

## The Aspect of Intelligence in Negotiation Processes

Svetlana D. Gurieva<sup>a</sup>, Oksana V. Zashchirinskaia<sup>a</sup>, Ekaterina O. Shumskaya<sup>a</sup>,  
Elena A. Karpova<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>St.-Petersburg State University, Russia

<sup>b</sup>Information Technologies, Mechanics and Optics (ITMO) State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia

---

The presented article is devoted to the study of the relationship between social and emotional intelligence with the choice of a negotiation strategy. The scientific research involved 79 mid-level executives working for the XXX Company in the city of St. Petersburg. The respondents were surveyed by a range of methodologies including J. Guilford's 'Social Intelligence' test, questionnaire on emotional intelligence 'EmIn' (by D.V. Lyusin), S.P. Myasoedov's 'Styles of Negotiation' questionnaire, K. Thomas's 'Description of Behavior' test, and personal preferences forms. Data processing involved descriptive statistics of the parameters of all diagnostic tools, Spearman's Rho correlation analysis, one-way ANOVA test, and factor analysis. The study tested hypotheses on the relationship between the level of social and emotional intelligence and the choice of the negotiation strategy. The study demonstrated significant differences by gender; also, an interaction was revealed between the level of emotional and social intelligence, the choice of a negotiating strategy, and behavior in conflict situations.

**Keywords:** social intelligence, emotional intelligence, negotiation strategies, negotiation styles, conflict, dialog, cooperation, interaction.

---

### Introduction

The negotiation as a method of reaching agreement clearly has been used since ancient times; however, the scientific consideration of negotiation as an object of scientific analysis was not in the trend until the second half of the 20th century. Following J. Camp (2012), P.T. Steele and T. Beasor (2004), R. Fisher and W.L. Ury (2011), the negotiations are perceived as a dialogue between parties discussing an idea, information, and alternatives to reach a mutually acceptable solution (agreement) [1–3]. Each of the participants is immanent to own interests only; still, the parties are interdependent and therefore use negotiations to find a mutually acceptable solution to the problem. W. Mastenbrook paid particular attention to the problem of interdependence. The author perceived negotiation as 'the ability to pursue one's own interests, combined with the realization of the inevitability of the interdependence' [4]. The researcher has repeatedly emphasized that the negotiation process arises precisely due to interdependence: participants follow interests

that they cannot satisfy on their own, and at the same time, their interests intersect just by the nature of the case. According to Mastenbrook, the negotiations aimed at resolving this opposition. In 2015, S.D. Gurieva proposed four styles of negotiation (focus on action, process, people, and idea). At the same time, negotiation styles are determined by several factors that ranged from personal characteristics to the interests and needs of the participants [5]. The choice of a particular style depends on the goals of the negotiations, as well as on the conditions for their conduct and further cooperation with the adverse party [6].

It is also essential to respect the fact that negotiation that takes place (both within the framework of cooperation and in conditions of conflict) should involve communication between the participants. Thus, the negotiation process can be transformed into conflict interaction. As noted by the researchers (K. Kim, N.L. Cundiff, S.B. Choi, 2015), there is a need for emotional regulation of one's behavior, which is based on the principles of trust with a focus on long-term relationships [7]. Social intelligence acts as a

means of cognizing social reality, communications between participants in the negotiation process, and their perception of each other. The influence of social intelligence can be traced to many areas of human life. Intelligence, being an important aspect of common thinking, includes many cognitive abilities such as logic, planning, problem-solving, adaptation, abstract thinking, idea generation, language use, and learning [8, 9,10]. Social intelligence is one of the most important integral components of personal qualities, most clearly manifested in situations of tension, limited resources, personnel time quota, uncertainty, stress, and frustration. On the other hand, as emphasized by O.V.

Zashchirinskaia, negotiation practice is one of the areas of interaction in which personal qualities are most clearly manifested [11].

