Table 1

Categories and respective definitions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Category | Definition |
| Acts of providing and asking about negotiation-related information | Negotiators’ queries and provision of information to the other party regarding their preferences, reservation point, best alternative to negotiated agreement (BATNA), general needs, desires and goals (Weingart, Thompson, Bazerman, Carroll, 1987, p. 286) |
| Offers | Messages that convey the parties’ offer- counteroffer process (Tutzauer, 1992; Lewicki, Saunders, Barry, 2015, p.235) |
| Acts of persuasive communication/influence-seeking communication | Forcing behaviors and statements individuals deploy to bring out desired attitudinal or behavioral change (to adjust the other party’s positions, perceptions, opinions; Lewicki, Saunders, Barry, 2015, p. 285), and that aim at convincing the opponent to comply with one’s own proposals (Giebels, De Dreu, Van de Vliert, 2000, p. 262) |
| Socio-emotional statements | Statements that capture the relational interaction between parties, such as expressing feelings or lightening the atmosphere (Kauffeld, Lehmann-Willenbrock, 2012) |
| Unethical behaviors | Behavior that is commonly regarded as ethically unacceptable and inappropriate (Robinson, Lewicki, Donahue, 2000; Fulmer, Barry, Long, 2009), exceeding “traditional competitive bargaining” tactics (Lewicki, Saunders, Barry, 2015, p. 161) |
| Acts of process-related communication | Communication about the negotiation process entails statements that indicate how well the interaction is going, remarks about the process itself, and suggestions for improving the negotiation (Brett, Shapiro, Lytle, 1998) |
| Disruptions of the conversation | External issues that disrupt the interaction |

Table 2

Integration of codes from selected articles (N = 88)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | New code | Definition | Old Codes | Definition and Appearance |
| Acts of providing and asking about negotiation-related information | Stating values | Statements of an exact value of one party’s profit table | Information exchange | Frequency of participants directly stating exact values of their profit (3); Proportion of statements in which a negotiator mentioned numbers from his/her profit table (6); trading information about the specific value of potential offers, frequency negotiators ask for and give truthful numerical information (13), (18), problem solving behavior (24), |
| Honesty | telling the truth; the party expresses the indifference regarding the values of the indifference issues and leaves it up to the opponent to choose the option (40) |
| Providing priority-related information | Providing information that reveals parties’ priorities among issues | Priority information | (2), (10), (11), (13), (18), Integrative Information (22), (23), problem solving behavior (24), task behavior (28), providing information (31), (33), (35), information that reveals negotiators' preferences for an issue or priorities among issues (36) |
| Give priority information | (2); statements about priorities, for example what is more and what is less important, Direct Integrative strategy (10), (11), (13), (22), (23), (35), the intensity with which a negotiator (a) provided information about his/her priorities among negotiation issues (43), providing information about priorities across multiple issues (59) |
| Asking for priority-related information | Ask for parties’ priorities among issues | Ask priority information | (2); (11); (13), (18), (22), (23), (35), the intensity with which a negotiator asked for information about the priorities of his/her counterpart (43), questions about the other party’s priorities across issues (59) |
| Equivalence | a bid for mutual identification (28) |
| Providing preference-related information | Providing information that reveals parties’ preferences for an issue | States issue preferences | information that reveals negotiators' preferences for an issue or priorities among issues (36), Integrative Information (22), (23), problem solving behavior (24), task behavior (28), providing information (31), (33), Preference for a negotiable issue, option, relative importance of issues; assertion of interest(48) |
| Time preferences | (70) |
| Info-preferences | State preferred level within an issue (54), providing information about preferences within an issue (59) |
| Interests | Statements that interpret facts with reference to the wants, needs, or concerns of one or both parties. This may include questions about why the negotiator wants or feels the way he/she does.(30), (33), vs. power and right code (distributive) (37), revealing or asking for underlying interests (39) |
| Asking for preference-related information | Ask for parties’ preferences for an issue or preferences within an issue | Ques-preferences | Ask for preferred level within an issue (54), questions about the other party’s preferences within an issue (59) |
