides Information	Setting	1.122	0.259	< .001

Behavior	Predictor	B	SE	p
Task Behaviors > Exploratory Problem Solving	Communication	0.758	0.284	.008
Task Behaviors > Provides Reaction	Setting	0.713	0.269	.008
Affective Behaviors > Positive Affect	NegStyle	-0.675	0.268	.012
Task Behaviors > Requests Reaction	Setting	-0.568	0.257	.027
Strategic Behaviors > Promises	Setting	0.569	0.276	.039
Strategic Behaviors > Commitments	Setting	-0.495	0.263	.060
Task Behaviors > Provides Reaction	NegStyle	0.448	0.269	.096

Note. Coefficients (B) represent logit estimates from logistic regression models. SE = standard error. Predictors were coded as follows: negotiation setting (0 = integrative, 1 = distributive), communication availability (0 = no communication, 1 = communication), and negotiation style (0 = softline, 1 = hardline). p-values are two-tailed.

4.2.1 Effects of negotiation style

Negotiation style exhibited selective effects on behavioral use. A significant relationship was observed for affective behavior, such that a hardline negotiation style was associated with a lower likelihood of displaying positive affect ($B = -0.68$, $SE = 0.27$, $p = .012$). This suggests that a hardline negotiation style is associated with lower levels of positive affect.

In addition, negotiation style showed a marginally significant association with task-related behavior. Specifically, a hardline style was positively associated with providing reactions ($B = 0.45$, $SE = 0.27$, $p = .096$), indicating a tendency for more reactive engagement under a hardline approach. No significant effects of negotiation style were observed for other behaviors.

Overall, these findings indicate that negotiation style is more strongly associated with affective expression than with other behavioral domains.

4.2.2 Effects of negotiation setting

Negotiation setting emerged as the most consistent and influential predictor of behavioral use across the analyses. Several significant effects were observed across task, strategic, and affective domains.

With respect to task behaviors, participants in distributive settings were significantly more likely to engage in exploratory problem solving ($B = 1.82$, $SE = 0.29$, $p < .001$), provide information ($B = 1.12$, $SE = 0.26$, $p < .001$), and provide reactions ($B = 0.71$, $SE = 0.27$, $p = .008$). In contrast, distributive settings were associated with a lower likelihood of requesting reactions ($B = -0.57$, $SE = 0.26$, $p = .027$), indicating a lower likelihood of engaging in feedback-seeking behaviors.

Strategic behaviors also varied as a function of setting. Distributive settings were associated with a significantly lower likelihood of making demands ($B = -1.68$, $SE = 0.28$, $p < .001$) and a marginally lower likelihood of making commitments ($B = -0.50$, $SE = 0.26$, $p = .060$). Conversely, distributive settings increased the likelihood of making promises ($B = 0.57$, $SE = 0.28$, $p = .039$).

Finally, affective behaviors were strongly influenced by negotiation setting. Participants in distributive settings were significantly less likely to display positive affect ($B = -1.52$, $SE = 0.27$, $p < .001$).

Taken together, these results indicate that negotiation setting is associated with systematic differences in task-oriented, affective, and strategic behaviors.

4.2.3 Effects of communication

Communication availability had a more limited but meaningful impact on behavioral use. A significant effect was observed for exploratory problem solving, such that participants in conditions allowing communication were more likely to engage in this behavior ($B = 0.76$, $SE = 0.28$, $p = .008$).

No other significant effects of communication were found across the remaining behaviors. This indicates that communication is associated with exploratory problem solving rather than with other behaviors.

Overall, the findings indicate that while communication plays a role in enabling specific task-related behaviors, its impact is more targeted compared to the broader and more consistent effects observed for negotiation setting.

4.3 Stage 2: Behavior → Outcomes

To examine how negotiation behaviors relate to outcome variables, two linear regression models were estimated to predict satisfaction with the agreement and long-term willingness to engage with the negotiation partner. All models included control variables (negotiation setting, communication availability, and negotiation style), and standardized coefficients (β) are reported.

While Stage 1 analyses were restricted to the most frequently observed behaviors to ensure sufficient statistical power, all coded behavioral variables were included in Stage 2 regression models. This approach allows for the inclusion of less frequent behaviors that may still be associated with outcome variables.

