International Journal of Trade and Management

ISSN: 2820-7289

https://ricg-encgt.ma/

Volume 1, Issue 3, March 2024

DECISIONS AND NEGOTIATIONS IN BUSINESS: UNRAVELING THE INTERPLAY FOR OPTIMAL OUTCOMES

Noure KHAMLICHI

PhD Student, ENCG Tanger- Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Tangier, Morocco

noure.khamlichi@etu.uae.ac.ma

Pr. Nora BENAHMED

Professor-Researcher, ENCG Tanger Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Tangier, Morocco

nbenahmed@uae.ac.ma

ABSTRACT

In the intricate landscape of business operations, decision-making and commercial negotiation are fundamental processes crucial for value creation and conflict resolution. Despite their initial appearance as separate entities, a closer examination reveals their inseparable interconnection. Every negotiation begins with a complex sequence of decisions, spanning from defining objectives to navigating risks and benefits. In this paper, decision-making is characterized as the process of assessing various alternatives considering objectives, constraints, and available information. Business negotiation, on the other hand, encompasses the interaction between parties aimed at achieving mutually satisfactory agreements. Understanding this intersection is pivotal, as each decision influences negotiation strategies and offers opportunities for complex decision-making. Delving into decision-making biases and their impact on negotiations, as well as exploring the synergies between communication, perception, and decision-making, provides valuable insights for navigating these critical interactions effectively. Additionally, an interdisciplinary approach integrating psychology, economics, communication studies, and game theory will enrich the analysis, offering a holistic view of how various factors influence decision-making processes and negotiation outcomes.

Key words : Decision-making, Business Negotiation, Cognitive Biases, Decision-making Biases Negotiation Strategies.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the complex and dynamic world of business, decision-making and business negotiation stand out as fundamental pillars in the process of creating value, conflict resolution, and achieving mutually advantageous agreements. Decision-makers and negotiators constantly find themselves facing scenarios where their choices and actions have significant consequences on economic and relational outcomes (Simon, 1957; Thompson and Hastie, 1990). At first glance, these two areas may seem distinct, but a closer exploration reveals that decision-making and negotiation are inexorably linked, with each phase of the negotiation process being fueled by choices and probability assessments (Kahneman and Tversky, 1984).

The intricate interplay between decision-making and commercial negotiation underpins the core of transactions and agreements (Bazerman & Moore, 2013). Human decision-making is inherently susceptible to a myriad of cognitive and emotional biases, which can significantly reverberate within the context of commercial negotiations (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979; Bazerman, 2006). As parties engage in negotiations, they bring with them biases and thought patterns that can distort their objective evaluation of alternatives (Thompson et al., 2006). One such bias, often observed, is the anchoring effect. Initial offers made during negotiations can serve as anchors around which parties adjust their positions, potentially leading to unintended concessions or suboptimal agreements (Northcraft & Neale, 1986).

Similarly, overconfidence bias can influence negotiators to overestimate their abilities and underestimate potential risks, potentially leading to aggressive negotiation strategies and imprudent decisions (Moore & Healy, 2008; Babcock & Loewenstein, 1997). The loss aversion bias can also play a significant role, pushing parties to avoid risks and favor less ambitious options, even if more advantageous solutions are viable (Tversky & Kahneman, 1992).

Furthermore, how information is presented can also introduce significant biases. Confirmation bias urges negotiators to selectively seek and interpret information that confirms their preexisting beliefs, leading to a distortion of reality and a lack of objectivity in negotiations (Klayman & Ha, 1987).

After establishing the importance of the relationship between decision-making and business negotiation, the article will focus on several key aspects of this interconnected dynamic. Firstly, it will delve into the cognitive biases that influence decision-making and their impact on commercial negotiations. Subsequently, the article will examine how decision-making influences negotiation strategies and how decisions made at each stage of the negotiation process shape the final outcomes. Additionally, it will address strategies for managing cognitive biases in business negotiations, along with the crucial role of communication and perception in these contexts. Finally, the article will offer improvement perspectives and explore future trends in the field of decision-making and business negotiation.

2. METHODOLOGY

This literature review employs a rigorous methodology to ensure the comprehensiveness and relevance of the consulted sources. Initially, a systematic search was conducted across various academic databases, including Google Scholar, Scopus, Cairn, Web of Science, and JSTOR, utilizing specific keywords such as "decision-making," "business negotiation," "cognitive biases," and other relevant terms. This search yielded a diverse array of pertinent articles, theses, books, and reports.

