*Corresponding Author's Email: ekatburceva1987@icloud.com
Proceedings of the International Conference on Research in Psychology
Vol. 2, Issue. 2, 2025, pp. 43-54
DOI: https://doi.org/10.33422/icrpconf.v3i1.1464

ISSN: 3030-0622 online

Diamond Scientific Publishing

Silence Speaks: The Contact–Withdrawal–Contact Cycle in Cross-Cultural Negotiations —A Gestalt Perspective on Respectful Distance

Ekaterina Burtseva

Head of International Trade in Banking, Samara, Russia
Gestalt therapist, Moscow Institute of Gestalt and Psychodrama, Moscow, Russia

Abstract

In the context of global uncertainty, international business negotiations increasingly require more human-centred and relationship-based approaches. This study operationalises the Contact–Withdrawal–Contact (CWC) cycle—a Gestalt-based framework—across 37 cross-border B2B negotiations over 12 months, using a practitioner-observer design. CWC-applied cases (n=20 with refusal or distancing) were compared with standard practice (n=17) and peer benchmarks (29 managers). CWC yielded a 60% return rate after refusal (vs. 15–20% baseline, $p < 0.001$), 83% conversion after return, and an overall 50% conversion from initially declined cases (Cohen's $h = 0.84$, large effect). These findings indicate that relational rhythm—awareness, legitimised withdrawal, and deliberate re-engagement—enhances negotiation outcomes under geopolitical volatility and algorithmic mediation.

Keywords: Gestalt therapy, cross-cultural negotiation, business communication

1. Introduction

Two forces now reshape cross-cultural business relations: geopolitical volatility and AI-mediated communication. This study asks: how can negotiators sustain relational homeostasis amid algorithmic mediation and geopolitical division? The CWC cycle offers one such way: by deepening awareness, dialogue, and respectful distance, negotiators can maintain dynamic balance (what Gestalt theory describes as relational homeorhesis) and preserve the authenticity of human interaction, making it more effective.

2. Literature Review

Classical negotiation models (Lewicki et al., 2021) distinguish distributive and integrative modes, emphasising BATNA (Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement) and concession strategies.

Cultural frameworks (Hofstede, 1980; Hall, 1976; Triandis, 1995) prove inadequate in volatile environments (Brett, 2014). Process research (Adair & Brett, 2005; Harinck & De Dreu, 2004) reframes pauses as constructive phases, not failures—central to the CWC model.

Intra-national polarisation limits cultural profiles' predictive power, underscoring the need for interaction-focused approaches.

2.1 Neurobiological Foundations of Contact

The amygdala rapidly categorises in-group vs. out-group within milliseconds (LeDoux, 1996; Phelps et al., 2000; Cikara & Van Bavel, 2014). In polarised contexts, these biases amplify, requiring person-centred approaches. Pauses activate prefrontal regulation, shifting from automatic categorisation to conscious contact.

2.2 Philosophical and Therapeutic Roots

Buber's I–Thou (1923/2004), Lewin's field theory (1947), and Gestalt therapy (Perls et al., 1951) provide philosophical grounding: dialogical presence, field dynamics, and resistance-as-contact. The CWC model, adapted from Resnick and Resnick's (2022) contact cycle, frames withdrawal as a constructive phase.

2.3 Temporal Regulation, Impasses, and Trust in AI-Mediated Negotiation Processes

Recent negotiation research increasingly conceptualises trust and decision-making as temporally regulated processes rather than static states. Trust evolves through responsiveness, timing, and relational rhythm (Olekalns & Smith, 2009; Kong et al., 2021). While AI-mediated communication accelerates negotiation, it may simultaneously erode interpersonal trust by compressing tempo and reducing dialogical presence (O'Neill & McQuillan, 2025). Research on algorithmic mediation shows a dual dynamic: appreciation for efficiency and consistency (Logg et al., 2019) coexists with aversion in high-stakes interpersonal contexts where authenticity and human presence matter (Dietvorst et al., 2015; Jago, 2019). In such contexts, AI-mediated exchanges may undermine epistemic trust, triggering defensive withdrawal driven by disrupted relational tempo rather than substantive disagreement (Sahebi & Formosa, 2025; Hoff & Bashir, 2015).

