



RESEARCH ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL APPROACH IN NEGOTIATION SKILLS AND RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT

***Mr. Efstathios Marios Papakonstantinou**

Assistant Professor, Business College of Athens, (Hospitality and Tourism Management), 205 Alexandras Ave, Athens, Greece

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received 20th October, 2024
Received in revised form
16th November, 2024
Accepted 27th December, 2024
Published online 24th January, 2025

Keywords:

Negotiation skills, Perception, Culture, International business, Intercultural communication.

*Corresponding author:

Efstathios Marios Papakonstantinou

ABSTRACT

Perception throughout the negotiating process is influenced by culture. One element that is frequently disregarded in international commercial discussions is the complexity of human perception. We are aware that culture shapes perception and that each of us processes and interprets the world through a cultural lens. Perception affects how we communicate, and our views about ourselves and other people mirror these communication experiences. Our cultural experiences in daily encounters are the source of the social component of social cognitions. However, we frequently overlook the impact of culture in our discussions. Once the role that perception may play in the negotiation process is recognized, it becomes easier to comprehend the intricate communication process involved in negotiations, particularly those involving international company. Our views of ourselves and other people are influenced by culture. Different behaviors are interpreted or viewed differently in different cultures. We must examine how perception affects the negotiating process more thoroughly if we hope to comprehend the dynamics of unsuccessful international commercial negotiations. In particular, consider how faulty viewpoints could ultimately prevent consensus.

Copyright©2025, Efstathios Marios Papakonstantinou. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Mr. Efstathios Marios Papakonstantinou. 2025. "International approach in negotiation skills and relationship management", *International Journal of Recent Advances in Multidisciplinary Research*, 12, (01), 10626-10631.

INTRODUCTION

The negotiating process has been studied, researched, and analyzed by scholars for many years within the framework of success. How can one "get to yes" successfully? "What tactics ensure cooperation?" We have spent the last forty years trying to answer the following questions: "What are the best negotiation personality and characteristics?" and "How do cultural dimensions determine best tactics?" We appear to be repeating the same, well-known recipe with minimal component variation and, consequently, no discernible flavor variation. As a result, we now have a narrow perspective on international business conversations. This is not to argue that the lessons we have learned about successful negotiations are irrelevant, but this viewpoint might make it more difficult for us to comprehend the full scope of the complexity of our agreements and actions. For a successful negotiation, we have hammered out lists of strategies, tactics, communication skills, and stages of the negotiating process. However, we are aware that we are lacking something. Some people give up and say that's just the way negotiations work. Others probe farther, seeking the solution: what did we overlook?. The most significant and innovative paradigm shifts, according to history, happen when someone is ready to fail. Thomas Edison's remark, "I failed my way to success," reflects his

knowledge of the significance of comprehending failure. Michael Jordan was aware that his career depended on his ability to fail. "Over 9000 shots have been missed in my career," he says. I have about 300 games lost. I've been trusted to make the game-winning shot 26 times, but I've missed. I have repeatedly failed throughout my life. And for that reason, I am successful. When we look at people who have truly inspired us to succeed, they credit failure as a necessary part of their quest for improvement for their abilities, successes, and results. In the negotiation sector, there are hints of a paradigm change. The movement is shifting its attention from strategy-focused success to analyzing failures in order to encourage constructive change. The importance of failure as the main focus has not been examined, despite previous research's lip service to understanding the "what went wrong" approach. Examples of how learning from mistakes can result in successful negotiations include Tim Harford's (2011) *Adapt*, Faure's (2012) book *Unfinished Business*, and the Harvard Business Review's (Rottenberg, 2011) "Failure chronicles". We must consider the worldwide impact as we delve into the concept of failure and its crucial role in successful agreements and long-term partnerships. The reasons why international commercial negotiations fail are still unclear or nonexistent.

METHODOLOGY

The present study is mainly established on secondary data which are gathered from renowned research articles, journals, position papers, etc. and are all related to "International approach in Negotiation Skills."

