

## DETERMINANTS OF THE RELATIONSHIP QUALITY IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE ENTERPRISE – BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT INSTITUTIONS

Anna TOMASZUK

Bialystok University of Technology; a.tomaszuk@pb.edu.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-2675-0323

**Purpose:** The aim of the article is to learn about the attitudes of innovative enterprises representatives towards the strength and importance of relations in regard to business environment institutions (BEI).

**Design/methodology/approach:** The presented analyzes constitute a part of a broader study on the determinants of the quality of relations between enterprises in the quadruple helix. The article focuses on the enterprise – BEI. The research was carried out with the use of CATI method on a sample of 200 innovative enterprises

**Findings:** The results show that in the case of the relationships strength and importance, communication is an important construct in relation to BEI. The significance of trust, commitment and satisfaction with regard to the strength and importance of the relationship between an innovative enterprise and BEI was not indicated. Moreover a high positive correlation was indicated between the individual relationship quality constructs.

**Research limitations/implications:** The research sample is a limitation. The research was conducted on a sample of 200 innovative enterprises, but only 33% declared maintaining relations with BEI.

**Practical implications:** The article indicates which quality constructs should be paid attention to by BEI in managing relations with enterprises.

**Originality/value:** The article indicates that in some aspects of relationship management, communication is more important component than trust, commitment and satisfaction.

**Keywords:** relations quality, relations quality constructs, enterprise, business environment institutions.

**Category of the paper:** research paper.

### 1. Introduction

The growing importance of business relations between various entities is one of the most important development trends in modern mechanisms of value creation, competitiveness and innovativeness (Moczyłowska et al., 2017; Belderbos et al., 2004; Tu et al., 2014). The quality

of relationships, on the other hand, is an important prerequisite for their long-term success (Danik, 2017). For the purposes of research, relationship quality has been defined as a superior concept consisting of a series of correlates. Although, when formulating the assumptions of the study, the author took into account the possibility of various correlates occurrence depending on the subject that the relationship occurs with, ultimately she relied on the assumption that a list of universal symptoms proving the relationship quality should be formulated. The most important determinants of the relationship quality were trust, commitment (devotion), contentment (satisfaction) and communication.

For the purposes of classifying market participants, the concept of a quadruple helix was used, covering the system of representatives' connections in four sectors. The article presents the results concerning the determinants of relations quality in the perspective of an enterprise – BEI. The aim of the article was to learn about the attitudes of representatives of innovative enterprises towards the strength and importance of relations in regard to BEI.

## 2. Literature review

The concept of inter-organizational relations quality does not have just one definition in the literature – it is most often equated with the result of the assessment of the extent to which it satisfies the needs and expectations of the parties (Hennig-Thurau, Klee, 1997; Smith, 1998) or with the overall depth and atmosphere of relationships between companies (Johnson, 1999). This is partly due to the fact that the notion of relation itself does not have an unambiguous definition in the literature (Kolemba, 2009).

A popular approach is to define the quality of a relationship as a metaconstruct, made up of a number of components (Holmlund, 2008), which not only corresponds to the intuitive understanding of the concept, but also provides the basis for creating tools for its measurement (Danik, 2017). There is no consensus among researchers regarding a list of the components of relationship quality, nevertheless, there are constructs considered key ones by most researchers (Danik, 2017; Inków, 2017), which include trust, commitment (devotion) and satisfaction (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2002; Ulaga, Eggert, 2006; Barry, Doney, 2011; Tung, Carlson, 2013; Walter, 2003; Ahamed, Skallerud, 2013; Hajli 2014; Vieira et al., 2008; De Wulf et al., 2001; Skarmeas, Robson, 2008). Many researchers also consider as an important dimension of inter-organizational quality: communication (Pannirselvam et al., 2014; Jiang et al., 2016; Heroux, Hammoutene, 2012; Whipple et al., 2010, Athanasopoulou, 2009) and conflict (or lack of it) (Leonidou et al., 2006; Skarmeas, Robson, 2008; Ghzaiel, Akrou, 2012; Heroux, Hammoutene, 2012; Hoopner et al., 2015; Athanasopoulou, 2009). Additionally, there is an approach that considers cooperation, distance, understanding, dependence and adaptation as components of relations quality (Leonidou et al., 2006).