Of particular interest are the studies highlighting the special role of such cognitive components of social intelligence as social memory, social perception, the ability to social reasoning, the flexibility of social thinking, and creativity [12, 13].

The format of the negotiation process presupposes the importance of considering social intelligence as the competence of an individual; the latter competence is aimed at developing a general picture of awareness in society [14, 15]. It is also this competence that provides the opportunity for adequate adaptation in the face of social changes. Cognitive processes - perceptual, mnemonic, and mental - are typically seen as mediators of social behavior. As is commonly known, the argumentation of the position is crucial in the negotiation process, and the idea that social intelligence is a favorable factor, in this case, is natural and finds its empirical confirmation [16, 17, 18].

The quantitative characteristics of the levels of communicative activity are considered to ensure the correct assessment of the situation, the adoption and implementation of error-free solutions; such characteristics allow achieving awareness and harmonization of relations [19,20]. Factors affecting the negotiation process are of particular interest among the content characteristics of social intelligence: the

ability to understand people's behavior and interact with them; understand their circumstances and intentions; the ability to comprehend verbal and non-verbal symbols; exercise reasonable judgments, predict people's behavior, and provide adequate behavior adjustment in interpersonal interactions [21, 22]. The development of social competence obviously affects the personal and professional efficiency of the individual and the success of his/her adaptation to the environment; the social competence is also quite significant for effective interaction and communication between people. However, it is not only social intelligence that influences the outcome of negotiations. Recently, the determinant role of emotional intelligence attracted the attention of the scientific community. The relevance of the studies of this topic is explained by the need to reveal the factors associated with negotiations, as well as by the call to manage these factors.

Emotional intelligence is increasingly perceived as one of the most important parts of the personality. Since the 1990s, this phenomenon has become a particular object of its study and is rapidly acquiring a factual basis. In theory, J. Mayer, P. Salovey, and D. Caruso proposed to distinguish between 'ability models' and 'mixed models' of emotional intelligence [23]. The first type includes its own model that defines emotional intelligence as a cognitive ability; the second includes models that define emotional intelligence as a combination of cognitive abilities and personality traits. 'Mixed models' are models of emotional intelligence by R. Bar-On and D. Goleman; they combine cognitive, personal, and motivational traits, due to which they are closely related to adaptation to real-life [24]. These models involve measuring emotional intelligence using self-reported questionnaires that are similar to traditional character traits checklists. Noteworthy that D. Goleman's model must feature emotional intelligence not as a separate ability but as associated with the purposefulness of the individual [25].

The study of emotional intelligence and styles of business communication has been the object of research in several works by

modern authors (Gurieva, S., Kuznetsova, I., Yumkina, E., 2018). As apart of the results obtained, it was shown that managers focused on the procedural side of business communications were also more targeted on the development of interpersonal emotional intelligence, maintaining the trust and constructive agreements. Those managers focused on achieving the task paid more attention to details, had better control over their own reactions, and, accordingly, also better managed their emotions[26].

Summarizing various publications on this topic, it could be stated with confidence that social and emotional intelligence penetrates all areas of professional activity. The fundamental basis for the practice of negotiation and mediation is not only the cognitive analysis of competing interests and the rational development of the most effective outcome but also the recognition of the underlying emotional factors.

### Research design

The **goal** of the presented research was to study the preferred negotiation strategies depending on the level of social and emotional intelligence of the participants in the negotiation process.

**The object of research** was the level of social and emotional intelligence, methods of conflict resolution, and negotiation styles of mid-level executives.

The study involved 79 participants (35 men and 44 women) aged 25-55 (average age 31.9 and 39.3, respectively), mid-level executives employed by the XXX company, and residing in the city of St. Petersburg.

The **principal hypothesis** consisted of the proposition that there are significant differences in the choice of a negotiating strategy and methods of conflict resolution depending on the level of social and emotional intelligence of the participants in the negotiation process.

