

TRUST-BASED NEGOTIATIONS

Andrzej KOZINA

Cracow University of Economics; kozinaa@uek.krakow.pl, ORCID: 0000-0001-8973-8279

Purpose: one of the key factors determining conducting negotiation processes is the trust of their participants, which enables achieving greater operational efficiency. An important and promising objective of the paper is to present the author's concept of describing and analyzing the impact of trust on these processes.

Design/methodology/approach: the paper is of a theoretical nature, i.e. it contains an original concept of describing negotiation processes based on trust. An original approach was adopted to identify key aspects of the interpretation of these processes. It was assumed that trust may affect them in two forms, i.e. strengths - positive and weaknesses - not necessarily negative.

Findings: developing an original, comprehensive concept of negotiations based on trust. A precise and comprehensive characterization of both forms of the influence of trust on negotiation processes is presented in the context of eight key aspects of the interpretation of these processes.

Practical implications: the presented concept enables comprehensive identification and analysis of trust-based negotiation processes and their effective implementation. It is precise and insightful, as well as universal, i.e. it can be used to assess and implement a wide variety of practical negotiation situations.

Originality/value: unlike many other works on trust-based negotiation processes, which concern fragmentary and selective problems related to these processes, the concept of their description and analysis presented in the paper is of a synthetic and complex nature.

Keywords: socio-economic negotiations, trust, trust-based negotiations.

Category of the paper: viewpoint.

1. Introduction

Global, very dynamic and turbulent environment stimulated by modern and omnipresent information technology is highly challenging for contemporary organizations. Within them and their environment numerous, very dynamic, and highly complicated intra- and inter-organizational relations occur, of both competitive and cooperative character. That results in sharply increasing in scope and importance of negotiations. Frequently they involve many parties at the table, which make it difficult to reach satisfactory agreement between numerous

stakeholders. It is necessary to include their various objectives, either common or conflicting. Creating and applying effective negotiation strategies and tactics becomes more and more complicated. The activities of negotiators often involve considerable risk or even uncertainty.

Considering presented features of contemporary negotiations, it should be concluded that one of the most important factors from the point of view of performing negotiation processes effectively enough is trust and reliance between their parties. This kind of dependence may lead to the creation of partnership relations between the participants of the negotiations. Trust is an inherent part of the negotiation context. Parties engage in a negotiation because they have each decided that they are dependent on the other to provide something—particularly the exchange of accurate information and the willingness to implement their agreement—that will improve their current situation and enable them to negotiate successfully (Lewicki, Polin, 2013a). Therefore, establishing and maintaining partner relations, both within and between organizations, is a key determinant of achieving the desired level of organizational effectiveness. Looking for negotiations partners who can be relied on and who will not disappoint their trust is a kind of challenge for modern managers.

2. Literature review

On the one hand, the number of works and research projects dealing with of the impact of trust on negotiations processes is significantly large, especially issued throughout last twenty years. Some of those works are traditional ones, like (Ross, LaCroix, 1996; Solomon, Flores, 2001), the others were issued in recent years, e.g. (Towalski, 2017; Lopez-Fresno, Savolainen, Miranda, 2018; Lua et. al., 2017; Barrientos, 2020).

The books and papers worth considering from the point of view of the paper objective may be divided into three groups. The first one comprises the publications within which the matter of trust is perceived from very general, universal perspective, i.e. considering its place and importance in human life within society. In (Vanzant, 2017) and (Solomon, Flores, 2001) trust is perceived in very broad context, including business, politics, relationships as well as in life, self, relations with other people, even in God. P. Sztompka (2007) treats trust as the foundation of society, D. Milaszewicz (2016) as specific social value, and R. Towalski (2016) as a key resource in conducting social dialogue. Therefore, the first group of discussed works is important for identifying clarifying the nature and features of trust in general and in negotiations, contributing substantially to formulate its general definition.

The second group of analyzed works is focused on different aspects of trust in business, for instance including its meaning and importance from the following perspectives: services delivery (Malik, Bouguettaya, 2009), managing business relationships (Henneberg, Naude, 2007), as well as risk in contrast to mistrust (Ward, Smith, 2003). In (Peterson, Covey, Kaplan,

2016) and (Whiple, Griffis, Daugherty, 2013) the principle for building trust in business and its determinants are taken into consideration. That group of publications only indirectly refers to the considered problem, i.e. emphasize merely the general determinants of the influence of trust of negotiations.