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A common tool for analyzing potential sources of conflict or disagreement is perspective. A successful agreement in negotiation, particularly international negotiation, is said to depend on cultural perspective. The idea is that by learning about another person's culture, we may better comprehend their message, their intention, and the methods and tactics they employ when negotiating both within and outside of their culture. Scholars of negotiation have urged us to shift our approach to international negotiations from one that is self-focused to one that is other-focused and, more recently, to one that is mutually face-focused. Although it has improved negotiation skills, the sensitive and broad view of potential viewpoints does not fully address the complexities of perception and culture. A fundamental comprehension of the complexity of how communication interactions mirror perception. A six-person communication model was put forth by Barnlund (1970, 2008) in an effort to better comprehend the intricacy of communication. According to his transactional model, communication is a continuous process in which communicators transmit and receive messages at the same time. These signals' meanings are greatly impacted by the culture and prior experiences of the individual. Our perception is based on our cultural background and experiences. We can better understand how these perceptions impact message choices and how we interpret other people's messages if we approach negotiating from a perception framework. Consider how this manifests in a cross-cultural encounter, like a business negotiation abroad, as we go over this six-person model. Barnlund's six-person model is used in the discussion that follows.

- How you see yourself
- How you perceive the other individual
- How you think other people perceive you
- The way the other person sees themselves
- How you are perceived by others
- How you are perceived by the other person.

Let's take a quick look at each of these and examine how each positional viewpoint reflects the international negotiating process. Your past, present, and future self-perceptions all have an impact on how you see yourself. This affects how we communicate, how we show ourselves, and how we use facework techniques. Our capacity to observe the negotiation process objectively is impacted when we use face-saving strategies to protect our reputation. We need to keep in mind that our self-perception is reflected in both our spoken and unspoken signals. Assessments such as intercultural intelligence, negotiation skills, cultural sensitivity, and numerous personality and trait tests are designed to give us an idea of our identity in the cross-cultural context. In more recent times, mindfulness assessment has emerged as a significant factor in self-awareness.

Being self-aware, or knowing how we see ourselves, is crucial for international negotiators because it enables us to recognize our strengths and weaknesses and, perhaps more crucially, the consequences of our limited perspective. Our poor understanding of our own self-perception will always limit our ability to evaluate and influence a negotiation outcome. Our standing in day-to-day encounters is influenced by our culture. Our status, function, and influence in our culture and organizations are shaped in part by factors including gender, race, age, income, and generational history. Furthermore, how we perceive ourselves in relation to others affects how we perceive ourselves. Hofstede's aspects of masculinity/femininity, power distance, and individualism/collectivism aid in our comprehension of how culture shapes day-to-day relationships. The significance of talking about these cultural aspects here is that they affect our self-perception and are mirrored in the messages we choose to convey in cross-border commercial discussions. The cultural layer of influence may be ingrained with the potential nightmare of our self-perception. Our prior experiences are largely responsible for how we perceive other people. We use a range of techniques to learn about other people. In order to prepare for a negotiation, we try to learn as much as we can about the opposing party. According to Berger and Calabrese (1975), there are three ways we usually learn more about someone we don't know well. Our experiences might be passive (watching), active (researching information about the other person, such as readings, media, and stories shared by others), or active interactive (first-hand interactions). These tactics provide us with information about other people, which, if we have some knowledge about them, lessens our uncertainty about them.