Trust in inter-organizational relationships can be defined as the belief of one party that the other party will perform future actions with honesty, integrity and fairness (Anderson, Weitz, 1989; Morgan, Hunt, 1994; Leonidou et al., 2006). It is the belief that the business partner will take actions that will benefit the organization and that he will not take actions that may have negative consequences (Anderson, Narus, 1990).

Trust is a state which, despite the lack of full knowledge about the factors influencing cooperation, contributes to the lack of uncertainty regarding the partner's behavior and, at the same time, to accepting a certain degree of dependence on this partner (Danik, 2017). Therefore, trust in inter-organizational collaboration helps to establish the true value of the relationship, reduce security and monitoring costs, and prevent opportunistic behavior (Goodman, Dion, 2001; Bromiley, Cummings, 1995; Dyer, Chu, 2003). The positive influence of trust on the results of relations is confirmed by empirical research (Delbufalo, 2015).

Commitment also plays a key role in shaping relationships (Wieselquist et al., 1999), being another fundamental dimension of relational ties (Dwyer et al., 1987; Sarkar et al., 1998). It is defined as the belief of the exchange partner that the ongoing relationship is important enough to justify making maximum efforts to maintain it, thus contributing to the faith of the involved party that the relationship is worth ensuring its longest duration possible (Morgan, Hunt, 1994). According to Skarmeas et al. (2002) commitment is a diverse set of factors including desire, eagerness, sacrifice, expectation of continuation, faith and the importance of relationships.

Another foundation of relationship quality is satisfaction (Moliner et al., 2007). As it influences the loyalty of partners, it helps to build and secure future revenues, creates barriers for competitors' activities and reduces future transaction costs (Lewin, 2009). Satisfaction in inter-organizational relations can be related to both a single transaction (transactional satisfaction) and to their cycle (cumulative satisfaction).

Some of the studies on satisfaction analyze also communication as one of its determinants (Mohr, Sohi, 1995). On the other hand, among researchers dealing with the subject of relationships, communication is most often analyzed as another important determinant that may affect the relationships quality. At the same time, one should not ignore the fact that communication, often analyzed as one of the components of the relationships quality is also closely related to them. Punctuality, appropriate frequency and provision of appropriate information can increase trust in relationships. Commitment can be reinforced with appropriate communication, as it often results from the belief that the relationship is safe and that the partner is reliable. Also, the relationship between communication and satisfaction seems to be obvious – meeting (or exceeding) communication expectations increases the satisfaction with the relationship (Kwiatek et al., 2009). Prerequisites for good communication are: long-term orientation, network coordination and the use of information techniques and technologies facilitating communication (Paulraj et al., 2008).

### 3. Research methodology

When analyzing relations in the inter-organizational aspect, it is extremely important to pay attention to the classification of entities with which the relations are established. The six-market model is often used in the study of relationship management issues (Payne et al., 2005). From the point of view of the analysis of inter-organizational relations quality, the model seems to be insufficiently precise (no clear classification from the point of view of the cooperating subsystems that form a network of values and dependencies), it does not take into account the division of market entities due to their functions and at the same time it is too wide – covers issues unnecessary in the analyzed system (for example – potential employees). Therefore, for the purposes of classifying market participants, the concept of a quadruple helix was used, covering the system of connections of representatives of four sectors – private, scientific, public and civil society (represented by BEI) (Carayannis et al., 2012; Carayannis, Campbell, 2011; Bojar, Machnik-Słomka, 2014).