From the point of view of the objective of the paper the most substantial is of course the third group of discussed works, i.e. characterize the issue of trust in negotiations, enabling us to identify and clarify its features. Majority of publications belonging to that group concern theoretical issues, e.g. (Barrientos, 2020; Koeszegi, 2009; Lewicki, Polin, 2013a; Lewicki, Polin, 2013b; Malhorta, 2004; Robinson, Yannakou, 2016; Osika, 2013; Ross, LaCroix, 1996; Tu, 2014). Only very few present practical problems of trust in negotiations and the results of empirical research on that problems, e.g. (Kim, Wang, Park, 2015; Kong, Dirks, Ferrin, 2014; Lua et al., 2017; Tu, 2013). Several review works were also issued, summarizing and comparing many other publications on the discussed mater, e.g. (Chmielecki, Sułkowski 2015; (Cronin, Weingart, 2005; Kim, Wang, Park, 2015; Kong, Dirks, Ferrin, 2014; Lewicki, Polin, 2013a; Lopez Fresno, Savoalinen, Miranda, 2018; Ross, LaCroix, 1996; Tu, 2013).

Majority of the compared works are of universal, general character, i.e. the issue of trust in negotiations is considered in broader context of negotiations processes, as one of their important aspects, e.g. (Cronin, Weingart, 2005; Lewicki, Polin, 2013a; Lewicki, Polin, 2013b; Lopez Fresno, Savoalinen, Miranda, 2018; Robinson, Yannakou, 2016; Ross, LaCroix, 1996). The other publications are more specialized, i.e. focused on specific issues within the discussed are of interest, for instance concerning the following problems:

- principles of building trust in negotiations (Malhorta, 2004);
- description of trust as unique negotiation capital (asset) (Osika, 2013);
- the matter of trust within international trade negotiations (Kim, Wang, Park, 2015);
- the impact of trust on negotiations in multicultural context (Chmielecki, Sułkowski, 2015);
- their sociocultural aspects of negotiations (Lopez Fresno, Savoalinen, Miranda, 2018);
- different determinants of trust in negotiations (Lua et al., 2017);
- relationships between trust and risk in negotiations (Koeszegi, 2009; Malhorta, 2004);
- the interdependence between trust and ethical matters of negotiations (Tu, 2013);
- the influence of trust on negotiating styles (Robinson, Yannakou, 2016; Tu, 2014);
- negotiating to build relationships and trust (Barrientos, 2020).

On the other hand, despite the key role played by trust within entire negotiation process, so far not commonly recognized, complex and coherent methodological concept of the analysis of impact of trust on those processes has been elaborated. Very few authors (like the ones quoted in the paper) have discussed that issue, without trying, ad to elaborate such a concept suggesting purely partial solutions to selected problems and presenting limited tools for analyzing and conducting negotiations supported by trust, without applying systems approach to them.

Empirical studies on the discussed problem are scarce as well. That considers in particular the negotiations on difficult and complex ventures like establishing strategic partnership, undertaking joint ventures, strategic alliances, mergers and acquisitions, creating networks and virtual or process-oriented organizations, maintaining industrial relations, and within other complex transactions, comprising numerous issues and parties.

Taking into consideration the theoretical weaknesses of the research on trust-based negotiations, the paper is focused at presenting author's own concept (framework) of such negotiations, i.e. these taking place within an organization, between its units as well as those occurring between its representatives and external stakeholders. Therefore, the paper aims at filling least partially the methodological gap indicated above.

3. Research methods

The paper is of theoretical character, i.e. contains original concept of trust-based negotiations processes. In order to describe the impact of trust on such processes in the main parts of the paper, the author's approach to the key aspects of the interpretation of negotiations was adopted as a methodological scheme (Kozina, 2018, pp. 13-17), i.e. perceiving them as a process, method of conflict management and reaching agreement, mutual dependence of the parties and processes of: decision making, communicating, mutual exchange and value creation. These aspects were distinguished based on the analysis of the extensive literature on the subject, e.g. (Jung, Krebst, 2019; Lewicki et al., 2018; *Negocjacje i komunikacja...*, 2023; Rockman et al., 2020; Thompson, 2013; Weiss, 2020). The author's own approach to the considered determinants was supplemented with selected findings by other authors based on a comparative and critical analysis of the literature on the subject.