Table 6

Linear Regression Results Predicting Satisfaction and Long-Term Willingness

Outcome	Predictor	β	SE	t	p
Long-Term Willingness	Hardline style	-0.825	0.113	-7.30	< .001
	Rejections	-0.258	0.115	-2.23	.03
	Provides information	0.211	0.114	1.85	.07
	Positive affect	0.505	0.120	4.22	< .001
Satisfaction	Hardline style	-0.964	0.108	-8.92	< .001
	Threats	-0.310	0.178	-1.74	.08
	Attacking arguments	-0.332	0.191	-1.73	.08
	Positive affect	0.340	0.115	2.97	< .001

Note. Standardized coefficients (β) are reported. Only significant predictors ($p < .05$) and marginally significant predictors ($p < .10$) are displayed. For long-term willingness, $R^2 = .344$, adjusted $R^2 = .285$, and $F = 5.79$. For satisfaction, $R^2 = .399$, adjusted $R^2 = .345$, and $F = 7.33$.

4.3.1 Long-term willingness

The regression analysis revealed several significant predictors of long-term willingness. Negotiation style had a strong and statistically significant negative effect ($\beta = -0.825, p < .001$), representing the strongest predictor in the model. Among the behavioral variables, positive affect emerged as a strong positive predictor ($\beta = 0.505, p < .001$). In contrast, rejections were

negatively associated with long-term willingness ($\beta = -0.258, p = .03$). Providing information showed a marginally significant positive effect ($\beta = 0.211, p = .07$).

In terms of relative effect sizes, negotiation style and positive affect exhibited the largest coefficients, whereas the effects of rejections and providing information were comparatively smaller. While rejections reached conventional levels of statistical significance, the effect of providing information remained marginal.

Overall, the model explained a substantial proportion of variance in long-term willingness ($R^2 = .344$, adjusted $R^2 = .285$, $F = 5.79$).

4.3.2 Satisfaction

The regression model predicting satisfaction showed a similar pattern, with both structural and behavioral predictors included in the analysis. Negotiation style had a strong and statistically significant negative effect ($\beta = -0.964, p < .001$), representing the strongest predictor in the model. Among the behavioral variables, positive affect was positively associated with satisfaction ($\beta = 0.340, p < .001$).

In addition, two competitive behaviors showed marginally significant negative effects. Both threats ($\beta = -0.310, p = .08$) and attacking arguments ($\beta = -0.332, p = .08$) were negatively associated with satisfaction. In terms of relative effect sizes, negotiation style and positive affect exhibited larger coefficients, whereas the effects of threats and attacking arguments were comparatively smaller and remained at a marginal level of statistical significance.

Overall, the model explained a considerable proportion of variance in satisfaction ($R^2 = .399$, adjusted $R^2 = .345$, $F = 7.33$).

Taken together, the results from Stage 1 and Stage 2 provide a basis for examining the relationships between contextual factors, negotiation behaviors, and outcome variables. These relationships are further addressed in the following discussion section.

5 Discussion

The purpose of this discussion is to interpret the findings of the study in relation to the theoretical framework and previous research on negotiation processes. The chapter first

summarizes the key findings regarding the relationships between negotiation context, behavior, and outcomes. The findings are then discussed in relation to the proposed hypotheses and existing literature, followed by an examination of their practical implications, limitations, and directions for future research.

5.1 Overview of Key Findings

This section summarizes the main findings of the study. First, the effects of contextual negotiation factors on behavioral patterns are discussed (Stage 1). Second, the relationships between negotiation behaviors and outcome variables are summarized (Stage 2). Finally, the findings are integrated to provide an overall interpretation of how contextual conditions, behavioral processes, and negotiation outcomes are connected.

5.1.1 Context → Behavior (Stage 1)

The first stage of the analysis examined how contextual factors shape the likelihood of engaging in specific negotiation behaviors. The findings indicate that contextual influences are not uniform across behaviors but instead operate in a selective and behavior-specific manner.

Among the contextual variables, negotiation setting emerged as the most consistent and influential predictor of behavioral use. Significant effects were observed across task, strategic, and affective domains, indicating that structural characteristics of the negotiation environment play a central role in shaping behavioral patterns.

With respect to task-related behaviors, distributive settings were associated with a higher likelihood of engaging in exploratory problem solving, providing information, and providing reactions. At the same time, distributive settings were associated with a lower likelihood of requesting reactions. Taken together, this pattern suggests a shift toward more self-directed and less feedback-seeking forms of interaction, in which negotiators contribute information and responses but are less likely to actively solicit input from their counterparts.

