A CLEARLY FORMULATED GOAL OF ENTERING INTO NEGOTIATION IS HALF OF THE BATTLE

Kamola Alautdinova
doctoral student, faculty of Foreign Philology, National University of Uzbekistan
E-mail: kamola.mansurovan.phd@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The existence of 'specific languages' or registers in the various business sectors appears to be the most prominent feature of language use. But what are the functions and influences of such registers on employees' perceptions and on corporate life? A recent empirical investigation has revealed that "terminology which may originally have been no more than a handy abbreviation now fulfils several additional functions: it promotes cohesion within its user-group, helps maintain necessary attitudes among existing members, and instils such attitudes in new entrants". Group solidarity and efficiency are among the positive results claimed by those who advocate the adoption of military models, concepts, and terminologies in organisational life. Tough Negotiations - Manipulation, pressure, bluff, deception. Using these techniques against you means that the enemy was preparing for negotiations and really wants to win. If you do not have the appropriate training, then you will most likely lose. Negotiation is a very technological process in which you can learn to win. How? Just read this guideline for the beginner negotiator. However, it will be useful for real negotiation sharks.
Keywords: tough negotiations, friendly communication, Business formal communication, Partnership negotiations, subject of negotiations, result of negotiations.

"Negotiation is not about figuring out who is right or wrong.
It is about getting the parties involved
to agree to embrace the other party's perspective."
— ELIZABETH SUAREZ

INTRODUCTION

In our article we want to discuss one of the ultimate moments of business communication - Negotiations. "Negotiations begin with preparation," a sophisticated

reader will say when seeing the title of the article, and will be absolutely ... wrong, because negotiations begin with terminology, defining key concepts, some control points on which we will build our preparation for negotiations and all subsequent actions ... To change our behaviour in negotiations to a more effective one, we need to be able to analyse situations, and without a conceptual, methodological apparatus, this is impossible!

So come on, dear reader, let's come up with the negotiator's language, in which we will speak with you! What definitions do we need? Well, of course, what is "negotiation". There are thousands of definitions for this word, starting with Jim Kemp, who argued that negotiations are a process in which each party has the right to veto, and ending with Vladimir Dal, who doesn't have this word in "explanatory dictionary" at all.

In this scientific work, we intend to adopt a rather different and more complex notion of communication and one which is centred on the vision of organisations as essentially communicating at all levels. In an important if obvious sense, no 'organisation' exists prior to communication: organisations are talked into being and maintained by means of the talk of the people within and around them. Among the 'competing discourses' that shape daily organisational life, some become dominant.

In our article, we will use the following definition: Negotiations are a process of interaction between two or more parties in order to find out how much each party is interested in cooperation, what result it expects from it and what is ready to do for this cooperation. The global meaning of negotiations is to explore how much I can satisfy my interests more effectively than it could be done without conducting any negotiations, but using another, alternative solution.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

Watzlawick's bold statement that "All behaviour is communication" would have been met with disbelief by the physicists and engineers who during the first half of this century were active in the field of 'communications', concerned with the efficient use of channels rather than the nature of the 'message'. Not surprisingly, their communication models are simple, linear, mechanistic models like the well-known Shannon and Weaver (1949) model of communication. It is when language becomes the object of analysis in the communicative process that the shift from linear models to structural models of communication takes place. First Peirce, philosopher and logician, and later de Saussure focus on the meaning aspect of communication, leading the way towards alternative 'semiotic' models of communication.

A more sophisticated (theoretical) framework is discussed in Donnellon, Gray and Bougon (1986). As in the previous work, both qualitative and quantitative tools are employed but in this particular study the latter predominate. In fact, ethnographic research precedes theoretical sampling, which is followed by propositional and linguistic analysis. The four 'communication mechanisms' that the authors identify have strong pragmatic overtones: metaphor, logical argument, affect modulation and linguistic indirection.

Donnellon et al.'s contention is that despite limited shared meanings, organised action can and does take place, and they illustrate, by means of discourse extracts, how meaning and action are linked in communication. A drawback to their work is the use of students as corporate actors: our personal experience, at Italica and Britannica and observing MBA students engaged in simulated negotiations, strongly suggests that there are fundamental differences between real-life organisational discourse practices and apparently similar situations re-created in an artificial environment.