Process-oriented research reframes pauses as functional regulatory phases (Schweinsberg et al., 2022; Warsitzka et al., 2023; Filzmoser et al., 2016), demonstrating that outcomes depend on when and how communicative moves are made (Olekalns & Druckman, 2014). From a Gestalt perspective, this literature converges on a core premise of the CWC framework: withdrawal is not merely a tactical pause but an active form of resistance-as-contact—an emotional and relational recalibration that sustains interaction rather than terminating it (Resnick & Resnick, 2022). By structuring withdrawal as a deliberate phase within a rhythmic cycle, CWC operationalises negotiation as stabilised flow (homeorhesis) rather than static equilibrium.

2.4 Gaps in the Literature

Three critical gaps remain:

1. No Gestalt-based negotiation framework. While process research acknowledges pauses as regulatory phases (Schweinsberg et al., 2022; Filzmoser et al., 2016), no existing framework operationalises Gestalt principles—awareness, boundary clarity, resistance-as-contact, and homeorhesis—into a replicable behavioural grammar for cross-cultural negotiations.

2. Withdrawal as an active phase remains under theorised. Impasse typologies describe what happens during pauses (Warsitzka et al., 2023) but do not systematically address how to structure withdrawal and re-contact as relational interventions that preserve trust and enable re-entry.

3. AI mediation's relational impact is underexplored in negotiation contexts. While trust erosion in algorithmic systems is well-documented (Sahebi & Formosa, 2025; Jago, 2019), the specific mechanisms by which AI-accelerated communication disrupts negotiation

rhythm—and how human-paced pauses within the CWC framework can counterbalance this effect.

Addressing these gaps provides the rationale for the present study, which operationalises Gestalt-based principles into a replicable framework for cross-cultural negotiations under technological and geopolitical uncertainty.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 Buber as a Bridge to Conscious Contact

Buber's I–Thou stance interrupts automatic categorisation, meeting the other as a person rather than a category. In AI-mediated contexts, I–Thou presence counters reduction of the other to a dataset, sustaining dialogue across divides.

3.2 Gestalt Principles in Negotiation

Gestalt theory provides a phenomenological approach to interaction, grounded in five interrelated principles directly relevant to negotiation.

Awareness in the here-and-now. Focusing attention on the immediate moment reduces decisions shaped by outdated assumptions or projected threats, distinguishing current interaction from distortions rooted in past experience.

Creative adjustment. Adapting one's behaviour to the evolving field without losing coherence of self or purpose is essential in negotiations under shifting geopolitical or relational pressures.

Boundary management. Recognising and respecting personal, cultural, and organisational limits that define the negotiation space, including sensitivity to how cultures signal openness, caution, or closure.

Resistance as contact. Reframing hesitation, silence, or refusal as active forms of engagement. In polarised contexts, resistance may even appear as sharp value-based opposition. Gestalt practice regards this not as disengagement but as another form of dialogue— sometimes to be amplified rather than resolved. In negotiations, objections can be approached similarly: not as barriers, but as invitations to deepen understanding and strengthen the relationship. In the CWC model, the withdrawal phase itself—whether expressed as hesitation, silence, or explicit refusal—constitutes resistance-as-contact: an active relational move that maintains the field of interaction rather than terminating it.

Homeorhesis—self-regulation as stabilised flow (Resnick & Resnick, 2022)—applies to negotiation as capacity to maintain relational equilibrium across shifting contexts rather than restoration of a prior baseline, recognising that balance is maintained within continuous change.