Strategic behaviors also showed differentiated patterns as a function of negotiation setting. Distributive settings were associated with a lower likelihood of making demands and a marginally lower likelihood of making commitments, while increasing the likelihood of making promises. This combination of effects suggests that negotiators do not uniformly intensify competitive tactics in distributive contexts. Instead, they appear to selectively adjust

their strategic behavior, potentially favoring approaches that maintain flexibility while avoiding strong binding positions.

In the affective domain, distributive settings were associated with a substantially lower likelihood of displaying positive affect. This finding indicates that more competitive environments are characterized by reduced expression of positive emotions, which may reflect a shift toward a more instrumental and less relational interaction style.

In contrast to the broad effects of negotiation setting, negotiation style exhibited more limited and targeted influences. A hardline negotiation style was associated with a lower likelihood of displaying positive affect, suggesting that individual strategic orientation is reflected in emotional expression during negotiation. In addition, there was a marginal association between hardline style and providing reactions, indicating that a more rigid approach may be linked to increased reactive engagement. However, beyond these effects, negotiation style did not significantly influence the majority of behaviors examined, suggesting that its impact is more specific rather than general.

Communication availability showed a focused but meaningful effect on behavioral use. Specifically, communication was associated with a higher likelihood of engaging in exploratory problem solving. This suggests that the opportunity to communicate supports behaviors that involve joint exploration and information exchange. However, communication did not significantly influence other behaviors, indicating that its effects are more targeted and do not extend broadly across behavioral domains.

Overall, the findings from Stage 1 demonstrate that contextual factors differ not only in the strength but also in the scope of their influence on negotiation behavior. Negotiation setting exerts a broad and systematic influence across multiple behavioral domains, whereas negotiation style and communication have more selective effects. Importantly, these results highlight that different types of negotiation behaviors respond differently to contextual conditions, underscoring the need to consider behavior-specific dynamics when examining negotiation processes.

5.1.2 Behavior → Outcomes (Stage 2)

The results of Stage 2 provide important insights into how specific negotiation behaviors are associated with outcome variables. Across both models, a consistent pattern emerged in which both structural conditions and behavioral dynamics were related to satisfaction and long-term willingness.

Most notably, negotiation style was the strongest predictor in both models. A hardline negotiation style was strongly and negatively associated with both satisfaction and long-term willingness, suggesting that highly competitive or rigid approaches may be detrimental to both immediate and relational outcomes. This finding is consistent with previous research indicating that competitive negotiation orientations often come at the expense of relationship quality and positive interaction experiences (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986; Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993).

In contrast, positive affect emerged as the most consistent positive behavioral predictor across both outcome variables. The presence of positive emotional expressions during negotiation was associated with higher satisfaction as well as increased willingness to engage in future interactions. This supports the view that affective processes play an important role in shaping not only subjective evaluations of negotiation outcomes but also the broader relational dynamics between negotiation partners (Van Kleef et al., 2004).

Beyond these dominant effects, several competitive behaviors showed weaker and less consistent associations with outcomes. Rejections were negatively associated with long-term willingness, whereas threats and attacking arguments showed weaker, marginally significant negative associations with satisfaction. These findings suggest that overtly competitive or confrontational behaviors may be associated with less favorable outcomes, although their effects appear to be smaller, and more context-dependent compared to structural factors and affective expressions.

In contrast, task-oriented behaviors such as providing information showed only a marginally positive association with long-term willingness and did not emerge as a significant predictor of satisfaction. This may indicate that while informational exchanges contribute to the negotiation process, they are less central in shaping evaluative and relational outcomes compared to affective and strategic dimensions.

Taken together, the results suggest that negotiation outcomes are not only influenced by structural conditions but are also closely related to how negotiators interact on a behavioral level. In particular, affective expressions appear to play a key role in shaping both satisfaction and relational intentions, whereas competitive behaviors tend to be associated with less favorable outcomes.

5.1.3 Linking Context, Behavior, and Outcomes

Taken together, the findings from Stage 1 and Stage 2 provide a more comprehensive understanding of how negotiation outcomes are shaped through the interaction of contextual factors and behavioral processes. While Stage 1 demonstrates that contextual variables influence the likelihood of engaging in specific behaviors, Stage 2 shows that these behaviors, in turn, are differentially associated with negotiation outcomes. This combined pattern suggests that context may affect outcomes not only directly but also indirectly through its influence on behavioral dynamics.