In order to enhance our insight on the topic the following **specific hypotheses** were developed:

- 1) there are significant differences in preferences for choosing a negotiating strategy and

methods of conflict resolution depending on gender;

- 2) there are significant differences in preferences for choosing a negotiating strategy and methods of conflict resolution depending on age;

- 3) there is a relationship between the level of social and emotional intelligence and the preferred negotiation strategies, as well as methods of conflict resolution.

### Sampling and research methods

The respondents were represented by different mid-level executives: deputy heads of services, heads of departments, deputy heads of departments, heads of sectors, and senior shift dispatchers. The sample consisted of 79 participants: 35 men and 44 women. All respondents had higher education and worked in St. Petersburg. The age of respondents varied from 25 to 55; 49.4% of them regularly participated in negotiations, 10.1% - on the daily basis, 6.3% once a month and 34.2% rarely did so. The overwhelming majority of respondents (86.1%) participated in negotiations as a negotiating party, 13.9% conducted or administered the negotiation process. An analysis of marital status showed that 62% of the participants were married, 38% were single.

During the survey procedure, the test forms were handed out to the respondents in a printed form; instructions were given orally to every respondent before handing over the tests. No strict time limits were applied; the respondents filled the blanks at a convenient time and handed the forms back within two-three days or just took pictures of their answers and sent them by e-mail. The study employed five different techniques:

1. 'Social Intelligence' test (J. Guildford in the 1960s). This test is featured by a battery of standardized tests aimed at diagnosing various aspects of one of the most interesting mental phenomena - social intelligence, that is, the ability to understand

and predict people's behavior in different everyday situations, as well as recognize intentions, feelings and emotional conditions of a person by non-verbal and verbal expression. 25 respondents were tested by J. Guilford's method in the presence of the author of the study.

2. 'Emotional Intelligence' (EmIn) test (D.V. Lyusin, 2006). This test assisted in revealing managers' ability to understand and manage the emotions of their own and others.
3. 'Styles of Negotiation' questionnaire (S.P. Myasoedov, 2008). This technique identified leading negotiating styles such as compromise, bargaining, threat, emotion, rationale, and acceptance.
4. 'Behavioral Description' test (K. Thomas, adopted by N.V. Grishina, 2001). The very test was designed to study personal predisposition to conflict behavior and identify certain styles of conflict resolution. It also may be used as a guideline for the study of adaptive and communicative personality traits and styles of interpersonal interaction.
5. Author's profiling questionnaire. Its questions were aimed at establishing the socio-demographic characteristics of the interviewed respondents (gender, age, marital status, educational level, work experience), as well as the degree of their participation in negotiations.

To interpret empirical data using the IBM SPSS Statistics 24.0 program, various methods of mathematical and statistical analysis were used, including primary descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, one-way ANOVA, analysis of variance, and factor analysis.

## Results and discussion

Analysis of the social characteristics of the respondents revealed that men (among mid-level executives) are most often the leaders in negotiations - 70%. Women more often become negotiating parties - in 59.4% of cases. The primary data show that the overwhelming majority of negotiators are not married (almost 55.6%). On the contrary, among other employees, 64.3% are married. At the same time, the authors studied the frequency of participation in the negotiations with the leaders and other parties. Based on the data obtained, it can be concluded that the respondents participate in negotiations in the role of moderators regularly (70%) and even daily (20%). Parties to the negotiation are invited to communicate with partners at least once a month (53.3%) or on a regular basis (33.3%).

Based on the data obtained with J. Guilford's test, it can be seen that the majority of respondents (48%) in the study demonstrate an average level of social intelligence. This concept in the context of the methodology is represented by the definition of the feelings and intentions of opponents: the assumption of the outcome of the negotiations; opponent's status interrogation, along with his/her thoughts, feelings, and intentions interpreted by expressive movements, postures, gestures, and facial expressions; correct understanding of the meaning of phrases and intentions of the participants to the negotiation process. The most frequent choices of the respondents fell on the correct understanding of verbal expression.