3.3 The Contact–Withdrawal–Contact Dynamic

Building on Bob and Rita Resnick's refinement of the Gestalt contact cycle, the CWC dynamic reframes negotiation as a rhythmic oscillation: contact → withdrawal → re-contact (Resnick & Resnick, 2022). Contact—the stage of initial interaction where participants exchange greetings, intentions, and ideas through verbal and non-verbal communication. Withdrawal—a pause that allows participants to process emotions, reflect, or momentarily step back from the discussion. Re-contact—the renewed engagement after reflection, when both sides re-enter dialogue with greater clarity and readiness to cooperate.

3.4 Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question 1 (RQ1): How can the CWC approach, grounded in Gestalt principles, enhance the quality and effectiveness of cross-cultural business negotiations compared with traditional, culturally framed models?

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Applying Gestalt-based awareness—originally developed in therapy, organisational consulting, and education—can enhance negotiation effectiveness relative to standard practice by fostering emotional rhythm, presence, and relational adaptability in strategic contexts.

Research Question 2 (RQ2): How can Gestalt-based awareness help maintain relational homeorhesis in negotiations destabilised by geopolitical volatility and algorithmic mediation?

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Gestalt-informed negotiation practices support the maintenance of dynamic equilibrium (homeorhesis) and trust within global business communication, enabling authentic human contact in technologically mediated and politically divided environments.

4. Methodology

Over 12 months (July 2024–June 2025), 37 cross-border B2B negotiations were tracked using a practitioner-observer design: practice-based quasi-experiment comparing CWC application vs. standard approaches among 29 peer managers.

4.1 Participants and Setting

The dataset comprised 37 cross-border negotiations observed across four consecutive quarters (Q3 2024 – Q2 2025). All involved small and medium-sized enterprises:

Sectors: Manufacturing 35%, Trade 32%, Services 33%. Regions: EU (n=15), Central Asia (9), Middle East (8), East Asia (5).

Languages: English (22), Russian (10), interpreted (5).

Each case met four inclusion criteria: cross-border transaction exceeding USD 50 000, at least three substantive exchanges, a clear decision point (agreement, refusal, or pause) within the study period, a documentary record of communications.

4.2 Sampling and Comparability

Case assignment protocol. Negotiation cases were allocated through centralised dispatch using geographic rotation, language-capability matching, and chronological order, eliminating self-selection bias.

CWC-Applied Cases (n=20)

A case was classified as "CWC-applied" when all three behavioural phases were documented. Contact: establishing relational ground, setting context, or clarifying expectations through initial dialogue. Withdrawal: an intentional pause following refusal or distancing—stepping back from escalation, legitimising the counterpart's hesitation, or postponing decision-making to create space for reflection. Return to Contact: a re-engagement action within 2–4 weeks (follow-up call, clarified proposal, or renewed dialogue after emotional de-escalation).

Standard-Practice Comparison Group (n=17)

The 17 standard-practice cases consisted of negotiations conducted by the same practitioner between July 2024 and June 2025 that reached agreement in the first round without experiencing refusal or distancing. These interactions followed the organisation's routine

negotiation pattern: linear bargaining with immediate closure, without structured withdrawal or relational re-calibration. This group serves as a within-practitioner baseline for conversion rates under conditions where no withdrawal phase was needed, allowing isolation of CWC's specific contribution in situations involving relational disruption.

Peer Benchmark (29 managers)

The outcomes of the remaining 29 managers—tracked via quarterly performance rankings and organisational CRM records—constitute the naturalistic comparison group. All operated under identical structural conditions (mandate, product portfolio, case allocation protocol, market context) but without systematic application of a structured CWC cycle. This peer benchmark provides an external behavioural reference for evaluating the distinct contribution of the CWC approach beyond individual practitioner effects. Robustness of CWC effects across deal size, geographic region, and language of negotiation is examined through sensitivity analyses in Section 4.9.