| Asks questions about preferences | Integrative Information (22), (23), problem solving behavior (24), task behavior (28), (33) |
| Mutuality | Statements of similarities or differences between the parties’ interests | Mutuality | statements of commonalities or differences between the parties' interests, for example noting compatible or divergent issues, Direct integrative strategy (10), Notes differences in a positive way (11), Integrative Action (22), (23), task behavior (28), Noting converging or diverging interests (36) |
| Notes general differences | Integrative Action (22), (23), noting areas where parties have different objectives (36) |
| Notes general similarities | Integrative Action (22), (23), noting common interests (36) |
| Notes differences | (22), (23) ; (48) |
| Notes differences [in a negative way] | (11) |
| Asking for positional information | Ask the other party for reservation price, BATNA, minimum terms or information about competitors (every question that is aiming for positional information) | Ask/Seeks positional information | (2), (11), distributive offensive (29), reservation price and BATNA (31), questions (32), Asks for bottom line (22), (23), (31) |
| Providing positional information | Statements that reveal information about one party’s reservation price, BATNA, minimum terms or competitors | Gives positional information | (2), (11), distributive defensive (29), informational statements (32), BATNA and reservation price |
| States minimum terms | (11), Reference to limits = one's inability to make more concessions (rational influence)(36), Reference to minimum acceptable price or conditions (reservation price) (48) |
| Refers to BATNA | (11), Reference to the presence of alternatives (BATNA) = conveys one's power to walk away from the table (rational influence) (36), Reference to BATNA (Best Alternative to Negotiation Agreement—what we do if we don't reach an agreement) (48) |
| Information about competitor | Information about competitors (other stations, other cartoons or shows, other suppliers) (48), Reference to competitors = relational power argument relying on contextual rather than task-related factors (affective persuasion) (36) |
| Refers to bottom line (minimum terms) | (22), (23), |
| Facts/Additional information | Any information that is not related to preferences, priorities, positional information and does not follow an argumentative structure (“…, because”) but is pure information providing. | Introduce new information about self, other, situation | (11), distributive defensive (29), information about own company (strategic plan, profitability, long-term relationships, reputation, power) (48) Reference to personal stake of negotiator in transaction (48) |
| Continue information about self, other, situation | (11), distributive defensive (29) |
| Probing and responding | Asking factual questions; answering questions or volunteering factual information (8) |
| Extension | Extending or continuing the topic in the immediately preceding utterance (52) |
| Additional information/information provision | Provides information to the opponent that is in direct response to a request for said information; can be an unsolicited clarification of the topic under discussion or unsolicited information that the opponent had requested (50) |
| Shows insight | Integrative Action (22), (23) |
| Extension questions | Questions that ask for additional information or clarification (not substantiation), that are not related to preferences, priorities, positional information | Questions of clarifications/clarifications request | (32), asking for additional information (52) |
| Limits of case information | One party is missing information regarding the negotiation issue (48) |
| Questions/extension question | A request for additional information or a continuation of the topic in the preceding utterance, phrased as a question (50) |
| Asks miscellaneous task related questions | (22), (23) |
| Inaction | Statements that are aborted without being interrupted by the other party | Inaction | Failure to enter dialogue despite opportunity. Scored when an individual failed to respond to the other on three consecutive occasions. (60) |
| Submissive | Show apathy, a lack of understanding, or an inability to cope with the events (60) |
| Offers | Single-Issue Activity | Making a single-issue offer (proposal that represents only one of several possible issues)or referring to one. | Makes single issue offer | (2), Indirect “Integrative” strategy (10), (11), Distributive Action(22), (23), distributive offensive (initiation) (29), any proposal representing only one of several possible issues (36), (48), Number of offers made (6) |
