



RHETORICAL ARGUMENTATION AND PERSUASION IN BUSINESS NEGOTIATIONS

Kęstutis Peleckis¹, Valentina Peleckienė², Kęstutis Peleckis³

^{1,2,3} *Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Business Management Faculty,
Saulėtekio al.11, LT-10223 Vilnius-4, Lietuva*

Email: kestutis.peleckis@vgtu.lt; valentina.peleckiene@vgtu.lt; k.peleckis@vgtu.lt

Abstract. The paper deals with the problems of rhetorical effect common to another side of the negotiations. It is argued that a persuasive speech is very important competence of negotiator, as nothing can change negotiator's speech. Only directly negotiating, providing evidences, arguments, counter-arguments, and controversy the negotiators can move quickly to the overall objective of the agreement. Even with a well-developed modern means of communication, the Internet, electronic negotiation support systems, negotiators are able to move to direct negotiations. In bargaining process negotiator demonstrates himself, his appearance, mind, manners, emotions, ethics, etiquette knowledge, characteristics of voice, gestures, movements, facial expressions, reactions and their other communication options. The usage of rhetorical tools in bargaining process, the success of staying in contact with another side of the negotiations is an important factor of effective negotiations. If classical rhetoric focused attention on how to convince another part, in modern rhetoric, the emphasis is put on dialogue, interaction between speakers, and harmonization of relations.

Keywords: rhetorical argumentation, business negotiation, persuasion of opponent, logical reasoning, negotiator fervor, ethics of reasoning.

JEL classification: M21, M54.

1. Introduction

The negotiating parties are trying to convince each other in the correctness of their views, positions in business negotiations. For this purpose, the usage of variety of tools starting from logic diagrams and finishing with various appeals, speculation, sophistries are discussed in scientific literature (Wetlaufer 2005; Zarefsky 2006, 2008a, 2008b; Estrada 2010; King 2010). Rhetoric extending from Aristotle, is "not only as the word art to persuade, but also as structured science of persuasive speech with its own structure, definition, terminology, categories, rules" (Koženiauskienė 2009). Persuasive speaking is very important competence of the negotiator. Nothing can replace the persuasion of a live word by the negotiator. Only directly negotiating, submitting evidence, arguments, counter-arguments, polemicizing, negotiators can move quickly towards the joint target of the agreement (Eckhouse 1999; Hallahan 1999; Andersen 2001; Tindale 2004; Ulbert *et al.* 2004 Maaravi *et al.* 2011). If in the rhetoric of Aristotle communication act was a one-way, so the modern rhetoric says that there are no passive sides in the act of communication - and the speaker and the listener are playing an active role (Arvanitis, Karampatzos 2011). Even with a well-developed modern means of communication, the Internet, electronic negotiation

support systems, negotiators move to another part of the world for live, direct negotiations. The negotiator in the process of a negotiating express himself, his look, mind, manners, emotions, ethics, etiquette knowledge, features of his own voice, gestures, movements, facial expressions, and other reactions of his communicational capabilities (Nauckūnaitė 1998, Nauckūnaitė 2002, Nauckūnaitė 2007a, Nauckūnaitė 2007b). As indicated by R. Koženiauskienė, "in rhetorical theory the rhetorical tools are estimated at several hundreds, and they are quite different, each has its own purpose, carries out certain functions, and helps to influence the addressee. Theoretically, all the rhetorical tools are neutral; their positive or negative influence is determined by the speaker's purpose and the circumstances under which the instrument is being used. Rhetorical measures primarily have to embody and help to clarify the content, to convey and clarify certain information, reinforce arguments, to lead by the way of wisdom, truth and proof, rather than oratory. Knowledge of rhetorical tools helps to reveal a logical order, the consistency of the information provided, the links of sentences causality. Another important feature of rhetoric tools – is to maintain a successful contact with the audience" (Koženiauskienė 2009). The use of rhetorical measures in the negotiating, the success of staying in contact with other part of the negotiations are