Subsequently, a stringent selection process was applied to retain only the most pertinent and high-quality works. Inclusion criteria were based on the content's relevance to the evolving literature on the intertwining of decision-making and commercial negotiation. Additionally, publications had to originate from reputable sources and be published between the 1950s and the present period, in order to capture a comprehensive perspective on the field's evolution.

Following this, a thematic analysis was employed to categorize the selected works into distinct themes, encompassing the foundations of decision-making, emerging negotiation theories, the impact of cognitive biases, integration of biases in practice, and adaptation to modern trends. This thematic classification shed light on key trends and evolutions over the decades.

Finally, the methodology also encompassed a critical evaluation of the various sources, highlighting the strengths and limitations of each consulted work. This approach was crucial in ensuring the reliability and validity of the information extracted from the literature review.

3. CONTEXTUALIZATION OF DECISIONS AND NEGOTIATIONS

Building upon the foundational understanding of business operations, we now delve into the contextualization of decisions and negotiations within the dynamic landscape of commerce.

The business landscape is a theater of operations where crucial decisions are made at every turn, from strategic planning to operational management (March and Simon, 1958; Bazerman and Moore, 2008). These decisions shape the outcomes, orientations, and overall performance of companies. Negotiations, on the other hand, embody the delicate art of reaching agreements that satisfy the parties involved (Fisher and Ury, 1981; Malhotra and Bazerman, 2007). These agreements are not only the result of a series of financial transactions, but also the outcome of deliberate and strategic choices made by negotiators to maximize value and minimize risks.

The Natural Interweaving of Decision-Making, Business Negotiation, and Cultural Dynamics

Transitioning from the contextualization of business operations, we now examine the intricate interplay between decision-making, business negotiation, and cultural dynamics. Decision-making and negotiation, although distinct in appearance, are deeply interconnected. Every negotiation begins with a complex sequence of decisions made by the involved parties (Bazerman and Carroll, 1987; Thompson et al., 2000). These decisions go beyond the mere choice to engage in negotiation; they determine the objectives, concessions, and limits to be observed (Lax and Sebenius, 1986; Raiffa, 1982). At the same time, each step of the negotiation process represents a series of decisions that reflect the balance between potential advantages and inherent risks (Thompson, 2005; Neale and Sinaceur, 2006). Each negotiation is a dance of conscious decisions, influencing the trajectory of the final agreement. However, in delving into the interplay between decision-making and business negotiation, it's crucial not to overlook the profound influence of culture, particularly in cross-cultural contexts. Cultural norms, values, and communication styles can significantly shape both decision-making processes and negotiation strategies, often acting as invisible but potent forces guiding interactions. Anthropological and sociological perspectives offer invaluable insights into understanding these dynamics, shedding light on how cultural backgrounds influence individuals' perceptions, preferences, and approaches to decision-making and negotiation. For instance, concepts such as collectivism versus individualism, high-context versus low-context communication, and power distance play pivotal roles in shaping negotiation dynamics. Ignoring the cultural dimension can lead to misunderstandings, misinterpretations, and ultimately, failed negotiations. Thus, integrating anthropological and sociological perspectives enriches our understanding of decision-making and negotiation processes, equipping practitioners with the cultural competence necessary to navigate diverse business landscapes successfully.

4. KEY CONCEPTS

Having explored the natural interweaving of decision-making and negotiation, we now turn our attention to defining key concepts essential for understanding these dynamic processes.

4.1. Definition of Decision-Making

Decision-making can be defined as a process by which an individual or a group of individuals evaluate different alternatives and select the best option based on goals, constraints, and available information (Simon, 1957; Kahneman and Tversky, 1979). This evaluation involves analyzing potential costs and benefits, considering risks and uncertainties, as well as integrating emotional and behavioral factors into the decision-making process. Herbert A. Simon, a pioneer in the study of decision-making, developed the idea that humans have limited capacities to evaluate all alternatives and often adopt mental shortcuts, known as heuristics, to solve problems satisfactorily rather than optimally (Simon, 1955).