Accordingly, social intelligence below average was revealed in 28% of the surveyed, and only 3% were above average. Also, the majority of respondents had an average value for general emotional intelligence (based on the data obtained with the 'Emotional intelligence' test, see Table. 1). D.V. Lyusin comprehended emotional intelligence as a mixed construct that combines cognitive abilities and personal characteristics of an individual: the ability to understand and control one's own and other people's emotions; the ability to understand and otherwise manage other people's emotions; tacit understanding of the emotional state of a person based on external

manifestations of emotions (facial expressions, gestures, the ring of one's voice); sensitivity to the other people inwardness; the ability to evoke certain emotions in other people and reduce the intensity of unwanted feelings; tendency to manipulate; awareness, recognition, and identification of own emotions and understanding the reasons for expressing feelings along with the ability to describe them verbally; the ability to manage own emotions, including evoking and maintaining desirable emotions and keeping unwanted ones under control; self-control of the external emotional manifestations.

Thomas questionnaire, are presented in Table 3.

Table 3  
**Average figures for conflict resolution methods**

Methods of conflict resolution	Meanvalue (M)	Standarddeviation (σ)
Competition	3.71	2.54
Collaboration	6.43	1.68
Consentsettle	7.90	1.91
Avoidancebehavior	6.95	1.87
Adaptation	5.01	2.26

Table 1

**Respondents' general emotional intelligence**

Generalemotionalintelligencelevel	Number of respondents
Very low	7
Low	16
Moderate	31
High	16
Very high	9

The average values for negotiating styles obtained from the results of the 'Negotiating Styles' questionnaires are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

**Average figures for negotiating styles**

Negotiating styles	Meanvalue (M)	Standard deviation (σ)
Acceptance	5.22	2.91
Consentsettle	8.91	2.13
Bargaining	10.79	2.16
Threatening	6.56	3.28
Reasoning	9.37	2.44
Emotions	4.15	2.48

The graph shows that while negotiating, respondents prefer to rather 'bargain' and use a rationale for this. The average figures for conflict resolution methods, obtained by the results of the K.

Based on the primary data, it can be stated that in conflict situations the participants of our study are more likely to prefer consent settle and avoidance options. To a lesser extent, the company's employees are focused on competition. The analysis of primary statistics allows concluding that the obtained data correspond to the norms according to the test results and have distributions close to normal. Thus, it is possible to conduct a correlation analysis to identify the interrelationships of the specifics of the intelligence aspect of negotiation and to identify differences between the groups of respondents.

Correlation analysis revealed differences in the figures of emotional intelligence in women and men. To identify gender characteristics in terms of emotional intelligence, the data obtained from the male (N = 35) and female (N = 44) subsamples (N = 79) was analyzed. Compared to the male sample, women have a more developed general (2.9), interpersonal (2.7), and intrapersonal (3.1) emotional intelligence, which is reflected in the marginal mean values.

Differences in negotiation styles and methods of conflict resolution were also examined among executives of a different gender. The authors have analyzed the data obtained as a result of the diagnostics of executives' negotiation styles (Fig. 1). It was established that the most pronounced style in both groups is the 'bargaining' negotiations. This method is characterized by taking

advantage of the business by exchanging various values that are important to each of the parties. However, an opportunity to offer something in return is essential in bargaining. The negotiating party might be willing to lower some expectations if it allows getting some concessions from the other side. Next goes the 'rationale' and 'consent settle' style. The use of reasoning is a very common technique to persuade the other side to make concessions. It requires statistics and evidence presented in such a way that one side can convince the other of the correctness of the concessions. These negotiations should take into account both the relationship between the parties and the objectives. Participants are characterized by striving for long-term goals and gaining benefits. Yet, this style of negotiation takes long to prepare.