| Suggests to discuss one issue/Single-issue suggestion | (22), (23) , (2); see also refers to single issue (11) |
| Refers to single issue | (11) |
| Multi-issue activity | Making a multi-issue offer (proposal that represents 2 or more of several possible issues)or referring to one. | Suggests package trade-offs | Integrative Action (22), (23) |
| Multiple-issue activity | Offer or suggestion (2), Indirect integrative strategy (10), (11), offer: Integrative Action (22), (23), (35), any proposal representing two or more issues (36) |
| Multi-issue offer without trade-off | (11) |
| Multi-issue offer with trade-off | (11) |
| Refers to multiple issues | (11), Reference to or preference for multiple issues with or without tradeoffs (48) |
| Incorporation | Incorporating the other party’s requests, ideas, or part of the other’s offer into a new offer | Alternative | Proposal of a concession or solution that has not previously been considered during the negotiation. (60) |
| Direction information exchange | pointing out how the other could make an acceptable offer (13) |
| Incorporation | Incorporating part of the other's offer into one of their own (13)proposal: A statement that does not necessarily ask the question "why" or respond to "why" the negotiator wants something, but is an offer proposing a solution incorporating what s/he wants (30) |
| Suggests creative solutions to meet own interests | (22), (23), |
| Systematic concession making | Measure of heuristic trial and error (13); occurs when a bargainer explores various offers at about one value before proceeding to a lower level; index is calculated by examining the number of unique offers made by a party which are within close distance to each other, expressed as a ratio of the total number of offers made(6); where a bargainer explores various options at one level of value to himself/herself before proceeding to a lower level (13) |
| Backward concession making | Negotiators make offers which are more demanding than their previous position (index is computed by calculating the difference between the negotiator’s profit associated with the final agreement and his/her lowest offer (6) |
| Proposes coordination (COORD) | proposal for mutual concessions or a trade-off of one commodity for another (57) |
| Concession | Change of previously made offer away from the target towards the other party’s requests (only use concession when it refers to previous made offer, if it’s a new offer use single-issue or multiple-issue offer, if it’s incorporating the other party’s offer, use Incorporation) | Offer Concessions | Statements which change the initial offer, position, or proposal away from the target.(30), Contains an offer which is less than the sender’s immediately prior offer pertaining to the issue(s) under discussion (50), Accommodations (29) |
| Indicate flexibility | indicate range (11), indicates at least some degree of flexibility in the speaker’s position |
| Suggests compromise | Integrative Action (22), (23), also see compromising style (process), displaying the willingness for concession (49), Suggest a compromise or willingness to concede on an issue |
| Fostering mutual concession-making | Compromising style (39) 🡪 integrative |
| Stressing fairness | Compromising style (39) |
| Request Action | Asking the other party to make an offer, to show a response/reaction to an offer or on an idea or making an open-ended comment that needs a reply | Opening | Provides an answer to the opponent and nothing else, leaving the upcoming response choice open for the opponent (50) |
| Requests for offer | Questions asking for a proposal or offer (30), invitations for the other party to "make an offer" (31), one party summons the other party to propose an offer (49) |
| Request reaction | Requesting the other’s reaction to a proposal (13), task behavior (28), integrative message (29) |
| Make open-ended comments | (11) |
| Imperative | (85) |
| Request for offer modification | Demand a concession/offer modification or acceptance of an offer without altering the own position/offer (not fostering mutual concession making) | Calls for concession | demand for a unilateral concession from the other bargainer (57) |
| Appeal | Sincere request for the other party to reconsider altering his/her current attitude to comply with the individual’s desire, with no suggestion of personal sacrifice. (60) |
| Demands | strategic behavior (28), distributive defensive (29), needs, demands, goals (31) Forceful expression of a favor or concession wanted from the opposing party (60), Assert rights/needs: Statement that addresses requirements/ expectations consistent with prior subject area, clearly arguing for compliance.(52) |
| Make extreme demands | (80) |
| Propose modifications to opponent’s offer | (11) |
| Assert proposal/offer | Asking the other to accept specific modifications in the proposal under discussion (52) |
