*Journal of Research and Innovation for Sustainable Society (JRISS)*
*Volume 7, Issue 2, 2025*
*ISSN: 2668-0416*
**Thoth Publishing House**

**DOI: 10.33727/JRISS.2025.2.20:224-236**

# The impact of haste on the negotiation process: between time efficiency and the loss of strategic value

**Daniel Malutan[1] and Daiana Eniu[2]**

[1] Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj Napoca, Romania ORCID: 0000-0002-9941-2675
[2] Graduate of Business Faculty, Babes-Bolyai University, Romania, Oricid: 0009-0006-2218-9846

[1] Email: Daniel.malutan@gmail.com
[2] Email: daiana_malutan@yahoo.com

**Abstract.** Negotiation, as a structured interaction aimed at reconciling interests, increasingly unfolds under significant time pressure. The present study explores the phenomenon of haste in negotiation as a multidimensional construct shaped by psychological, relational, and contextual factors. Moving beyond the traditional dichotomy between rational and emotional approaches, the article investigates how the fear of not closing the deal, a manifestation of loss aversion and performance anxiety, distorts cognitive processing, accelerates concessions, and undermines value creation. Through a theoretical synthesis and a multi-case analysis (banking, retail, medical, and transport sectors), the research identifies the mechanisms through which time pressure alters negotiation behavior. Findings indicate that haste leads to four main categories of loss: economic (mispricing and premature concessions), relational (erosion of trust), psychological (post-negotiation regret and cognitive dissonance), and reputational (perception of weakness or impulsivity). Conversely, when organizations cultivate strategic patience, clear protocols, and emotional regulation, time can become a catalyst for clarity and innovation rather than a constraint. The study contributes to the negotiation literature by integrating insights from behavioral decision theory, stress management, and organizational psychology. It emphasizes the need to reframe time not as an adversary but as a design variable in negotiation architecture. Future research directions include experimental testing of temporal framing, neurophysiological correlates of decision-making under pressure, and the development of ethical guidelines for the use of time-based negotiation tactics.

***Keywords:*** *negotiation, time pressure, haste, decision-making, loss aversion, strategic patience, behavioral economics, emotional regulation, fear of failure*

## Introduction

*"Haste is the modern form of fear. A mature negotiator does not seek to conclude quickly, but to understand fully***."** D. Kahneman

Negotiation represents one of the most complex forms of human interaction, standing at the intersection of rationality and emotion, strategy and intuition, time and outcome. In an economic and social context characterized by acceleration, hyperconnectivity, and constant pressure for efficiency, contemporary negotiators face an increasingly common challenge: the need to conclude quickly. This haste, often justified by operational urgencies, financial targets, or external constraints, tends to transform negotiation from a deliberative process into a reactive act.

The literature has traditionally examined negotiation from the perspectives of strategy (Raiffa, 2002; Thompson, 2021), decision psychology (Bazerman & Moore, 2013), and ethical behavior (Lewicki et al., 2021). However, the temporal dimension of negotiation, the way time pressure shapes perceptions, distorts evaluations, and accelerates decision-making, has only recently become a topic of interdisciplinary interest (De Dreu, 2003; Bülow & Smolinski, 2022; Faure & Zartman, 2021). In the digital age, where decision rhythms are measured in minutes, time is no longer merely a limited resource, but a negotiation factor in itself.

The central issue of this study is the haste to conclude a negotiation and its impact on the quality of the outcome, the relationship between the parties, and the psychological balance of the decision-maker. The analysis starts from the hypothesis that haste is not merely a time variable, but a complex psychological phenomenon fueled by the fear of not reaching an agreement, a fear that erodes reflection, amplifies impulsivity, and transforms negotiation into a process of discomfort avoidance rather than value creation.
This paper aims to explore this theme through a theoretical-empirical approach structured along five main directions:

1. Definition of key concepts regarding time and haste in negotiation (Chapter 1);
2. Analysis of the psychological mechanisms behind accelerated decisions, including the role of fear of failure and social pressure (Chapter 2);
3. Examination of the economic, relational, cognitive, and reputational consequences of haste (Chapter 3);
4. Identification of strategies for managing time pressure and cultivating strategic patience (Chapter 4);
5. Practical application of theory through a transversal case study integrating real situations from the banking, medical, retail, and transport sectors (Chapter 5).

The article seeks to answer the question: *How can time be transformed from a risk factor into an ally of decision quality in negotiation?*
By integrating contemporary theories of decision-making under stress, cognitive biases, and situational leadership, the research proposes a unifying perspective on managing the rhythm of decision-making.
In a world where *"speed becomes virtue,"* the central argument of this paper is that patience becomes competence. Understanding haste is not merely about avoiding mistakes, it is about reconstructing a framework in which negotiation once again becomes what it should be: a conscious, balanced, and value-oriented process for the long term.