According to proponents of the uncertainty reduction theory, we may employ all three of these general tactics when we first meet someone in order to learn more about them and lessen our uneasiness. An opinion or perspective about that individual is subsequently developed using the information gathered. To explain how uncertainty about another person affects the communication interaction experience in first encounters, Berger and Calabrese offer a number of axioms. Furthermore, according to the Uncertainty Reduction Theory, people try to learn more about others in order to forecast their own behavior during an interaction as well as that of the others. In particular, we will communicate more verbally while bargaining with someone we don't know well in an effort to learn more and lessen our doubts about them. To learn more about the individual, we shall employ information-seeking techniques. In order to obtain information, we frequently use negotiating strategies including probing, questioning, hypothetical inquiry, and even silence. We become less uncertain if we find commonalities between ourselves. Uncertainty will rise if we discover differences. This increase could go so far as to reduce communication and create a bad impression. The idea that we are similar to the other person is one of the things that will reduce uncertainty. This perceived resemblance improves communication and ease of information exchange while reducing our apprehension about another. We can explain why someone uses a particular communication style or behaves in a particular way by pointing out apparent similarities in things like background, attitudes, and experiences. Parties get to know one another better during the negotiating process, and if they see similarities, they will probably move past the initial, cursory information exchange.

Negotiators are less apprehensive and anxious about one another when they perceive a likeness, which facilitates the development of common interests and an honest sharing of information. The ebb and flow of communication continues as we move past the initial phase of getting to know one another and look for more detailed information about the attitudes and behavioral predictability of the other. This is particularly crucial when we want to know what motivations the other party has for us to get to a mutually agreeable solution. Our level of doubt about the other also affects nonverbal communication. Our nonverbal affiliative expressiveness is favorable when we discover commonalities. Perceived similarities rise as a result of the positive affiliative expressions. In the United States, for instance, we tend to communicate in a loving or affectionate tone, make more eye contact, nod our heads, and speak in pleasant tones when we meet someone who is similar to us. Cultural differences in nonverbal conduct necessitate careful interpretation when interpreting meaning. Another possibility is that we might see differences, which makes us more apprehensive or nervous about the other.

Our anxiety levels rise when this difference is significant, which frequently leads to behaviors like leaving the negotiation or becoming disinterested in the discussion. Removing oneself from the environment, or in this case, the bargaining process, lessens the discomfort of not finding similarities or common ground. Similar to perceived similarity, nonverbal behavior is influenced by dissimilarity. Negative emotional leaks frequently manifest as nonverbal cues such as angular body posture, increased physical space between negotiators, and limited eye contact. When there is a higher chance of a negotiation breakdown due to a misunderstanding of the other genuine or perceived difference, the nightmare could start. Our attitude toward the other is influenced by how we see them, which in turn may affect the result of the negotiation. Building relationships is thought to be a key component of successful international negotiations. Relationships are valued differently in different cultures. We would be naive to ignore how our perceptions of people affect our actions and, ultimately, the relationship required for a successful end, especially given the globalized world we live in and the cost of developing an international commercial agreement.

Fault in Fundamental Attribution: The Cognitive bias can cause us to perceive things incorrectly based on how we assess our interactions with other people. Our assessments of other people frequently lead to what scholars refer to as "fundamental attribution error." When we minimize the situational elements that could explain someone else's action and instead focus on their personality traits, we are making a fundamental attribution error. Additionally, we often credit positive behavior to our character characteristics and overemphasize situational conditions as the cause of our own undesirable behavior rather than a deficiency in our character. This is regarded as cognitive bias in our behavior judgment. This mistake can lead to a breakdown in the negotiation process and be quite expensive in international discussions. How we assign causes to behaviors can be influenced by culture. For instance, Western cultures tend to turn to the individual to explain conduct, while collectivistic cultures tend to attribute causes of behavior to the situation