| Conciliation/flexibility | Proposing flexibility in the speaker’s position. (52) |
| Reject offer | Rejecting the other party’s offer or part of it, disagreeing with an agreement | Reject opponent’s offer | Challenging, disagreeing or rejecting any part of the other's proposal. (52) |
| Retract/retractions | Clear withdrawal from a previously acknowledged agreement, regardless as to whether or not the speaker provides an explanation for their change in attitude. (60) |
| Vigorous rejections | a vigorous or strongly worded rejection of the other's offer (13) |
| Impasses | number of partial impasses (ranging from zero to nine impasses; partial impasses occur only on the pair level) (45) |
| Accept offer | Agreeing with or accepting the other party’s offer/concession or part of it | Accepts concessions | (11) |
| Acceptances | (29), (33)), (48), Giving agreement, assistance, acceptance or approval to any part of the other's offer or proposal (52) |
| Clarification | Paraphrasing previous statements (I mean..”), summarizing previous statements and agreements, | Clarification | Clarifies a statement or offer, distributive offensive (29) |
| Summarization of agreement(s) | (64) |
| Acts of persuasive communication/influence-seeking communication | Substantiation | Statements that follow an argumentative structure (…, because), and statements that connect information with opinions or recommendation (“You need this...”) | Substantiation | (11), Distributive Action (22), (23), persuasive behavior (28), distributive defensive (29), -->Substantiation = informational persuasion about why the other party needs sth. (rational influence) (36) Providing information or evidence supporting the speaker’s own position. (52), Make arguments for own position, arguments against other’s (54), arguments for one’s position on an issue (59) |
| Negative substantiation | Negative substantiation (you don't need/because . . . ) (48) |
| Positive substantiation | Positive substantiation (you do this/good for you/because how affects you, your company) or neutral substantiation (we need/because why; informational persuasion (48) |
| Argument/ self-supporting arguments | includes informational persuasion about why one party needs something (rational influence) (36) |
| Analogy | Gives a comparison between one situation and a dissimilar other event (82) |
| Example | gives an example of the idea or the proposal ; demonstrates how the proposal worked in the past (82) |
| Statistical | provides numerical or quantitative support for arguments (82) |
| Refers to Rights | Non-proposal related comments or references to norms, standards, fairness, justice, or contractual issues (30), included three types of arguments (department function, department budget, and company policy) (33), focusing on who is right (37) Negotiator’s personal stake, asking for sympathy = appeal to other party's emotions or norms for fairness (affective persuasion) (36) Discussion of formal or informal standards. Solutions based on formal regulations or informal standards (72) |
| Persuasive Communication/Persuasive Arguments | a statement of justification or strong desire  for the other to accept an offer (13), (18), forcing behavior: aim at convincing the opponent to comply with one’s own proposals (24), persuasive behavior (28) |
| Refers to mutual interests to influence other party | (22), (23), |
| Persuasion based on interests of the other party | Discussion of the other party's interests. Creating proposals that meet these interests. Suggesting trade-offs to meet the other party's high-priority interests (72) |
| Question substantiation | Asking about the other party’s substantiation (“Why should I...”) or questioning it (“Do you really think...”)? | Asks about others’ substantiation/Argumentation | Attack Arguments (2), (22), (23), persuasive behavior (28) |
| Ques-substantiation | Question the arguments presented (54), questions about the other party’s arguments (59) |
| Stressing power | Referring to one’s status, to being superior, to having more power than the other party, to the lack of power or competence of the other party, | Refers to power | (22), (23), (35) included arguments that referred to the focal negotiator’s power, status, or expertise. (33), focusing on who is more powerful (37), statements meant to stress power, dominating style (39), Reference to status of oneself or one’s company = appeal to social norms to defer to those with high power or status,-Reference to competitors (also see information about competitors) = relational power argument relying on contextual rather than task-related factors (affective persuasion) (36) Demands, threats, or rebuttals based on relative social power of speaker. Illusions that other high-status third parties support the speaker's suggestions (72) |