4.3 Baseline Benchmarks

Organisation-wide data for 2023 showed: initial agreement rate ≈ 55% (±7%), return-after-refusal 15–20%, and success-after-return 30–40%. Observed outcomes—return rate 60% (12/20) and success-after-return 83% (10/12)—exceeded these baselines substantially. External benchmarks were inapplicable (Brett, 2014); validity rests on internal comparability and temporal progression. For inferential testing, the upper bound of the historical baseline range ($p_0 = 0.20$) was used as the null hypothesis reference point. This conservative choice—testing against the strongest baseline performance rather than the mean—reduces the risk of overstating intervention effects and provides a more rigorous benchmark for statistical comparison.

4.4 Procedure

Cases ending in refusal/distancing were treated as withdrawal phases. I acknowledged the counterpart's stance, legitimised the pause, and proposed re-engagement within 2–4 weeks. Operationalisation of withdrawal:

1. Unexplained distancing: when communication ceased, a concise message explicitly recognised the silence and offered a later follow-up.

2. Direct refusal: the client’s rationale was validated, gratitude expressed, and permission sought to revisit the matter after a short interval.

This intentional structuring transformed refusals into pauses within an ongoing dialogue. By Q1–Q2 2025 return rates reached 75% per quarter, with 60% (12/20) of initial refusals re-entering discussion overall and 83% (10/12) of returns ending in signed agreements, yielding 50% (10/20) overall conversion.

4.5 Coding Procedures, Reliability, and Data Transparency

All cases were coded retrospectively using predefined, behaviourally anchored criteria based on time-stamped communication records (email, messaging, CRM logs, and video call notes). While the specific mode of communication for each interaction (email, WhatsApp, video call) was not separately coded as a variable, all cases involved digital mediation at some stage, reflecting standard B2B practice during 2024–2025. Coding focused on observable actions, excluding inferred intentions or assumed motivations. Examples of behavioural markers included: documented statements of unavailability or constraint, cessation of communication for 7+ days without explanation, explicit phrases such as “not ready to proceed” or “need time to consider,” and subsequent re-initiation by either party with

reference to prior discussion. Under CWC, refusal or distancing was coded as an active withdrawal phase within an ongoing cycle rather than negotiation termination (Resnick & Resnick, 2022).

The study employed a single-practitioner design; formal inter-rater reliability was not calculated. Subjectivity was mitigated through time-stamped CRM records, explicit behavioural anchors, and triangulation with peer rankings. Future studies may employ independent raters to establish inter-rater reliability (κ or ICC).

Due to commercial confidentiality and client privacy protections, raw negotiation transcripts cannot be publicly shared. However, anonymised aggregate data (sector, region, timeline, outcome), the full coding manual with behavioural criteria, and descriptive case summaries are available from the author upon reasonable academic request, in accordance with principles of open science and reproducibility. The resulting dataset, structured according to these coding procedures, comprised 37 cross-border negotiations, of which 20 involved documented refusal or distancing and were eligible for CWC application (see Section 4.3 for full sampling criteria).

4.6 Data Collection and Variables

Three sources of evidence were used: Quantitative tracking: negotiation counts, refusals, follow-ups, and agreements from CRM records. Comparative metrics: quarterly performance rankings across 29 managers. Qualitative observation: field notes on communication tone, pauses, and re-engagement cues. Dependent variables: return rate, success after return, and overall conversion. Independent variable: application of the CWC protocol (used vs not used).

4.7 Statistical Analysis

Analysis was descriptive and inferential, focusing on proportions and effect sizes consistent with the exploratory nature of the study.

Exact binomial test. To test whether the observed return rate differed from the organisational baseline, an exact two-tailed binomial test was conducted with the null hypothesis H_0: $p = 0.20$, where p represents the probability of return after refusal. Given 12 returns out of 20 refusal cases ($\hat{p} = 0.60$), the test yielded $p < 0.001$, indicating that the observed return rate was significantly higher than the baseline expectation.

