

EFFECTS THAT ORIENT BEHAVIOR IN CONFLICT NEGOTIATIONS: A SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL, SOCIO-CULTURAL, AND PSYCHO-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS

LEPSKYI, MAKSYM¹

Abstract

The article provides a socio-philosophical analysis of the phenomenon of effects that orient behavior in conflict negotiations in socio-cultural and psycho-semantic dimensions. Despite the intensive development of negotiation theory and practice, contemporary scholarly discourse reveals the absence of a comprehensive conceptual model capable of integrating the multiple dimensions of this phenomenon into a cohesive analytical framework. First, there remains a lack of systematic explanation regarding the interplay between rational and irrational components of negotiators' behavior. Most existing studies emphasize rational-instrumental approaches, which presuppose a linear, causal relationship among strategies, tactics, and outcomes. However, emotional-motivational, impulsive, and subconscious aspects of behavior often remain marginal or are addressed in a fragmented manner. This narrow focus significantly limits the analytical potential of research, particularly given that, in real-world negotiations, irrational factors frequently shape the course and dynamics of interaction. Five effects are identified – impulse, ambition, victory, outcome, and relationship – which act as hidden regulators of interaction dynamics and can form both constructive and destructive scenarios. Modern scientific research has updated holistic models that are relevant to the evolving conditions of the real world and capable of integrating rational and irrational factors, the psycho-semantic profile of effects, and socio-cultural variability. A methodological framework is proposed that integrates socio-philosophical, socio-cultural, and topological approaches to studying the limits of rationality, the structure of effects, and their impact on the effectiveness of conflict negotiations. The article demonstrates that reflective and culturally sensitive management of effects reduces the risk of conflict escalation and increases the stability of agreements. The article outlines directions for further research, particularly the development of diagnostic tools and models of participatory effects management in complex negotiations. The analysis confirms that the effects of momentum, ambition, victory, outcome, and relationships constitute more than just the emotional backdrop of negotiation – they act as key regulators of its dynamics. These effects influence interaction patterns, strategic choices, the evolution of communication, and the quality and longevity of the agreements reached.

Key words: negotiations, behavioral effects, social philosophy, momentum, ambition, victory, outcome, relationships, conflict, peacemaking.

Statement of the Problem. In contemporary global dynamics, negotiations have become one of the primary instruments for conflict management and the pursuit of mutually beneficial solutions across political, economic, social, and cultural domains. The urgency of comprehending the nature of negotiations is heightened by the current international system's inability to deter aggression through diplomatic means. This situation underscores the pressing need to explore the conditions, capacities, and prospects for conducting negotiations during conflicts of varying scales, as well as in post-conflict reconciliation processes.

Traditional analytical approaches often emphasize rational strategies and tactical techniques, while overlooking the implicit psychological and socio-cultural factors that shape the behavior of stakeholders and decision-makers. Among such factors are

the so-called effects that guide behavior – subtle, yet influential elements that determine the dynamics, quality, and effectiveness of negotiations. Neglecting these effects leads to the erosion of crucial semantic and value-based contexts, increases the risk of conflict escalation, and undermines the durability of achieved agreements.

The relevance of this research stems from the need to integrate socio-philosophical and psycho-semantic perspectives in the study of negotiation effects. Such integration facilitates a deeper understanding of the underlying nature and mechanisms of these effects, expanding both the theoretical foundation and applied potential of negotiation science.

Thus, analyzing the effects that guide behavior in negotiations holds both theoretical importance and practical value for enhancing the effectiveness of diplomatic efforts and strengthening peacebuilding strategies.

Statement of the Problem. In contemporary global dynamics, negotiations have become one

¹ Zaporizhzhia National University (Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine)
E-mail: waysensey@gmail.com
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5604-641X>

of the primary instruments for conflict management and the pursuit of mutually beneficial solutions across political, economic, social, and cultural domains. The urgency of comprehending the nature of negotiations is heightened by the current international system's inability to deter aggression through diplomatic means. This situation underscores the pressing need to explore the conditions, capacities, and prospects for conducting negotiations during conflicts of varying scales, as well as in post-conflict reconciliation processes.