When constructing a research tool, the author relied on the assumption that measuring the relationships quality should be based on a multidimensional scale, consisting of the subscales of trust, satisfaction, commitment and communication behavior. While formulating the study assumptions the possibility of various correlates occurrence was taken into account, depending on the entity with which the relationship occurs, but ultimately they were based on the assumption that a list of universal symptoms proving the quality of the relationship should be formulated.

Due to the multidimensionality and the multitude of ways of defining the constructs influencing the relations quality there is no single research tool or methodology that would comprehensively investigate the quality of relations (Paine, 2003). As in the case of trust other constructs of relationships quality also, as unobservable categories, cannot be directly measured. Thus, the scale (a set of theorems reflecting the observable features of the analyzed constructs) was adopted as the measuring instrument (Sankowska, 2011) modified for the purposes of the conducted study. Knowing the recommendations for the study of complex constructs (more in Blunsdon, Reed, 2003; Sankowska, 2011; Lewicka et al., 2016) and, at the same time, taking into account that the study covers a phenomenon consisting of several constructs, efforts were made to optimize the number of statements used to test each of them.

Analysis of measurement scales for the study of individual relationship constructs (Lages et al., 2005; Walter, Ritter, 2003; Ryciuk, 2013; Stach, 2013; Woo, Ennew, 2004; Roberst et al., 2003) allowed for the development of statements used to build a scale to measure individual constructs (Table 1).

**Table 1.**  
*Identified dimensions of relationship quality*

<b>Trust</b>	We are convinced that BEI we work with are fair	T1
	We believe that BEI we work with know what they do.	T2
	We trust BEI we work with because they have trusted us.	T3
	We believe that cooperation with BEI will be beneficial for us.	T4
	BEI usually keep their promises to our company.	T5
<b>Commitment</b>	We believe BEI treat cooperation with us as an element of long-term relationships.	C1
	We believe BEI prefer long-term cooperation with us over short-term profits.	C2
	We believe that BEI we work with would not do business with others at our expense.	C3
	We believe that BEI we work with are ready to invest time and resources in developing relationships with us.	C4
	From time to time we are ready to make sacrifices to help BEI.	C5
<b>Satisfaction</b>	Taking into account all aspects of cooperation, our experience with BEI is very satisfactory.	S1
	Our relations with BEI have positively surprised us.	S2
	We are very pleased with the cooperation with BEI.	S3
<b>Communication</b>	The contents of messages from BEI are clear to us.	Cm1
	BEI communicate with us in an open manner.	Cm2
	Our contacts with BEI are very frequent.	Cm3
	Our contacts with BEI are very often direct.	Cm4
	BEI make efforts to better understand us and our needs.	Cm5

Source: own study.

The reliability of the created scale was checked with the use of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The calculated statistic (for confidence – 0.87, for commitment – 0.88, for satisfaction – 0.88, for communication – 0.78) indicates a high consistency of items included in the created scale. For each of the statements contained in the questionnaire, the respondent was asked to indicate his position by marking the category on a five-point Likert scale, from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The survey was conducted using the CATI method on a sample of 200 innovative enterprises in the last quarter of 2021 (microenterprises were excluded from the survey due to its specificity). The characteristics of the enterprises are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.**  
*Research sample characteristics*

<b>Industry</b>		<b>Enterprise size</b>	
Production	26%	10-49	57%
Construction	16.5%	50-249	34,5%
Trade	29%	>249	8,5%
Transport	9%		
Service	19.5%		
<b>Active in the market</b>		<b>Operations range</b>	
Up to year	0%	Local	21%
1-3 years	0.5%	Regional	18%
4-9 years	5.5%	Domestic	31,5%
More than 9 years	94%	International	29.5%
<b>Established relations</b>			
With other enterprises – 98%			
With administration units – 38%			
With research and development units – 22.5%			
With BEI – 33%			

Source: own study.

The analyzes presented in the article are an excerpt from wider research and concern the determinants of the relations quality in the perspective of an enterprise – BEI. The characteristics of enterprises (N = 66) with established relations with BEI are included in Table 3.