A consent settle is characterized by the participants' desire to seek an intermediate point of view between the parties. This social behavior is not negative; still, it may indicate a lack of desire to strive for maximum benefits and derive more value from their work. Consent settle is often used to maintain good relationships.

Styles such as 'threatening', 'emotions', and 'acceptance' were least expressed in both groups. The use of latent or weak threats can be a very effective tool and is within the purview of any negotiator. Being carefully employed, the threat can add significantly more value to the case, without requiring reciprocity. This is the first of the 'one-way moving' - methods that can be used to get concessions from the opposite side without requiring any reciprocal movement. The main purpose of using this negotiation style is to satisfy its interests. However, it often leads to the suspension of further discussion of the problem from both sides, because the weaker partner decides to stop it or even quit. This style is used for quick decision-making, as well as for situations where the other side begins to use threats.

Emotion is one of the methods of persuasion, which is both 'free' and effective. This is a way to induce the other party to do something of their own free will or for other reasons arising from their feelings. The

'emotion' style is the most effective tool used by an experienced negotiator to speed up decision making. The 'acceptance' style denotes a preference for accepting the status quo and not negotiating further. This tactic is rather ineffective because it allows the party to gradually agree on pretty much everything.

**Figure 1.** Manifestation of negotiation styles among executives of different genders

Thus, both men and women tend to bargain in the negotiation process, use reasoning, and seek a compromise that will suit both parties. At the same time, they try to avoid threats, emotional pressure, and are not inclined to accept other people's conditions.

Further, the methods employed by male and female executives in resolving conflicts were investigated (Fig. 2). It was revealed that respondents in both groups most often use the 'consent settle' strategy in conflict situations, i.e. agreement between the parties to the conflict, achieved through mutual concessions. The least preferred strategies were 'competition', which implies the desire to achieve the satisfaction of one's interests at the expense of the other, and 'adaptation' - as opposed to the competition - sacrificing own interests for the sake of another.

**Figure 2.** Conflict resolution methods among executives of different genders

The graph demonstrates that both men and women tend to seek a compromise solution. Comparative analysis showed that there is a tendency towards differences in terms of Avoidance and Competition ( $p \leq 0.1$ ). It can be assumed that unlike men, women are more likely to avoid conflicts, rather than defend their interests. Men are more likely than women to choose competition as a way of resolving conflict.

Thus, a comparative analysis of conflict resolution methods among employees of different genders revealed indicators of 'avoidance' and 'competition', which demonstrate that in a conflict situation,

women try to avoid entering into a conflict, while men are holding their ground more firmly.

The study has also revealed a relationship between emotional intelligence and negotiation styles. According to our results, negotiation styles were associated with indicators of emotional intelligence, measured by the 'EmIn' test (see Table. 4).

Table4

**Relationship between emotional intelligence and 'threatening' and 'reasoning' negotiation styles**

\*\*Correlation is significant at p = 0.01 (2-way)

\*Correlation is significant at p = 0.05 (2-way)

Thus, it can be concluded that general emotional intelligence (intrapersonal, in particular) is associated with a preference for rationale in negotiations. A trend towards the relationship of interpersonal emotional intelligence using Reasoning is also seen quite clearly. General and interpersonal emotional intelligence is associated with the tactics of 'threatening' in negotiations.

Revealing the relationship between the level of emotional intelligence and the method of conflict resolution is also of particular scientific interest (see Table 5). As a result of the correlation analysis, significant relatedness was revealed at the level of 0.01 between emotional intelligence and some methods of resolving conflict situations.