Traditional analytical approaches often emphasize rational strategies and tactical techniques, while overlooking the implicit psychological and socio-cultural factors that shape the behavior of stakeholders and decision-makers. Among such factors are the so-called effects that guide behavior – subtle, yet influential elements that determine the dynamics, quality, and effectiveness of negotiations. Neglecting these effects leads to the erosion of crucial semantic and value-based contexts, increases the risk of conflict escalation, and undermines the durability of achieved agreements.

The relevance of this research stems from the need to integrate socio-philosophical and psycho-semantic perspectives in the study of negotiation effects. Such integration facilitates a deeper understanding of the underlying nature and mechanisms of these effects, expanding both the theoretical foundation and applied potential of negotiation science.

Thus, analyzing the effects that guide behavior in negotiations holds both theoretical importance and practical value for enhancing the effectiveness of diplomatic efforts and strengthening peacebuilding strategies.

Analysis of Recent Research and Publications.

A systematic understanding of behavioral aspects relevant to negotiations can be traced back to Vilfredo Pareto's concept of "derivatives" (Pareto, 1978, pp. 89–93; Pareto, 1935, pp. 1435–1436). Within the framework of sociological analysis, he described remnants of past experience – myths, fears, superstitions – as persistent patterns of behavior that continue to shape present actions, even when their original cause has disappeared. Pareto integrated sociology and psychology, conceptualizing "derivatives" as subconscious regulators of social interaction, which in the context of negotiations correspond to the impulse effect (Лепський, 2024, С. 84-88).

A major development in the second half of the 20th century was the emergence of the Harvard School

of Negotiation, led by R. Fisher, W. Ury, and B. Patton (Fisher, Ury & Patton, 2011), which introduced the concept of principled negotiation. Their models – win-win, win-lose, lose-lose – evaluated outcomes through the lens of party interests and objective criteria. Central to their approach was the victory effect, aimed at achieving mutually beneficial solutions.

During the late 1980s and 1990s, Donald Trump (Trump, 2004) became notable for his use of agenda-expansion techniques to reach agreements without loss of face for either side, effectively blending the victory effect with the relationship effect. Around the same time, Gavin Kennedy's British School of Negotiation (Kennedy, 2008) conceptualized negotiation as a bargaining process centered on measurable outcomes, thereby prioritizing the outcome effect.

At the turn of the millennium, Johan Galtung (Galtung, 2004, Webel & Galtung, 2007, Galtung & Fischer 2013.) advanced a model of conflict transformation rooted in non-coercive, mutually acceptable solutions, where the relationship effect was elevated above short-term strategic gains. Similarly, Friedrich Glasl (Glasl, 1999) developed a framework outlining nine stages of conflict escalation, including the "together into the abyss" stage, which dramatizes the destructive potential of an unchecked victory effect.

Marshall Rosenberg's theory of nonviolent communication (Rosenberg, 2015) further contributed by advocating for empathetic listening, clear articulation of needs, and the avoidance of blame, laying the groundwork for a stable relationship effect in negotiations.

John Paul Lederach (Lederach, 1997) deepened this trajectory through his model of conflict transformation in divided societies, integrating social philosophy, anthropology, and cultural mediation. He envisioned negotiation as a multi-level process – from political elites to grassroots communities – where the relationship effect is key to sustainable peace.

In recent decades, negotiation studies have evolved into an interdisciplinary field, with growing attention to emotional dynamics, cross-cultural variations, and mechanisms of shared value creation. These dimensions directly reflect the interplay of impulse, ambition, victory, outcome, and relationship effects.

Contemporary scholarship exemplifies this trend. A study by S. Benetti, E. Ogliastri, and A. Caputo (Benetti, Ogliastri & Caputo, 2021) analyzes distributive and integrative strategies in cross-cultural

settings in the United States and Italy, revealing how cultural norms influence manifestations of victory and relationship effects. Work by A. Caputo and colleagues proposes a shift from resource allocation to value creation, drawing on game theory and pro-social motivation, thereby actualizing the outcome effect and cooperative dimensions of the victory effect.