(Imada, 2012; Rips, 2011). Relying on stereotypes of a particular culture that we have learned through passive knowledge will lead us to choose a negotiation tactic that may or may not be appropriate. If we incorrectly attribute someone else's behavior to our own poor judgment, it may lead to harmful relationships in the future. It is crucial to make sure you don't lose the chance to evaluate other people during the negotiating process. Being in the present is the best way to avoid fundamental attribution error during negotiations. We stay informed and attentive when we collect data about another without evaluating it. The key to avoiding needless errors is avoiding the fundamental attribution error trap. Consider, for example, that you are meeting with ABC Company to establish a joint venture in the development of innovative instructional software technologies. You get to the designated meeting space ten minutes ahead of time. Since your company's regular procedure is to arrive here at least fifteen minutes early, you know that you were running a little behind schedule. Fifteen minutes over the appointed time, the other party, who is representing their organization, shows up. You have basically been waiting for twenty-five minutes. Your perspective of the tardy behavior is a little unnerving because you value your time and your bill rate is in 15-minute increments back home. You have a number of clear-cut theories as to why the other party is late. Maybe she is indolent (trait focused), maybe there was a misunderstanding at the beginning (situational related), or maybe there was a lot of traffic. With the first two reasons, you can continue the negotiation without passing judgment on the other party. Because you want to build a connection, you keep lines of communication open and continue to utilize pro-social compliance obtaining strategies as your preferred negotiation strategy. You meet to resume the negotiation the following day, but the other party is again late. When this conduct happens again, you blame the other person's "situational tardiness" on their "personal characteristic laziness," which is a bad quality. Your speech is obviously forceful, and you are frustrated by the negative attribution you have made to the other party's traits. The opposing party's tardy behavior has not changed while the negotiation goes on for several days. Another negative attribution is made since, by this point, you have not only come to the conclusion that she is lazy, but you also think that her tardiness is disrespectful.

Humans have a propensity to lump together positive and negative things without any evidence to back our conclusions. The "halo effect" is the term used to describe the positive cognitive bias of grouping (King, 2014). Putting groupings of traits together based on a single activity is likely to affect how you behave and perceive the other person. Your impression is flawed since you are inferring that someone has unfavorable personality traits from an action that you saw as "lateness." As you can see, there is a chance that unfavorable traits will be grouped together. In order to create an impression of the other person's personality, you begin to combine traits - in this case, negative ones - together. Building a cooperative relationship with the other party depends heavily on the halo effect. Long-term effects on negotiating strategy, method, and message selection result from the potential perception error. It could affect your drive and receptivity to fresh information, which could lead to a negotiating breakdown. We can avoid the fundamental attribution error by first questioning our attribution assignment to another's behavior.

For example, we could ask the other party what time is best to start negotiations, or we could ask them about their transportation problems, which would allow tardiness to be a situational attribution. If you continue to evaluate tardiness as a situational issue - "train ran late" - you would probably have maintained a more neutral view of her. Second, we must be aware of how we feel about time. Although we may be aware that our cultural norms are effective within our culture, they may also be causing us to view time in an ethnocentric manner. This is easily accomplished in cross-cultural settings. We will make a mistake in attribution if we fail to recognize the cultural differences in transportation or the difference in how time is perceived (polychronic versus monochronic). Because it distorts our perception of the other party, this basic attribution error will affect how we interact with them.

Additionally, we must refrain from drawing broad conclusions about the other party based on a single action. We can remain as objective as possible during the negotiating process by avoiding the halo effect and staying focused on what we already know. Finally, we might discover that the other party is, in fact, disrespectful and lazy - so what? We can keep working together to reach a consensus if we can learn to "separate the person from the problem," as Fisher, Ury, and Patton (1991) would remark. Our perception of other people can eventually affect how they treat us. According to Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968), "self-fulfilling prophecy" occurs when our actions toward other people are influenced by how we see them, which prompts them to act in a way that meets our expectations. You act toward person x as though that were true if you think they are unreliable. This person reacts to your untrustworthy actions by becoming aloof or secretive. For instance, I believe that you are attempting to use my cooperative style in international negotiations. My actions are influenced by my perspective, therefore I start to restrict the information I am willing to give you and employ competitive strategies to maintain my position. You then observe a shift in my conduct and react to it by being less open about problems. As a result, my view has triggered a chain of events and responses that eventually undermine the interaction's success. Be cautious - perception without evidence leads to confirmation without justification. My behavior toward you is influenced by how I believe you perceive me. This is made clear in talks while choosing a strategy. What do we think other people think of us, and why does it affect us? The Looking Glass Self Theory by Cooley might be useful. According to the Looking Glass Self Theory (Cooley, 1968), how other people perceive us reflects how we see ourselves. We are reflected in the opinions of others. When we communicate with someone, they respond, and their answers have an impact on our self-perception. As a negotiator, for instance, you have been told over the years that you are a "tough negotiator," and since you respect their viewpoint, you accept this assessment of yourself. Your present strategy decision is determined by this self-perception that was gained from others. You employ a hard bargaining strategy in your negotiations, favoring strategies like intimidation, bluffing, stalling, and low balling. In essence, how other people saw you affected how you see yourself and, eventually, how you act. The opinions of those we respect have a direct impact on how we see ourselves and behave. Not only does our behavior depend on this perspective, but the way we act will also affect how other people react to us.