**Table 3.**

*Characteristics of enterprises which established relationships with BEI*

Industry		Enterprise size	
Production	27%	10-49	56%
Construction	18%	50-249	36%
Trade	27%	>249	8%
Transport	17%		
Service	11%		
Active in the market		Operations range	
Up to year	0%	Local	12%
1-3 years	0%	Regional	20%
4-9 years	4.5%	Domestic	38%
More than 9 years	95.5%	International	30%
Established relations			
With other enterprises – 100%			
With administration units – 37%			
With scientific and development units – 29%			

Source: own study.

The aim of the analyzes was to find out about the attitudes of innovative enterprises representatives towards the strength and importance of relations in regard to BEI.

The following research questions were posed:

- P1 – Which of the relationship quality constructs affect the strength of the relationship in the enterprise – BEI area?
- P2 – Which of the relationship quality constructs affect the importance of the relationship in the enterprise – BEI area?
- P3 – Is it possible to determine the dependencies between the individual relationship quality constructs in the enterprise – BEI area?

#### 4. Research results analysis

Representatives of the surveyed enterprises were asked to respond to individual statements reflecting the features of the constructs (Table 4). The degree of the respondents' compliance ranges from 3.38 to 4.17. The median and dominant levels remain at a similar level (4), the only deviations (indicators at level 3) can be noticed for the C3 statement, and, in the case of the dominant index – a multiple (3 and 4) – for the S2 statement.

**Table 4.**

*Assessment of respondents' compliance with the statements reflecting individual relationship quality constructs*

Construct	Item	$\bar{x}$	$M_e$	$D$	$n_D$	Min.	Max.	Standard deviation
<b>Trust</b>	T1	4.06	4	4	28	2	5	0.82
	T2	4.17	4	4	31	3	5	0.71
	T3	4.02	4	4	27	2	5	0.83
	T4	4.11	4	4	32	1	5	0.83
	T5	3.85	4	4	32	1	5	0.85
<b>Commitment (devotion)</b>	C1	3.70	4	4	25	1	5	1.10
	C2	3.65	4	4	27	1	5	0.95
	C3	3.38	3	3	26	1	5	1.03
	C4	3.61	4	4	28	1	5	0.93
	C5	3.76	4	4	28	1	5	0.91
<b>Satisfaction</b>	S1	3.85	4	4	32	2	5	0.77
	S2	3.64	4	3; 4	24	2	5	0.89
	S3	3.77	4	4	29	2	5	0.84
<b>Communication</b>	Cm1	3.94	4	4	32	2	5	0.78
	Cm2	3.95	4	4	32	2	5	0.81
	Cm3	3.42	4	4	27	1	5	1.04
	Cm4	3.60	4	4	23	1	5	1.04
	Cm5	3.40	3	4	25	1	5	0.94

Source: own study.

The respondents also assessed the strength and importance of relations with BEI for the functioning of the company (Table 5). Comparing the significance of the relations in regard to all the studied groups only in the case of relations with enterprises both indicators are higher. Relations with administrative and research units (both in terms of strength and importance of the relationship) are of less importance. This clearly shows that representatives of enterprises increasingly appreciate the importance of BEI and the help they can get from them (more in Tomaszuk, Wasiluk, 2021).

**Table 5.**

*The importance of relationships with BEI in the respondents' perception*

	$\bar{x}$	$M_e$	$D$	$n_D$	Min.	Max.	Standard deviation
<b>Strength</b>	3.52	4	4	29	1	5	0.83
<b>Importance</b>	3.74	4	4	25	1	5	1.06

Source: own study.