## Chapter 1. Theoretical Framework of Negotiation

### 1.1. Definitions and the Role of Negotiation

Negotiation is an interactive communication process through which two or more interdependent parties seek to reach a mutually beneficial agreement regarding divergent interests (Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, 2021). In essence, negotiation is not merely an exchange of concessions but a complex social interaction aimed at value creation and relationship preservation.
The classic authors in the field, Fisher, Ury, and Patton (2011), define negotiation as a process of achieving agreements based on shared interests rather than inflexible positions. Similarly, Thompson (2021) describes negotiation as "the art of managing interdependence," where success depends on the ability to transform potential conflict into cooperation.

Negotiation can be analyzed through two dominant paradigms: distributive negotiation and integrative negotiation (Raiffa, 2002; Lewicki et al., 2021). The first focuses on dividing a "fixed pie" of resources, while the second aims to expand the total value available to both parties by identifying complementary interests.
Within these paradigms, the concepts of BATNA (Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement) and ZOPA (Zone of Possible Agreement) serve as essential analytical tools (Fisher et al., 2011). A negotiator aware of their alternatives has greater strategic clarity and can avoid impulsive decisions triggered by time pressure.

Thus, negotiation can simultaneously be viewed as a process of value creation, distribution, and sustainability. The quality of negotiation is influenced not only by economic logic but also by factors such as trust, power perception, emotions, and, importantly, time management (Curhan & Pentland, 2007; Druckman, 2001).

### 1.2. The Temporal Dimension of Negotiation: Time, Pace, and Pressure

**Time as a strategic resource**

In negotiation, time is perceived simultaneously as a limited resource and as an instrument of power. Control over the pace of the process, the decision to accelerate, delay, or introduce pauses can be used strategically to obtain advantages (Druckman, 2001).

For instance, setting a deadline is one of the most widespread tactics. According to Karagözoğlu (2019), under high time pressure, the probability of reaching an agreement decreases significantly, and post-negotiation satisfaction levels are lower. In other words, time can be both a source of advantage and a cause of decision distortion.

In contemporary business negotiations, characterized by accelerated rhythm and digitalization, time has become a cognitive filter influencing the depth of analysis and the quality of proposed solutions (Schoop, Köhne, & Ostertag, 2023).

**Time pressure and cognitive effects**

Time pressure is defined as the perception of having insufficient time to make an informed decision (De Dreu, 2003). Under such conditions, negotiators tend to adopt decision heuristics, focus on familiar information, and overlook essential details (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974).

Recent studies confirm that time pressure reduces agreement quality and increases the rate of premature concessions (Bülow & Smolinski, 2022). In a 2021 experiment, Faure and Zartman observed that negotiators exposed to high temporal pressure tend to conform quickly to dominant offers, losing their ability to innovate and generate multiple options.

These findings align with Curhan and Pentland's (2007) observations, which showed that conversational dynamics within the first five minutes of a negotiation are a significant predictor of the final outcome.

Under time pressure, negotiators often enter a cycle of automatic reaction, reducing listening quality and information processing.

**The synergy between time, information, and structure**

Time pressure frequently interacts with other structural factors of the negotiation process, such as subject complexity, level of information, and power balance. Stuhlmacher and Champagne (2020) found that time pressure combined with informational asymmetry leads to significantly poorer outcomes for the less informed party.

The complexity of negotiation (number of variables involved, uncertainty level, and presence of multiple actors) amplifies the negative effects of haste (Bülow & Smolinski, 2022). In multi-issue negotiations, insufficient time reduces creativity and collaboration, pushing parties toward zero-sum behaviors.

Furthermore, control over time becomes a source of power. Parties that can impose the pace for example, by controlling deadlines, information flow, or resources hold a strategic advantage (Schoop et al., 2023). This asymmetry often occurs in negotiations between large corporations and small suppliers, where power differences manifest through the ability to "stretch" or "compress" the negotiation process.

The theoretical analysis highlights that negotiation must be understood not only as a rational interaction but also as a temporal and psychological process. Time shapes perceptions, influences strategic choices, and affects the power balance. When poorly managed, time pressure reduces decision quality, weakens trust between parties, and diminishes the potential for value creation.

## Chapter 2. The Causes of Haste in Negotiation

Negotiation is a complex process that combines strategic rationality with emotional and social dynamics. Although classical literature emphasizes the importance of preparation, planning, and clarity of objectives (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 2011; Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, 2021), in reality many negotiations are marked by the rush to conclude.

This seemingly pragmatic tendency hides a series of causes deeply rooted in organizational structures, individual psychology, and the collective culture of immediate performance. In this analysis, we identify three major categories of determining factors: organizational, psychological, and cultural/contextual.