Effect size was estimated using Cohen's h, calculated as $h = 2 \cdot \arcsin(\sqrt{\hat{p}}) - 2 \cdot \arcsin(\sqrt{p_0})$,

where $\hat{p} = 0.60$ (observed return rate) and $p_0 = 0.20$ (baseline rate). The resulting effect size ($h = 0.84$) corresponds to a large effect according to conventional benchmarks. 95% confidence intervals were computed using the Wilson score method, which provides more accurate coverage for small samples and proportions distant from 0.5: Return rate 60% [36–81%]; Success after return 83% [52–98%]; Overall conversion 50% [27–73%].

Quarterly trend: Effect sizes comparing each quarter to baseline ($p_0 = 0.20$) were: Q3 2024 $h = 0.64$ (medium), Q4 2024 $h = 0.84$ (large), Q1 2025 $h = 0.84$ (large), Q2 2025 $h = 1.17$ (very large), demonstrating progressive strengthening of the intervention effect.

Descriptive statistics: Mean time to re-contact 28 days (SD = 12); mean follow-ups 2.3 (SD = 0.8); no sectoral differences in return rates ($\chi^2 = 0.08$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.96$).

Table 1. Quarterly Outcomes

Quarter	Refusals	Returns	Return %	Success After Return
Q3 2024	6	3	50%	3 (100%)
Q4 2024	5	3	60%	2 (67%)
Q1 2025	5	3	60%	3 (100%)
Q2 2025	4	3	75%	2 (67%)
Total	20	12	60%	10 (83%)

4.8 Alternative Explanations and Validity Checks

Potential threats were assessed as follows:

1. Selection bias: minimised by centralised case allocation.

2. Practitioner expertise: Gestalt training may have influenced results; replication by non-therapist practitioners is recommended.

3. External factors: macroeconomic volatility affected all 29 managers equally.

4. Regression to the mean: the consistent upward trajectory suggests a systematic rather than random effect.

5. Hawthorne effect: awareness of observation cannot be excluded but was likely limited.

Validity: internal (organisational equivalence, triangulation), external (context-bounded), reliability (standardised documentation, 12-month period). All negotiations formed routine professional duties; no client-identifying data are reported.

Limitations and Transparency

This study's ecological validity is balanced by methodological constraints: single-practitioner design without random assignment, small sample (37 cases, 20 refusals), retrospective coding, and context-specific setting (2024–2025). Replication by multiple practitioners is needed. Nevertheless, CWC proved operationalisable and quantitatively evaluable in commercial settings—a methodological contribution. The upward trajectory and large effect size ($h = 0.84$) suggest plausible causal linkage.

4.9 Sensitivity Analysis and Robustness Checks

To assess whether CWC effects varied systematically across contextual conditions, three sensitivity analyses were conducted on the 20 withdrawal cases.

Deal Size. Cases were stratified by transaction value relative to the sample median (USD 125,000). Return rates showed no significant difference: 58% (7/12) for deals below the median vs. 62% (5/8) for deals above ($\chi^2 = 0.05$, $p = 0.82$). This suggests that CWC's relational mechanism—legitimising withdrawal and structuring re-entry—operated

independently of financial magnitude.

Regional Variation. Return rates across macro-regions were: EU 67% (6/9), Central Asia and Middle East 55% (6/11). No refusals occurred in the East Asian subsample (n=5), preventing comparison. The consistency between EU and Central Asia/Middle East ($\chi^2 = 0.26$, $p = 0.61$) indicates that CWC principles—rooted in universal relational dynamics rather than culture-specific scripts—translated across diverse negotiation contexts.

Language of Negotiation. Return rates by primary communication language: English 59% (10/17), Russian or interpreted 67% (2/3). While the interpreted subsample is small, directional consistency suggests that the core CWC rhythm—acknowledgment, pause, re-engagement—remained effective across linguistic modes.

Interpretation

These checks indicate that the CWC effect was robust across the range of conditions present in the dataset. The absence of significant variation by deal size, region, or language supports the universality claim advanced in Section 3.4: CWC's effectiveness derives from attention to present interaction rather than pre-categorisation by cultural or transactional profile. Nevertheless, replication with larger, stratified samples is needed to confirm boundary conditions and identify contexts where withdrawal duration or re-contact timing may require calibration.