An interdisciplinary review by E. J. Boothby, G. Cooney, and M. E. Schweitzer (Boothby, Cooney & Schweitzer, 2023) explores the interconnection of emotional, cognitive, and group processes, highlighting how impulse and ambition effects intersect with dynamics of power and identity. A systematic review by M. T. Sikorski and A. Albrecht (Sikorski & Albrecht, 2025) underscores the importance of cultural sensitivity and adaptability in fostering trust during cross-cultural negotiations, with the relationship effect emerging as a core success factor. Research by M. C. PérezYus and colleagues (PérezYus et al., 2020) confirms that enhancing emotional competence transforms the impulse effect and strengthens the relationship effect, thus increasing negotiation effectiveness.

In summary, the current state of research confirms the growing relevance of transitioning from narrow instrumental negotiation models to multidimensional frameworks. In such models, the effects of impulse, ambition, victory, outcome, and relationships are viewed as interrelated variables that shape both immediate results and the long-term sustainability of agreements.

The success of a negotiation frequently depends not on formal logic alone, but on the ability to recognize these embedded effects – rooted in personality, culture, strategy, and situational context. This makes the study of effects that guide behavior in negotiations both theoretically significant and practically necessary for advancing the effectiveness of diplomacy and peacebuilding.

Highlighting Unresolved Parts of the Problem.

Despite the intensive development of negotiation theory and practice, contemporary scholarly discourse reveals the absence of a comprehensive conceptual model capable of integrating the multiple dimensions of this phenomenon into a cohesive analytical framework.

First, there remains a lack of systematic explanation regarding the interplay between rational and irrational components of negotiators' behavior. Most existing studies emphasize rational-instrumental approaches, which presuppose a linear, causal

relationship among strategies, tactics, and outcomes. However, emotional-motivational, impulsive, and subconscious aspects of behavior often remain marginal or are addressed in a fragmented manner. This narrow focus significantly limits the analytical potential of research, particularly given that, in real-world negotiations, irrational factors frequently shape the course and dynamics of interaction.

Second, a fully developed socio-cultural and psycho-semantic profile of the key behavioral effects is still lacking. Many analyses treat effects superficially, failing to uncover their internal structure, semantic fields, typological variations, and conditions of activation. Such oversimplification expands the domain of uncertainty within negotiations. Without such profiling, it becomes impossible to develop diagnostic tools for identifying, measuring, and anticipating the influence of specific effects on negotiation processes.

Third, the socio-cultural variability of behavioral effects across contexts remains underexplored. Many existing models are based on assumptions of behavioral universality, often overlooking culture-specific distinctions in perceptions of power, status, trust, emotional expression, and social roles. This approach relegates cultural specificity to a secondary factor, even though in many situations it serves as a key determinant of acceptable and effective behavioral strategies.

Moreover, there is a critical shortage of empirical tools for diagnosing effects in the context of real-time negotiations. Most existing methodologies are adapted from psychological testing or sociological surveys and fail to reflect the dynamic, interactive nature of negotiation exchanges. As a result, the capacity to conduct precise measurement and timely adjustment of negotiation strategies is significantly constrained.

The Purpose and Objectives of the Article.

The purpose of this article is to explore the nature, defining characteristics, and typology of the effects that guide behavior in negotiations, with particular attention to their socio-cultural and psycho-semantic contexts. It also aims to identify the mechanisms through which these effects influence the effectiveness and sustainability of negotiation processes. The anticipated outcome is the development of a conceptual foundation for designing diagnostic and management tools applicable in negotiation practice.

The specific objectives of the research are as follows:

To define the limits of rationality in negotiation processes and to identify the domains in which irrational factors play a decisive role;

To analyze the structural composition of behavioral effects, incorporating their motivational, emotional, and cognitive dimensions;

To uncover the core content of major types of effects, along with their semantic fields and the conditions under which they are activated during negotiations;

To explain the functional role of these effects in shaping effective and durable agreements, as well as in mitigating the risk of conflict escalation.