In the second part of the paper the idea of trust in negotiations is discussed, starting from the general interpretation of trust in broad social context and in business environment. The next parts of the paper present the results of the analysis of the specific features of negotiation processes resulting from the impact of trust between their parties. These results were compiled in accordance with the aspects of the interpretation of the negotiations distinguished above. In some cases, recommendations are also included that may counteract this impact. The summary lists the essential features of trust-based negotiation processes and indicates the directions of research enriching the proposed concept.

There are two types of influence factors of trust on negotiation processes.

1. Strengths – positive ones, creating new opportunities and possibilities, supporting and facilitating negotiation processes.
2. Weaknesses – may or may not be disturbing or limiting to those processes, potentially restrictive, but not negative in the strict sense, sometimes only neutral.

It is because of this very interdependence (between negotiators) that trust—which is about risk in and of itself—or distrust will develop between negotiating parties. Therefore, trust, distrust, interdependence, and information sharing are integral to the negotiation process itself and to its ultimate success or failure (Lewicki, Polin, 2013a).

It can be assumed that the first form of impact prevails, because trust mainly has a positive impact on all spheres of our lives (see definition below). The second form have a much lesser impact on the conduct of negotiations processes.

4. The idea of trust in negotiations

As a starting point to define the notion of trust in negotiations the following statement by P. Sztompka (2007) may be applied: a bet made on the uncertain future actions of other people. Thus, trust is the expectation of a certain behavior on the part of someone, which entails a certain action, such as relying on someone for something or the action itself. As you can see, trust can involve taking risk.

In order to clarify and specify this general definition, a comparative analysis of several proposals by different authors was carried out. This analysis covered both works from the first group distinguished above (Sztompka, 2007; Vanzant, 2017; Milaszewicz, 2016; Towalski, 2017; Whiple, Griffis, Daugherty, 2013), which present the general concept of trust, and the third group (Barrientos, 2020; Cronin, Weingart, 2005; Koeszegi, 2009; Kong, Dirks, Ferrin, 2014; Lewicki, Polin, 2013a; Osika, 2013; Robinson, Yannakou, 2016; Ross, LaCroix, 1996), which explains the specificity of trust in negotiations.

As a result of this analysis, the operational definition of trust-based negotiation process was formulated. by listing of such processes. Thus, they can be understood as a unique type of relationship between their participants, having the following specific features:

1. Generally positive attitude and approach to partners, despite undoubted and understandable differences regarding the goals, opinions, values, views, expectations, imaginations, etc. of individual participants.
2. Treating everyone as equal partners and coordinated action to achieve common benefits as a kind of synergy effect.
3. Strong focus on integration and cooperation, not competition, and constant expansion of the scope and enrichment of forms of cooperation.
4. Full compliance in essential matters, i.e. in striving to effective cooperation, through:
 - joint (consistent) ensuring the desired level of fulfillment of all needs and expectations, efficient information flow, effective management of possessed resources and implementation of other activities aimed at increasing efficiency,

- eliminating those activities that lower it and do not bring value and removing barriers to the flow of goods and information, delays in the implementation of tasks.
- 5. Striving for a consensus or compromise when resolving any less significant disputes (with respect to the differences mentioned).
- 6. Shaping an appropriate level of both mutual trust itself and other co-created values, i.e. reliability, credibility, solidity, etc.
- 7. Making key decisions together, determining the achievement of goals and interests of all participants.
- 8. Joint support in ongoing analysis and solving emerging problems.
- 9. Mutual agreement and joint representation of uniform positions and opinions towards external entities.
- 10. Creating and maintaining a positive image of trustworthy mutual partnership.

To sum up it can be emphasized that trust is reflected either in beliefs and attitudes of the parties or their behaviors and activities within negotiations process, and even their emotions.

5. The concept of trust-based negotiations

5.1. The process of trust-based negotiations

Negotiations are a comprehensive action extended over time, including a number of sub-processes (stages, phases), and within them specific actions (activities), which interact with one another in many ways, i.e. they are carried out sequentially, in parallel and/or cyclically, as well as a number of events and interactions between the parties. An important feature of negotiations is their changeability, which makes modelling them difficult. They are auxiliary in relation to the processes and basic projects implemented in the organization.

