

Negotiating Strategies: A Review of Process, Tools, Typologies, and Preparation Frameworks in Professional Negotiation

*Adebowale A Adedokun

School of Management, Department of Procurement, International
University Bamenda, Bamenda, Cameroon

*Correspondence

Abstract

Negotiation is a pervasive feature of organisational and interpersonal life, underpinning procurement, commercial dealmaking, dispute resolution, and everyday decision-making. This paper reviews the processes, tools, typologies, and preparation frameworks that constitute contemporary negotiation practice. It defines negotiation and outlines the sequential stages through which agreements are typically reached, from preparation through implementation and follow-up, and considers the ethical boundaries marked by bad-faith bargaining. The review then addresses the strategic and tactical vocabulary of negotiation, including the role of third-party advocates, and examines the communication, analytical, and influence tools that support negotiators in practice. Negotiation is further classified into distributive, integrative, text-based, integrated, principled, team, and adversarial types, drawing on the negotiation literature to characterise the assumptions, tactics, and appropriate contexts associated with each. The analysis considers how individual personality differences shape negotiation style and reviews established preparation frameworks, with particular attention to the concept of the Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement (BATNA) as a benchmark for evaluating proposed settlements. The discussion integrates these strands to demonstrate that effective negotiation rests on the disciplined combination of strategic clarity, interest-based analysis, and rigorous preparation. The paper concludes with practical recommendations for negotiators and organisations seeking to strengthen negotiation capability.

Keywords:

Negotiation Strategy; Distributive Negotiation; Integrative Negotiation; BATNA; Principled Negotiation; Negotiation Preparation

1. Introduction

Negotiation is a dialogue between two or more parties intended to resolve differences, secure advantage, or craft outcomes that satisfy divergent interests (Thompson, 2014; Lewicki, Saunders, & Barry, 2015). It occurs across a wide range of settings, including commercial contracting, labour relations, diplomacy, litigation, and personal life, and is conducted by both specialist practitioners, such as union representatives and diplomats, as well as by individuals who may not consciously recognise the activity as negotiation (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 2011). The outcomes of negotiation influence the allocation of resources, the terms of contracts, and the resolution of disputes; consequently, the quality of an organisation's negotiation practice has direct implications for its commercial and operational performance.

The negotiation literature is synthesised in a structured review that covers four primary themes. Section 2 outlines the negotiation process, its constituent stages, and the ethical boundaries marked by bad-faith bargaining. Section 3 reviews the strategic and tactical elements of negotiation, including the use of advocates and representatives. Section 4 surveys the communication, analytical, and influence tools available to negotiators. Section 5 classifies negotiation into recognised typologies, including distributive, integrative, text-based, integrated, principled, team, and adversarial forms. Section 6 examines the role of personality and systematic preparation, with particular attention to BATNA. Section 7 discusses the interconnections among these themes, and Section 8 concludes with recommendations for practice.

2. The Negotiation Process: Stages and Ethical Boundaries

2.1 Defining Negotiation and Its Domains of Application

Negotiation is most usefully understood not as a single act but as a process through which parties attempt to align divergent interests into an agreement that each considers preferable to no agreement at all (Raiffa, Lax, & Sebenius, 2007). The degree of trust between negotiating parties is a significant determinant of whether a negotiated solution will be faithfully implemented, and this dimension of trust distinguishes cooperative from adversarial negotiation contexts (Shell, 2006). Negotiation is practised by specialists — including union negotiators, hostage negotiators, and diplomats — but is also a general-purpose skill, often exercised unconsciously, in commercial, organisational, and personal settings (Hames, 2011). The growth of automated and algorithmic negotiation, in which software agents bargain on behalf of human principals, illustrates the increasing formalisation of negotiation as a modellable process rather than a purely interpersonal art (Lewicki et al., 2015).