Research Methodology. The methodological foundation of this article integrates socio-philosophical, socio-cultural, and topological approaches. This combination provides a multidimensional framework for comprehensively understanding negotiations as a space where worldview structures are formed, contested, and co-developed.

Within the socio-philosophical perspective, negotiations are conceptualized not merely as instrumental procedures for achieving rationally defined goals, but as dynamic phenomena wherein the participants engage in a mutual exchange of world-perception, world-feeling, world-understanding, and world-picture. Each of these layers functions as a responsive stratum of worldview, influenced by negotiation effects that imprint specific interpretive patterns onto the participants' experience of reality.

The worldview in negotiation processes emerges through direct experiential interaction – sensory, emotional, and communicative impressions – that initiate predispositions toward trust or distrust, openness or defensiveness. It reflects the emotional-value backdrop of negotiations, where certain effects (such as impulse or victory) may enhance the willingness to cooperate or, conversely, provoke resistance. On the cognitive-interpretive level, participants evaluate incoming information through the lens of personal knowledge, expectations, and strategic frameworks. The resulting world-picture serves as an integrated model of social reality, reinforcing behavioral patterns and shaping long-term attitudes toward the other party. In this domain, negotiation effects become crucial determinants of future interaction strategies, particularly in recurring or protracted conflicts.

The socio-cultural approach highlights the inseparability of the social and cultural dimensions within negotiations. The social is viewed as the dynamic network of relationships,

connections, and communicative exchanges between actors, continuously reproduced through direct interaction and collective activity. The cultural, in turn, is seen as the durable outcome of this process – embodied in memory, norms, and value systems – which manifests as culturally conditioned behavioral automatisms. In conflictual interactions, such automatisms function as “cultural reflexes,” shaping permissible forms of emotional expression, argumentation, and strategic maneuvering. Thus, the socio-cultural lens elucidates how cultural patterns emerge from lived interaction and subsequently condition the behavioral expectations and responses of negotiation participants.

The topological approach is employed to investigate the spatial-semantic configuration of the negotiation process. In this context, negotiations are interpreted as a multidimensional space in which actors navigate between zones of conflict and resolution, tension and alignment, control and openness. Behavioral effects function as “topological nodes” – energetic focal points that restructure the configuration of the negotiation field depending on their intensity, direction, and influence. This perspective reveals how both rational and irrational, conscious and subconscious factors jointly shape the architecture of the negotiation space, influencing the likely trajectories of the parties' engagement.

Together, these methodological perspectives support a critical and reflexive interpretation of negotiations – not merely as technical procedures for agreement-making, but as deep arenas of meaning-making, value exchange, and the strategic construction of shared futures. Within this interpretive framework, behavioral effects are not peripheral; rather, they constitute pivotal mechanisms that influence decisions, define the space of interaction, and co-produce enduring worldviews.

Presentation of the main research material with justification of the obtained scientific results

1. The Limits of Rationality and Irrationality in Negotiations. In most classical theories, the negotiation process is interpreted as an activity aimed at achieving rationally formulated goals, implemented through the selection of optimal strategies and tactics. This approach assumes predictability in participants' behavior and presumes that communication can be entirely governed by logic. However, real-world negotiation practice reveals a far more complex dynamic: rational factors interact with irrational ones, forming a field

of decision-making shaped not only by objective data but also by subjective, emotional, and subconscious impulses.

These impulses, known as behavioral effects, are often invisible yet highly influential. Although we tend to believe that negotiations are guided by logic, interests, and positions, a significant portion of the process is defined by an unseen architecture of effects and their social gravity. These forces, though not part of the intellectual map, determine the trajectory of negotiations. Effects do not pursue goals, follow commands, or arrange themselves logically – they emerge as consequences, much like shadows cast without direct light.

In management theory, it is standard to distinguish between controllable factors and those independent of the subject's will. In negotiations, this distinction is realized through the interplay of objective factors (external, structural, resource-based) and subjective factors (perception, emotion, consciousness, and values). Often, negotiators' behavior exceeds the boundaries of pure rationality.