Most notably, negotiation setting, which emerged as the strongest and most consistent predictor of behavioral use in Stage 1, appears to shape outcomes through its systematic effects on both task-oriented and affective behaviors. Distributive settings were associated with increased engagement in task-related behaviors such as exploratory problem solving and information provision, while simultaneously reducing the expression of positive affect. When considered alongside the Stage 2 findings, this pattern suggests a potential trade-off: although distributive contexts may promote structured, task-focused interaction, they may also undermine relational outcomes by limiting positive emotional expression. Given that positive affect was identified as a key predictor of both satisfaction and long-term willingness, the reduction of positive affect in distributive settings represents a plausible pathway through which contextual conditions may negatively impact outcomes.

In contrast, the effects of negotiation style appear to operate more directly on outcomes rather than primarily through a broad range of behavioral changes. In Stage 1, negotiation style showed relatively limited behavioral effects, mainly influencing affective expression. However, in Stage 2, hardline negotiation style emerged as the strongest negative predictor of both satisfaction and long-term willingness. This suggests that the impact of negotiation style on outcomes may not be fully mediated by the observable behavioral patterns captured in this

analysis. Instead, it may reflect broader perceptions of rigidity or competitiveness that directly influence how negotiation partners evaluate the interaction.

At the same time, the behavioral effects associated with negotiation style—particularly the reduction in positive affect—may still contribute to this negative relationship. Given the strong positive association between affective expression and both outcome variables, even relatively targeted behavioral differences may have meaningful downstream consequences for relational and evaluative outcomes.

Communication availability presents a more focused pathway linking context and outcomes. In Stage 1, communication was associated with increased exploratory problem solving, while in Stage 2, task-oriented behaviors showed only limited associations with outcome variables. This suggests that the effects of communication on outcomes may be indirect and relatively weak compared to those of affective or structural factors. While communication facilitates certain forms of interaction, these behaviors may not be the primary drivers of satisfaction or long-term relational intentions.

Overall, the combined findings highlight that the relationship between context and outcomes is not uniform but depends on the specific behavioral pathways through which contextual factors operate. Structural aspects of the negotiation environment, particularly negotiation setting, appear to influence outcomes by shaping multiple behavioral domains simultaneously, whereas negotiation style exerts a more direct and outcome-relevant influence. Importantly, affective processes emerge as a central linking mechanism, connecting both contextual conditions and behavioral patterns to negotiation outcomes.

These results underscore the importance of considering negotiation as a multi-stage process in which context, behavior, and outcomes are dynamically interconnected. Rather than viewing contextual variables as having only direct effects, the findings suggest that their influence is at least partly transmitted through behavior-specific mechanisms, highlighting the value of integrating contextual and behavioral perspectives in the study of negotiation processes.

5.2 Discussion of Findings in Relation to Theory and Previous Research

The findings provide varying levels of support for the proposed hypotheses and offer several insights into the behavioral processes underlying online negotiations. While some results were

consistent with established negotiation theory, others diverged from theoretical expectations and suggest that the relationship between negotiation context, behavior, and outcomes may be more complex than previously assumed. The following discussion interprets the findings in relation to existing literature and the theoretical framework developed in this study.

The findings provide partial support for H1. Consistent with expectations, hardline negotiation style was associated with a lower likelihood of displaying positive affect. This finding aligns with previous research suggesting that competitive negotiation orientations reduce relational and emotional forms of communication (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986; Van Kleef et al., 2004). Negotiators adopting a hardline approach are typically expected to prioritize substantive outcomes over relationship maintenance, which may reduce the use of positive emotional expressions during interactions. However, contrary to expectations, hardline style was not associated with a greater likelihood of competitive behaviors. This suggests that strategic orientation may be reflected more strongly in affective expression than in overt behavioral tactics within online negotiation environments. One possible explanation is that negotiators interacting with a standardized computer counterpart may adapt their emotional tone more readily than their substantive bargaining behavior. Overall, the findings suggest that hardline negotiation style influences how negotiators communicate relationally rather than systematically increasing all forms of competitive behavior.

H2 also received partial support. As predicted, distributive settings were associated with significantly lower levels of positive affect and marginally lower levels of commitments, supporting theoretical arguments that competitive environments reduce relationally oriented communication (Walton & McKersie, 1991; Thompson, 2020). These findings are consistent with research suggesting that distributive negotiations encourage a more instrumental focus on individual gains and reduce emphasis on interpersonal relationship building (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993).