| PosSelf | Overt bragging about the superiority of personal ability or current situation in comparison to the ability of the other party. (60) |
| Status slurs/put-downs | Expressed as proportions of the total number of verbal exchanges (6); derogatory statements about the other's status or position (13), (18), forcing behavior: negative affect reactions aimed at trying to put oneself in a better position than the other (24) |
| Charge fault/derogation | Charge fault/derogation: Attributes to an opponent such things as incompetence or lack of good faith. Contains a disparaging remark or places into question something regarding the opponent, his organization, or offer(s) (50), Attributing lack of good faith, incompetence, negligence; derogating something about the other. (52) |
| Discourage | Attempts to discourage the other party from adopting a particular viewpoint or performing a particular action. (60) |
| Rejection substantiation | Disagreeing with the other party’s arguments, denying their relevance, disagreeing or rejecting the other party’s accusations | Reject opponent's arguments | (11), Reject rationale/utterance; Challenging: disagreeing or rejecting the immediately preceding utterance that is not related to the proposal per se (52) |
| NegReply | Short retorts that have a negative or uncaring tone but were not necessarily in response to the other party’s demands or offers. (60) |
| Deny relevance | Reject suggested structuring of the procedures suggested and/or assert the relevance of the issue/information raised by the other (52) |
| Personal rejection | Rejection of an opponent’s utterance combined with a personal insult of the opponent, his organization and/or products (50) |
| Deny fault with personal rejection | Challenging, disagreeing, or rejecting the immediately preceding utterance accompanied with a rationale and personal affront.(52) |
| Denial | Refusal to accept an accusation made by the other party. Such denials are not accompanied by an explanation of why the individual should be exonerated. (60) |
| Justify | Reply with evidence or contraindication (17) Explanation of a previous or future action. This variable was coded when the negotiator admits responsibility, but rejects the idea that the behavior is negative. Note that justify and excuse are opposites in terms of admitting responsibility. (60) |
| Interrupt | Disrupting the other party’s turn of speak (when it’s clear that the other party is not yet done articulating an idea/statement) | Interrupt | Continuous disruption of the opposing party. Scored as positive only after occurring twice over consecutive dialogue. (60) Cutting in on the other party's comment (72) successful/unsuccessful (87) |
| Criticism | Criticizing the other party’s behavior or accusing them of performing (or not performing) a particular action (not rejecting the other party’s accusations, not questioning the other party’s ability or referring to a lack of power) | Criticism | Criticism of the opposing party’s behavior or ability (this would fall under referring to power), where an explanation is given for the evaluation. (60) |
| Accuse | Challenge an assertion made by the opposing party, or fault the other party for performing (or not performing) a particular action. (60) |
| Stressing appreciation | Compliment the other party, showing support or encourage the other party to perform a particular action | Flattery (emotional influence) | (85) |
| Sympathy | Sympathy (you do this/good for you/because how affects me, my company) (48), expressing sympathy for other’s situation, express relief, happiness, or thanks (8) |
| Compliment | Praise for the opposing party’s attitude or behavior. (60) |
| Other-supporting arguments |  |
| Show other support | (11)Indicates agreement, acceptance, or approval of something about the opponent that is not a direct response to an offer and is not accompanied by a change in topic (50) Giving agreement, assistance, acceptance or approval to the immediately preceding utterance that is not related to the proposal, per se (52) |
| Encourage | Active encouragement of the opposing party to adopt a particular perspective or take a discussed action. (60) |
| Reassurance | Attempts to restore the other party’s confidence or to confirm again a particular opinion or questionable fact about the opinion or questionable fact about the current situation. (60) |
| Confidence | Expressions of trust in the others’ ability to perform a particular action. (60) |
| Deference | Submissiveness to another (28) |
| Commitments | Make promises or commitments to the other party | Promises | strategic behavior (28), distributive defensive (29), Conditionals (= instrumental behaviors) (32), |
| Recommendations | Conditionals (= instrumental behaviors) (32), |
| Positional commitments | Expressed as proportions of the total number of verbal exchanges (6), strategic behavior (28), distributive defensive (29), make commitments to unalterable positions |