From a socio-philosophical perspective, the boundary between rational and irrational does not appear as a rigid line but as a fluid zone where worldviews intersect. Rationality encompasses purposeful planning, logical argumentation, and analytical assessment. Irrationality reflects intuition, emotion, cultural norms, and subconscious responses shaped by personal and collective memory. These components interact continuously: irrationality may either disrupt or enhance rational planning, while rational frameworks can help interpret or regulate irrational impulses.

The socio-cultural perspective reveals this interaction through the fusion of social and cultural dimensions. The social dimension manifests in live interpersonal interaction, while the cultural dimension accumulates long-term experiences encoded in norms, values, and automatisms. In conflict negotiations, these automatisms can either facilitate constructive dialogue or provoke emotional escalation that defies rational control.

Topologically, the boundary between rationality and irrationality resembles a turbulence zone – a dense field where meanings, emotions, and strategies intertwine. Within this zone, established negotiation paths may suddenly shift due to unexpected emotional reactions, changes in trust levels, or perceived threats. It is here that effects such as impulse, ambition, hope for victory, outcome, and relationship are most vividly activated, often transcending deliberate planning.

Therefore, rationality and irrationality in negotiation constitute a multilayered, interdependent system. A nuanced understanding of their interplay is essential for developing a holistic theory of negotiations – one capable of explaining how decisions emerge under tension and uncertainty.

2. Structure of Behavioral Characteristics of Effects. Effects that orient behavior in conflict negotiations exhibit a complex, multidimensional structure encompassing cognitive, emotional, motivational, and culturally embedded components. These effects are not random or chaotic; each has an internal organization manifested through consistent reaction patterns and behavioral strategies. Understanding this structure is critical for analyzing how negotiations evolve and for designing effective tools to influence their trajectory.

From a socio-philosophical perspective, the structure of effects emerges at the intersection of world-perception, world-feeling, world-understanding, and worldview. At the perceptual level, effects appear as direct signals – intonation, gestures, reaction speed, and body language. World-feeling colors these signals emotionally, evoking sympathy, interest, or mistrust. World-understanding interprets them through the lens of prior experiences and strategic aims. Finally, the worldview integrates these impressions into long-term attitudes that shape behavior in subsequent negotiations.

Socioculturally, behavioral effects possess both universal and culturally specific features. Basic emotional reactions – defensiveness, cooperation, competition – are shared across cultures, but the modes of their expression, thresholds of acceptability, and related values vary. For instance, the victory effect in individualistic cultures may entail personal triumph and overt displays of superiority, while in collectivist contexts it may involve face-saving and the integration of success into shared outcomes.

Within the topological framework, effects form 'nodes' in the negotiation space – points of concentrated emotional and cognitive activity that shape possible paths for interaction. The impulse effect, for example, may swiftly escalate conflict, whereas the relationship effect can reorient negotiations toward consensus and collaboration.

Importantly, effects are not goal-oriented results but post-factum consequences – sometimes anticipated, other times spontaneous. They may be conditioned by culture or triggered by subtle cues, operating independently of deliberate intention. Their unconscious nature grants them power, especially in

prolonged or recurring conflicts, where patterns may persist beneath awareness.

Vilfredo Pareto's notion of «derivatives» (Pareto, 1976, p.180-181) – residual myths, fears, and past experiences – illustrates this concept. People may act based on deep-seated cultural residues without remembering their origins. Such archetypal effects govern behavior implicitly and may derail negotiations for seemingly insignificant reasons that hold symbolic or unconscious weight.

Behavioral effects share four defining characteristics:

1) Behaviorism – effects manifest as irrational actions or automatisms rather than deliberate strategies. Sometimes, inaction itself distorts the negotiation space. Behaviorism represents a mode of being within conflict, not a planned activity.

2) Unconsciousness – effects operate below the threshold of conscious regulation. The actor may not be aware of why they act in a certain way; behavior arises from hidden logics rather than conscious decision-making.

3) Rationalization – following the effect-driven behavior, actors create logical justifications post-factum. This retrospective logic serves to legitimize the action but emerges only after the impulse has passed.

4) Value Dominance – effects reflect temporary hegemonies of specific values (e.g., power, profit, dignity, security) that take precedence over others based on situational context. What seems most important may shift depending on the negotiation climate.