4.2. Definition of Business Negotiation

Business negotiation, on the other hand, is a complex process through which parties interact with the aim of reaching an agreement that is mutually satisfying (Fisher and Ury, 1981; Lewicki and Litterer, 1985). It can take various forms, ranging from daily commercial transactions to long-term strategic negotiations. At the heart of negotiation are a series of decisions made by the involved parties, whether regarding offers, counteroffers, concessions, or even the decision to withdraw from the talks. Business negotiations can be characterized by power dynamics, financial stakes, cultural considerations, and psychological factors that interact to influence the parties' decisions and the direction of the negotiation (Neale and Bazerman, 1992; Adair and Brett, 2005).

This literature review aims to explore the fascinating intersection between decision-making and business negotiation. While decision-making and negotiation are often perceived as separate processes, it is essential to recognize that these two aspects are closely intertwined, with each decision influencing negotiation strategies and each negotiation offering opportunities for complex decision-making. Understanding how these domains converge can not only shed light on the nature of business negotiations but also offer valuable insights into how parties can successfully navigate through these crucial interactions to achieve favorable outcomes (Bazerman and Carroll, 1987; Thompson and Hastie, 1990).

In the upcoming sections, we will delve deeper into decision-making biases that can influence business negotiations, as well as the influence of decision-making processes on negotiation strategies. Finally, we will highlight the synergies between communication, perception, and decision-making in business negotiation contexts, while emphasizing practical implications for professionals engaged in these dynamic processes (Neale and Sinaceur, 2006; Putnam and Wilson, 1982; Curhan and Neale, 2004).

5. DECISION-MAKING BIASES IN BUSINESS NEGOTIATION

Building upon our understanding of decision-making concepts, we now investigate the influence of cognitive biases on business negotiations.

Human decision-making is inherently prone to a multitude of cognitive and emotional biases that can have significant repercussions in the context of business negotiations (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979; Bazerman, 2006). When parties enter negotiations, they bring with them biases and ways of thinking that can alter their objective evaluation of alternatives (Thompson et al., 2006). One such bias, often observed, is the anchoring effect. The initial offers made during negotiations can serve as anchor points around which parties adjust their positions, potentially leading to unintended concessions or suboptimal agreements (Northcraft and Neale, 1986).

Similarly, overconfidence bias can influence negotiators to overestimate their abilities and underestimate potential risks. This can lead to aggressive negotiation strategies and imprudent decisions (Moore and Healy, 2008; Babcock and Loewenstein, 1997). Loss aversion bias can also play a significant role, pushing parties to avoid risks and favor less ambitious options, even if more advantageous solutions are possible (Tversky and Kahneman, 1992).

Furthermore, the way information is presented can also lead to significant biases. Confirmation bias drives negotiators to selectively seek and interpret information that confirms their pre-existing beliefs, which can result in a distortion of reality and a lack of objectivity in negotiations (Klayman and Ha, 1987).

6. INFLUENCE OF DECISION-MAKING ON BUSINESS NEGOTIATIONS

Having examined decision-making biases, we now shift our focus to how decision-making processes directly shape negotiation strategies and outcomes.

The influence of decision-making is palpable at every stage of the business negotiation process (Gneezy and Rustichini, 2000; Bazerman and Neale, 1992). The decisions made by the parties even before entering the negotiation room can set the tone for the talks (Thompson et al., 2000). Choices to select a business partner, set specific goals, and define concession limits represent crucial decisions that will have lasting repercussions on the upcoming negotiation (Adair and Brett, 2005).

Furthermore, decisions made during the negotiations themselves directly influence the outcomes. Choices regarding counteroffers, acceptance, or rejection of proposals shape the dynamics and terms of the potential agreement (Lax and Sebenius, 1986). Strategic decision-making can also be observed in how parties disclose or withhold information, thereby influencing the perception of value and negotiation position (Brett and Thompson, 2015).

Collective decision-making adds an additional layer of complexity. When multiple parties are involved, concerted choices must be made based on different perspectives and interests. Collective decision-making often requires a careful evaluation of the pros and cons of various options, while considering group dynamics and interpersonal relationships (Thompson, 2011).

Finally, decisions made after the conclusion of the negotiation have long-term implications. Implementing agreements, managing agreed-upon terms, and evaluating results are integral parts of ongoing decision-making in the cycle of business relationships (Bazerman and Moore, 2008).

In summary, decision-making and business negotiation are inextricably intertwined. Decision-making biases can influence negotiations in multiple ways, while decisions made at each stage of the negotiation process shape the final outcomes. Understanding these complex links provides crucial insights for professional negotiators, as it enables them to recognize and manage biases that may compromise advantageous and enduring agreements (Bazerman and Carroll, 1987; Neale and Sinaceur, 2006).