Multiple regression analysis was used in order to qualify which of the constructs primarily determine the strength and importance of the relationship. When analyzing the influence of constructs on the strength of the relationship, strength was considered a dependent variable, while trust, commitment, satisfaction and communication were assumed as independent variables. A similar analysis was carried out for the importance of the relationship. The results are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6.**

*Multiple regression analysis for the strength and importance of enterprises relationships with BEI*

<b>Relationship strength</b>				
N = 66	b*	SE with b*	t	p
Constant			2.46	0.02
Communication	0.52	0.11	4.88	0.01
Models parameters: $R^2 = 0.27$ $F(1.64) = 23.843$ $p < 0.00001$ Standard error of estimation: 0.71				
<b>Relationship importance</b>				
N = 66	b*	SE with b*	t	p
Constant			1.47	0.15
Communication	0.49	0.11	4.55	0.01
Models parameters: $R^2 = 0.24$ $F(1.64) = 20.71$ $p < 0.00002$ Standard error of estimation: 0.92				

Source: own study.

In both cases, communication turned out to be the influencing construct. The analysis showed no influence of the other relationship quality constructs on the strength or importance of the relationship. It may be conditioned by the specificity of these relations – in the case of BEI, trust does not seem to be such an important component as communication and informative. On the other hand, the analysis of the correlation of the relationship individual dimensions showed many significant (and positive) relationships between them (Table 7).

**Table 7.**

*Pearson's r-correlation coefficient of quality dimensions*

<b>The relationships quality dimension</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
1	Trust	1			
2	Commitment	0.73	1		
3	Satisfaction	0.82	0.79	1	
4	Communication	0.67	0.67	0.77	1
The market correlation coefficients are significant with $p < .05000$ N = 66					

Source: own study.

The strongest observed correlation is the positive correlation between satisfaction and trust and between satisfaction and commitment; followed by the correlation between communication and satisfaction as well as commitment and trust. The lowest correlation (although also high) occurs between communication and trust as well as communication and commitment, which confirms the thesis that individual components cannot be fully presented as independent entities (Leonidou et al., 2006; Danik, 2017).

## 5. Summary

The quality of the relationship is a construct of a higher order influencing a number of conditions, thus constituting an important factor conducive to achieving a better result of cooperation from the point of view of all parties (Danik, 2017). However, when analyzing the cooperation on the enterprise – BEI level, it should be noted that both parties do not treat

cooperation with these entities as a priority. The conducted research indicated that only 1/3 of enterprises have established relationships with BEI (included non-government organization (NGOs)), on the other hand – 65% of NGOs declare cooperation with business (for comparison – 88% cooperate with other NGOs, 84% with the local community and 85% with the local government) (Kondycja..., 2021). The results obtained with the research show that communication is a construct of the relations quality influencing both their strength and importance. No relationships have been determined for trust, commitment and satisfaction, which may be due to the specificity of these relationships (completely different goals than in the case of, for example, B2B relationships). The obtained results seem interesting, but their major limitation may be the research sample – the research was carried out on a sample of 200 companies, but only 33% had relations with BEI, which significantly reduced the number of respondents for the area analyzed in the article.

## Acknowledgements

The article was written as a result of the scientific activity No. 2019/03/X/HS4/01540 financed by the National Science Centre Poland.

## References

1. Ahamed, A.F.M.J., Skallerud, K. (2013). Effect of Distance and Communication Climate on Export Performance: The Mediating Role of Relationship Quality. *Journal of Global Marketing, Vol. 26, No. 5*, pp. 284-300, <https://doi.org/10.1080/08911762.2013.830170>.
2. Anderson, J.C., Narus, J.A. (1990). A model of distribution firm and manufacturing firm working partnerships. *Journal of Marketing, Vol. 54, No. 1*, pp. 42-59, <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299005400103>.
3. Anderson, E., Weitz, B. (1989). Determinants of continuity in conventional industrial channel dyads. *Marketing Science, Vol. 8 No. 4*, pp. 310-323, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mksc.8.4.310>.
4. Athanasopoulou, P. (2009). Relationships quality: a critical review and research agenda. *European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 43, No. 5/6*, pp. 583-610, <https://DOI:10.1108/03090560910946945>.
5. Barry, J.M., Doney, P.M. (2011). Cross-cultural examination of relationships quality. *Journal of Global Marketing, Vol. 24, No. 4*, pp. 305-323, <https://doi.org/10.1080/08911762.2011.602321>.