important factors for effective negotiations. If classical rhetoric is focused on how to convince the other part, so in modern rhetoric greater focus is on the dialogue, mutual interaction, harmonization of relations between speakers (Koženiauskienė 2009). There are some statements provided by S. Palazzi about rhetoric of negotiations: “rhetoric – that is to say the right things at the right time in the right place at the right way to gain the chosen goal” (Koženiauskienė 2009). Thus, the rhetorical competence of the negotiator could be described as the ability to speak well, to prove, to argue, to use correctly, properly rhetorical measures necessary to evaluate the bargaining situation, the context of the negotiations, the peculiarities of communication (rhetorical) situation, be able to analyze and critically evaluate own discourses and of other negotiator, to reveal the cause of effective and ineffective speaking, recognize manipulation and bluffing, to know how to convince the other side of the negotiation.

Problem – the lack of theoretical knowledge in rhetorical argumentation and practical skills can become an essential obstacle for negotiator to achieve effective results of the negotiations.

The study object is the sources and mechanisms applied by negotiator and persuasive impact on the opponent.

The aim is to reveal the most important sources and tools of negotiator persuasive effect on the opponent and to characterize their expression.

Research methods applied in the paper are systematic, comparative, logical analysis and synthesis of scientific literature.

2. The sources of persuasive impact to the opponent in business negotiations

The most important function of rhetoric is persuasive impact, covering very extensive range to other person (or group of persons) – from persuasion, suggestion, inspiration, faith reinforcement, encouragement till captivating (Koženiauskienė 2013). What are the sources we can use? Aristotle in his "Rhetoric" much attention put on rational arguments in persuasion, the appealing to the logos, that is to the mind thinking, reasoning and consideration, but also provided an important role for other factors of persuasion - ethos and pathos (Koženiauskienė 2009). R. Koženiauskienė (2009) and Z. Nauckūnaitė (2007a, b) presented the most important features of logos, ethos and pathos (Table 1).

3. Logical argumentation in business negotiations

Knowing the opponent's persuading by his logical evidence and arguments, we can say that bargaining in business negotiations should be accurate, precise, specific, and logical. Any logical errors of the negotiators are violations of one or the other requirements of the Logic law, that is the Law of Identity (Latin *Identitas*), the Law of Contradiction (Latin *Contradictionis*), the Third is not given Law (Latin *Tertium non Datura*), the Law of Sufficient Ground (Latin *Rationis Sufficient*) or otherwise.

The Law of Identity requires that in business conversations or in negotiations the thought, the statement, the notion expressed by person or the opponent during the entire conversation or negotiating period would mean the same. Formally, this law can be expressed by the formula: $A = A$. If you said in negotiations that you are selling complete set of services ($a + b + c$) as a unit and can't be other options, so any other your manipulation combinations of services ($a + b$, $a + c$, $b + c$) - already conflict with Identity law.

According to Law of Identity it is important that both sides of business conversations or negotiations would have the same understanding of the thesis. Also submitted statement must be unique, not ambiguous or not defined. It seems that it is very simple requirement but not always it succeeds to express an idea on adequate language structure.

Frequently, the errors in business talks and negotiations appear which arise from ambiguity of words and phrases. These errors are divided into 3 groups:

- Equivocal (Latin *aequivocus* – ambiguous) errors (due to multiple meanings of words). They are occurring when in conversation or business negotiations ambiguous words are used for one or another value, assuming that it is presented clearly.

- Logomachy (logo + gr. *machia* – fight) errors (due to lack of commonality of topics for conversation, jumping from topic to topic).

- Amphibology (gr. *amphibolia* – ambivalence, ambiguity) errors (ambiguity resulting intonation, sentence structure, punctuation errors).

The Law of Contradiction (formed by Aristotle) argues that two conflicting statements – a statement and its denial – cannot be true at the same time (is not true that A and non-A at the same time are correct). If the thesis is considered to be true, then the antithesis acquires significance of lies. An example: If the thesis is: "This is an honest businessman," it is the antithesis – "This businessman is dishonest" – a lie.