Table5

Type of Emotional Intelligence (EI)	Conflict resolution strategy	
	Cooperation	Avoidance
General EI	0.264*	-0.393**
Interpersonal EI	0.21	-0.321**

Intrapersonal EI	0.242*	-0.301**
------------------	--------	----------

**Relationship between emotional intelligence and conflict resolution**

\*\*Correlation is significant at p = 0.01 (2-way)

\*Correlation is significant at p = 0.05 (2-way)

The level of conflict avoidance among

Type of Emotional Intelligence (EI)	Negotiation styles	
	Threatening	Reasoning
General EI	-0.263*	0.305**
Interpersonal EI	-0.238*	0.236*
Intrapersonal EI	-0.191	0.336**

respondents was largely associated with indicators of emotional intelligence. Significant negative correlations between the level of conflict avoidance and general, interpersonal, and intrapersonal emotional intelligence were revealed via 'EmIn' test scales. There was also a tendency towards the reliability of the relationship between general and intrapersonal emotional intelligence with such a strategy as 'cooperation'.

Next, the authors analyzed the relationship of social intelligence with the strategies of negotiation by company employees. Compared with the results of the manifestation of the emotional intelligence characteristics, the correlation analysis did not show significant connections between the phenomenology of social intelligence and various styles of negotiation and conflict resolution. However, according to some indicators, a tendency towards statistical reliability was revealed at the level of 0.05, namely, the relatedness was revealed between social intelligence and behavior of the 'avoidance' type, the frequency of participation in negotiations, and the 'acceptance' style of negotiations, as well as between social and interpersonal emotional intelligence. Also, significant negative associations of 'threatening' with 'reasoning' (r = -0.749) and 'consent settle' (r = -0.561) were found. The 'reasoning' indicator has a reliable positive relationship

relationship with the ability to behave with 'consent settle' ( $r = -0.458$ ).

Significant negative connections between 'cooperation' and 'avoidance' ( $r = -0.407$ ) with 'acceptance' ( $r = -0.298$ ) are seen among the ways of behavior in conflict situations. 'Cooperation' and 'competition' have a negative significant relationship with 'conflict avoidance' ( $r = -0.407$  and  $r = -0.448$ , respectively).

One-way analysis of variance made it possible to identify the mean values for the indicators of preferred negotiating styles and methods of behavior in conflict situations among the participants and leaders (administrators) of the negotiation process (see Table 6).

Table 6

**Comparative analysis of preferred negotiating styles and conflict resolution methods depending on the role in the negotiation process**

Factor analysis made it possible to identify and define two groups by factors (negotiating styles and behavior in conflicts); the groups also formed internal relations.

Further, factor analysis also made it possible to single out two factors that formed a system of internal relations through the factor of negotiation styles. The data obtained are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

**Results of factor analysis of negotiating styles**

Negotiation styles	Factors	
	Logical compromise	'Poker face' bargain
Reasoning	<b>0.911</b>	
Threatening	<b>-0.782</b>	
Consent settle	<b>0.710</b>	0.462
Acceptance	-0.433	
Emotions		<b>-0.952</b>
Bargaining		<b>0.916</b>

Thus, two groups of respondents are distinguished. The authors called the first

operative factor 'Logical compromise' since this factor is characterized by a high positive relationship with 'reasoning' (0.911), 'consent settle' (0.710), and a negative significant relationship with 'threatening' in the negotiation process. This factor also implies that the parties are committed to long-term goals; therefore, both relationships and joint problem-solving appear quite important for them. The second factor draws together the group of respondents with significant interconnections in 'bargaining' (0.916) and 'emotions' (-0.952). It received the name 'poker face bargain' since it allows achieving the goal through logic and evidence of the appropriateness of the position taken.