2.2 Stages of the Negotiation Process

Although the specific steps vary by context, the negotiation literature converges on a broadly sequential model comprising preparation, opening, information exchange, bargaining and problem-solving, agreement, closure, and implementation and follow-up (Fisher et al., 2011; Hames, 2011). Preparation entails gathering information, clarifying objectives, and anticipating the other party's perspective. The opening stage establishes rapport and a working level of trust. Information exchange allows each party to surface interests, needs, and preferences, supported by active listening and clarifying questions. Bargaining and problem-solving involve the substantive exploration of options and concessions, ideally through creative techniques such as brainstorming rather than positional bargaining alone. Once terms converge, the parties move to formalising and confirming the agreement, followed by implementation, in which regular communication and periodic review help ensure that commitments are honoured (Thompson, 2014).

Fisher, Ury, and Patton's (2011) *Getting to Yes* offers several techniques for separating the people from the problem during this process, including adopting the other party's perspective, discussing perceptions openly, acting in ways that contradict unhelpful preconceptions, allowing room for face-saving, and practising active and purposeful listening. These techniques are widely cited in the negotiation literature as mechanisms for moving parties toward integrative rather than purely positional bargaining (Lewicki et al., 2015).

2.3 Bad Faith Negotiation

A negotiation is conducted in bad faith when one party appears to negotiate while secretly harbouring no intention of compromising — a pattern documented particularly in political and diplomatic contexts (Solomon & Quinney, 2010). Political psychology has examined this phenomenon through models of information processing in which an opposing party is presumed implacably hostile and any evidence to the contrary is dismissed as propaganda or a sign of weakness; Holsti's (1962) study of Cold War diplomacy is a foundational example of this 'inherent bad faith' model. Recognising the signs of bad-faith bargaining — an unwillingness to make any substantive concession, or a pattern of raising new demands after apparent agreement — is an important diagnostic skill for negotiators operating in adversarial or high-stakes contexts.

2.4 The Negotiation Pie: Principles, Interests, and Alternatives

The 'negotiation pie' metaphor describes the total value available for distribution between negotiating parties, a quantity that can expand, shrink, or remain static over the course of a negotiation (de Felice, 1976). Parties who succeed in expanding the pie can achieve a win-win outcome, but this potential is often constrained by a 'small pie bias' — the psychological tendency to underestimate the available value — and an 'incompatibility bias' that leads negotiators to overlook opportunities for mutually beneficial trade-offs (Thompson, 2014). A related framework, sometimes referred to by the acronym PIE, directs negotiators to analyse three elements: the Principles that establish fairness and legitimacy in the process, the underlying Interests that lie beneath each party's stated positions, and the Alternatives — including each party's BATNA — that bound the negotiation (Fisher et al., 2011). Attending to all three elements helps negotiators move beyond rigid positional bargaining toward solutions that create, rather than merely divide, value.

3. Strategic and Tactical Dimensions of Negotiation

3.1 Elements of Negotiation Strategy

Negotiation can be analysed along three basic elements — process, behaviour, and substance — where process concerns the context and sequence of the negotiation, behaviour concerns the relationships and communication styles among the parties, and substance concerns the issues, options, and agreements actually under discussion (Lewicki et al., 2015). A complementary four-part model distinguishes strategy (top-level goals concerning relationship and outcome), process and tools (the steps and roles used in preparing for and conducting the negotiation), and tactics (specific statements, actions, and responses), with persuasion and influence increasingly recognised as integral to each (Shell, 2006). Commonly identified strategic postures include collaborative or win-win approaches, competitive or win-lose approaches, compromising or middle-ground approaches, avoidance or withdrawal, and accommodation, each suited to different combinations of stakes, relationship value, and relative bargaining power (Thompson, 2014). Skilled negotiators typically adapt their strategic posture as the negotiation unfolds rather than committing to a single approach throughout (Malhotra & Bazerman, 2007).