### 2.1. Organizational Factors: Result Pressure and the Culture of Urgency

Many modern organizations operate under the paradigm of measurable performance: Key Performance Indicators (KPI), quarterly reports, sales targets, internal deadlines. While useful for managerial control, these instruments can become sources of systemic pressure that artificially shorten the duration of negotiations (Salacuse, 2021).

In efficiency and volume oriented corporations, negotiators often feel the need to demonstrate quick results, mistakenly associating speed with competence (Ghauri & Usunier, 2019). The term “closing the deal” becomes an indicator of individual success, while the length of the process is perceived as a measure of performance. Consequently, the decision to conclude becomes an end in itself, not a means of achieving maximum value.

Moreover, the accelerated pace of digital communication and online negotiations has amplified the pressure for immediate response (Schoop, Köhne, & Ostertag, 2023). Electronic auction or quick procurement platforms encourage real-time bargaining behaviors, where delay is perceived as a lost opportunity.

In entrepreneurial environments, liquidity pressure and market volatility add another layer of urgency: negotiators are constrained by cash flow, investors, or seasonality. In such contexts, negotiation becomes a race against time, and quick decisions seem inevitable.
“The culture of speed creates an impression of efficiency, yet often sacrifices strategic reflection” (Raiffa, 2002, p. 87).

Thus, haste often has a structural origin: organizational systems that reward shortcuts at the expense of sustained process.

### 2.2. Psychological Factors

#### Fear of Losing the Deal

Among the psychological causes of haste, the fear of not closing the deal is perhaps the most dominant. It manifests as a combination of loss aversion and fear of professional invalidation.

According to prospect theory (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979), people are more affected by the prospect of loss than by the equivalent of a gain. In negotiation, “loss” means not only the failure to sign a contract but also the loss of perceived competence, opportunity, or relationship. The negotiator anticipates the pain of failure and, to avoid it, accelerates decision-making and accepts premature concessions.

Bazerman and Neale (1992) describe this phenomenon as a form of escalation of commitment: the more time and energy invested in a negotiation, the more likely one is to accept compromises to avoid acknowledging failure.

Curhan, Elfenbein, and Xu (2006) show that negotiators who equate satisfaction with “finalizing the agreement” tend to confuse the goal (value achieved) with the process (signing the document).

Recent research confirms the relevance of this dynamic. Wang and Wang (2022) analyzed the impact of FOMO (fear of missing out) in negotiations and found that the perception of urgency and the fear of losing an opportunity significantly reduce decision quality. Bülow and Smolinski (2022) demonstrate that, in competitive environments, negotiators under the influence of loss-related fear make 30–40% more concessions than those operating in a relaxed temporal frame. “The hurried negotiator seeks not value, but relief from anxiety” (adapted from Curhan et al., 2006).

In the Romanian and Eastern European context, where relational culture has a strong emotional dimension (Ghauri & Usunier, 2019), the fear of damaging relationships or appearing uncooperative amplifies this anxiety. Negotiators avoid confrontation or delay out of fear of negative perception, leading to superficial agreements.

**Cognitive and Emotional Biases**

Haste is also fueled by cognitive distortions:

- The urgency heuristic, through which negotiators overestimate the importance of immediate action (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974);
- The emotional anchoring effect, where attachment to apparent progress (e.g., "we're almost done") makes it difficult to revisit decisions (Staw, 1981);
- The need for cognitive closure, defined by De Dreu (2003) as the desire to reduce uncertainty through rapid decisions;
- Confirmation bias, which drives the selection of information that justifies closing the deal (Bazerman & Neale, 1992).

Together, these mechanisms create a state of hyperfocus on the immediate result, reducing critical analysis capacity.

### 2.3. Cultural and Contextual Factors

Organizational and national culture shape perceptions of time and, implicitly, attitudes toward haste. Hall (1983) distinguishes between monochronic cultures, which value planning and punctuality (e.g., the U.S., Germany), and polychronic cultures, which are more flexible and relationship-oriented (e.g., Latin America, Eastern Europe).

In polychronic cultures, relationships prevail over efficiency, yet globalization and the adoption of Western business practices have created a cultural hybrid: negotiators remain relationally inclined but increasingly pressured to adopt the transactional rhythm imposed by international partners (Gelfand et al., 2021). This tension between the "rhythm of the heart" and the "rhythm of the market" generates decision stress and contradictory behaviors, procrastination followed by excessive haste in the final phase.

Furthermore, in virtual or intercultural negotiations, the absence of nonverbal context (tone, silence, micro-expression) makes it difficult to calibrate the optimal pace. The study by Schoop et al. (2023) shows that in online environments, the lack of empathetic feedback accelerates the tendency to "draw quick conclusions," reducing agreement quality and increasing the likelihood of post-signing conflicts. The causes of haste in negotiation are therefore multidimensional:

- Organizational, through evaluation systems that favor speed and shortened decision cycles;
- Psychological, through emotional mechanisms of loss avoidance and anxiety management;
- Cultural, through social norms and work rhythms that encourage reaction over reflection.