However, distributive settings did not consistently increase competitive behaviors as expected. Particularly surprising was the finding that distributive settings increased exploratory problem solving and information provision while decreasing demands. This pattern contrasts with traditional assumptions that distributive environments primarily encourage competitive and positional bargaining behavior. Rather than relying more heavily on overtly competitive tactics, participants appeared to engage in more task-oriented communication. One possible explanation is that even in competitive environments, negotiators still require information

exchange and discussion to effectively manage the negotiation process. Because participants negotiated with a standardized computer agent rather than a human counterpart, information provision may have served a functional rather than a cooperative purpose. In this context, information exchange may have been necessary to navigate the negotiation process rather than reflecting genuine collaborative intentions. These findings suggest that distributive settings do not necessarily eliminate cooperative or task-oriented behaviors and that negotiation context may shape behavior in more nuanced ways than predicted by traditional competitive–cooperative distinctions.

The findings support H3. Communication availability was associated with a higher likelihood of exploratory problem solving, consistent with previous research suggesting that communication facilitates information exchange, coordination, and collaborative interaction during negotiations (Fisher et al., 2011; Morris et al., 2002). Communication allows negotiators to clarify positions, explore alternatives, and respond more effectively to counterpart actions. Although communication did not significantly influence most other behaviors, its effect on exploratory problem solving highlights the importance of communication opportunities for enabling more interactive forms of negotiation behavior. This finding is particularly relevant in online negotiation environments, where communication channels often shape the extent to which negotiators can jointly explore potential solutions and coordinate their actions.

The results of Stage 2 provided mixed support for the proposed behavior–outcome hypotheses. H4 received only limited support. While information provision showed a marginal positive association with long-term willingness, other cooperative behaviors such as accommodations were not significantly related to either outcome variable. This suggests that cooperative behaviors may not influence subjective negotiation outcomes equally and that some forms of cooperation may be more consequential than others. Although previous research frequently associates cooperative interaction with positive negotiation outcomes (Deutsch, 1973; Pruitt & Rubin, 1986), the present findings indicate that simply engaging in cooperative behaviors may not be sufficient to shape participants' evaluations of the negotiation experience.

Stronger support was found for H5a. Positive affect emerged as one of the most consistent predictors across both outcome variables, being positively associated with satisfaction and long-term willingness. This finding closely aligns with affect-based perspectives on negotiation, which propose that emotional expressions influence interpersonal evaluations, trust development, and relationship formation during negotiation processes (Van Kleef et al.,

2004). Positive affect may signal cooperativeness, goodwill, and openness, thereby improving both immediate evaluations of the negotiation and willingness to engage in future interactions. The consistency of this finding across both outcomes suggests that affective processes play a particularly important role in shaping subjective and relational dimensions of negotiation success.

In contrast, H5b was not supported, as negative affect did not significantly predict either outcome variable. However, negative affect was observed only rarely within the dataset, which may have limited the statistical power necessary to detect meaningful relationships. Consequently, the absence of significant effects should be interpreted cautiously and does not necessarily imply that negative affect is unimportant in negotiation processes.

H6 received partial support. Rejections were negatively associated with long-term willingness, while threats and attacking arguments showed marginal negative associations with satisfaction. These findings are broadly consistent with research suggesting that confrontational negotiation tactics can damage relational perceptions and reduce positive evaluations of negotiation interactions (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986; Van Kleef et al., 2004). However, the effects of these behaviors were comparatively weaker than those observed for positive affect. This pattern suggests that while competitive behaviors may contribute to less favorable outcomes, the presence or absence of positive relational signals may be even more influential in shaping how negotiators evaluate their experiences and future interaction intentions.

Viewed through the broader distinction between cooperative and competitive negotiation behavior, the findings suggest that cooperative and relationally oriented behaviors were generally associated with more favorable outcomes than competitive behaviors. Positive affect and information provision showed positive associations with negotiation outcomes, whereas rejections, threats, and attacking arguments were associated with less favorable evaluations. Although not all cooperative or competitive behaviors produced significant effects, the overall pattern is broadly consistent with negotiation theories that distinguish between cooperative and competitive forms of interaction (Deutsch, 1973; Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). The findings therefore provide partial support for the theoretical distinction between cooperative and competitive behavioral processes in negotiation.

Beyond the individual hypotheses, the primary contribution of the present study lies in integrating contextual conditions, behavioral interaction patterns, and subjective negotiation

outcomes within a single analytical framework. While previous research has often examined contextual influences on negotiation behavior or behavioral predictors of negotiation outcomes separately, comparatively little research has connected these elements within a process-oriented model of online negotiation. In particular, the study extends prior research by demonstrating how contextual negotiation conditions shape behavioral interaction patterns that are subsequently associated with subjective and relational outcomes. The present findings demonstrate that contextual influences on negotiation processes are selective rather than universal. Rather than uniformly shaping all forms of negotiation behavior, contextual factors appear to affect specific behavioral domains, with affective behaviors emerging as particularly important for understanding subjective and relational outcomes.