Table 1. The explanation of definition's content related to persuasive impact sources (sources: Nauckūnaitė 2007a; Koženiauskienė 2009)

| The source of persuasive impact on the opponent | The explanation of definition's content related to persuasive impact source |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>Logos</i> | <p>Logos is designed that speaker with accurate and clear words can convince listeners, affect them by professional freedom of thoughts and speech logic, wisdom and the right words seeking to their goals. Logos - it is an appeal to the mind, or a synonym of justice criterion, it is faithfulness to the truth. Logos – it is the facts, events, actions, clear evidence supporting by witnesses, and documents, expert conclusions, language (Koženiauskienė 2009, p.431-432). Logos principle states that in order to convince the audience, addresser must consistently provide the evidence and follow the logic of the rules - regular course of reasoning. It seems that logic and rationality should be seen much more than the image of the addressee or the addressee's appeal to the emotions, but the formal reasoning of addressee is usually unacceptable (heavy and boring), so have to rely on rhetorical reasoning types. For this reason, the ratio of quality of the evidence and of persuasion categories is discussed so far (Nauckūnaitė 2007a, p.95).</p> |
| 2. <i>Ethos</i> | <p>Ethos - is loyalty to yourself, everything what is related with the ethics and etiquette - the speaker's general values, the ability to listen and understand the other person, to adapt the words of the topic, audience, circumstances, with respect to the law, as well as to the ordinary citizen, to the listener, to the opponent. This is the respect that is shown by the behavior and expressed in appropriate words. Ethos arguments appeal to the speaker's and the listener's moral norms (justice, fairness, sense of responsibility) commonality. Usually there are two kinds of psychological arguments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) arguments of understanding and acceptance, in order to characterize a person; 2) arguments of general condemnation, in order to characterize the behavior. <p>In fact ethos - is an appeal to human behavior (suggestion and linguistic behavior), or synonym of sincerity criterion. Each speaker is allowed to claim only what he believes himself. Aristotle notices that we listen not to the language but to the person who is speaking, and had opinion that from all three categories most persuasive is ethos. Values and beliefs or personal moral authority, becomes the basis of rhetorical appeals (Koženiauskienė 2009, p.432-433). Ethos refers to the speaker's moral qualities. From Greek language <i>ethos</i> arose <i>ethics</i>, <i>ethical</i>, and modern communication science <i>ethos</i> tends to interpret by the word <i>image</i> because Aristotle <i>ethos</i> used to describe such features of the speaker's character, which he reveals to the audience. Aristotle said that we tend to trust more the speaker, who is "wise, honest, and kind-hearted." Today near the features of the <i>common sense</i>, as <i>good character</i> and <i>good will</i> are attached <i>the competence</i> - addresser must be not only a great man, but also well versed in the subject matter about which he is speaking or writing. Therefore, when writing argumentative text, <i>ethos</i>, as the image of author is created by (Nauckūnaitė 2007a, p.95):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) choice of tone and style, a discursive manner suitable for the top of our society; b) displaying an excellent understanding of the subject. |
| 3. <i>Pathos</i> | <p>Pathos, according today's understanding are speaker's emotions - everything that shows the strength of the speaker's position, his sincere determination to defend justice and explain the truth after the movement of the audience's feelings. Aristotle's pathos - is an appeal to the senses, and the most important - the ability to put themselves in another person's emotional state, nowadays commonly called empathy, which is a synonym of relevance criterion (relevance is understood as mutual feelings of fulfillment, balance between the speaker's and the listener's emotions). Relevance criterion requires that the speaker to know the audience emotions and starved the same, what feelings he expects from the audience, that he do not go from the subject, do not lie, do not to play, that he would be sincere (Koženiauskienė 2009, p.434-435). Pathos refers to the speaker's ability to connect with audience's feelings, desires, wishes, fears and desires. Assessing in the addressee's perspective, it is necessary that the addressee would hear and understand you (if you are unable to connect with the audience, do not neither speak nor write). Evaluation the contact from the view point of audience, is dangerous because it can easily become a victim of manipulation: after all, the decisions often are not based on rational reasoning - the strongest impact on human decisions, according to Aristotle, has anger, pity, fear, and contrary to their feelings (Nauckūnaitė 2007a, p.95).</p> |