7. STRATEGIES FOR MANAGING BIASES IN BUSINESS NEGOTIATIONS

Transitioning from the influence of decision-making on negotiations, we now explore strategies aimed at mitigating the impact of cognitive biases in business negotiations.

The recognition of decision-making biases in business negotiations has led to the development of strategies aimed at mitigating their impact (Bazerman and Moore, 2013; Bazerman and Neale, 1992). Negotiators can take a proactive approach by preparing strategies that take potential biases into account (Bazerman and Carroll, 1987). For instance, to counter the anchoring effect, a tactic could be to start with balanced offers rather than anchoring with an extreme offer (Northcraft and Neale, 1986). Awareness of overconfidence bias can prompt parties to be more cautious in their estimations and seek external advice to validate their assessments (Moore and Healy, 2008).

The use of "outside view" is another common approach (Bazerman and Moore, 2013). This involves considering the situation from different angles, which can help mitigate cognitive biases by broadening perspective and making more balanced decisions (Kahneman and Lovallo, 1993). Additionally, gathering objective information and factual data can help counter confirmation bias, as it encourages an evaluation based on evidence rather than preconceived beliefs (Nickerson, 1998).

8. ROLES OF COMMUNICATION AND PERCEPTION IN NEGOTIATIONS

Shifting our focus to communication and perception, we delve into their pivotal roles in shaping negotiation dynamics.

Communication plays a vital role in business negotiations, acting as a channel through which parties express their interests, concerns, and positions (Lewicki et al., 2015). Decisions regarding the timing, tone, and content of communication can influence the direction of the negotiation (Thompson et al., 2005). Communication biases, such as overestimating the clarity of communication or the tendency to misinterpret messages, can lead to misunderstandings that compromise potential agreements (Pruitt and Rubin, 1986).

Perception is also crucial (Adair and Brett, 2005). Parties are constantly assessing each other's intentions and credibility. Decision-making is guided by how negotiators perceive the movements, signals, and proposals of the other party (Brett and Okumura, 1998). Biases such as attribution bias, which can lead to attributing negative motivations to the actions of the other party, can hinder open communication and the building of trust (Robinson et al., 1997).

9. IMPROVEMENT PERSPECTIVES

Lastly, we explore improvement perspectives and future trends in the field of decision-making and business negotiation, aiming to offer insights into evolving practices and potential areas for further research.

Given the potential impact of decision-making biases on business negotiations, it is imperative to consider improvement approaches that can strengthen the integrity and fairness of negotiation processes (Thompson and Loewenstein, 2006). Several avenues are worth exploring to help professionals navigate successfully in this complex context (Bazerman and Moore, 2008).

One of these approaches is to foster a culture of continuous learning within organizations and negotiation teams (Brett and Thompson, 2015). Awareness of cognitive and emotional biases can play a crucial role in helping negotiators recognize and anticipate these tendencies. Training sessions and workshops focused on bias awareness, as well as management strategies, can enhance negotiators' skills and prepare them to face inherent challenges (Neale and Bazerman, 2008).

Furthermore, the integration of collaborative negotiation techniques can offer a significant improvement perspective (Lewicki and Hiam, 2011). By emphasizing the creation of mutual value rather than simply maximizing individual gains, negotiators can transcend biases that favor more competitive approaches. Establishing an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect can help mitigate distrust biases and foster more informed decisions (Thompson et al., 2006).

The use of technology and data can also provide a path for improvement (Bazerman and Moore, 2013). Data analysis tools can help identify recurring decision patterns, enabling negotiators to make more informed, evidence-based decisions. Simulation models can be used to explore different options and their potential consequences, helping to avoid biases related to excessive focus on a single option (Curhan et al., 2003).

Finally, adopting a multidisciplinary approach can enrich the understanding of decision-making biases in business negotiations (Thompson et al., 2010). By leveraging insights from psychology, behavioral economics, communication, and game theory, negotiators can develop a more holistic understanding of the processes at play and ways to positively influence them (Bazerman and Moore, 2013).

In conclusion, the recognition of decision-making biases in business negotiations offers an opportunity for continuous improvement. Through training, the adoption of mitigation strategies, a focus on collaboration, and smart use of technology, negotiators can enhance their performance and achieve more favorable outcomes for all parties involved.