Usually, due to their complexity and volatility, the processes of socio-economic negotiations, are not easily structured. They are difficult to be programmed into procedures. Many activities are carried out intuitively. Regarding negotiations based on trust, the above statements absolutely do not apply. We are dealing with an entirely different situation. The actions of negotiation partners who trust each other are almost fully predictable and transparent. They know exactly what to expect from each other. Nothing surprises them in the negative sense of the word. They carry out only the necessary activities in an orderly manner. Negotiations are run smoothly and rhythmically. As a rule, there are no cases of taking actions that are incomprehensible or taken by surprise. Therefore, modeling trust-based negotiations is relatively simple. Predicting their course seems trivial. They require simplified coordination of necessary activities carried out as an effect of a smaller number of interactions. Moreover, trust makes these processes much faster than without it.

On the other hand, the existence of trust between the parties to the negotiations processes can sometimes cause significant labor consumption in the implementation of those processes. This happens when the parties patiently and persistently strive to achieve a favorable outcome of negotiations in a positive atmosphere created by mutual trust. Negotiators are drowning in the details in the false hope that it will lead to higher quality results. They often forget the old adage that “the better is the enemy of the good”. The time lost for such an exegesis of the issues under consideration may ultimately lead to a decrease in the effectiveness of the negotiations. Frequently an overly positive attitude can put negotiating partners to sleep.

5.2. Trust-based negotiations as a method of conflict management

This is their competitive dimension, as their parties strive to achieve their own goals and obtain the best possible results. Negotiators have divergent intentions and differing views on the contentious issues under consideration. It is therefore necessary to consistently seek solutions to these issues. Contradictions also concern values, principles, expectations, imaginations, etc., which create the emotional context of negotiations, significantly affecting substantive issues, and in the case under consideration, having a great importance (as mentioned above).

Above all, in negotiations based on trust, the principle of reciprocity can and should be applied in the event of conflict. negotiating partners respond favorably to the positive reactions and actions of others, avoid negative moves and refer to the similarity of the situation in which they find themselves together, in accordance with the old adage “do as you would be done by” or “what goes around comes around”. Applying this principle in an atmosphere of mutual trust results in a small number of potential conflicts. Obviously, there are serious and sometimes even sharp disagreements on substantive issues, mainly material ones. Negotiating parties can resolve such conflicts in an integrative, cooperative and even creative way, treating understandable differences of opinion as a help in dealing with disputes, not a hindrance. They can accurately and comprehensively identify, explain and analyze emerging conflicts, their nature, types, causes and effects, and are able to apply effective methods of conflict resolution. Moreover, within trust-based negotiations as a rule, there are no unnecessary conflicts concerning different values, stereotypes in perceiving others, excessive emotions, lack of data and so on. In addition, it is not easy to use competitive negotiation techniques, take advantage of the effect of surprise or asymmetry of information, threaten and promise, bluff, etc., because the parties to negotiations are rather “well informed”.

However, it may happen that the parties to the negotiations, focusing on integrative resolution of serious conflicts of interest in an atmosphere of mutual trust, forget less important contentious issues. They may take the form of hidden conflicts of seemingly minor importance. Omitting them may result in a reduction in the effectiveness of the agreement, and have negative effects deferred in time, i.e. sooner or later they will be revealed. Over time, their importance may increase, and even they can swing the balance. In addition, conflicts that are less

important on the substantive level can become acute in the emotional dimension. Thus, any misunderstandings, even seemingly insignificant ones, should not be underestimated.

5.3. Negotiations based on trust as a method of reaching an agreement

This aspect concerns their intended result, beneficial for all participants, i.e. meeting their needs. They also have common goals, so they are interested in the effects of negotiations, which are important for them (tangible and intangible). The cooperation of the parties is therefore necessary to achieve the desired level of effectiveness. This, in turn, requires the conclusion of a series of contracts specifying the terms of the agreement between them.