The Law of Contradiction is seen as a significant in business talks and negotiations. Consciously using it is possible to detect and eliminate the contradictions of claims, critically evaluate claims

and inaccuracy of behavior and incoherence. Law of Contradiction is commonly used when you need to prove something: if it is established that one of the most controversial statements is correct so the

other statement is incorrect. Determination of controversy of the chatter, the opponent claims is one of the strongest arguments in defense of their position. If in business conversations, negotiations are not violations of the Law of Contradiction - that means that the other speakers, negotiators statements and thoughts are assured in any way logical link between statements.

The Third is not given Law argue that from the two conflicting statements one must be correct. Its essence is as follows: available or as stated, or as describes his denial – there is no a third possibility. Formally, it is expressed by the formula: true A or not A. If the statement: "Our enterprise is competitive in Lithuania" is correct, so the statement: "Our company is not competitive in Lithuania" is wrong.

The Third is not given Law is important in business talks, negotiations, because it requires a certain consistency in facts and demand to avoid contradictions in statements. From this Law arises a requirement for business talks, negotiations: it is not allowed not to recognize one of the conflicting claims and to search for the third among them. If one of the following statements is recognized as correct, so contrary to his assertion it is necessary to recognize a wrong one and do not try to look for a third option that does not exist, because it cannot be.

Law of Sufficient Ground says: "The claim is correct, if it is sufficiently reasoned. To prove correctness of claim "Sufficient reason" might be another idea or any claim. Why it is said "sufficient reason" and not "ground"? For reasoning of the claim innumerable amount of grounds can be found. However, only some of them can be considered to be sufficient, of course, if the same statement is correct. No one ground will be insufficient if the claim itself is false. Let us take sophists who are trying to prove obviously false claims. Trying to justify their own statement they provide the basis which is not sufficient. Basis is sufficient when it proves the correctness of the statement.

Implementation of Law of Sufficient Ground in business conversations, negotiations requires that each expressed attitude, the statement must be sufficiently justified. Paying proper attention to validity of the opinion, we can distinguish the correct statement from the incorrect, false. In argumentation process in expressing and disclosure of logical relations induction and deduction have highly importance. Induction - is a method of reasoning, when summarizing separate partial statements some conclusion are done. Deductive reasoning - contrary than induction - is method of reasoning when from general statements are made narrower conclusion useful for partial, particular

cases. So, in induction - conclusions are derived going from the partial to the total, and in deductive reasoning on the contrary. Induction – can be complete and imperfect. Complete induction provides the conclusion which is done after examination of all possible individual situations. However, this is usually impossible. Therefore, imperfect induction is used. For example, in public surveys only a certain part of society is interviewed and the conclusions are made about the whole society. Imperfect induction is of 3 types:

1. Simple monitoring (if all observed facts support the conclusion – so it is summarized that it is typical for everyone in that kind of facts).

2. Fact selection (when are discarded random facts that can't be attributed to the findings).

3. Scientific induction (will not be touched because it is not the object of this work).

During the negotiations, business talks there are always applicable simple observation and selection of facts induction methods. However, the application of the method for facts selection often in business talks are performed by some manipulations – useless facts, figures, and data suppressed. Sometimes can be made and summarized irrelevant facts aiming to gain the agreement in the negotiations. Therefore, the facts, the statements must be checked in one of five ways:

1. Determine if the correct facts or claim form the basis for aggregation, findings. Sometimes inaccurate facts, figures, statements can make highly doubtful and of aggregation and the same recipient or opponent.