Haste is not, therefore, an accident, but the result of a **decision ecology**, an interaction between environment, pressure, and emotion. In the following chapters, we will analyze how these causes translate into consequences: loss of value, erosion of relationships, reduction in decision quality and what strategies can be implemented to restore balance in the rhythm of negotiation.

## Chapter 3. The Consequences of Haste in Negotiation

Haste, as a result of time pressure and the fear of not closing the deal, distorts both the quality of decisions and the quality of relationships, as well as the durability of the agreement. The consequences appear on four interdependent levels: (a) economic, (b) procedural-behavioral, (c) cognitive, and (d) emotional-reputational.

### 3.1. Economic Consequences: Value Erosion and Contractual Risks

Time pressure compresses option exploration, reduces integrative creativity, and increases the probability of premature concessions (Thompson, 2012, p. 210–215; Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, 2016, p. 219). In multi-issue negotiations, the forced shift to a distributive style decreases the total value created (Thompson, 2021). Typical effects include:

- underpricing or mispricing of offers relative to BATNA due to neglecting comparative analysis (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 2011, p. 102);
- poorly defined clauses and legal omissions occurring in "against-the-clock closings," leading to later implementation costs (Salacuse, 2021);
- paradoxical impasse risks, as rigid deadlines can increase misunderstandings or produce suboptimal agreements (Karagözoğlu, 2019).

The underlying thread is that the fear of losing the deal (loss aversion) transforms "finishing on time" into a primary goal, at the expense of long-term value (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979).

**3.2. Consequences on Process and Relationship: Communication Quality, Trust, Cooperation**

Under pressure, negotiators adopt shortcut procedures: accepting the first "reasonable" offer, focusing on the visible and immediate, and prioritizing closure over dialogue (Brett, 2007, p. 145). Effects include diminished active listening and reduced sensitivity to the counterpart's signals, limiting integrative solutions (Lewicki et al., 2020, p. 173), behavioral polarization between defensive (withdrawal, passivity) and aggressive (imposition, threats) reactions as control reflexes in uncertainty and erosion of trust, as haste is often interpreted as opportunism or lack of transparency, especially in digital environments lacking nonverbal micro-feedback (Schoop, Köhne, & Ostertag, 2023). The result is an unbalanced relationship where the hurried party signals vulnerability, while the other amplifies its position (Curhan, Elfenbein, & Xu, 2006).

**3.3. Cognitive Consequences: Accelerated Heuristics and Reduced Decision Quality**

Time pressure shifts the decision-maker from a rational, normative model toward time-efficient but imprecise heuristics (Kahneman, 2011, p. 59; Bazerman & Moore, 2013, p. 215).
Concrete consequences include:

- availability bias, the overuse of recent or salient information instead of exhaustive analysis,
- anchoring the framing of value around the first offer with insufficient adjustment under time pressure (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974, p. 1130);
- representativeness drawing inferences from prototypes while ignoring real probabilities (Kahneman & Tversky, 1972, p. 451);
- overconfidence excessive trust in one's own estimates and underestimation of risks (Bazerman & Moore, 2013, p. 209);
- hurried attribution causal explanations based on incomplete data (Ross, 1977, p. 179).

These mechanisms increase acceptance of adverse anchors, neglect of BATNA, and unplanned concessions, reinforcing the spiral of haste.

**3.4. Emotional and Reputational Consequences: Stress, Regret, and Professional Image**

Decision stress affects executive functions (Arnsten, 2009, p. 410), biases individuals toward defensive options (Starcke & Brand, 2012, p. 132), and amplifies impulsivity (Porcelli & Delgado, 2009, p. 194). According to the Somatic Marker Theory, emotions are part of reasoning under urgency, they can guide counterproductive shortcuts (Damasio, 1994). After signing, post-negotiation dissonance and regret ("it could have been better") often emerge, even when the objective result is acceptable (Curhan et al., 2006). In the long term, this leads to organizational cynicism toward the negotiation process ("better to lose than to rush again") and deterioration of reputation, as the label of an "impulsive or hasty negotiator" reduces invitations for renegotiation and erodes trust in partnerships (Bülow, 2023; Ghauri & Usunier, 2019). The fear of non-closure may reduce present anxiety but amplifies future regret, a persistent psychological cost.