Concession strategy is a further important dimension of tactical practice: negotiators are generally advised to consider the optimal timing of concessions, to make concessions incrementally rather than all at once, and to ensure that the value of each concession is explicitly recognised by the other party rather than treated as a routine re-statement of an existing position (Shell, 2006).

3.2 Advocacy and Third-Party Representation

Where a party lacks the time, expertise, or emotional detachment to negotiate effectively on its own behalf, it may appoint an advocate or negotiation agent to represent its interests (Andrea Schneider & Honeyman, 2006). Advocates bring specialised negotiation expertise, provide emotional distance from a charged process, save the principal's time, strengthen bargaining power through skilled presentation, help preserve relationships by acting as a buffer between the parties, and can bring a longer-term strategic perspective to bear on the negotiation (Echavarria, 2015). Advocacy-based negotiation, however, also carries the risk of more adversarial tactics, including cherry-picking of favourable information, salami tactics that extract concessions incrementally, and the 'good guy/bad guy' routine, in which one negotiator applies pressure while a counterpart offers an appearance of reasonableness (Nierenberg, 1995). Selecting an advocate, therefore, requires care regarding expertise, trustworthiness, and the alignment of incentives with the principal's actual goals.

4. Tools Supporting Negotiation Practice

4.1 Communication Tools

Effective negotiation depends on a repertoire of communication tools spanning verbal communication (face-to-face dialogue, calls, presentations, and written correspondence), nonverbal communication (body language, facial expression, and tone), visual aids that clarify complex information, structured written communication, active listening, and feedback mechanisms that allow concerns to surface during the process (Lumsden, Lumsden, & Wiethoff, 2010; Hamilton, 2015). Technology-based tools — including video conferencing, instant messaging, and collaboration platforms — have extended the

reach of these communication modes into remote and asynchronous negotiation contexts (O'Rourke, 2015).

4.2 Data and Decision-Support Tools

Negotiators increasingly rely on data and information analysis tools to inform their positions and evaluate proposals, ranging from spreadsheet software for basic calculations to statistical analysis packages, data visualisation and business intelligence platforms, text analytics, and data mining tools capable of identifying patterns relevant to negotiation strategy (Shmueli, Patel, & Bruce, 2019; Field, Miles, & Field, 2012). Complementing these are problem-solving and decision-support techniques such as SWOT analysis, the fishbone or Ishikawa diagram for root-cause analysis (MindTools, n.d.; Ishikawa, 1985), decision matrices and decision trees for comparing alternatives, Pareto analysis for prioritising the most consequential factors, Edward de Bono's Six Thinking Hats for structured perspective-taking, and systematic root-cause analysis more broadly (Kepner & Tregoe, 2013). These tools help negotiators move from intuition toward a more evidence-based assessment of options and trade-offs.

4.3 Influence and Persuasion Tools

Because negotiation is fundamentally a persuasive activity, negotiators also draw on established principles of social influence, including reciprocity, social proof, appeals to authority or expertise, and the drive for consistency between stated commitments and subsequent behaviour (Cialdini, 2009). These principles, most systematically catalogued by Cialdini (2009) and examined empirically within dual-process models of persuasion such as the elaboration likelihood model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), operate alongside broader theories of social influence and attitude change (Dillard & Pfau, 2002). Understanding these mechanisms allows negotiators both to deploy legitimate persuasive tactics and to recognise when they are being used against them.

5. Typologies of Negotiation

5.1 Distributive Negotiation

Distributive negotiation, sometimes termed zero-sum or win-lose negotiation, treats the value under discussion as fixed, such that one party's gain corresponds to the other's loss, and typically concerns a single issue such as price (Lewicki et al., 2015). Because the parties' objectives are directly opposed, distributive negotiation tends to be more adversarial and can strain relationships if pursued without regard for the counterpart's position. Practical guidance for distributive bargaining commonly includes persistence combined with polite assertiveness, making the first offer to anchor the discussion favourably, and withholding disclosure of one's minimum acceptable outcome (Shell, 2006).