2. To examine whether the claim has a connection with the conclusion. Let's say that a brand of wood lacquer is less expensive than lacquers B, C, D. It seems that it can be concluded that the best interest to buy a brand of varnish. However, such a conclusion would be wrong, because is not detailed lacquers B, C, D performance ratio. A lacquer is defined only in terms of price. Better lacquers B, C, D quality makes them more useful for lacquer A. This is a typical inductive reasoning error.

3. Determine whether enough is given the information, examples, and facts. To solve this problem, it is necessary to take into account not only the number of facts but also into the sample which aims to ensure representativeness. For example, if you investigate cases of incompetence only of 2 businessmen it follows that all the Lithuanian businessmen are incompetent will be wrong. In Lithuania there are hundreds of thousands entrepreneurs. Therefore, several cases of malpractice can't provide a basis for such a finding.

4. Determine if the selected examples, cases, the facts are typical. This method is closely related

to the previous method, because the number of samples depends on how much they are representative.

5. Determine whether there are negative examples, to which should be paid attention. The negative example is an example that does not feed into the conclusions. This is an exception to the rule.

If the speaker's opponent is aware of such negative examples he alone can deny the arguments. In business conversations and negotiations is essential such option of induction as reasoning on causation (Lee *et al.* 2006). Causation – that is interdependence between two or more events, when one phenomenon (reason) is the base to occur to another (the result). For example: prices of oil went up - it means that will become more expensive gasoline, diesel fuel.

In any case of dispute, the causal logical connection should be checked in accordance with the following rules:

1. Can occur perceived phenomenon, when not available the presumed reason? If the answer is - yes, it can't be said that before the consequence going phenomenon is the only reason for the consequences. In this case, it can be said that either there is no connection between the two phenomena, or is another possible cause.

2. Does happen that there are no consequences when the reason is obvious? If the answer is - yes, it can't be said that this seems to be the only possible cause. Or there is no connection between these events; either it is another possible consequence.

3. Is there a relationship between implicit and perceived cause of the phenomenon is not accidental, but conceived as causal because of the events following each other in time and space. An example: it is argued that limiting alcohol and beer advertising in the media significantly decreased alcohol consumption. But there at the same time was increased the excise on alcoholic beverages. As a result their price increased. So decline in the purchase of alcohol outlets may be affected by the increase of illegal homemade vodka production volumes, consumption of contraband alcohol, and growth of surrogates' volume.

4. Are there other possible causes? Sometimes we are interested in the cause may seem more important than the real main cause.

5. Are there other potential consequences? Cause-effect reasoning is oriented to the future, because of changing reasons; conclusions are drawn about the possible consequences in the future. However, in most cases no one is taking to check the validity of such predictions and evaluation of other effects.

The arguments will be logical and form the basis logically to prove and justify the position if they comply with the following requirements:

1. The arguments can be considered only those statements that are accurate or nobody doubts them.

2. The arguments will be proven independently regardless of the thesis (they must have self-validity).

3. The arguments must be consistent.

4. The arguments must be sufficient.

4. Ethics of argumentation and persuasion in business negotiations

In terms of ethical reasoning should be noted that the bargaining requires cooperation. But it is possible only in mutual trust and responsibility conditions. Therefore rhetorical ethos is manifested in two aspects:

1) the negotiator speech quality that gives the other side of the negotiation the basis for confidence in the speaker;

2) the other side of the negotiation features encouraging the speaker to be ethical.

As observed by D. Zarefsky "self-perception has an impact on how you will be perceived by the listener. Do they accept you as a knowledgeable and well-informed or as arrogant and proud? In the first case, you can expect that the audience will support your efforts to share information and ideas, in the second case people can outrage that you have explained to them what to do" (Zarefsky 2008a). D. Zarefsky emphasizes that critical self-assessment will tell you how to change or obtain better their own ethos. Sometimes for the purpose you have little things to change. For example, different wording, such as "all remember" instead of "I want to remind you, can help to create a sense of community and will not be highlighted your advantage, and dependence of the listeners. Focusing on this aspect of the ethos especially is important when the audience is culturally diverse" (Zarefsky 2008a).