These characteristics enable us to assess the intensity and direction of effects within the negotiation environment. They interact, transform, and combine into dynamic profiles that shape behavior beyond rational control. For example, ambition may supersede profit, or security may become paramount. Effects form fluid constellations rather than fixed roles.

The internal structure of each effect typically includes:

- a trigger – a cue that activates the effect (e.g., a remark, facial expression, or unexpected proposal);
- a behavioral response – automatic or near-automatic actions taken in reaction to the trigger;
- a cognitive interpretation – mental framing that aligns the behavior with the negotiator's internal worldview;
- a socio-cultural modifier – the cultural filter that adjusts behavior to socially accepted norms within a given context.

Together, these elements form consistent yet adaptable patterns that influence negotiation processes on both conscious and subconscious levels. Analyzing them allows researchers and practitioners to move beyond superficial descriptions and engage with the deep architecture of strategic behavior.

3. Contents of the Main Types of Effects

Impulse Effect. The impulse effect is characterized by a sudden and seemingly spontaneous shift in behavior – an unfiltered response that bypasses internal censorship. In negotiations, this often manifests as abrupt remarks, changes in tone, or expressive gestures that emerge before conscious regulation can occur. It is a limbic system response (Kohlrieser, 2006, pp.199-201), where the rational mind temporarily yields to emotional reactivity.

Experienced negotiators distinguish themselves not by suppressing these impulses, but by transforming them into constructive signals. The art of 'cultivating the impulse' lies in giving emotional responses a form that supports dialogue rather than disrupts it.

Ambition Effect. The ambition effect reflects the drive for achievement, status, and recognition. It encompasses self-confidence, public image, and personal or collective goals. In many cultures – such as in Japanese diplomacy – preserving face is essential for trust-building. Offending one's dignity undermines the potential for sustainable agreements.

Ambition may inspire forward movement and assertiveness but also carries risks of rigidity, tunnel vision, and dominance-seeking. In negotiations, it can transform the process into a contest for prestige, obstructing mutual solutions. The challenge lies in maintaining healthy ambition without allowing it to obscure the purpose of dialogue.

Victory Effect. The victory effect arises from the perception of prevailing in negotiation. It generates confidence and motivation, but may also foster arrogance or strategic inflexibility. Some victories are visible and explicit; others are subtle and internal. While success can provide momentum, failure to integrate the victory effect tactfully may alienate the other party or create long-term imbalance.

Victory can also act as a psychological anchor for future interactions, potentially leading to phantom triumphs or setting the stage for retaliatory behavior.

Outcome (Result) Effect. The outcome effect is linked to rational calculation and the tangible or intangible results of the negotiation process. These include signed agreements, resource exchanges, reputational gains, and strengthened trust. This effect

reflects not only what has been achieved but how meaningful and complete the negotiation feels to participants.

It aligns with reasoned, interest-based bargaining, where emotional displays are moderated and decisions are grounded in analysis, feasibility, and future implementation.

Relationship Effect. The relationship effect is the connective tissue of negotiations. It manifests in tone, nonverbal cues, listening dynamics, and small relational gestures (Arbinger Institute, 2015, Arbinger Institute, 2015B, Rosenberg, 2015). These relational elements often outlast formal agreements and shape future cooperation or tension. Even in conflict, this effect may act as a bridge if parties can recognize each other as co-navigators in a difficult process.

Nurturing the relationship effect supports resilience, adaptability, and long-term peacebuilding – especially in culturally sensitive or post-conflict environments.

4. The Role of Effects in the Effectiveness and Sustainability of Negotiations. Effects in negotiations are not incidental psychological phenomena; they are structural forces that shape the very architecture of the negotiation process. Like wind shifting the sails of a vessel, effects can redirect the course of interaction – sometimes advancing the process toward resolution, other times pushing it off course.

These effects play a dual role in determining effectiveness. On one hand, they function as catalysts, activating latent resources, enhancing motivation, sharpening focus, and encouraging creative or unconventional solutions. On the other hand, they can become obstacles – impulse turning into aggression, ambition muting empathy, victory breeding hubris, or outcome becoming fixated on narrow gain while overlooking the broader picture.