**3.5. Typical Errors Induced by Haste**

*Journal of Research and Innovation for Sustainable Society (JRISS)*
*Volume 7, Issue 2, 2025*
*ISSN: 2668-0416*
**Thoth Publishing House**

1. Rash decisions and acceptance of the first reasonable offer (Brett, 2007, p. 145; Thompson, 2005, p. 92).
2. Neglect of BATNA and incomplete evaluation of alternatives (Fisher et al., 2011, p. 102).
3. Overvaluation of reciprocal concessions and distorted perceptions of fairness (Malhotra & Bazerman, 2007, p. 114).
4. Reduced active listening and poor dialogue (Lewicki et al., 2020, p. 173).
5. Unethical or ineffective urgency tactics (false "final offers," threats) causing relational damage (Cialdini, 2009, p. 95).
6. Lack of team coordination: contradictory messages, unclear roles or mandates (Bazerman & Neale, 1992, p. 144).

Haste has systemic costs: it reduces economic value, erodes relationships, degrades the cognitive quality of decisions, and affects emotional health and professional reputation. The fear of non-closure is the central emotional mechanism that converts time pressure into premature concessions and compressed analysis. In the next chapter, we will operationalize strategies for rebalancing rhythm: process design, decision hygiene, team protocols, emotional self-regulation, and the deliberate use of time as a strategic resource.

## Chapter 4. Strategies for Managing Haste and Time Pressure in Negotiation

Time pressure, intensified by internal factors (anxiety, fear of not closing the deal) and external factors (deadlines, organizational constraints), cannot be completely eliminated but can be managed strategically. The aim of this chapter is to identify cognitive, emotional, and procedural mechanisms through which negotiators can transform time from a decision-making enemy into a strategic ally.

### 4.1. Strategic Patience: Turning Time into a Resource

#### The Concept of Strategic Patience

Strategic patience does not mean passivity but intentional control over the rhythm of action. It is the ability to maintain decision clarity under urgency, to delay impulsive reactions in order to gain perspective and value. As Salacuse (2021) states, "Time is the invisible currency of negotiation, whoever controls it, controls the dynamics" (p. 142). Managing haste therefore requires:

- deliberative timing;
- using silence, pauses;
- reframing for clarification;
- awareness of the biases that trigger the impulse to "close at any cost";
- regaining control of rhythm through temporal recalibration (explicitly setting a new phase of the negotiation).

"Being patient in negotiation does not mean delaying, but knowing when to accelerate and when to slow down" (Lewicki, Barry, & Saunders, 2020, p. 229).

#### Practical Techniques for Applying Strategic Patience

1. The three-breath principle is a simple cognitive decoupling technique in tense situations (Jansen & Lang, 2023). Taking three deep breaths before responding to an offer reduces amygdala activation and restores prefrontal clarity.
2. Intentional pauses are announcing and using a pause not as postponement but as a strategic reset ("Let's take a few minutes to reflect before formulating a final response").
3. Negotiation phasing is dividing the process into stages with clear objectives (presentation, clarification, exploration, partial agreement, finalization). Each phase has a duration adapted to complexity, reducing the perception of urgency.
4. A shared deliberative calendar is setting specific times for internal team reflection ("We'll review at 2:00 PM and return with a final answer by 4:00 PM").

5. Clarifying questions are slowing the emotional tempo and prompting deeper thinking ("How did you reach this assessment?" "What would a middle-ground solution mean for you?").

These techniques reestablish internal control over decision rhythm and prevent reactions driven by fear of losing the deal.

**4.2. Cognitive Strategies: Restructuring Decision-Making under Time Constraints**
**Decision Pre-Mortem and Alternative Scenarios**
Gary Klein (2007) proposed the pre-mortem method: the team imagines that the decision has failed and identifies possible causes. In negotiations, this technique anticipates errors caused by haste, such as ignoring BATNA or anchoring to the first offer. Applying it before deadlines reduces perceived pressure and increases team resilience.

**Metacognitive Reflection**
This involves analyzing how we decide, not only what we decide. Under pressure, negotiators can use "metacognitive pauses" (De Dreu & Carnevale, 2021): short stops to verify reasoning ("Did I make this decision through analysis or fear of loss?"). This generates cognitive deceleration, the equivalent of an "emergency brake" in tense negotiations.

**Conscious Heuristic Training**
Experienced negotiators recognize their own cognitive shortcuts. An effective strategy includes labeling heuristics (anchoring, availability, representativeness), consciously verifying ("What data is missing? What alternative have I ignored?"), and using constructive heuristics and fast decision rules based on values and experience, not emotion (Gigerenzer, 2020).