Evaluation of your ethos as indicated by D. Zarefsky (2008a), is advised to consider all your significant and future listeners similarities and differences that have an impact on listeners approach to you. Change what would improve the perception of the listeners to you but remain yourself. Analyze yourself, as you control your behavior affecting the listener's view of your ethos" (Zarefsky 2008a). As observed by D. Zarefsky, to adapt to the listeners is not difficult, because the speaker basically control their behavior. Accordingly to which the audience evaluate its ethos. Finally, you can choose whether to maintain eye con-

tact, smile, frown, or make a pause, and so on. You make a decision by what underlying material to use, how to lay out it, how to gesticulate.

The obtained control affects the audience's opinion about you. Of course, you would like those listeners to perceive your ethos, and not just because of the fact that you like when others well think about you. Aristotle said that the real way of the speaking may be the most important tool to convince the listener. The fact of how listeners perceive your ethos will be affected by what they will think about your speech (Zarefsky 2008a).

Argumentation ethics in negotiations is concerned with the rules that are equally recognized both by the speaker, as well listener. Rhetorical ethic is concerned on compliance with morality, ethics, etiquette, law, as well as the technical norms of language (Wahl, Prause 2013; Sequeira, Ferreira-Lopes 2013). Despite the importance of norms, negotiation ethics, including the ethics of negotiating language is not limited to them. Rhetorical negotiation involves ethics and cooperation conditions of communicating parties.

When negotiating, discussing, evaluating facts, preparing and making joint decisions occurs a new negotiating experience that summarizes and creates a new reality, which is determining further actions of negotiating party and conditions in which the negotiating will take place in the future. This process inevitably more or less may be vulnerable for particular rules and regulations (Kearney *et al.* 2013). In the light of these consequences of violation, norms and rules can be extended and supplementary narrowed or – if the negotiator language, his proof, the arguments are ethically unacceptable. Negotiating language governing norms are related to the use of languages in the negotiations, freedom of speech (and abuse), the freedom of conscience, copyright and intellectual property, privacy, confidentiality, goods and services, advertising and other things. Observance of ethical norms is associated with the adequacy of the bargaining language, speaking order and consistency, the right to the appropriate language. Here is an important language style to ensure its accuracy, precision, and clarity. It must be not forgotten responsibility for misrepresentation, bluffing, manipulation, psychological, emotional pressure to the other side of the negotiations, compliance with the rules of etiquette and politeness.

For ethics of negotiating is important to ensure the following conditions:

1. A systematic focus on other negotiating part outlines thoughts, replies, speeches, statements. Rhetorics in negotiations begins on the desire and ability to grasp the opponent as one

who listens, understands and remembers what is said, is in a better position. Ethical negotiator seeks that his opponent could fully speak. Possession of detailed information enables the selection of appropriate reasoning tactics and more productively to participate in negotiating process.

2. It is required continuous analysis of the information. The negotiator tries to separate the content of the opponents' speech from his personality, to analyze the content of the opponents' statements through the prism of his goals and interests, to analyze the content of the opponents' statements and compare this to their own purposes and interests, distinguish in the opponents' speeches acceptable part from unacceptable.

3. The use of positive information. Communication development is based on the ideas and facts that are mutually acceptable. In order to develop an effective negotiating dialogue it is needed to stop disparities and focus on matters of common interest. Thus, the evaluation of positive, leading to the common interest aspects of the opponents' speeches is very important for the efficiency of negotiating.

4. Ethical negotiator submits the following statements, which are relevant to the opponent, assesses content of the opponent's statements and takes it into account.

5. The negotiator seeks his goals and interests, but recognizes the right of the opponent to have his own goals and interests, tolerates his position.