This viewpoint affects our choice of messaging and even how attracted we are to other people. Through a positive lens, we can further see the implications of how we believe others see us. According to attraction theory, we like people who like us. I will feel good about you if you show me that you like or are attracted to me in a positive way and I have a positive self-image. The catch is that, naturally, you will assume that there is something wrong with someone who wants you if you don't think well of yourself. This is summed up in Groucho Marx's statement, "I wouldn't join a club that would have me as a member" (Trenholm and Jensen 2013). We can also look at how the opposing party's negotiating approach might be affected by this idea. In order to discredit the negative barriers, we might act in ways that contradict the negative pre-existing beliefs that people have about our reputation in international negotiations. For instance, you can adopt "relationship" - focused tactics that demonstrate sincere concern for the other party's problems if you are aware that you are perceived as a "ethnocentric American." Concessions tactics, compromise, and collaboration are all good approaches to show "other-focused" messaging that help you change your image. We make room for others to see us differently when we shift from being self-centered to mutually focused. In essence, you try to assist the other person in resolving their issues and treat their difficulties as your own. In order to create a win-win agreement, Fisher, Ury, and Patton advised us to "make the other party's problem part of your problem to solve."

The other person's perception of themselves. In negotiation situations, the other person's self-awareness enhances the communication exchange. The opposing party frequently acts from a true position of power if they are extremely self-aware and believe they have a clear understanding of who they are and what they have to offer. However, it leads to a situation of miscalculations and misunderstandings at the negotiating table if the other person's self-perception is erroneous. For instance, the emotional atmosphere may turn into one of annoyance and misunderstanding if the other person thinks she is a great communicator but you actually find her hard to comprehend. Conversely, if the other party is aware of their strengths and limitations and modifies their negotiating approach to capitalize on their advantages and steer clear of circumstances that exploit their disadvantages, their awareness contributes to the development of a more effective framework for success. Miscommunication is less likely when one has a realistic assessment of their abilities and limitations.

How can we know what the other person thinks about her? Throughout the discussion, pay close attention to the communication messages and their framing. Strategies like bluffing, threatening, snowshoeing, insulting, mocking, and exaggeration have a detrimental effect on the negotiating and communication process in general. The person may choose a competitive strategy because he believes he is in a more powerful position than you. The choice of message is influenced by the person's perception of her power base. Negotiators frequently employ these strategies in difficult negotiation situations in an effort to secure the largest possible share of the pie. Additionally, their self-perception may be inferred from their body language. Perhaps the greatest way to tell how someone truly feels about a topic is to look at their facial expressions. In general, facial expressions are hard to manage and are frequently overlooked when negotiating.

Culture has a big influence on eye gazing. Your reputation, the strategy they choose, and their desire to collaborate with you are all influenced by how they perceive you. Throughout the discussion, their verbal and nonverbal clues frequently convey their attitude toward you. They are more inclined to provide information about their interests and potentially reach a mutually advantageous deal if they believe you to be trustworthy. One should not undervalue the importance of having the opposing party see you favorably, or at least not negatively, in international talks. Strategies like information sharing, self-disclosure, compromise, and teamwork are examples of communication signals that show interest in and support for your needs. Negotiators are more inclined to use an integrative negotiation approach if a good rapport is developing. Relationships are treasured and sought after in cultures that understand how important it is to build a good rapport before doing business. In the bargaining process, your reputation is crucial. Others decide how credible you are as a negotiator. Credibility is a quality that you acquire through the opinions of others. We can only do actions that give people a chance to evaluate us favorably. The opinion of the opposite side is always the final arbiter of credibility. You will navigate challenging discussions with the ethos of your negotiating competency.