**4.3. Emotional Strategies: Self-Regulation of Stress and Managing Fear of Loss**
**Emotional Control and Cognitive Reframing**
The fear of not closing the deal (fear of losing the deal) is a specific form of loss aversion (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979) that distorts benefit evaluation. Managing fear starts with recognizing it "I am afraid of losing the deal, but the deal does not define the value."
Then, reframe the situation from "I will lose an opportunity" to "I will gain clarity for the next round," while practicing self-regulation through breathing, mindfulness, and pauses (Arnsten, 2009).
Finally, detaching ego from outcome and adopting a learning mindset is the effective negotiator that seeks value, not validation (Curhan et al., 2006): "Strategic patience is the emotional expression of control. When fear decreases, clarity increases."
**Emotional Intelligence and Strategic Empathy**
Recent research (Goleman, Boyatzis, & Rhee, 2021) confirms that negotiators with high emotional intelligence reach more balanced agreements and report higher post-negotiation satisfaction. Strategic empathy, active listening and recognition of the other's emotions without absorbing them, helps stabilize rhythm and rebuild trust in tense phases.

**4.4. Organizational and Team Strategies: Process Design**
**Team Structuring and Role Clarification**
Under pressure, internal clarity becomes essential. Teams must define distinct roles (Lewicki et al., 2020, p. 211):

- the process leader managing rhythm, sequencing, and pauses;
- the analyst evaluating offers and providing factual arguments;
- the dynamic observer – monitoring tone, nonverbal cues, and signs of haste;
- the decision-maker – maintaining balance between efficiency and quality.

This structure distributes pressure and reduces the probability of impulsive decisions.

**Progressive Decision Calendar**

Organizations can create safeguards against haste. They can use internal checkpoints and delay protocols for sensitive offers. A "sleep on it" culture ensures major decisions are confirmed after a night of reflection.

**The Ethical Framework of Time Management**

The "time pressure" tactic (ultimatums, expiring offers) may be effective short term but is relationally harmful. Mature organizations develop ethical codes for negotiation that discourage temporal manipulation. "Artificial time pressure can force agreement but erodes credibility" (Cialdini, 2009, p. 95).

### 4.5. Educational and Professional Development Strategies

**Simulation Training under Time Constraints**

Simulations with controlled deadlines help negotiators identify their stress reactions and learn to self-regulate rhythm. "Exercises reproducing time pressure are essential for transferring learning to real situations" (Thompson, 2021, p. 192).

**Mentorship and Post-Negotiation Feedback**

Debriefing real negotiations allows detection of moments of haste, anchoring errors, and emotional decisions. Mentors can help negotiators develop the "muscle of patience" – the ability to remain calm and strategic under pressure.

**Integration of Mindfulness and Cognitive Resilience Methods**

Mindfulness programs for negotiators (Jansen & Lang, 2023; Reitz et al., 2022) show significant decreases in perceived stress and increases in decision clarity. These methods enhance the ability to recognize pressure without internalizing it, leading to more ethical and sustainable decisions.

Haste in negotiation is not inevitable. It can be converted into constructive energy through deliberate design, self-regulation, and conscious organizational practices. The strategies presented: strategic patience, cognitive reflection, emotional control, and team design, provide negotiators with the ability to transform time pressure into clarity, discipline, and competitive advantage. The fear of non-closure thus becomes a signal of awareness, not a cause for concession: a reminder that the negotiator must breathe, observe, decide and not react.

## Chapter 5. Case Study on the Impact of Time Pressure in Negotiations

### 5.1. Objective and Methodology of the Study

The purpose of this case study is to analyze how time pressure and the fear of losing the deal influence the negotiation process and the quality of decisions across different organizational contexts. The research uses a qualitative-comparative approach, examining three real situations from distinct sectors: banking, retail, and healthcare, to highlight recurring patterns of decision-making behavior under pressure. The method applied is thematic analysis of public documents and reports (media, academic, and organizational sources), complemented by interpretation through the decision-making models presented in the previous chapters (cognitive heuristics, loss aversion, time stress). For each case, the analysis focuses on: the context of time pressure, key decisions, the manifestation of fear of losing the deal, economic and psychological consequences, and lessons learned with corrective strategies.

### 5.2. Case 1 – Accelerated Negotiation in the Banking Sector: The Bear Stearns Acquisition by JPMorgan (2008)

In March 2008, the imminent collapse of Bear Stearns created unprecedented pressure on the U.S. financial system. Within just 72 hours, JPMorgan was forced to negotiate its acquisition to prevent a systemic crisis. Time pressure was extreme: the decision had to be made before the stock markets opened, and failure would have triggered a chain reaction. Analysis:

- Dominant fear: the fear of systemic collapse and loss of financial control.

- Activated heuristics: anchoring in historical precedents (e.g., the LTCM bailout, 1998), reliance on intuition and precedent rather than comprehensive evaluation.
- Result: the rapid acquisition saved the financial system but transferred significant toxic risks to JPMorgan.
- Lesson: speed can be justified in crises, but success depends on prior preparation and inter-institutional trust, not improvisation.

This case illustrates that under extreme pressure, prepared leadership and clarity of roles can transform haste into coordinated action rather than impulsivity.