More broadly, the findings contribute to negotiation theory by highlighting the central role of affective interaction processes in online negotiations. Across both analytical stages, positive affect emerged as a key behavioral mechanism connecting contextual conditions and negotiation outcomes. This suggests that even in digitally mediated negotiation environments, where social cues are reduced, and communication is more constrained, relational and emotional signals remain highly influential. By linking negotiation context, behavior, and outcomes within a single framework, the study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of how online negotiation outcomes emerge through the interaction of contextual conditions and behavioral dynamics.

5.3 Practical Implications

The findings of the present study offer several practical implications for both negotiation training and the design of online negotiation environments.

First, the results suggest that negotiation training programs should place greater emphasis on interpersonal and affective aspects of negotiation in addition to traditional bargaining tactics. While negotiation training often focuses on strategic positioning, persuasion techniques, and value-claiming strategies (Fisher et al., 2011; Thompson, 2020), the present findings indicate that positive interpersonal communication may play an important role in shaping negotiators' satisfaction and willingness to engage in future interactions. Training programs may therefore benefit from incorporating skills related to constructive communication, positive relationship management, and emotional awareness during negotiation processes.

Second, the findings suggest that negotiators should be encouraged to consider the potential relational consequences of highly competitive interaction styles. While hardline approaches may be perceived as effective tools for pursuing immediate negotiation goals, they may also reduce the likelihood of positive negotiation experiences and future cooperation. Training programs can therefore help negotiators develop a better understanding of how competitive tactics influence not only substantive outcomes but also relational perceptions and long-term interaction potential.

The results also have implications for organizations that rely on online negotiations, such as digital marketplaces, procurement platforms, or customer-service environments. The findings highlight the importance of providing communication opportunities that facilitate interaction and discussion between negotiating parties. Features that enable negotiators to exchange information, clarify positions, and explore alternatives may support more constructive negotiation processes and improve the overall user experience.

Furthermore, designers of online negotiation systems may benefit from incorporating mechanisms that encourage positive and constructive communication. For example, platforms could provide communication guidelines, structured discussion prompts, or interface features that facilitate respectful interaction. Such design elements may help create more positive negotiation environments and support the development of cooperative relationships between negotiating parties.

Finally, the findings suggest that organizations should evaluate negotiation success using a broader set of criteria than immediate agreement outcomes alone. Satisfaction with the negotiation process and willingness to engage in future interactions may be particularly important in contexts involving repeated exchanges, long-term partnerships, or ongoing customer relationships. Considering these relational outcomes alongside substantive negotiation results may support more sustainable and effective negotiation practices.

5.4 Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings of the present study. First, behavioral variables were aggregated at the participant level using binary indicators reflecting whether a specific behavior occurred at least once during the negotiation (1 = behavior present, 0 = behavior absent). While this approach captures whether participants

engaged in particular behaviors, it does not account for the frequency, intensity, or duration of their use. As a result, differences between participants who used a behavior only once and those who relied on it extensively cannot be distinguished. This may lead to an underestimation of the effects of highly frequent or particularly salient behaviors and limits the ability to assess the relative importance of different behavioral patterns.

A second limitation concerns the operationalization of communication within the study. While communication availability was included as a contextual variable, the study did not directly assess participants' perceptions of communication quality, trust development, message clarity, or the interpretation of relational signals during the negotiation process. Previous research suggests that online negotiation environments may influence how negotiators interpret communication behavior and relational intentions due to reduced interpersonal cues and increased uncertainty (Naquin & Paulson, 2003; Thompson & Nadler, 2002). Moreover, communication effectiveness may depend not only on whether communication is available, but also on the quality and constructiveness of the exchanges between negotiation partners (Schoop et al., 2010). Consequently, the present findings should be interpreted as reflecting communication availability rather than communication quality.

A third limitation relates to the treatment of negotiation behaviors as distinct behavioral categories. Although this approach allowed for the systematic examination of a broad range of coded behaviors, it does not fully capture the dynamic and interdependent nature of negotiation interactions. Previous research suggests that individual behaviors may serve multiple functions depending on the negotiation context and may occur simultaneously with other behavioral strategies (Olekalns & Smith, 2000; De Dreu et al., 2007). For example, behaviors that appear cooperative in one situation may serve strategic purposes in another, while competitive and cooperative behaviors may coexist within the same interaction sequence. Consequently, categorizing behaviors into separate groups may oversimplify the complexity of negotiation processes.