How you are perceived by the other person. You could be asking yourself, what now? Why should I give a damn about what the other person thinks of me? When engaging in international negotiations, this knowledge becomes relevant for a number of reasons. Among many other things, we know that attitude and perception influence the choice of message, the disclosure of information, the degree of trust, and the development of relationships. Consider it this way. I have a choice in what and how I communicate with you, and perception affects my message choice. The impression I have of you becomes important, particularly when we are negotiating and an agreement is in the cards. For instance, I think you are cruel and dishonest, and I suppose you think the same. However, that is not how I genuinely feel about you, but it seems from our past interactions this might be occurring. If I have this perception, and my purpose is to create a trustworthy connection, I will seek to change this view by picking messages that will challenge that perception. "Thank you for your willingness to compromise on this issue," "I appreciate your honesty," or "I'm glad to see we share compassion on this issue" are some possible responses. The idea is that I will present arguments that will prompt a reconsideration of this present viewpoint. However, I might create confusion and misunderstandings or lose a chance to communicate effectively if I am misinterpreting how you believe I see you.

How to address Negotiation's Perception Problem. The effect of unconscious bias in the workplace has only just been addressed by organizations (McCormick, 2016). According to a 2015 Wall Street Journal article, 20% of American businesses offer training on unconscious prejudice. What does the term "unconscious bias" mean? Unconscious biases are "mental shortcuts based on social norms and stereotypes," according to Guynn (2015). Bias can be based on a variety of category schemas that we may have developed via observation or life experiences, such as foreign accents, gender, age, height, weight, marital status, sexual orientation, and hair color. Biases are not innate in us. They are acquired and give us a fast way to interpret circumstances. In other words, even

though these categories are erroneous, they aid our brain in making snap decisions. The problem with unconscious bias is that we don't even realize we have categories or groupings until something happens that challenges our conclusions. Given that we are probably employing these unconscious prejudices to reach crucial agreements, this topic is crucial to international negotiations. We might not be cognizant of our own unconscious prejudice, which could contribute to unsuccessful negotiations. Our efficacy may suffer as a result of judgments made about perceptions. What are our options? Training in mindfulness and awareness can help us understand who we are. We have the chance to completely broaden the search for common interests and cooperation once we gain awareness and learn to be totally present in the moment without bias. The question of how identity plays a role in this awakening arises from awareness of ourselves and others.

Recognizing The Impact Of Identity On Perception: Social identification and personal identity are two forms of identity that influence your negotiating role. A person's reference to her participation in a collective group is known as her social identity. Five categories of social identity were examined by Deaux (2001): personal ties, vocations and avocations, political affiliations, stigmatized groups, ethnicity, and religion. Social identities give us a feeling of our identity in relation to other people. For both in-group and out-group members, it gives us normative behavior guidelines and regulatory behavior guidelines. Our social group identities define common group objectives, worldviews, norms, and attitudes (Abedelal, Herrera, Johnston, and McDermott, 2009, p. 19). Due to disparate social identities, international talks are susceptible to misunderstandings and expectations being broken. Greetings, gift-giving customs, and even our degree of aggressive communication are all influenced by the social group category we identify with. The degree to which we value our identity or group membership determines how strict it is to adhere to these standards. According to Tajfel's (1978) Social Identity Theory, our self-image is significantly influenced by our social identity. Our self-perception is frequently influenced by our social identity. Until someone transgresses the expectations or transgresses the regulations established by their social identification group, the norms of their group are internalized and remain subconscious.