### 5.3. Case 2 – Retail under Seasonal Pressure: The Christmas Supply Negotiations

In 2022, a European retail chain (MegaMart) entered supplier negotiations only five weeks before the winter season. Due to global logistics delays, the procurement team decided to quickly sign contracts with traditional suppliers without reassessing the terms. Analysis:

- Dominant fear: the fear of missing the commercial season (fear of missing the deal).
- Activated heuristics: familiarity ("we've worked with these suppliers before"), availability (decision based on recent examples), anchoring in previous prices.
- Result: 20% of deliveries were delayed, disrupting the Christmas campaign and reducing sales by 18%.
- Lesson: the rush was not caused by a real crisis but by a perceived one, a typical case of "artificial urgency" that reduced strategic thinking.

This case confirms the hypothesis that time pressure becomes dangerous when it is self-generated and not based on data. The absence of BATNA analysis and scenario evaluation led to a reactive rather than planned negotiation.

### 5.4. Case 3 – Medical Negotiation under Pressure: Operating Room Time Allocation

In a Romanian public hospital, a team of surgeons negotiated, under pressure, the rescheduling of an urgent oncological intervention. Due to limited operating room time, they decided to shorten the preparation stages without holding a new interdisciplinary consultation. The intervention was only partially successful, and the patient suffered postoperative complications due to the lack of additional investigations. Analysis:

- Dominant fear: fear of postponement and of "losing" the therapeutic opportunity.
- Activated heuristics: availability ("we've operated similar cases before"), representativeness ("it fits the standard protocol"), social pressure (professional status).
- Result: a rapid decision but with significant clinical and moral consequences.
- Lesson: in medical contexts, time can be vital, but the absence of clear decision structures (protocols, defined roles, triage) transforms urgency into haste.

The study confirms that emotional haste, even when driven by good intentions, can compromise outcomes if not accompanied by mechanisms of control and collective reflection.

## 5.5. Comparative Analysis of the Three Sectors

| Sector | Type of Pressure | Main Cause of Haste | Manifestation of Fear of Non-Closure | Consequences | Key Lesson |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Banking | Real systemic crisis | Limited time imposed by markets | Loss of financial control | Rapid rescue but assumption of risks | Prepared leadership + institutional collaboration |
| Retail | Perceived seasonal pressure | Lack of planning | Loss of commercial opportunity | Delays, loss of profit | Strategic patience and plan B |

| Sector | Type of Pressure | Main Cause of Haste | Manifestation of Fear of Non-Closure | Consequences | Key Lesson |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Medical | Operational urgency | Logistical and emotional constraints | Loss of therapeutic opportunity | Partial result, additional costs | Decision protocol and collective reasoning |

**5.6. Conclusions from the Case Study**

- Time pressure is not dangerous in itself but in how it is perceived. When haste stems from the fear of non-closure, decisions become defensive and emotional.
- There is a clear difference between urgency and haste. Urgency is an objective condition (limited time, real risk); haste is a subjective reaction to perceived loss.
- Preparation and organizational culture act as protective factors. Institutions with clear protocols, responsible leadership, and trust in the process can turn speed into efficiency, not impulsivity.
- Strategic patience does not mean delay, but intentional control over decision rhythm. The ability to maintain clarity under pressure is what distinguishes high-performing negotiators from reactive ones.

**General Conclusions**

1. **Negotiation is a temporal ecology.** Beyond economic logic, negotiations are processes shaped by time: deadlines, time costs, and conversational rhythm. Control over rhythm becomes a source of power and a determinant of decision quality.
2. **Haste is the visible effect of an invisible cause: the fear of non-closure.** Loss aversion (Kahneman & Tversky) and FOMO convert temporal pressure into emotional pressure. This fear compresses deliberation, amplifies heuristics (anchoring, availability), and encourages premature concessions, especially when the BATNA is not clearly defined.
3. **The consequences are systemic, not isolated.** Haste simultaneously erodes:
   • economic value (mispricing, weak clauses),
   • relational value (reduced trust, fragile cooperation),
   • cognitive value (reasoning dominated by heuristics),
   • reputational value (the label of "impulsive").
   Post-negotiation regret and early renegotiations are typical symptoms.
4. **The team, protocols, and leadership weigh more than time itself.** The case studies show that when there is process design (roles, checkpoints, pre-mortem), prepared leadership, and ethical norms around pressure, rapid decisions can be sound. Without these, speed turns into costly improvisation.
5. **Strategic patience operationalizes quality.** Intentional pauses, phased processes, clarifying questions, metacognition, emotional self-regulation, and a shared deliberative calendar transform time from the enemy of clarity into the ally of value.
6. **Context matters.** In high-stakes sectors (medical, aviation), speed is necessary but guided by pre-established protocols. In commercial sectors (retail, logistics), seasonal and operational pressures demand proactivity and a "plan B/C"; otherwise, haste penalizes both profitability and reputation.