Relatedly, the participant-level aggregation used in the present study focused on whether a behavior occurred at least once during the negotiation and therefore did not account for the temporal ordering or sequencing of behaviors. Negotiation interactions unfold dynamically over time, and the meaning and impact of a particular behavior may depend on when it occurs and how it relates to preceding or subsequent actions. As a result, the present analysis cannot capture the interaction patterns through which negotiation processes develop.

Another limitation concerns the characteristics of the negotiation setting itself. Participants negotiated with a standardized computer agent rather than a human counterpart. While this approach increased experimental control and ensured consistency across negotiation conditions, it may limit the generalizability of the findings to real-world negotiations. Negotiators may respond differently when interacting with human counterparts who display greater behavioral variability, emotional responsiveness, and interpersonal complexity.

5.5 Future Research

The limitations of the present study provide several promising directions for future research. First, future studies could employ more fine-grained behavioral measures that capture not only whether a behavior occurred, but also how frequently and intensely it was used. Examining behavioral frequencies or intensity-based indicators may provide a more nuanced understanding of how negotiation behaviors contribute to negotiation outcomes and may reveal effects that remain hidden when using binary behavioral measures.

Second, future research could extend the analysis of communication processes by incorporating participants' perceptions of communication quality, trust, fairness, and relational climate. Combining objective behavioral indicators with subjective evaluations may provide a more comprehensive understanding of how communication influences negotiation processes and outcomes in online environments.

Third, future studies could move beyond static behavioral categories and examine negotiation as a dynamic interaction process. Sequential analysis, process-tracing approaches, or interaction-based methods could be used to investigate how behavioral patterns unfold over time and how specific sequences of cooperative and competitive behaviors influence negotiation outcomes. Such approaches may provide deeper insight into the mechanisms linking negotiation context, behavior, and outcomes.

Another promising avenue involves comparing negotiations conducted with computer agents and human counterparts. Such comparisons could help determine whether the behavioral patterns observed in the present study are specific to human-agent interactions or generalize to interpersonal negotiation settings. This may be particularly relevant given the increasing use of automated systems, negotiation support tools, and artificial intelligence in negotiation environments.

Finally, future research could build on the integrated framework proposed in this study by examining additional contextual variables and outcome measures. Factors such as personality characteristics, negotiation experience, perceived fairness, trust, or objective agreement quality may provide a more comprehensive understanding of how negotiation outcomes emerge. Expanding the framework in this way may further contribute to the development of process-oriented theories of online negotiation.

6 Conclusion

The present study examined how contextual negotiation conditions influence behavioral interaction patterns and how these behaviors are associated with subjective and relational negotiation outcomes in online negotiation environments. Drawing on a process-oriented perspective, the study integrated negotiation context, behavior, and outcomes within a single analytical framework, thereby contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of online negotiation processes.

The findings demonstrated that contextual factors influence negotiation behavior in selective rather than uniform ways. Among the contextual variables examined, negotiation setting emerged as the most consistent predictor of behavioral use, affecting task-oriented, strategic, and affective behaviors. Communication availability was associated with increased exploratory problem solving, while negotiation style primarily influenced affective expression. These results suggest that different contextual conditions shape distinct aspects of negotiation behavior and that behavioral responses vary depending on the specific characteristics of the negotiation environment.

The study further showed that behavioral interaction patterns are associated with negotiation outcomes. Across both outcome measures, positive emotional expression showed the strongest positive associations, while more confrontational forms of interaction tended to coincide with less favorable evaluations of the negotiation experience. In addition, a hardline negotiation style was strongly and negatively related to both outcome variables. These findings highlight the importance of interpersonal and affective processes in shaping negotiators' evaluations of the negotiation experience and their willingness to engage in future interactions.

Beyond the individual findings, the primary contribution of this study lies in connecting contextual influences, behavioral interaction patterns, and negotiation outcomes within a single

process-oriented framework. While previous research has often examined these elements separately, the present study demonstrates how contextual conditions and behavioral processes are interconnected in shaping negotiation experiences. In particular, the findings suggest that emotional aspects of negotiation play an important role in explaining how contextual conditions are reflected in negotiators' experiences and evaluations.