| Heavy commitments | (13), strategic behavior (28), distributive defensive (29) |
| Acknowledge to be wrong | Regretting and apologizing for a previous action, realizing and stating to be wrong | NegSelf | A reflective criticism of personal behavior or ability. Often shown as an indirect realization of personal wrongdoing. (60) |
| Apology | Direct regretful acknowledgement of previous actions. (60) |
| Excuse | Acceptance of wrongdoing that involves a pleading for forgiveness from the other party on account of extenuating circumstances. The negotiator may recognize that their behavior is negative, but denies ultimate responsibility for the event. (60) |
| Patter | Chit-chat, [miscellaneous](https://www.dict.cc/englisch-deutsch/miscellaneous.html) statements unrelated to negotiation, repetition of previous statements | Patter | Expressed as proportions of the total number of verbal exchanges (6), references to the hypothetical commercial context of the negotiations which are used to pressure the other side into concession (13), garrulous behaviors(=talks-too-much-item) (32), the seller's chitchat unrelated to the specifics of bargaining (e.g., comments about the weather) (34) persuade the other bargainer to concede by bringing in extraneous issues (57) |
| Abstractness | Abstract principles, generalizations, and hypothetical statements that supplant discussion of concrete individuals and events related to conflict. (62) |
| Semantic focus | Statements about the meaning of words or the appropriateness of labels that supplant discussion of conflict. (62) |
| Filler | Misc. or non-information providing statements (80) |
| Pestering | Repetition |
| Avoiding | Change subject or shift discussion to new issue without terminating/agreeing on a previous issue | Avoiding style | making evasive and uncertain statements and by postponing an issue (39), Attempt to move interaction away from the current issue, through either a direct request or a more subtle change to the focus of discussion. (60) |
| Topic change | Introduces a new subject that changes the direction of the discussion (50) |
| Shift | Termination of the discussion by communicating an issue different from that spoken in the previous utterance. (60) |
| Unethical behavior | Threats | Warning of the costs if other party does not comply with made propositions | Warnings | Conditionals (= instrumental behaviors) (32), |
| Threats | Expressed as proportions of the total number of verbal exchanges (6); (11); (13), (18), Distributive Action (22), (23), communicate the intention to punish if the other fails to concede (24), strategic behavior (28), distributive offensive (29), Conditionals (= instrumental behaviors) (32), express threats (39) |
| Exit-threats | Threaten to end negotiation (18), forcing behavior: threat to leave and go to the alternative negotiator (24) |
| General threats | Use of general threats (18), e.g. to reverse a prior arrangement (24) |
| Omission | Offering less information than requested or concealing indifference toward options | Deception by omission | passive deception, passive misrepresentation; party makes use of an indifference option in a trade-off with another contract issues or when bargaining parties conceal relevant information regarding their indifference toward the options (40) |
| Information concession | Offering less information than is requested. (52) |
| Lying | Giving false information | Deception by commission/lying | active deception, active misrepresentation; party actively misrepresents the indifference options by lying about his/her situation(40) |
| Give false numerical information | Frequency of lie (13), Gives false information (GFI) is a lie about one's profit schedule or limit (57) |
| Give false priority information | Frequency of lie (13) |
| Bluffing | (49) |
| Hostility | Use of indecent language directed at other party, teasing and provoking or directly insulting other party | Provoke | An overt attempt to aggravate the opposing party into taking some aversive action. (60) |
| Insult | Degrading comment or scornful abuse directed at the opposing party. |
| Hostile joking | Joking or teasing that faults the partner. (62) |
| Profanity | The use of obscene swearing or other indecent language. (60) |
| Socio-emotional statements | Negative affective reaction | negative reactions to the other party's offer(s), idea(s), and general negative affect statements (31) (does not include rejection of offer but the emotional response) | Negative Affect | Number of questions and statements of negative affect (6), behavior in which actors express their negative feelings or emotions toward one another or toward a situation affect (28 |
| Anger at bidding behavior | Communication that shows antagonism, intolerance, combativeness, or that is belittling or disparaging (26) |