5. Results and Findings

5.1 Primary outcomes

Baselines (2023): return-after-refusal 15–20%, success-after-return 30–40%. CWC practitioner ranked top among 29 managers (Q1–Q2 2025). From 20 negotiations that initially ended in refusal, 12 re-entered active discussions (60%) and 10 of those 12 concluded with signed agreements (83%), yielding an overall conversion of 50% from the originally declined set.

1. Significance vs baseline: With $p_0 = 0.20$ (organisational return-rate baseline), 12/20 returns produce binomial $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed).

2. Effect size (return rate): Cohen's $h = 0.84$ (large).

3. Confidence intervals (Wilson 95%): return 60% [36–81%]; success-after-return 83% [52–98%]; overall conversion 50% [27–73%].

4. Sectoral differences: none detected ($\chi^2 = 0.08$, $p = 0.96$).

These results indicate that CWC is associated with substantively and statistically higher re-engagement than standard practice (RQ1), consistent with H1 (Gestalt-based awareness strengthens outcomes by fostering relational rhythm and adaptability).

5.2 Temporal dynamics

Quarterly return rates strengthened from 50% → 60% → 60% → 75%. Relative to the baseline, quarterly Cohen's h values were: Q3 2024 = 0.64, Q4 2024 = 0.84, Q1 2025 = 0.84, Q2 2025 = 1.17, suggesting a cumulative implementation or learning effect rather than random fluctuation.

5.3 Descriptive process metrics

Table 2. Process metrics (descriptive)

Metric	Mean	SD	Range
Time to first re-contact (days)	28	12	14–56
Number of follow-ups before re-engagement	2.3	0.8	1–4
Duration of withdrawal phase (days)	35	18	10–90

These metrics characterise how the CWC rhythm was enacted: short, consent-based pauses with light, relevant touchpoints before re-entry.

5.4 Qualitative Findings

The CWC rhythm—contact → withdrawal → re-contact—was enacted across three recurrent scenarios. In each case, withdrawal was coded not as disengagement but as resistance-as-contact, signalling a need for temporal or relational recalibration within the negotiation field.

The vignettes below illustrate how CWC decisions and timing were calibrated to sustain relational homeorhesis.

Case A: Silent distance (EU, Trade, Q3 2024). Following an initial exchange, the client ceased responding across channels. After seven days, this pattern was coded as withdrawal rather than disengagement. The practitioner acknowledged the client's withdrawal, validated the client's possible need for pause, and deliberately suspended further pursuit while setting a clear horizon for re-contact. No interim follow-ups were initiated. After four weeks, the practitioner reinitiated contact in line with the stated frame. The client responded openly, referencing the earlier interaction and re-entering dialogue. The negotiation resumed from a restored relational baseline and subsequently resulted in agreement.

Case B: Explicit refusal (Central Asia, Manufacturing, Q4 2024). The client explicitly declined the proposal and indicated a decision to proceed with an alternative provider. This refusal was coded as withdrawal rather than closure of the negotiation field. The practitioner acknowledged the decision without argument or counter-pressure, affirmed respect for the client's choice, and intentionally suspended further pursuit. A specific re-contact interval was named to maintain relational continuity without activating defensive resistance. After the agreed pause, the practitioner reinitiated contact in line with the stated timing. The client responded openly and re-entered dialogue, explicitly referencing the non-pressured handling of the refusal. The negotiation resumed from a restored field of trust and non-defensiveness.

Case C: Ambiguous engagement with minimal-contact maintenance (Middle East, Services, Q1 2025). Following initial exchanges, the client remained polite and responsive but avoided commitment, with no movement toward decision. This pattern was coded as conditional withdrawal—contact without progression. Rather than intensifying pursuit, the practitioner made the existing pause explicit by naming the lack of movement and inviting clarification of unspoken constraints. This explicit naming immediately shifted the interaction into re-engagement: the client responded with increased openness, articulating previously unexpressed constraints as a relational response to non-intrusive contact.