By definition, the existence of trust between the parties to the negotiations encourages them much more to cooperate than to compete. It creates conditions conducive to the search for solutions beneficial to all negotiators. The desire to cooperate is one of the specific features of trust (as discussed earlier). In negotiations based on trust, a very important issue is the ability to correctly perceive the dependencies, and especially the differences between substantive issues and the relations of the parties to the negotiations. One must be able to find a balance between them. To achieve this, two rules must be followed. Firstly, the principle of complementarity, which defines the extent to which solving substantive problems and shaping mutual relations have a beneficial effect on each other. Secondly, the principle of separation should be respected, which defines the extent to which the two issues under consideration are separable, as the effective implementation of one of them should not have a negative impact on the other and vice versa. Having confidence in other participants of the negotiations, one should neither strive to achieve one's own benefits at the expense of spoiling good relations with them, nor to improve these relations at the expense of incurring one's own losses. In trust-based negotiations mostly collaborative techniques are used. It should be added that if you have positive experience of working with trusted partners, it is much easier to attract new cooperators in the negotiation environment. Obviously, the scope of cooperation with the ones whom you trust should be constantly extended.

Potential problem within the negotiations under consideration, is that there may occur a very specific case of limiting or even eliminating the positive impact of trust on the conduct of negotiations. Such a case is a consequence of significant differences in the bargaining power of the parties to the negotiations. Even though they trust each other, they are forced to respect these differences, considering their real possibilities of achieving their goals and pursuing their interests through negotiations. The stronger party may impose certain terms of the agreement on the weaker party, and the latter has no choice but to accept them, because is subordinated to the former one. As mentioned earlier, it is crucial to separate substantive issues from positive relations with partners. If possible, in order to maintain mutual trust, the stronger party should try to compensate the weaker party in some way for the need to adopt an unfavorable solution, e.g. by concessions on less important issues, reducing risk by spreading repayments over time, granting exclusivity in cooperation, etc.

5.4. Trust-based negotiations as the mutual dependence of the parties

The interaction of the dimensions of cooperation (cooperation) and competition (rivalry), i.e. the coexistence of contradictory and convergent goals of the participants in the negotiations. It expresses the desire of the parties to achieve a result favorable to them, conditioned by the need to resolve the conflict between them. None of the parties can achieve its goals alone, and at the same time each of them can help others to achieve their goals.

By definition, trust creates a decidedly positive, strong and enduring dependence between negotiators, strengthened and enriched by the accumulation of positive experiences from cooperation, beneficial to all parties involved. There is a complete understanding between the partners and mutual acceptance of their needs, expectations and requirements, individual opportunistic attitudes that interfere with the implementation of beneficial cooperation opportunities are not revealed. Cooperation and competition coexist in the form of cooperation strategies. In order to shape the relationship between the parties to the negotiations, based on mutual trust, the following three principles regarding this relationship should be observed.

- 1) durability - permanent, regularly repeated contacts, reflected in the form of appropriate procedures, and even established in the form of tradition or custom;
- 2) intensity - a continuous and strong relationship, somewhat routine (in a positive sense), i.e. on the basis of "understanding each other without words", there are set conditions, readiness to communicate and agree to adapt to changes in the cooperation environment;
- 3) credibility - negotiators do not take false, illegal or unethical actions towards each other, and even such statements (so-called half-truths) or selectivity in communication, they know what they can expect from each other, and nothing surprises them in the negative sense of the word.

It should be added that in negotiations, as in the road, the principle of limited trust should be applied, bearing in mind the differences between substantive issues and the relations of the parties (described above).

On the other hand, a strong bond of trust between the parties in the case of their long-term cooperation means that they are somehow "doomed to each other", negotiating out of compulsion, not choice. As a result, they often do not see the possibility of acquiring other partners for cooperation in the negotiation environment. In addition, a strong relationship between them, resulting from an excessive level of trust, may create too strong emotional ties between them, friendship, not to say cordial. They focus more on creating a good impression and a warm atmosphere than on finding solutions to the negotiated issues. They give each other pleasure and favorites as well as pay compliments. This type of relationship is more like a social meeting in an atmosphere of mutual admiration than settling business through substantive negotiations.

5.5. Negotiations based on trust as a decision-making process

Their most important interpretation focused on directly finding solutions to the negotiated issues by the parties involved. In the preparatory phase, this process is carried out by them independently of each other, i.e. each analyses the negotiation situation from the point of view of its goals and interests. On this basis, they determine initial solutions to the negotiated problems based on their own criteria for selecting solutions. Then, they iteratively make the necessary arrangements of variants, determining the area of negotiations, i.e. a set of acceptable solutions to the negotiated problems, based on the analysis of commonality and divergence of interests. By adopting common criteria and selection rules, they find a solution accepted by all.