| Negative reactions | (22), (23) also see affect (process statements), distributive offensive (29), negative reactions to the other party's offer(s), idea(s), and general negative affect statements (31) |
| Negative reaction to opponent | (11), (22), (23), distributive offensive (29) |
| Disagreement without Anger | Conveys disagreement, passive rejection or formality; emotional content such as tension, anxiety, frustration(26) |
| Negative climate | Remark about the atmosphere(2) |
| Positive affective reaction | positive emotional reactions to the other party's offer(s), idea(s), and argument(s) and general positive affect statements | Direct positive reactions | direct positive or negative responses to the other party's suggestions or offers, direct integrative strategy (10), positive reactions to the other party's offer(s), idea(s), and argument(s) (31), (36), for negative reaction also see negative reaction to opponent (contentious…), Positive or neutral reaction (vague, ideas, arguments) or positive acceptance of offer (48) |
| Positive affect | Number of questions and statements of positive affect (6), behavior in which actors express their positive feelings or emotions toward one another or toward a situation, (28), |
| Makes positive comments | Integrative Action (22), (23) |
| Positive climate | Rapport or remark about the atmosphere(2) |
| Empathy | Recognition, understanding and interest in the other bargainer’s welfare and situation | Empathy | Sympathetic understanding for the explanations or feelings presented by the opposing party about their current situation. (60) |
| Showing concern for the opponent | includes recognition of the differential importance across issues for others, general empathic reactions, socioemotional concern, paraphrasing, and reviews of past behaviors (31), statement indicating interest in the other bargainer's welfare(57) |
| Humor | Use of humor and laughter | Humor | Attempts to use humor to lighten the tone of the negotiations. (60) |
| laughter | Frequency of laughter (6) |
| Relationship-building behavior | Statements that reflect a (positive) relationship between the parties and that facilitate a smooth and naturalistic interaction | We | Number of “we” statements (6), We/I ratio (67) |
| Emphasize collaboration | (39), positive relationship statement (49) |
| Expectations of the future | (70) |
| Off-task comments | Integrative Information behavior that helps building a relationship (22), (23) |
| Smalltalk, clichés, empty phrases (before or in-between discussing negotiation issues, if during discussion, code as patter) | Salutations, remarks about the weather, football…(49) |
| No objective psychological information | explicative acknowledgements or interjections, initiations or salutations, questions/answers that facilitated either conversational turn taking or basic information exchange (12), (15) |
| Acts of process-related communication | Procedural suggestions | Commenting on the mode, approach or process of the negotiation or suggesting an action regarding the process of the interaction | General approach | Use of general suggestions about how the pair could jointly handle the negotiation (13) suggestion of a general approach that might be used to produce agreement (57) |
| Move to new issue/Suggests to move on | (11), (22), (23), (28), (50) |
| Comment on process or reciprocity | (11), (48) |
| Suggests using reciprocity | (22), (23) |
| Suggests vote | (22), (23) |
| Proc-l-issue | Suggest addressing one issue at a time |
| Procedural discussion | Agreeing, disagreeing, clarifying or asking for clarification regarding a procedural suggestion/comment | Procedural disagreement | (28) |
| Procedural agreement | (28) |
| Procedural clarification | (28) |
| Hurry | Time checks, remarks about time that is running-out and suggestion to hurry and come to quick solutions | Encouraging quick solutions | Compromising style (39) |
| Time checks | Push to closure (22), (23) |
| Time out | Asking for or suggesting a break to break, calculate, think, or consult with the own party | Time out to calculate, think or break | (48) |
| Team-based discussion | State needs to discuss with own team members (80) |
| Disruptions of the conversation | Disruptions of the conversation | External issues that disrupt the interaction | Engineering/IT-related remarks | (49) |
| Noise | Other people talking, traffic noise, coughing or sneezing… |
| Someone enters the room |  |
| Moderator | Third party interrupts, terminates, moderates negotiation |
| Other/Residual category | All items that do not fit into the above categories (8), (21), Any statements that do not fit into the above categories.(30) |

*Note.* The numbers in brackets refer to the respective article (see <https://osf.io/fwe8t/?view_only=f2ce018bcb3d4f1888c5f221b878871c>, “Included papers”)