5.2 Integrative Negotiation

Integrative negotiation — also called interest-based, merit-based, or principled negotiation — seeks to expand rather than merely divide the available value, either through trade-offs across multiple issues (logrolling) or by reframing the underlying conflict so that both parties benefit (Fisher et al., 2011; Walton & McKersie, 1965). Integrative approaches typically require a higher degree of trust and relationship investment than distributive bargaining, and research suggests that negotiators who concede too quickly forgo opportunities to discover integrative, mutually beneficial trade-offs (Pruitt, 1981). Because integrative negotiation defines a good agreement as one that provides optimal joint gain rather than maximum individual gain, it is particularly suited to relationships expected to continue beyond a single transaction.

5.3 Text-Based and Integrated Negotiation

Text-based negotiation refers to the iterative drafting of an agreement's wording, as seen in constitutional drafting, the legislative process, and multilateral negotiations over the reform of the United Nations Security Council or the drafting of the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (Raiffa et al., 2007). Integrated negotiation, by contrast, is a strategic approach to maximising value across a sequence of related negotiations and operating decisions rather than within a single negotiation in isolation. A frequently cited illustration is John D. Rockefeller's decision to site

his first major oil refinery in Cleveland rather than Pittsburgh, recognising that Cleveland's multiple competing railroads would strengthen his negotiating position on transport costs relative to Pittsburgh's single-railroad monopoly (Chernow, 1998, as cited in Raiffa et al., 2007). Comparable dynamics arise where organisations consolidate otherwise independent purchase orders to build supplier leverage, or where individuals time career or contractual decisions to maximise their negotiating position at a later stage.

5.4 Principled, Team, and Adversarial Negotiation

Principled negotiation, as formalised by Fisher, Ury, and Patton (2011), rests on four elements: pursuing mutual gain, focusing on underlying interests rather than positions, separating emotional responses from the substantive issues, and grounding proposals in objective criteria such as market data or professional standards. Team negotiation, common in large commercial transactions, distributes negotiation functions across roles such as leader, observer, relationship-builder, recorder, critic, and deal-builder, with the team's effectiveness depending on how well these roles are coordinated (Lewicki et al., 2015). Adversarial negotiation, a markedly distributive approach, relies on tactics such as hard bargaining, promises of future benefit offered in exchange for present concessions, and feigned loss of interest, and requires negotiators to develop specific countermeasures, such as requesting that verbal promises be documented in writing (Shell, 2006).

6. Individual Differences and Preparation

6.1 Personality and Negotiation Style

Negotiation style is shaped by individual personality dispositions, including assertive or competitive orientations that favour aggressive, win-focused bargaining; accommodating or cooperative orientations that prioritise relationship preservation, sometimes at the cost of exploitation risk; analytical or logical orientations that rely on data and objective argument but may under-invest in rapport; collaborative or integrative orientations that actively pursue win-win outcomes; and emotionally attuned or socially oriented styles that build rapport through empathy but may under-emphasise assertiveness (Smith & Mackie, 2007). Because most negotiators exhibit a blend of these tendencies that varies by context, effective negotiation practice involves recognising one's own default style and adapting to counterparts' styles (West & Turner, 2018).

6.2 Preparation Frameworks

Systematic preparation is consistently identified in the literature as the single most controllable determinant of negotiation outcomes (Weitzel, 2003). Recommended preparatory steps include clearly defining objectives and fallback positions, gathering information about the counterpart's interests and constraints, assessing one's own and the counterpart's likely BATNA, identifying areas of potential trade-off, developing an explicit strategy, planning key messages and anticipated objections, identifying acceptable concessions and their conditions, investing in relationship-building where appropriate, planning for contingencies, and rehearsing the negotiation through role-play (Lewicki et al., 2015; Hames, 2011).