Sustainability refers to the long-term viability of agreements. Effects are deeply embedded in the interactional fabric and influence whether trust continues after a deal is signed. They affect whether parties remain open to future dialogue or default to suspicion. For example, if the relationship effect is neglected in favor of a short-term victory effect, an agreement may appear strong on paper but prove fragile under pressure.

The interaction between effects is equally critical. Momentum may energize ambition, but if unmoderated, it could damage the relationship effect. Conversely, when the outcome effect is

aligned with emotional and cultural expectations, victory can transform from individual gain into shared accomplishment, reinforcing durable cooperation. Thus, effects should be seen not only as variables in momentary decisions but as long-range tools for strategic management. Their intentional integration into negotiation practice enables the crafting of agreements that are resilient to future tensions and balanced between goal attainment and relationship preservation.

Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research. The analysis confirms that the effects of momentum, ambition, victory, outcome, and relationships constitute more than just the emotional backdrop of negotiation – they act as key regulators of its dynamics. These effects influence interaction patterns, strategic choices, the evolution of communication, and the quality and longevity of the agreements reached.

Operating on both conscious and subconscious levels, effects serve as integrators of social, cultural, rational, and irrational elements. Their impact extends beyond the signing of agreements; they shape future willingness to cooperate and the capacity to respond to emerging challenges. The sustainability of negotiations relies on how effectively these effects are balanced and harmonized within the participants' shared worldview.

The practical value of these findings lies in viewing effects not as uncontrollable variables, but as potential tools for strategic negotiation management. Conscious attention to effects can support the development of robust solutions that acknowledge both instrumental interests and the emotional-cultural context of interaction.

Future research directions include the development of empirical methods for identifying and diagnosing effects during real-time negotiation; the creation of psycho-semantic profiles with attention to cultural modifiers; the analysis of effect dynamics in complex, multi-phase negotiations; the application of participatory effect-management models in peacebuilding, political, and business contexts; and the exploration of topological patterns that illustrate how managed effects can support transitions from conflict to resolution.

Incorporating the knowledge of effects into negotiation theory and practice is not only an academic endeavor – it is a necessary step toward improving communication effectiveness under conditions of tension, mistrust, and cultural diversity.

References

- Arbinger Institute. (2015a). *Leadership and self-deception: Getting out of the box* (2nd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Arbinger Institute. (2015b). *The anatomy of peace: Resolving the heart of conflict* (Expanded 2nd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Benetti, S., Ogliastri, E., & Caputo, A. (2021). Distributive/integrative negotiation strategies in cross-cultural contexts: A comparative study of the USA and Italy. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 27(4), 786–808. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2020.47>
- Boothby, E. J., Cooney, G., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2023). Embracing complexity: A review of negotiation research. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 74, 299–332.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (2nd ed.). Penguin Books.
- Galtung, J. (2004). *Transcend and transform: An introduction to conflict work*. Pluto Press.
- Galtung, J., & Fischer, D. (2013). Conflict transformation by peaceful means (The Transcend Method). In J. Galtung, *Springer Briefs on Pioneers in Science and Practice* (Vol. 5, 59–69). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-32481-9_5
- Glassl, F. (1999). *Confronting conflict: A first aid kit for handling conflict*. Hawthorn Press.
- Kennedy, G. (2008). *Everything is negotiable: How to get a better deal every time*. Random House Business Books.
- Kohlrieser, G. (2006). *Hostage at the table: How leaders can overcome conflict, influence others, and raise performance*. Wiley.
- Lepskiy, M. A. (2024). *Criminal profiling and politics: Monograph*. TsNSD.
- Pérez-Yus, M. C., Ayllón-Negrillo, E. A., Delsignore, G., Magallón-Botaya, R., Aguilar-Latorre, A., & Oliván-Blázquez, B. (2020). Variables associated with negotiation effectiveness: The role of mindfulness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1214.
- Rosenberg, M. B. (2015). *Nonviolent communication: A language of life* (2nd ed.). PuddleDancer Press.
- Sikorski, M. T., & Albrecht, A. (2025). Trust in the context of intercultural negotiations: A systematic review. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 18(1), 1–41.
- Trump, D. J., & Schwartz, T. (2004). *The art of the deal*. Physicalbook.
- Webel, C., & Galtung, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook of peace and conflict studies* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203089163>