Social identity fosters a we-they mindset even though it frequently results in a good feeling of self. As a means of isolating ourselves from others who do not adhere to our norms and rules, this distinction frequently results in unfavorable opinions of the out-group members. Sue, for instance, strongly identifies as an American. Sue's approach to her contact during the first phase of the negotiation is influenced by normative habits, such as addressing people by their first name. The other party is Japanese, and Sue calls him by his first name, Han. Americans are accustomed to communicating informally as a way to establish relationships and to uphold their fundamental values of equality and individualism. This casual first-name allusion, however, offends Han. Sue sees informal address as a sign of friendship, while Han sees formal address as a sign of respect. The negotiation process may start off awkwardly as a result of this exchange. There is a greater chance of failure or accident when the significance of social identity in the negotiating process is overlooked. This possibility of a breakdown could

lead to an unfavorable perception of the other and ultimately affect Sue and Han's ability to come to an agreement. Because negotiators' social identities influence their own and other people's perspective taking and action plans, their influence is crucial in international business negotiations. Furthermore, we must acknowledge that our social identities may consist of multiple groups. Both the people we are bargaining with and our own social identification prejudice must be taken into account. Potential social identities that impact our relationships include gender, political systems, organizational structures, and national and regional culture. These factors are particularly important in persuasive processes like corporate negotiations. In the bargaining process, personal identity should also be taken into account. Our individual traits, attitudes, and behaviors form the foundation of our own identities.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This paper looked at perception's function and the potential drawbacks for international business discussions. Understanding human biases and the part perception plays in reaching successful or unsuccessful negotiated agreements is essential to preventing avoidable negotiation failures, particularly in cross-cultural contexts. Perception complexity shouldn't be reduced. We can further analyze our experience with intercultural communication by critically analyzing the influence of perception and the inaccuracies it may produce. We can steer clear of the traps of our cultural lens if we start by mindfully observing negotiating methods and tactics as they develop throughout the process.

REFERENCES

- Abedelal, R., Herrera, Y. M., Johnston, A.I. and McDermott, R. 2009. *Measuring Identity: A guide for Social Scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Barnlund, D. C. 1970. A transactional model of communication. In Kenneth K. Sereno and C. David Mortensen (Eds), *Foundations of Communication Theory*, (pp. 83–107). New York: Harper & Row.
- Barnlund, D. C. 2008. A transactional model of communication. In C. David Mortensen (Eds), *Communication Theory*, (pp. 47–57). New York: Routledge.
- Berger and Calabrese 1975. Some exploration in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a development theory of interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research*, 1, 99-112.
- Cooley, C. H. 1968. The social self: On the meanings of I. In Chad Gordon and Kenneth J.
- Deaux, K. 2001. In J. Worrel (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Gender and Women*. San Diego: Academic
- Gerden (Eds), *The Self in Social Interactions, Vol. I Classic and Contemporary Perspectives* (pp. 87-91). New York: Wiley.
- Guynn, J. (2015). Google's "bias busting" workshops target hidden prejudices. *USA Today*.
- Faure, G. O. (Ed.). 2012. *Unfinished Business: Why International Negotiations Fail*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Fisher, R., Uri, W. and Patton, B. 1991. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. New York: Penguin.
- Harford, T. 2011. *Adapt: Why Success Always Starts With Failure*. New York: Picador.
- Imada, T. 2012. Cultural narratives of individualism and collectivism: A content analysis of textbook stories in the United States and Japan. *Journal of Cross – Cultural Philosophy*, 43, 576-591.
- King, L. A. 2014. *The Science on Psychology* 3rd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill
- McCormick, H. 2016. *The real effects of unconscious bias in the workplace*. UNC Executive Development.
- Rips, L.J. 2011. Causation from perception. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6, 77-97.
- Rosenthal, R. and Jacobsen, L. 1968. *Pygmalion in the Classroom*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.
- Rottenberg, L. 2011. *Failure chronicles*. Harvard Business Review.
- Tajfel, H. 1978. *Intergroup behavior*. *Introducing Social Psychology*. New York: Penguin Books, 401-466.
- Trenholm, S. and Jensen, A. 2013. *Interpersonal Communication*. New York: Oxford University Press.