5. Fervor of negotiator's language in argumentation and proof system

Negotiator's language fervor not always is an expression of his emotional state – he just uses such speech technology, which creates a certain emotional image. In reasoning fervor is highly essential because language individuality of the negotiator occurs precisely through the speaker's pathos, which encourages listeners to empathize with content of the speech and the proposals. In addition rhetorical argument always deals with matters on which there is no consensus in negotiations (Laužikas, Mokšėckienė 2013; Laužikas, Dailydaitė 2013).

During negotiations nobody discuss suggestions and problems, which are not interesting for none side of the negotiations. Voluntary contraction of other side of the negotiations aimed to specific targets can be activated by emotional impact. Rhetorical fervor of the negotiator refers to the speaker's position in respect of subject matter and the solutions proposed. In theory of rhetoric there are distinguished three main types of rhetorical

pathos: sentimental, romantic and realistic. Each of these types of rhetorical pathos convey the appropriate emotions. Sentimental fervor in negotiating process can occur in the contrast to negotiating situation, presenting it as caused by forced power of the external reality, with the ideal image of negotiator, who is suffering from spiritual conflict.

In the case of the Romantic pathos the bargaining situation is presented which can be replaced by the forces of two negotiating sides. Romantic fervor in negotiations is the most common, because it is related to the enhancement of reasoning with getting the other side of the negotiations towards common goals by offering new ideas. In addition the use of romantic pathos enables to demonstrate emotions strong and constructive. Realistic fervor is based on a real assessment of the facts and the need to change the positions of negotiating parties in accordance with the requirements of real bargaining situations.

6. Conclusions

The need to use only reasonable, fair arguments determines that using at least one unreasonable, unconvincing argument there is a danger that the other person, opponent in general will doubt on justice of reasoning. If the opponent, the interviewer asks: "what else can you prove it?" - it means that the arguments and their presentation form is not sufficient to convince the opponent. But not always possible to behave in contrary: more of arguments, the better it is. Endlessly increasing the number of arguments begins to provide arguments of minor importance, and perhaps even contrary to one another. Thus, the adequacy of arguments must be understood not in terms of quantity but by their meaning and convincing.

Rhetorical argumentation in business negotiations – it is an attempt of certain statements or evidence to convince someone to change the opponent's position or belief and acceptance position of other's side of negotiations. It is in the appropriate form presented claims which are directed to the interviewer's mind and emotions that he could evaluate adopt or reject them. This is achieved without violence - only by persuasion. The rhetorical reasoning is characterized by the following aspects:

- examining the linkages between the thesis and its underlying claims of justice, and not the grounds on which the thesis is formulated and presented;
- it is targeted activity: attempts of logical, ethos and pathos factors to strengthen or weaken the beliefs of the interviewer, the opponent;

- it is a social activity, as it is directed to another person (or other people);
- it focuses on the dialogue and activates the other side of the negotiating react to the statements;
- it is considered the other side of the negotiations is rational, able intelligently to evaluate arguments, to accept them or deny and reject.

Ethics of argumentation and persuasion in the negotiations is related with the rules which are equally recognized by both the speaker and the audience. Rhetorical ethics is concerned with morality, ethics, etiquette, law, as well as compliance with the technical rules of the language. In Negotiating process necessarily more or less may be infringed certain rules and regulations. In view of the outcome of cases, norms and rules can be further expanded and narrowed, or - if the language of the negotiator, his proof, arguments are ethically unacceptable.