6. Belderbos, R., Carree, M., Lokshin, B. (2004). Cooperative R&D and firm performance. *Research Policy* 2004, Vol. 33, No. 10, pp. 1477-1492, doi:10.1016/j.respol.2004.07.003.
7. Blunsdon, B., Reed, K. (2003). The Effect of Technical and Social Conditions on Workplace Trust. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 12-27, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190210158493>.
8. Bojar, M., Machnik-Słomka, J. (2014). Model potrójnej i poczwórnej helisy w budowaniu współpracy sieciowej dla rozwoju innowacyjnych projektów regionalnych. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Organizacja i Zarządzanie*, Vol. 1923(76), pp. 99-111.
9. Bromiley, P., Cummings, L.L. (1995). Transaction costs in organizations with trust. *Research on Negotiations in Organizations*, Vol. 5, pp. 219-247.
10. Carayannis, E., Campbell, D. (2011) Open Innovation Diplomacy and a 21st Century Fractal Research, Education and Innovation (FREIE) Ecosystem: Building on the Quadruple and Quintuple Helix Innovation Concepts and the “Mode 3” Knowledge Production System. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 327-372, DOI:10.1007/s13132-011-0058-3.
11. Carayannis, E.G., Barth, T.D., Campbell, D. (2012) The Quintuple Helix innovation model: global warming as a challenge and driver for innovation. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 1-12, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-011-0058-3>.
12. Danik, L. (2017). *Wpływ kultury na jakość relacji w międzynarodowej współpracy przedsiębiorstw*. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza SGH.
13. de Wulf, K., Odekerken-Schröder, G., Iacobucci, D. (2001). Investments in consumer relationships: A cross country and cross-industry exploration. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 65, No. 4, pp. 33-50, <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.65.4.33.18386>.
14. Delbufalo, E. (2015). Subjective trust and perceived risk influences on exchange performance in supplier – manufacturer relationships. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 31, pp. 84-101, DOI: 10.1016/j.scaman.2014.06.002.
15. Dwyer, F.R., Schurr, P.H., Oh, S. (1987). Developing buyer-seller relationship. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 51, No. 2, pp. 11-27, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1251126>.
16. Dyer, J.H., Chu, W. (2003). The role of trustworthiness in reducing transaction costs and improving performances: empirical evidence from the United States, Japan and Korea. *Organization Science*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 57-68, <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.14.1.57.12806>.
17. Ghzaiel, K., Akrouf, F. (2012). Dimensions and antecedents of relationship quality in a business-to-business context: an exploratory study. *Journal of Supply Chain and Customer Relationship Management*, pp. 1-17, DOI: 10.5171/2012.589977.
18. Goodman, L.E., Dion, P.A. (2001). The determinants of commitment in the distributor-manufacturer relationship. *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 287-300.
19. Hajli, M.N. (2014). The role of social support on relationship quality and social commerce. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, Vol. 87, No. C, pp. 17-27, DOI: 10.1016/j.techfore.2014.05.012.

20. Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K.P., Gremler, D.D. (2002). Understanding relationship marketing outcomes. An integration of relational benefits and relationship quality. *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 230-247, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670502004003006>.
21. Hennig-Thurau, T., Klee, A. (1997). The impact of customer satisfaction and relation quality on customer retention: a critical reassessment and model development. *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 14, No. 8, pp. 737-764, [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6793\(199712\)14:8<737::AID-MAR2>3.0.CO;2-F](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6793(199712)14:8<737::AID-MAR2>3.0.CO;2-F).
22. Heroux, L., Hammoutene, A. (2012). Relationship marketing in the American and Canadian export sectors: a matter of trust. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 39-46.
23. Holmlund, M. (2008). A definition model, and empirical analysis of business-to-business relationship quality. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 1-46, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09564230810855707>.
24. Hoopner, J.J., Griffith, D.A., White, R.C. (2015). Reciprocity in relationship marketing: a cross-cultural examination of the effects of equivalence and immediacy on relationship quality and satisfaction with performance. *Journal of International Marketing*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 64-83, <https://doi.org/10.1509%2Fjim.15.0018>.
25. Inków, M. (2017). Zaufanie a przewaga konkurencyjna przedsiębiorstw. *Handel wewnętrzny*, nr 6(371), pp. 104-111.
26. Jiang, Z., Shiu, E., Henneberg, S., Naude, P. (2016). Relationship quality in business to business relationships – reviewing the current literatures and proposing a new measurement model. *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 297-313, <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20876>.
27. Johnson, J.L. (1999). Strategic integration in industrial distribution channels: managing the interfirm relationship as a strategic asset. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 4-18, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070399271001>.
28. Kolemba, A. (2009). Relacje przedsiębiorstwa z otoczeniem jako instrument budowania przewagi konkurencyjnej. In: M. Cisek (Ed.), *Kapitał relacyjny w nowoczesnej gospodarce*. Warszawa: Studio Emka.
29. *Kondycja organizacji pozarządowych. Raport z badań*. Stowarzyszenie Klon Jawor, [www.kondycjango.pl](http://www.kondycjango.pl), 25.04.2022.
30. Kwiatek, P., Leszczyński, G., Zieliński, M. (2009). *Komunikacja w relacjach business-to-business*. Poznań: Advertiva.
31. Lages, C., Lages, C.R., Lages, L.F. (2005). The REQUAL scale: a measure of relationship quality in export market ventures. *Journal of Business Research*, No. 54, pp. 1040-1048, doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2004.03.001.
32. Leonidou, L. C., Palihawadana, D., Theosiou, M. (2006). An integrated model of the behavioural dimensions of industrial buyer-seller relationships. *European Journal of Marketing* Vol. 40, No. 1/2, pp. 145-173, DOI: 10.1108/03090560610637365.

33. Lewicka, D., Krot, K., Książek, D. (2016). Metodyczne aspekty badania zaufania w naukach o zarządzaniu. *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie, nr 7(955)*, pp. 41-56, DOI: 10.15678/ZNUEK.2016.0955.0703.
34. Lewin, J.E. (2009). Business customers' satisfaction: what happens when suppliers downsize? *Industrial Marketing Management, Vol. 38*, pp. 283-299, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2007.11.005>.
35. Moczydłowska, J.M., Korombel, A., Bitkowska, A. (2017). *Relacje jako kapitał organizacji*. Warszawa: Difin.
36. Mohr, J.J., Sohi, R.S. (1995). Communications flows in distribution channels: impact on assessments of communication quality and satisfaction. *Journal of Retailing, Vol. 71, No. 4*, pp. 393-416, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4359\(95\)90020-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4359(95)90020-9).
37. Moliner, M.A., Sánchez, J., Rodríguez, R.M., Callarisa, L. (2007). Perceived relationship quality and post-purchase perceived value: an integrative framework. *European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 41, No. 11/12*, pp. 1392-1422, <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560710821233>.
38. Morgan, R.M., Hunt, S.D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing, Vol. 58, No. 3*, pp. 20-38, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1252308>.
39. Paine, K.D. (2003). *Guidelines for Measuring Trust in Organizations*. The Institute for Public Relations, [www.instituteforpr.com](http://www.instituteforpr.com).
40. Pannirselvam, G., Madupalli, R., Williams, C. (2014). Quality of business-to-business relationships: impact of customer-supplier differences. *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal, Vol. 18, No. 2*, pp. 149-167.
41. Paulraj, A., Lado, A.A., Chen, I.J. (2008). Inter-organizational communication as a relational competency: antecedents and performance outcomes in collaborative buyer-supplier relationships. *Journal of Operations Management, Vol. 26*, pp. 45-64, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2007.04.001>.
42. Payne, A., Ballantyne, D., Christopher, M. (2005). A stakeholder approach to relationship marketing strategy. The development and use of the 'six markets' model. *European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 39, No. 7/8*, pp. 855-871, DOI:10.1108/03090560510601806.
43. Roberts, K., Varki, S., Brodie, R. (2003). Measuring to quality of relationships in consumer services: an empirical study. *European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 37, No. 1-2*, pp. 169-196, DOI 10.1108/03090560310454037.
44. Ryciuk, U. (2013). Zaufanie międzyorganizacyjne – konceptualizacja, operacjonalizacja i pomiar. *Przegląd Organizacji, No. 12*, pp. 33-38, <https://doi.org/10.33141/po.2013.12.06>.
45. Sankowska, A. (2011). *Wpływ zaufania na zarządzanie przedsiębiorstwem. Perspektywa wewnątrzorganizacyjna*. Warszawa: Difin.
46. Sarkar, M.B., Aulakh, P.S., Cavusgil, S.T. (1998) The strategic role of relational bonding in interorganizational collaborations: an empirical study of the global construction industry. *Journal of International Management, Vol. 4, No. 2*, pp. 85-107.
47. Skarmeas, D., Katsikeas, C.S., Schlegelmilch, B.B. (2002). Drivers of commitment and its