Overall, the findings suggest that successful online negotiations depend not only on strategic decision-making or structural conditions but also on the quality of interpersonal interaction that develops throughout the negotiation process. Even in digitally mediated environments characterized by reduced social cues, positive affective communication appears to play an important role in promoting favorable negotiation experiences and future relational intentions. By highlighting the interplay between context, behavior, and outcomes, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of negotiation dynamics in online environments and provides a foundation for future research on behavioral processes in e-negotiations.

Use of Artificial Intelligence Tools

Artificial intelligence tools, particularly ChatGPT and Google Gemini, were used as supportive tools during the preparation of this thesis. Their use was limited to brainstorming, assistance with document structure and organization, language improvement, grammar correction, sentence reformulation, and support in developing and debugging R code used for data preparation and analysis.

In addition, AI-assisted literature search tools such as Elicit and Consensus were used to identify potentially relevant academic sources. The selection, evaluation, interpretation, and citation of all sources were carried out independently by the author.

All research questions, methodological decisions, data analyses, interpretations, conclusions, and academic judgments were developed and evaluated by the author.

All AI-generated suggestions were critically reviewed, revised where necessary, and verified by the author before being incorporated into the thesis.

References

- Adair, W. L., & Brett, J. M. (2005). The negotiation dance: Time, culture, and behavioral sequences in negotiation. *Organization Science*, 16(1), 33–51. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1040.0102>
- Croson, R. T. A. (1999). Look at me when you say that: An electronic negotiation simulation. *Simulation & Gaming*, 30(1), 23–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104687819903000105>
- Curhan, J. R., Elfenbein, H. A., & Xu, H. (2006). What do people value when they negotiate? Mapping the domain of subjective value in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(3), 493–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.3.493>
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Beersma, B., Steinel, W., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2007). The psychology of negotiation: Principles and basic processes. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (2nd ed., pp. 608–629). Guilford Press.
- Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*. Yale University Press.
- Donohue, W. A., Diez, M. E., & Hamilton, M. (1984). Coding naturalistic negotiation interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 10(3), 403–425. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1984.tb00025.x>
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (2nd ed.). Random House Business Books.
- Garajali, U. (2025, January 31). *Strategic patterns in verbal exchanges at eNegotiations: A bargaining process analysis approach* [Unpublished research presentation].
- Lewicki, R. J., Barry, B., & Saunders, D. M. (2021). *Essentials of negotiation* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Morris, M. W., Nadler, J., Kurtzberg, T. R., & Thompson, L. (2002). Schmooze or lose: Social friction and lubrication in e-mail negotiations. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 6(1), 89–100. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.6.1.89>

- Naquin, C. E., & Paulson, G. D. (2003). Online bargaining and interpersonal trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 113–120. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.113>
- Olekalns, M., & Smith, P. L. (2000). Understanding optimal outcomes: The role of strategy sequences in competitive negotiations. *Human Communication Research*, 26(4), 527–557. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2000.tb00768.x>
- Olekalns, M., Brett, J. M., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Phases, transitions and interruptions: Modeling processes in multi-party negotiations. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 14(3/4), 191–211. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022898>
- Pruitt, D. G., & Carnevale, P. J. (1993). *Negotiation in social conflict*. Open University Press.
- Pruitt, D. G., & Rubin, J. Z. (1986). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and settlement*. Random House.
- Putnam, L. L., & Jones, T. S. (1982). The role of communication in bargaining. *Human Communication Research*, 8(3), 262–280. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1982.tb00668.x>
- Putnam, L. L., & Jones, T. S. (1982b). Reciprocity in negotiations: An analysis of bargaining interaction. *Communication Monographs*, 49(3), 171–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758209376080>
- Schoop, M., Köhne, F., & Ostertag, K. (2008). Communication quality in business negotiations. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, Springer, 19(2), 193–209. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10726-008-9128-8>
- Thompson, L. L. (2020). *The mind and heart of the negotiator* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Thompson, L., & Nadler, J. (2002). Negotiating via information technology: Theory and application. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(1), 109–124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4560.00251>
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004). The interpersonal effects of emotions in negotiations: A motivated information processing approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(4), 510–528. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.4.510>

Walton, R. E., & McKersie, R. B. (1991). *A behavioral theory of labor negotiations: An analysis of a social interaction system*. Cornell University Press.

Weingart, L. R., Hyder, E. B., & Prietula, M. J. (1996). Knowledge matters: The effect of tactical descriptions on negotiation behavior and outcome. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(6), 1205–1217. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.6.1205>