Factor analysis made it possible to single out two factors that formed a system of internal relations through the factor of conflict

Indicator	Role in negotiation process				Significance		
	Administrator		Participant		F	p	
	Mean value (M)	Standard deviation ( $\sigma$ )	Mean value (M)	Standard deviation ( $\sigma$ )			
Negotiation styles	Acceptance	4.95	2.42	5.26	3	0.101	0.751
	Consent settle	7.91	2.29	9.07	2.08	2.886	0.093
	Bargaining	10.86	2.1	10.78	2.18	0.014	0.905
	Threatening	8.55	2.88	6.24	3.25	4.888	0.033
	Reasoning	8.27	3.27	9.55	2.26	2.651	0.108
	Emotions	4.45	2.55	4.1	2.49	0.196	0.659
Conflict resolution methods	Competition	4.82	2.48	3.53	2.52	2.489	0.119
	Cooperation	6.55	1.69	6.41	1.69	0.059	0.809
	Consent settle	7.64	1.69	7.94	1.95	0.24	0.626
	Avoidance	6.55	1.04	7.01	1.97	0.591	0.444
	Adaptation	4.45	2.38	5.1	2.24	0.78	0.388

resolution methods. The data are given in Table 8.

Table 8



**Results of factor analysis of behavior in conflict situations**

Behavior in conflict situation	Factor	
	Urge to avoid	Urgeto settle
Competition	<b>-0.808</b>	
Avoidance	<b>0.691</b>	
Cooperation	<b>-0.614</b>	
Consent settle		<b>0.825</b>
Adaptation	0.492	<b>-0.764</b>

The first factor draws together the group of respondents who are characterized by a low level of competition and are not inclined to develop cooperation. This behavior during the negotiation process is accompanied by ‘escapism’ or ‘avoidance’. Thus, one of the negotiating parties ceases to perceive the opponent’s arguments and begins to distance itself in the course of negotiations. The second ‘settle’ factor shows the desire to achieve joint agreements and to adapt to negotiation situations. The respondents in this group are characterized as negotiation-oriented employees.

**Conclusion**

The study resulted in revealing significant differences in the choice of negotiation strategy and methods of conflict resolution depending on the level of emotional intelligence of the parties to the negotiation process. There are also differences in the level of emotional intelligence and the choice of negotiation styles and strategies for conflict resolution depending on the gender of the negotiators. Unlike men, women prefer to assume a status quo and do not seek further negotiations. On the other hand, men show a stronger desire and motivation to continue negotiations to improve their situation.

At the same time, both men and women tend to use a bargaining strategy in the negotiation process (with the participation of logical arguments). As a result, both sides seek and are inclined to ‘consent settle’ option. Also, parties to the process are trying to avoid threats and emotional pressure while negotiating.

Still, men, more often than women, tend to choose competition as a way of resolving conflict.

Generally speaking, women exhibited a greater capacity for empathy than men. Women were also more likely to recognize and understand the emotions, including both of their own and others.

The results of the study did not reveal significant differences in the preferences for choosing a negotiating strategy and methods of conflict resolution depending on the age of the respondents.

The authors were able to identify a significant relationship between the level of emotional intelligence and preferred negotiation strategies, as well as methods of conflict resolution. However, the study did not reveal a connection between the level of social intelligence and the preferred negotiation strategies, as well as the methods of conflict resolution.

Two major models of negotiating and resolving conflicts used by mid-level executives of the XXX-company were identified: a logical compromise and flat (‘poker face’) bargaining. In the presented case, these negotiation styles appeared to be dominant. At the same time, strategies such as ‘avoidance’ and ‘consent settle’ were the main ways of behavior in conflicts.

**References**

1. Camp, J. No: The Only Negotiating System. -- Moscow: Dobraya Kniga, 2012. 270 c.
2. Steele, P.T., Beasor, T. Business Negotiation: A Practical Workbook/translation from English. Moscow, 2004.
3. Fisher R., Ury W.L. Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In. NY.: Penguin Books. 2011.
4. Mastenbrook, V. Peregovory [Negotiations]. Kaluga: Kaluga Institute of Sociology, 1993. 175 p.
5. Gurieva, S.D., Udavikhina, U.A. Negotiating styles in situation of limited resources and ambiguity: “Short” and “long” communications // Mediterranean Journal of Social