References

- Andersen, P. H. 2001. Relationship development and marketing communication: an integrative model, *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing* 16(3): 167–182.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/08858620110389786>
- Arvanitis, A.; Karampatzos, A. 2011. Negotiation and Aristotle's Rhetoric: Truth over interests, *Philosophical Psychology* 24: 845–860.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09515089.2011.569910>
- Eckhouse, B. 1999. *Competitive Communication: A Rhetoric for Modern Business*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Estrada, F. 2010. Uses of the argumentation in the negotiation, MPRA Paper 22761, University Library of Munich, Germany. [online] [accessed 6 February 2014]. Available from Internet: <http://mpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/22761>
- Hallahan, K. 1999. Seven models of framing: implications for public relations, *Journal of Public Relations Research* 11(3): 205–242.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s1532754xjpr1103_02
- Kearney, C.; Hisrich, R. D.; Antoncic, B. 2013. The mediating role of corporate entrepreneurship for external environment effects on performance, *Journal of Business Economics and Management* 14(Supplement 1):S328-S357.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3846/16111699.2012.720592>
- King, C. L. 2010. Beyond persuasion: the rhetoric of negotiation in business communication, *Journal of Business Communication* 47(1): 69–78.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0021943609355791>
- Koženiauskienė, R. 2009. *Basics of Legal Rhetoric*. Monograph. Vilnius: Registrų centras.

- Koženiauskienė, R. 2013. *Rhetorical and Stylistic Analysis of Publicistic Texts*. Monograph. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.
- Laužikas, M.; Dailydaitė, S. 2013. Benefits of social capital for sustainable innovation capabilities, *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues* 2(3): 85–97. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2013.2.3\(7\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2013.2.3(7))
- Laužikas, M.; Mokšėckienė. 2013. The role of creativity in sustainable business, *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues* 1(1): 10–22. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2013.1.1\(2\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2013.1.1(2))
- Lee, K.; Yang, G.; Graham, J. L. 2006. Tension and trust in international business negotiations: American executives negotiating with Chinese executives, *Journal of International Business Studies* 37: 623–641.
- Maaravi, Y.; Ganzach, Y.; Pazy, A. 2011. Negotiation as a form of persuasion: arguments in first offers, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 101(2): 245–255. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023331>
- Nauckūnaitė, Z. 1998. *Oratory Training*. Kaunas: Šviesa.
- Nauckūnaitė, Z. 2002. Classical rhetoric as communicative competence development paradigm, *Žmogus ir Žodis* [Man and The Word] 1(4): 59–65.
- Nauckūnaitė, Z. 2007a. Argumentation: proof and persuasion relation, *Žmogus ir žodis* [Man and The Word] 9(1): 94–100.
- Nauckūnaitė, Z. 2007b. Argumentation: concept and didactic perspectives, *Pedagogika: Mokslo Darbai*. [Pedagogy Studies: Research Papers] 86: 135–141.
- Sequeira, T. N.; Ferreira-Lopes, A. 2013. Social capital and investment in R&D: new externalities, *Journal of Business Economics and Management* 14(1): 77–97. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3846/16111699.2011.638667>
- Tindale, Ch. W. 2004. *Rhetorical Argumentation: Principles of Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Ulbert, C.; Risse, T.; Muller, H. 2004. *Arguing and Bargaining in Multilateral Negotiations*, Swiss Chair, Firenze: European University Institute [online] [accessed 6 February 2014]. Available from Internet: <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Publications/Detail/?ots591=0C54E3B3-1E9C-BE1E-2C24-A6A8C7060233&lng=en&id=27150>
- Wahl, M.; Prause, G. 2013. Toward understanding resources, competencies, and capabilities: business model generation approach, *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues* 1(2): 67–80. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2013.1.2\(1\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2013.1.2(1))
- Wetlaufer, G. B. 2005. The Rhetorics of Negotiations [online] [accessed 6 February 2014]. Available from Internet: SSRN: <http://ssrn.com>
- Zarefsky, D. 2008a. *Public Speaking: Strategies for Success*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. 480 p.
- Zarefsky, D. 2008b. Knowledge claims in rhetorical criticism, *Journal of communication* 58: 629–640. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00405.x>
- Zarefsky, D. 2006. Strategic maneuvering through persuasive definitions: Implications for dialectic and rhetoric, *Argumentation* 20: 399–416. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10503-007-9030-6>