10. SYNTHESIS

This comprehensive literature review delves into the intricate interplay between decision-making and commercial negotiation, revealing a nuanced relationship that underpins the dynamics of transactions and agreements. The exploration of cognitive biases in decision-making, such as anchoring effects, overconfidence, and loss aversion, sheds light on their pervasive influence in the realm of business negotiations. These biases, identified by seminal works like Kahneman and Tversky's Prospect Theory, have significant implications for negotiators, potentially leading to suboptimal outcomes. Moreover, the review highlights the pivotal role of communication and perception in negotiations, emphasizing their impact on the direction of talks and the establishment of trust between parties. The empirical studies and concrete examples cited illustrate the tangible effects of decision-making biases on commercial negotiations, providing real-world context to the theoretical underpinnings. Furthermore, the strategies for mitigating biases, such as employing deliberate thinking and diverse perspectives, offer actionable insights for negotiators seeking to navigate these complex interactions successfully. The incorporation of a multidisciplinary approach, drawing from psychology, behavioral economics, communication theory, and game theory, enriches the understanding of decision-making biases in commercial negotiations. Overall, this review not only elucidates the profound influence of decision-making on negotiation strategies but also provides practical avenues for professionals to enhance their negotiation performance in an ever-evolving business landscape.

11. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Looking ahead, there are several promising avenues for further exploration in the realm of decision-making and commercial negotiation. One crucial area of focus could be the integration of advanced technologies, such as artificial intelligence and machine learning, to assist negotiators in analyzing complex data and simulating various negotiation scenarios. These tools have the potential to provide valuable insights, enabling negotiators to make more informed decisions. Additionally, the evolving landscape of international trade and commerce presents an intriguing area for study. Understanding how cultural nuances and geopolitical factors influence decision-making processes in global negotiations could yield invaluable insights for negotiators operating on an international scale. Moreover, as the business environment continues to evolve, exploring the impact of emerging trends, such as remote work arrangements and virtual negotiations, on decision-making and negotiation dynamics could offer critical insights for adapting strategies in the digital age. Finally, delving into the psychological underpinnings of decision-making in negotiations, particularly in high-stakes situations, presents a rich area for future research. Investigating how factors like stress, time constraints, and ethical considerations influence decision-making processes can provide a deeper understanding of negotiator behavior. By delving into these future perspectives, researchers and practitioners can continue to advance the field, equipping negotiators with the knowledge and tools needed to navigate the complexities of commercial negotiations effectively.

12. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the intricate interplay between decision-making and business negotiation forms the foundation of transactional dynamics and agreements. Decision biases, inherent to human nature, exert a subtle yet significant influence on commercial negotiations. These biases, such as anchoring effects, overconfidence, and loss aversion tendencies, can alter the rationality and perception of the parties involved.

However, the recognition of these biases offers the opportunity to adopt proactive management strategies. By preparing conscious approaches that bypass cognitive and emotional biases, negotiators can maximize the chances of reaching mutually advantageous agreements. Furthermore, communication and perception play vital roles in negotiations, influencing the direction of discussions and the building of trust relationships.

Empirical studies and concrete examples highlight the real impact of decision biases on commercial negotiations. They underscore the importance of considering contextual and cultural elements in decision-making and international negotiations. This deep understanding helps guide negotiators towards more informed choices and more effective strategies.

Finally, perspectives for improvement offer paths towards fairer and more productive negotiations. Continuous learning, the adoption of collaborative techniques, the use of technology, and a multidisciplinary approach are elements that can transform how decisions are made and negotiations are conducted. The integration of game theory can also provide analytical frameworks for managing complex interactions and cooperation strategies.

In summary, the symbiosis between decision-making and business negotiation transcends academic and professional boundaries. Understanding how these two elements intertwine and mutually influence allows professionals to navigate successfully in the complex world of business, leading to solid, mutually beneficial, and sustainable agreements. While deliberate decision-making is crucial for negotiation success, it's essential to recognize that achieving absolute thoughtfulness in decision-making may not always be feasible. Therefore, while deliberate consideration enhances negotiation outcomes, acknowledging the inherent limitations in decision-making processes is equally important.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BAZERMAN, Max H.; MOORE, Don A. (2013). *Judgment in managerial decision making*. John Wiley & Sons.

BAZERMAN, Max H.; NEALE, Margaret A. (1986). *Heuristics in Negotiation: Limitations to Effective Dispute Resolution*. Negotiation Journal, 2(1), 11-32.