- Sciences. Volume 6, Issue 4S2, 1 July 2015, Pages 109-117. DOI: 10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n4s2p109
6. Kuznetsova I. V., Gurieva S.D., The Problems of Positive and Negative Argumentation Effective Use in Public Service Advertising // smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies. Volume 139, 2019, Pages 435-442 DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-18553-4\_54
  7. Kim K., Cundiff N.L, Choi S.B. Emotional Intelligence and Negotiation Outcomes: Mediating Effects of Rapport, Negotiation Strategy, and Judgment Accuracy // Group DecisNegot (2015) 24:477–493
  8. Mestre J.M., MacCann C., Guil R., Roberts R.D. Models of cognitive ability and emotion can better inform contemporary emotional intelligence frameworks. *Emot. Rev.* 2016; 8:322–330. doi: 10.1177/1754073916650497.
  9. Gardner H. *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. Basic Books; New York, NY, USA: 2011.
  10. McGuire C.V., McGuire W.J. *The Content, Structure, and Operation of Thought Systems*. Psychology Press; London, UK: 2014. The content, structure, and operation of thought systems; pp. 9–86.
  11. Zashchirinskaia, O.V. Kontseptual'nyepredstavleniya o struktureobshcheniya [Conceptual ideas about the structure of communication] //Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Series 12. Psychology. Sociology. Pedagogy, 2013, 4, pp. 89-98.
  12. Jones K., Day J.D. Discrimination of two aspects of cognitive-social intelligence from academic intelligence // *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 1997. Vol. 89. № 3. P.486–497. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.89.3.486.
  13. Lee J-E. et al. Social and academic intelligences: a multitrait-multimethod study of their crystallized and fluid characteristics. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 2000, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 539–553. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00213-5
  14. Kihlstrom J.F., Cantor N. *Social Intelligence // Handbook of intelligence*, 2nd ed / Eds. R.J. Sternberg. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2000. P. 359–379.
  15. Weis S., Süß H.-M. Reviving the search for social intelligence – A multitrait-multimethod study of its structure and construct validity // *Personality and Individual Differences*. 2007. Vol. 42. № 1. P. 3–14. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2006.04.027.
  16. Preiss, D.D. et al. Argumentative writing and academic achievement: A longitudinal study. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 2013b, vol. 28, pp. 204–211. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2012.12.013
  17. Murphy N.A., Hall J.A. Intelligence and interpersonal sensitivity: A meta-analysis. *Intelligence*, 2011, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 54–63. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2010.10.001
  18. Stanovich K.E., Stanovich P.J. A framework for critical thinking, rational thinking, and intelligence // *Innovations in educational psychology: Perspectives on learning, teaching and human development / Eds. D. Preiss, R.J. Sternberg*. NewYork: Springer, 2010. P. 195–238.
  19. Kunitsyna V.N., Kazarinova N.V., Pogolysha V.M. *Interpersonal*

- Communication: Textbook for universities. SPB: Peter, 2001. 544 p.
20. Yumartova N.M., Grishina N.V. Mindfulness: psychological characteristics and adaptation of measurement tools. Psychological Journal, 37 (4), pp.105-115.
21. Luneva, O.V. History of the study of the Social intelligence. Science. Culture. Society. 2016 (3). pp. 124-137.
22. LyusinD.V., UshakovD.V. Social intelligence: Theory, measurement, research. M.: InstituteofpsychologyRAS, 2004. 176 p.
23. Mayer J. D., Caruso D. R., Salovey P. The ability model of emotional intelligence: Principles and updates. Emotion Review, 2016, 8(4), 290–300.
24. Bar-On R., The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI), Psicothema, 18, suppl., 13-25, 2006.
25. Goleman, D. Emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books. 1995.
26. Gurieva S., Kuznetsova I., Yumkina E. Emotional intelligence and styles of behavior in business communication of middle manager // Business, Management and Accounting: Business and International Management. Revista Espacio, Volume 39, Issue 8, 2018, 14p ISSN:0798-1015