- impact on performance in cross-cultural buyer-seller relationships: the importer's perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 757-783.
48. Skarmas, D., Robson, M.J. (2008). Determinants of Relationship Quality in Importer–Exporter Relationships. *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 171-184, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2007.00537.x.
  49. Smith, J.B. (1998). Buyer-seller relationships: bonds, relationships management and sex-type. *Canadian Journal Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 76-92, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-4490.1998.tb00153.x>.
  50. Stach, P. (2010). Jakość relacji z interesariuszami. *Ekonomika i Organizacja Przedsiębiorstwa*, No 1, pp. 41-46.
  51. Tomaszuk, A., Wasiluk, A. (2021). *Przedsiębiorstwo w poczwórnej helisie*. Białystok: Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Białostockiej.
  52. Tu, C., Hwang, S.H., Wong, J.Y. (2014). How does cooperation affect innovation in micro-enterprises? *Management Decision*, Vol. 52, No. 8, pp. 1390-1409, <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-07-2013-0388>.
  53. Tung, B., Carlson, J. (2013). Modelling a formative measure of relationship quality and its effects: evidence from the Hong Kong retail banking industry. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 139-158, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332969.2013.770674>.
  54. Ulaga, W., Eggert, A. (2006). Relationship value and relationship quality: broadening the nomological network of business-to-business relationships. *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 40, No. 3-4, pp. 311-327, <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560610648075>.
  55. Vieira, A.L., Winklhofer, H., Ennew, C.T. (2008). Relationship Quality: a literature review and research agenda. *Journal of Customer Behaviour*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 269-291, <https://doi.org/10.1362/147539208X386833>.
  56. Walter, A. (2003). Relationship-Specific Factors Influencing Supplier Involvement in Customer New Product Development. *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 56, No. 9, pp. 721-733, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(01\)00257-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(01)00257-0).
  57. Walter, A., Ritter, T. (2003). The influence of adaptations, trust, and commitment on value-creating functions of customer relationships. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 18, No. 4/5, pp. 353-365, <https://doi.org/10.1108/08858620310480250>.
  58. Whipple, J.M., Lynch, D.F., Nyaga, G.N. (2010). A buyer's perspective on collaborative versus transactional relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 39, pp. 507-518, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2008.11.008>.
  59. Wieselquist, J., Rusbult, C.E., Foster, C.A., Agnew, R.C. (1999). Commitment, pro-relationship behavior, and trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 77, No. 5, pp. 942-966, doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.77.5.942.
  60. Woo, K., Ennew, Ch. T. (2004). Business-to-business relationship quality: an IMP interaction-based conceptualization and measurement. *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 38, No. 9/10, pp. 1252-1271, <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560410548960>.