BAZERMAN, Max H.; Tenbrunsel, Ann E. (2011). Blind Spots: *Why We Fail to Do What's Right and What to Do about It*. Princeton University Press

BRETT, Jeanne M.; OKUMURA, Tetsushi (1998). *Inter-and intracultural negotiation: U.S. and Japanese negotiators*. Academy of Management Journal, 41(5), 495-510.

CURHAN, Jared R.; ELFENBEIN, Hillary A.; XU, Hengameh (2003). *What do people value when they negotiate? Mapping the domain of subjective value in negotiation*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84(2), 496-513.

CURHAN, Jared R.; NEALE, Margaret A. (2004). *Negotiation Aversion: Why More Isn't Always Better.* Negotiation Journal, 20(1), 89-99.

DIAMOND, Jared. (2020). *Upheaval: Turning Points for Nations in Crisis.* Little, Brown and Company.

FISHER, Roger; URY, William; PATTON, Bruce (1991). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. Penguin Books.

GELFAND, Michele J.; BRETT, Jeanne M. (2004). *The Handbook of Negotiation and Culture*. Stanford University Press.

GINO, Francesca; Bazerman, Max H. (2009). *When Misconduct Goes Unnoticed: The Acceptability of Gradual Erosion in Others' Unethical Behavior*. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45(4), 708-719.

KAHNEMAN, Daniel; TVERSKY, Amos (1979). *Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk.* Econometrica, 47(2), 263-292.

KAHNEMAN, Daniel; KNETSCH, Jack L.; THALER, Richard H. (1991). *Anomalies: The Endowment Effect, Loss Aversion, and Status Quo Bias*. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 5(1), 193-206.

LEWICKI, Roy J.; HIAM, Alexander (2011). *Mastering business negotiation: A working guide to making deals and resolving conflict*. John Wiley & Sons.

LEWICKI, Roy J.; Saunders, David M.; Barry, Bruce. (2021). "*Negotiation.*" McGraw-Hill Education.

MALHOTRA, Deepak; BAZERMAN, Max H. (2018). *Investigative Negotiation*. Harvard Business Review, 96(9), 72-79.

MOORE, Don A.; HEALY, Paul J. (2008). *The trouble with overconfidence*. Psychological Review, 115(2), 502-517.

NEALE, Margaret A.; BAZERMAN, Max H. (2008). *Negotiating rationally*. Simon and Schuster.

NEALE, Margaret A.; BAZERMAN, Max H. (1985). *The effects of framing and negotiator overconfidence on bargaining behaviors and outcomes*. Academy of Management Journal, 28(1), 34-49.

PRUITT, Dean G.; RUBIN, Jeffrey Z. (1986). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and settlement*. Random House.

SCHURMANS, Marie-Noelle. (2013). *Négociations et transactions : un fondement socio-anthropologique partagé.* De Boeck Supérieur

SIMON, Herbert A. (1957). *Models of Man: Social and Rational*. Behavioral Science, 2(4), 239-248.

TENBRUNSEL, Ann E.; Diekmann, Kristina A.; Wade-Benzoni, Kimberly A.; et al. (2010). *The Ethical Mirage: A Temporal Explanation as to Why We Aren't as Ethical as We Think We Are*. Research in Organizational Behavior, 30, 153-173.

THALER, Richard H.; SUNSTEIN, Cass R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Yale University Press.

TVERSKY, Amos; KAHNEMAN, Daniel (1981). *The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice*. Science, 211(4481), 453-458.

TVERSKY, Amos; KAHNEMAN, Daniel. (2011). *Loss Aversion in Riskless Choice: A Reference-Dependent Model.* The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 106(4), 1039-1061.

THOMPSON, Leigh; Gentner, Dedre; LOEWENSTEIN, George. (2000). *Avoiding missed opportunities in managerial life: Analogical training more powerful than individual case training.* Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 82(1), 60-75.

THOMPSON, Leigh; LOEWENSTEIN, George (2006). *The role of deception in negotiations: Perceptions and consequences*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(2), 759-771.

THOMPSON, Leigh; LOVALLO, Dan (2006). *Beyond negotiation: Communication and persuasion in buyer-seller interactions*. Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 61(3), 276-291.

THOMPSON, Leigh; LOVALLO, Dan (2006). *Strategies of committing to mixed-strategy play*. Academy of Management Review, 31(2), 347-361.

THOMPSON, Leigh. (2018). *The Mind and Heart of the Negotiator.* Pearson.