6.3 BATNA: Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement

The Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement (BATNA) is the most favourable course of action available to a party if the current negotiation fails to produce an agreement, and it functions as the essential benchmark against which any proposed settlement should be evaluated: an offer inferior to one's BATNA should generally be declined, and one superior to it should generally be accepted (Fisher et al., 2011). Assessing BATNA requires identifying and evaluating all realistic alternatives, weighing their benefits, costs, and risks to establish a reservation point, and, where possible, actively strengthening the BATNA by developing additional options or partnerships (Ury, 1991). In some circumstances, it may be strategically advantageous to communicate a strong BATNA to the other party to influence their willingness to make concessions, although this disclosure carries its own risks and should be assessed on a case-by-case basis (Raiffa et al., 2007). Because the circumstances of a negotiation evolve, a BATNA should be continuously reassessed rather than fixed at the outset (Thompson, 2014). A robust BATNA is widely regarded as the single greatest source of negotiating

leverage, since it allows a party to walk away from an unfavourable agreement with confidence (Shell, 2006).

7. Discussion

The process, tools, typologies, and preparation frameworks reviewed are complementary rather than competing accounts of negotiation practice. The sequential process model in Section 2 identifies when key activities occur. The strategic and tactical vocabulary in Section 3 outlines the postures negotiators may adopt at each stage. The tools in Section 4 provide the practical means by which negotiators execute those postures. The typologies in Section 5 describe recurring patterns of negotiation shaped by the structure of the underlying conflict of interest. The individual-difference and preparation material in Section 6 addresses the negotiator-specific factors that influence the application of these approaches (Malhotra & Bazerman, 2007).

Two integrative implications emerge. First, the choice between distributive and integrative approaches should be determined by the objective structure of the negotiation, including the number of issues at stake, the value of the ongoing relationship, and the potential for value creation rather than mere division (Pruitt, 1981). Second, BATNA analysis serves as a unifying discipline across all typologies: whether a negotiation is distributive, integrative, or adversarial, a rigorously assessed BATNA provides the objective standard against which any proposed agreement should be evaluated (Fisher et al., 2011). Organisations seeking to strengthen negotiation capability should invest not only in tactical training but also in the fundamental disciplines of interest analysis, alternative development, and structured preparation.

8. Conclusion and Recommendations

Negotiation is best understood as a structured process, supported by a defined set of communication, analytical, and influence tools, shaped by typologies that reflect the underlying structure of the parties' interests, and ultimately conditioned by individual personality and the rigour of pre-negotiation preparation. No single tactic or typology is universally superior; the appropriate choice depends on the number of issues at stake, the value of the ongoing relationship, and the relative bargaining power of the parties involved.

Four recommendations are proposed. First, negotiators should systematically assess whether a negotiation is more naturally distributive or integrative before selecting a strategic posture, rather than defaulting to a habitual style. Second, organisations should treat negotiation preparation as a distinct discipline, including formal BATNA assessment, rather than as an informal or optional step. Third, negotiation training programmes should explicitly integrate communication, data-analytic, and influence tools, as these are essential for executing negotiation strategy. Fourth, given the ethical risks associated with bad-faith bargaining and adversarial tactics, organisations should establish clear internal guidance on acceptable negotiation conduct, particularly when negotiators act as advocates for others. Future research should examine how these classical frameworks, developed primarily in Western commercial and diplomatic contexts, translate into cross-cultural and digitally mediated negotiation settings, including automated negotiation agents.

References

1. Andrea Schneider, S., & Honeyman, C. (Eds.). (2006). *The negotiator's fieldbook*. American Bar Association.
2. Buzan, T., & Buzan, B. (1996). *The mind map book: How to use radiant thinking to maximize your brain's untapped potential*. Penguin.
3. Chernow, R. (1998). *Titan: The life of John D. Rockefeller, Sr.* Random House.
4. Cialdini, R. B. (2009). *Influence: Science and practice* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
5. de Felice, F. B. (1976). The 50% solution. In I. W. Zartman (Ed.), *Negotiation, or the art of negotiating* (p. 549). Doubleday Anchor.
6. Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*. Yale University Press.
7. Dillard, J. P., & Pfau, M. (Eds.). (2002). *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice*. Sage Publications.