Written organisational communication has also been studied by means of narrative semiotics (Fiol 1989). Letters from CEO's to shareholders have been submitted to textual analysis in order to prove the correlation between the strength of firms' interdivisional and external boundaries and the number of joint ventures. The author defends her methodological choice by saying that "semiotics exposes underlying oppositional values through the identification of structural invariants", and she is not therefore concerned with "the multiple variations of the behaviours themselves or their performance implications" (1989:298). Semiotic analysis differs significantly from content analysis, — with its focus on individual statements or actions, — in that the interpretation of data is based on an a priori value schema. Thanks to this approach, Fiol can claim to have exposed "the simple belief patterns" contained in the CEO's letters and made her schema available for further research.

And what kind of negotiations are there in principle? Agree that discussing with a friend whose car we are going fishing and negotiating with bailiffs who came to seize your property are somewhat different negotiations, and you need to prepare for them in different ways. As we can see, the importance of knowing what and how to say increases with the importance of the meeting; the one who is better prepared for it wins the war.

What types of negotiations exist?

1. **Friendly communication** - everything is simple here, there is no danger to wait for, you just talk, not trying to get something specific from your friend.

2. Business formal communication - communication takes place within the framework of professional roles, where the rules of conduct are clear, do not cause

tension, you simply exchange information with your opponents on work issues: "- Do you want to purchase four cars of universal sapper blades from us, very good, medical steel? - No, thanks, we have everything. "Then I'm sorry to bother you. - It's okay, goodbye. "

3. Partnership negotiations - all parties are interested in working together, in long-term relationships. There is equal control of the situation. The parties demonstrate a search for a compromise and a mutually acceptable solution. Here it is already important to know the techniques that accelerate the formation of agreements. It is important to be able to be honest, which is very difficult, but without 100% honesty it is impossible to achieve partnerships. Moreover, our success in life directly depends on the number of strategic partners, interaction with which allows us to receive benefits for all parties.

And how many strategic partners do you have? Try to count how many people are you willing to trust? Communication with what people allows you to develop dynamically and achieve more? Let's make a reservation right away that parents and friends don't count. Why? Because these are the people who, as you think, owe you something. You are offended by friends who did not wish you a happy birthday, you think that they should have done it, this is not a partnership. A partner is the one who sees the benefits of joint cooperation and his obligations exist only within the framework of existing agreements.

4. Tough negotiations. This is the most interesting thing. The allocated resource is limited, the parties are not interested in its equal distribution, they are actively trying to put pressure on the opponent in one way or another. Ultimate communication is observed in the situation of revealing the partner's weakness. Every opportunity is taken to establish greater control over the situation. There are hidden scenarios for achieving your goals. It is after losing in tough negotiations that people begin to realize their imperfection as a negotiator. It is after a collision with a tough opponent, having lost a lot of time, money, relationships, that they grab books or come to trainings. I hope that you, dear reader, are wiser and decided to prepare first, and that is why you have this book in your hands.

5. War. Each of us was in a state of war, where the main thing is victory, emotions overwhelm the mind, and you want to punish the enemy, but in no case agree. You are ready for rash actions and stop evaluating how much it will cost you. War is dangerous because the demonstration of readiness to negotiate is perceived as a pretext for an attack. And if you are already involved in a war, then there is no place for chance, the strongest wins. The demonstration of best tactics and strategy is considered as combat.

A war usually starts when a resource that you consider to be yours has been forcibly seized.

Purpose of entering into negotiations - why am I entering into these negotiations? What result do I want at the end of the meeting? What exactly do I need - signing a contract, making an appointment for the next meeting, getting information or something else?

The clearer the goal is, the clearer what needs to be done. There is a subtle point: the goal is important and needs to be formulated before we start interacting with the other side, but not focus on it during negotiations. Fixing our attention on goals during negotiations, oddly enough, reduces our efficiency and behavioral flexibility. Thinking about what I want to achieve from the interlocutor, I will always be late in realizing this goal and ... ultimately I will lose. Because you need to focus not on the goal, but on the enemy, the goal will not go anywhere, unlike him.