5.5 Algorithmic Mediation and Relational Homeostasis

Extending these qualitative observations into digitally mediated contexts, all negotiations involved digital mediation at some stage (email, messaging, video, AI-assisted contract drafting). Applying CWC meant restoring a human rhythm through three deliberate moves:

Contact phase: Dialogical presence (Buber's I–Thou) was enacted through voice or video communication, slowing the tempo and signalling authentic engagement beyond transactional exchange.

Withdrawal phase: Naming distance without judgment: "I sense you may need time. I'll follow up in three weeks unless you prefer otherwise."

Re-contact phase: Upon return, clients showed markedly greater openness. Trust had been preserved—and often deepened—through the rhythm itself. Relational homeorhesis was sustained not despite the pause, but because of it.

Illustration (manufacturing, Q4 2024): WhatsApp refusal → 48h pause + voice message → deal reopened and closed. The pause maintained homeorhetic flow under algorithmic acceleration (H2). This finding resonates with research on algorithm aversion (Dietvorst et al., 2015) and epistemic trust erosion (Sahebi & Formosa, 2025): when AI-mediated communication feels mechanistic, counterparts withdraw defensively; structured pauses reintroduce authentic human presence, enabling trust repair.

5.6 Synthesis

CWC improved outcomes (H1: higher return/closure rates; H2: restored balance in AI-mediated settings) via awareness, dialogue, and rhythmic presence—measurable expressions of Gestalt principles.

6. Discussion

The findings suggest a relational mechanism underlying CWC's effectiveness: structured withdrawal reframes negotiation tempo. By explicitly naming distance and proposing a bounded pause, refusals were transformed into marked phases within an ongoing dialogue rather than terminal events. This temporal reframing preserves relational continuity and aligns with process-oriented research emphasising when and how pauses occur in negotiation dynamics (Schweinsberg et al., 2022).

This mechanism was reflected in a 60% return rate after refusal compared with a 15–20% organisational baseline and remained stable across regions, languages, and deal sizes. The consistency of the effect suggests that CWC efficacy derives from real-time relational calibration rather than culture-specific negotiation scripts. Organisationally, the model offers a replicable micro-practice without procedural overload, positioning the ability to recognise distance, legitimise it, and re-engage consciously as a distinct professional competence. Under tight deadlines, micro-withdrawals (minutes or hours) proved more efficient than multi-week pauses. In high-stakes deals, explicitly framed pauses signalled diligence rather than delay. Virtual or hybrid settings favoured short, scheduled pauses followed by a defined re-contact time over continuous pursuit. In turbulent markets, aligning re-contact with external cycles—such as regulatory or budget milestones—accelerated re-entry and preserved trust.

7. Conclusion

This study reconceptualised cross-cultural negotiation as a relational process governed not solely by persuasion or strategy, but by temporal rhythm. The CWC framework operationalises core Gestalt principles—awareness, boundary clarity, and resistance-as-contact—into a replicable behavioural model applicable to cross-cultural business negotiations. Empirically, the study demonstrates that structured withdrawal within the CWC cycle is associated with significantly higher rates of renewed dialogue and agreement, indicating that negotiation outcomes depend not only on strategic positioning but also on the regulation of relational contact over time. Theoretically, the study contributes to negotiation and organisational scholarship by integrating Gestalt psychology, social neuroscience, and organisational behaviour through the concept of relational homeorhesis—defined here as the capacity to maintain stability through adaptive flow rather than return to a fixed baseline under technological and geopolitical turbulence. In an era of accelerated and algorithmically mediated interaction, the CWC framework suggests that relational resilience arises from presence and temporal attunement rather than speed, highlighting a dimension of negotiation that algorithmic systems cannot substitute: authentic human contact.