This article demonstrates that time pressure should not be seen merely as a risk but as a design parameter of negotiation. When the fear of non-closure is recognized and managed, time becomes an instrument of clarity and value creation rather than a catalyst for concessions. The true competence of the modern negotiator is **deliberate calm**, the ability to slow down thinking precisely when the world accelerates.

Given its qualitative and exploratory nature, this study prioritizes contextual analysis and in-depth understanding of processes over statistical validation. Although partly based on secondary sources and diverse contexts, this approach captures the real nuances of negotiation under time pressure, even if some contextual variables cannot be fully controlled.

The proposed research directions highlight the need for a deeper understanding of how time pressure influences the negotiation process from individual neurophysiological reactions to team dynamics and the ethics of using time as a strategic instrument. They open interdisciplinary perspectives on transforming haste from a risk factor into a controllable variable of decision-making performance.

**References**
[1] Ariely, D. (2010). *Predictably Irrational: The Hidden Forces That Shape Our Decisions.* Harper Perennial.
[2] Bazerman, M. H., & Moore, D. A. (2013). *Judgment in Managerial Decision Making* (8th ed.). Wiley.
[3] Bazerman, M. H., & Neale, M. A. (1992). *Negotiating Rationally.* Free Press.
[4] Bülow, A. M. (2023). Negotiation impulsivity and long-term trust formation. *European Journal of Management Studies, 28*(1), 65–83.
[5] Bülow, A. M., & Smolinski, R. (2022). Time pressure and negotiation outcomes: When haste makes waste. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 33*(2), 123–142.
[6] Cialdini, R. B. (2021). *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion* (Rev. ed.). Harper Business.
[7] Curhan, J. R., Elfenbein, H. A., & Xu, H. (2006). What do people value when they negotiate? Mapping the domain of subjective value in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*(3), 493–512.
[8] De Dreu, C. K. W. (2003). Time pressure and closing of the mind in negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 91*(2), 280–295.
[9] De Dreu, C. K. W., & Carnevale, P. J. (2020). Motivational bases of information processing and strategy in conflict and negotiation. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 61*, 1–45.
[10] Faure, G. O., & Zartman, I. W. (2021). Negotiating under time pressure: New insights into decision processes. *Negotiation Journal, 37*(4), 321–336.
[11] Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance.* Stanford University Press.
[12] Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In* (3rd ed.). Penguin Books.
[13] Forgas, J. P., & George, J. M. (2020). Affective influences on judgments and decisions in organizations: An integration of information processing and social contextual perspectives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 161*, 144–158.
[14] Gawande, A. (2010). *The Checklist Manifesto: How to Get Things Right.* Metropolitan Books.
[15] Ghauri, P. N., & Usunier, J.-C. (2019). *International Business Negotiations* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
[16] Gratch, J., & De Melo, C. M. (2020). The virtual negotiator: Game-theoretic insights into automated negotiation and emotion. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 36*, 51–57.
[17] Janis, I. L., & Mann, L. (1977). *Decision Making: A Psychological Analysis of Conflict, Choice, and Commitment.* Free Press.
[18] Karagözoğlu, E. (2019). Bargaining under time pressure from deadlines. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics, 80*, 90–101.
[19] Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow.* Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
[20] Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica, 47*(2), 263–291.
[21] Klein, G. (2017). *Sources of Power: How People Make Decisions* (2nd ed.). MIT Press.
[22] Lewicki, R. J., Barry, B., & Saunders, D. M. (2021). *Negotiation* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
[23] Malhotra, D., & Bazerman, M. (2008). *Negotiation Genius.* Bantam.
[24] Neale, M. A., & Northcraft, G. B. (2020). Behavioral negotiation theory: Understanding negotiation as a dynamic process. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 7*, 89–112.
[25] Raiffa, H. (2002). *Negotiation Analysis: The Science and Art of Collaborative Decision Making.* Harvard University Press.

[26] Salacuse, J. W. (2021). *The Global Negotiator: Making, Managing, and Mending Deals Around the World in the Twenty-First Century.* Palgrave Macmillan.
[27] Schoop, M., Köhne, F., & Ostertag, S. (2023). Negotiation in the digital era: Time, pressure and trust in virtual settings. *Group Decision and Negotiation, 32*(1), 51–72.
[28] Schweinsberg, M., Ku, G., Wang, C. S., & Pillutla, M. M. (2020). Negotiating in the 21st century: New questions and new tools. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 7*, 153–177.
[29] Shapiro, D. L., & Kulik, C. T. (2022). Negotiation, ethics, and trust in hybrid environments. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 36*(4), 622–639.
[30] Thompson, L. (2021). *The Mind and Heart of the Negotiator* (8th ed.). Pearson.
[31] Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science, 211*(4481), 453–458.