An incorrectly chosen word when formulating the goal of entering into negotiations leads to the appearance of an incorrect scenario of behavior (it is very important to think and formulate thoughts correctly, thoughts tend to materialize). A clearly formulated goal of entering into negotiations is half the battle, and this is no joke!

The subject of negotiations. In the dictionary of the Russian language by Ozhegov, the meaning of the word "subject" is defined as follows: "What the thought is directed at, what constitutes its content or what some action is directed at."

And it doesn't matter if there are negotiations on the amount of wages when communicating with the employer or the location of the upcoming vacation when negotiating with the wife. On the other hand, it is very important, fundamentally important, to monitor during the negotiations so that their essence and objectivity are not lost in the heat of battles. It is important to constantly keep under control: are we talking about the same thing with the interlocutor? Otherwise, negotiations automatically and inevitably come to a standstill.

RESULTS

The results of negotiation- is a result that may or may not suit you, but it is always a measurable parameter that can be touched, measured, recorded. Negotiations cannot end in vain (as you often hear from people), there is always a result, we just sometimes do not know how to clearly formulate it, and without fixing the results of this meeting it is impossible to effectively prepare for the next negotiations.

The rights of the negotiators. Negotiation should never be confused with sales; negotiation is a process of jointly developing solutions that would satisfy both sides.

The phrase “The client is always right” is absolutely unsuccessful in terms of negotiations. The main difference between sales technology and negotiation technology: in the first case, the focus is on the interests and desires of the buyer (at least formally), in the second case, the focus is on the positions of BOTH parties. Negotiation is an equal process! Yes, one of the participants can pull the blanket over themselves, deliberately forcing the other side to forget about its rights, such as:

- The right to refuse to continue negotiations at any time.
- The right to be heard by the other party.
- The right to insist on taking into account one's interests.
- The right to insist on substantiation of the position of the other party.
- The right to raise the issue of the rules of these negotiations.
- The right to monitor compliance with agreements already reached during negotiations. Remembering or forgetting about these unspoken rights is already a personal matter for the negotiator.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Exploration of the complexity of overt and covert issues conveniently subsumed under the heading of 'cross-cultural management' has a relatively recent history in comparison with other branches of management studies. The process of internationalisation of business will no doubt stimulate it and widen its existing agenda. For this to take place, increased conceptual and methodological multi-disciplinarity is required, integrating existing quantitative approaches with qualitative ones. A shift from the still dominant 'objective' analysis — with its clear limitations when dealing with human behaviour — towards the development of " anthropological acumen for subjective discussion by anecdote and by example" (Peng 1991) is a necessary step if researchers are serious about 'comparative analysis'.

REFERENCES

1. Adler, G. 1995 "The case of the floundering expatriate". Harvard Business Review. July-August. 24-30.
2. Austin, J.L. 1962 How To Do Things With Words. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
3. Bargiela-Chiappini, F. 1992 "Empty words in business: redundancy or rhetoric?»4rth ENCoDe International Seminar on "Perspectives for trainers and customers in a Europe without barriers". Free University, Amsterdam.

4. Cassell, C , and G. Symon (eds.) 1994 Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research. A Practical Guide. London: Sage.
5. Cameron, D. (2000b). Good to talk? Living and working in a communication culture. London: Sage.
6. Дмитрий Коткин. Жесткие переговоры или просто о главном, Написано пером 2015
7. Franck, G. 1990 "Mergers and acquisitions: competitive advantage and cultural fit". European Journal of Management. 8.1.40-44.
8. Gordon, P.C., and K.A. Scearce 1995 "Pronominalization and discourse coherence, discourse structure and pronoun interpretation". Memory and Cognition. 23.3.313-323.
9. Hassard, J., and D. Pym (eds.) 1990 The Theory and Philosophy of Organizations. London: Routledge. Hassard, J., and M. Parker (eds.)
10. Jakobson, R. 1960 "Closing statements: linguistics and poetics". In T.A. Sebeok (ed.) Style in Language. Mass.: MIT Press.
11. Koester, A. (2004). The language of work. London & New York: Routledge.
12. Vine, B. (2004). Getting things done at work: The discourse of power in workplacinteraction. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
13. Willing, K. (1992). Talking it through: Clarification and problem-solving in professional work. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.