8. Echavarria, M. (2015). Enabling collaboration: Achieving success through strategic alliances and partnerships. LID Publishing.
9. Field, A., Miles, J., & Field, Z. (2012). Discovering statistics using R. SAGE Publications.
10. Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2011). Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in (3rd ed.). Penguin.
11. Hames, D. S. (2011). Negotiation: Closing deals, settling disputes, and making team decisions. SAGE Publications.
12. Hamilton, C. (2015). Communication skills for engineers and scientists. CRC Press.
13. Heath, C., & Heath, D. (2008). Made to stick: Why some ideas survive and others die. Random House.
14. Holsti, O. R. (1962). The belief system and national images: A case study. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 6(3), 244–252.
15. Ishikawa, K. (1985). Guide to quality control (2nd ed.). Asian Productivity Organization.
16. Kepner, C. H., & Tregoe, B. B. (2013). The new rational manager. Princeton Research Press.
17. Lewicki, R. J., Saunders, D. M., & Barry, B. (2015). Negotiation: Readings, exercises, and cases (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
18. Lumsden, G., Lumsden, D., & Wiethoff, C. (2010). Communicating in groups and teams: Sharing leadership. Cengage Learning.
19. Malhotra, D., & Bazerman, M. H. (2007). Negotiation genius: How to overcome obstacles and achieve brilliant results at the bargaining table and beyond. Bantam.
20. McMillan, J. (1992). Games, strategies, and managers. Oxford University Press.
21. MindTools. (n.d.). Fishbone diagram (Ishikawa diagram). https://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newTMC_03.htm
22. Nierenberg, G. I. (1995). The art of negotiating: Psychological strategies for gaining advantageous bargains. Barnes and Noble.
23. O'Rourke, J. S. (2015). Management communication: A case-analysis approach (6th ed.). Pearson.
24. Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). Communication and persuasion: Central and peripheral routes to attitude change. Springer-Verlag.
25. Pruitt, D. G. (1981). Negotiation behavior. Academic Press.
26. Raiffa, H., Lax, D. A., & Sebenius, J. K. (2007). Negotiation analysis: The science and art of collaborative decision making. Harvard University Press.
27. Rubin, J. Z., & Brown, B. R. (1975). The social psychology of bargaining and negotiation. Academic Press.
28. Shell, G. R. (2006). Bargaining for advantage: Negotiation strategies for reasonable people (2nd ed.). Penguin.
29. Shmueli, G., Patel, N. R., & Bruce, P. C. (2019). Data mining for business analytics: Concepts, techniques, and applications in Python. Wiley.
30. Smith, R. H., & Mackie, D. M. (Eds.). (2007). Social psychology (3rd ed.). Psychology Press.
31. Solomon, R. H., & Quinney, N. (2010). American negotiating behavior: Wheeler-dealers, legal eagles, bullies, and preachers. United States Institute of Peace Press.
32. Thompson, L. (2014). The mind and heart of the negotiator (6th ed.). Pearson.
33. Ury, W. (1991). Getting past no: Negotiating in difficult situations. Bantam.
34. Walton, R. E., & McKersie, R. B. (1965). A behavioral theory of labor negotiations: An analysis of a social interaction system. McGraw-Hill.
35. Weitzel, W. (2003). Negotiation essentials: Theory, skills, and practices. Aspen Publishers.
36. West, R., & Turner, L. H. (2018). Introducing communication theory: Analysis and application (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
37. Willard, C. A. (1982). Argumentation and the social grounds of knowledge. University of Alabama Press.
38. Willard, C. A. (1996). Liberalism and the problem of knowledge: A new rhetoric for modern democracy. University of Chicago Press.