8. References

Adair, W. L., & Brett, J. M. (2005). The negotiation dance: Time, culture, and behavioral sequences in negotiation. *Organization Science, 16*(1), 33–51. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1040.0102

Brett, J. M. (2014). *Negotiating globally: How to negotiate deals, resolve disputes, and make decisions across cultural boundaries* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Buber, M. (2004). *I and thou (W. Kaufmann, Trans.).* T&T Clark. (Original work published 1923)

Cikara, M., & Van Bavel, J. J. (2014). The neuroscience of intergroup relations: An integrative review. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 9(3), 245–274. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614527464

Dietvorst, B. J., Simmons, J. P., & Massey, C. (2015). Algorithm aversion: People erroneously avoid algorithms after seeing them err. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 144(1), 114–126. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000033

Filzmoser, M., Vetschera, R., & Mitterhofer, R. (2016). Analyzing the multi-dimensionality of negotiation processes. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 248(3), 964–973. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2015.08.018

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Anchor Books.

Harinck, F., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2004). Negotiating interests or values and reaching integrative agreements: The importance of time pressure and temporary impasses. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34(5), 595–611. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.218

Hoff, K. A., & Bashir, M. (2015). Trust in automation: Integrating empirical evidence on factors that influence trust. *Human Factors*, 57(3), 407–434. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720814547570

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Sage Publications.

Jago, A. S. (2019). Algorithms and authenticity. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 5(1), 38–56. https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2017.0002

Kong, D. T., Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2021). Interpersonal trust within negotiations: Meta-analytic evidence, critical contingencies, and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64(5), 1235–1255. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0461

LeDoux, J. E. (1996). *The emotional brain: The mysterious underpinnings of emotional life. Simon & Schuster*.

Lewicki, R. J., Barry, B., & Saunders, D. M. (2021). *Negotiation* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations*, 1(1), 5–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872674700100103

Logg, J. M., Minson, J. A., & Moore, D. A. (2019). Algorithm appreciation: People prefer algorithmic to human judgment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 151, 90–103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2018.12.005

Olekalns, M., & Druckman, D. (2014). With feeling: How emotions shape negotiation. *Negotiation Journal*, 30(4), 455–478. https://doi.org/10.1111/nejo.12088

Olekalns, M., & Smith, P. L. (2009). Mutually dependent: Power, trust, affect and the use of deception in negotiation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(3), 347–365. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9774-4

O'Neill, C., & McQuillan, D. (2025). The AI-mediated communication dilemma: Epistemic trust, social media, and the challenge of generative artificial intelligence. *Synthese*, 205, Article 128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-025-04963-2

Perls, F., Hefferline, R. F., & Goodman, P. (1951). *Gestalt therapy: Excitement and growth in the human personality*. Julian Press.

Phelps, E. A., O'Connor, K. J., Cunningham, W. A., Funayama, E. S., Gatenby, J. C., Gore, J. C., & Banaji, M. R. (2000). Performance on indirect measures of race evaluation predicts amygdala activation. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 12(5), 729–738. https://doi.org/10.1162/089892900562552

Resnick, R. F., & Resnick, R. W. (2022). Online contemporary couples Gestalt therapy: "Two become one"—and then there are none! In H. H. Weinberg, A. Rolnick, & D. Snir (Eds.), Advances in online therapy (pp. 348–364). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003205029-25

Sahebi, A., & Formosa, P. (2025). Trust and AI-mediated communication: Philosophical and practical challenges. *Philosophy & Technology*, 38(1), Article 15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-024-00789-1

Schweinsberg, M., Ku, G., Wang, C. S., & Pillutla, M. M. (2022). Impasses in negotiation: Types, causes, and resolutions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000891

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Culture and social behavior*. McGraw-Hill.

Warsitzka, M., Grossmann, I., & Scholl, A. (2023). Impasses in integrative negotiations: A systematic review. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 16(2), 89–112. https://doi.org/10.1111/ncmr.12234