МАКСИМ, ЛЕПСЬКИЙ – доктор філософських наук, професор,
професор кафедри соціології, Запорізький національний університет (Запоріжжя, Україна)
E-mail: waysensey@gmail.com
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5604-641X>

ЕФЕКТИ, ЩО ОРІЄНТУЮТЬ ПОВЕДІНКУ ПІД ЧАС ПЕРЕГОВОРІВ З КОНФЛІКТУ: СОЦІАЛЬНО-ФІЛОСОФСЬКИЙ, СОЦІАЛЬНО-КУЛЬТУРНИЙ ТА ПСИХОСЕМАНТИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ

Анотація

У статті подано соціально-філософський аналіз феномену ефектів, що орієнтують поведінку у переговорах у соціокультурному та психосемантичному вимірах. Незважаючи на інтенсивний розвиток теорії та практики переговорів, сучасний науковий дискурс демонструє відсутність комплексної концептуальної моделі, здатної інтегрувати численні виміри цього явища в цілісну аналітичну структуру. По-перше, залишається брак систематичного пояснення взаємодії між раціональними та ірраціональними компонентами поведінки учасників переговорів. Більшість існуючих досліджень наголошують на раціонально-інструментальних підходах, які передбачають лінійний причинно-наслідковий зв'язок між стратегіями, тактикою та результатами. Однак емоційно-мотиваційні, імпульсивні та підсвідомі аспекти поведінки часто залишаються маргінальними або розглядаються фрагментарно. Цей вузький фокус значно обмежує аналітичний потенціал досліджень, особливо враховуючи те, що в реальних переговорах ірраціональні фактори часто формують хід та динаміку взаємодії. Виокремлено п'ять ефектів – імпульс, амбіція, перемога, результат і стосунки, – які виступають прихованими регуляторами динаміки взаємодії та можуть формувати як конструктивні, так і деструктивні сценарії. Сучасні наукові дослідження оновлюють холістичні моделі, релевантні до нових умов реального світу, здатні інтегрувати раціональні й ірраціональні чинники, психосемантичний профіль ефектів і соціокультурну варіативність. Запропоновано методологічну рамку, що об'єднує соціально-філософський, соціокультурний і топологічний підходи до вивчення меж раціональності, структури ефектів та їхнього впливу на результативність переговорів. Показано, що рефлексивне та культурно чутливе управління ефектами знижує ризик ескалації конфлікту й підвищує стабільність домовленостей. Окрес-

лено напрями подальших досліджень, зокрема розробку діагностичних інструментів і моделей партисипативного управління ефектами у складних переговорних процесах. Аналіз підтверджує, що вплив імпульсу, амбіцій, перемоги, результату та стосунків становить більше, ніж просто емоційний фон переговорів – вони виступають ключовими регуляторами їхньої динаміки. Ці ефекти впливають на моделі взаємодії, стратегічний вибір, розвиток комунікації, а також якість і довговічність досягнутих угод.

Ключові слова: переговори, поведінкові ефекти, соціальна філософія, імпульс, амбіція, перемога, результат, стосунки, конфлікт, миротворення.

© The Authors(s) 2025

This is an open access article under

The Creative Commons CC BY license

Received date 17.07.2025

Accepted date 19.08.2025

Published date 17.09.2025

How to cite: Lepskyi, Maksym. Effects that orient behavior in conflict negotiations: a socio-philosophical, socio-cultural, and psycho-semantic analysis. HUMANITIES STUDIES: Collection of Scientific Papers / Ed. V. Voronkova. Zaporizhzhia: Publishing house «Helvetica», 2025. 24 (101). P. 62–70
doi: <https://doi.org/10.32782/hst-2025-24-101-06>