The positive impact of trust on negotiations processes is mostly reflected by facilitating and supporting all typical activities in the process of interactive decision-making by negotiators, starting from problems identification and analysis, through collecting and analyzing information, joint formulating alternative solutions and selecting criteria for their assessment and choosing the best solutions to considered problems to necessary implementation activities. The discussed process is characterized by considerable flexibility, which is reflected by both mutual offering by the parties to the negotiations the largest possible number of solutions to the issues under consideration, which are beneficial for them, and in striving to obtain their required usefulness. Participants to trust-based negotiations fully support the creative search for alternative solutions and their comprehensive analysis, striving to maintain positive relations with partners. This is support by very broad access to information and satisfactory amount of data, gathered, analyzed and processed by the parties. Their information needs as decision makers are fully met, and the choices they made are careful, accurate, right, precise and made on time. This diminish substantially the risk or even uncertainty of their actions. They are forced to make decision fast and precisely enough. As a result, within trust-based negotiations decision-making processes are less time-consuming.

However, making decisions is always burdened with, if not uncertainty, then at least risk. Practically in every negotiation situation we are dealing with the impossibility or significant limitation of the negotiators' ability to predict the effects of their decisions. Partners' trust in each other is unlikely to ensure the correct perception of risk, but rather weakens their vigilance, which in turn favors underestimating the level of risk, if not ignoring it. In addition, an extremely important problem to solve is to determine whether and to what extent the partners share their attitudes to risk, i.e. they are inclined towards it, indifferent to it or averse to it. This problem must be solved together, otherwise unnecessary conflict will arise due to a lack of understanding in terms of attitude to risk, which may result in making wrong decisions and, consequently, in the failure of negotiations. The second potential disadvantage of trust-based negotiations is the possibility for the negotiators to choose not the best variant of solving the decision-making problem in each situation, but only the one that is satisfactory. This usually results from too hasty selection of the variant preferred by the parties already in the early stages

of the decision-making process, by applying the rule of dominance, i.e. the negotiators' choice of a solution based on one, the most obvious criterion, without considering others. This is usually the result of focusing more on mutual relationships based on trust than on the search for high-quality solutions. The third, however minor disadvantage of overconfidence in negotiations may be too extensive, meticulous, and thus labor-intensive and ineffective analysis of decision-making problems (as mentioned earlier in the characteristics of the negotiation process based on trust).

5.6. Trust-based negotiations as a communication process

That aspect concerns the mutual exchange of information, "permeating" all activities of the parties in the negotiation process, from the initial presentation of positions, through: shaping relationships, formulating and exchanging offers, persuading each other, asking questions and answering, listening, clarification of doubts, etc., until final arrangements and drafting of the contract.

The occurrence of trust in negotiations leads to full openness and symmetry of information, i.e. there are no communication barriers between cooperating partners. All data relevant to the implementation of tasks undertaken by individual participants in the negotiations flow freely and without restrictions. Communication channels are sufficiently clear. Information networks are consistent. The gathered, exchanged and processed information is highly useful, i.e. authentic, reliable (from reliable and verified sources), delivered at the right time and form, in the proper quantity and quality, to the right addressees, etc. There are no delays, shortages or falsification of necessary data. As a result, that provides the correct analysis and selection of negotiation tools, starting from the most general, i.e. negotiation strategies and styles, through techniques of their conduct, to the most detailed, i.e. offers and counteroffers, arguments and counterarguments, questions and answers, limits of concessions, etc. That in turn improves and enriches those tools, including the number and quality of offers and the accuracy of arguments, reduces the effectiveness of questions, makes it difficult to clarify doubts and effectively select negotiation techniques. The important advantage of trust-based negotiations is very limited need to analyze non-verbal messages, because their parties know each other so well that such analysis is not necessary for them.

On the other hand, the openness of communication processes within trust-based negotiations may be substantially reduced by in some sense evident and fully understandable necessity to limit the amount and content of information provided to each other by the parties to the negotiations. Limiting the scope of information exchange is usually caused by the need to keep secret the so-called sensitive data, often of strategic importance, mainly regarding the financial situation of a given organization. Hasty or unjustified disclosure of such information could jeopardize the interests of one of the parties to the negotiations and reduce considerably its information security. Therefore, based on the trust between them, before starting negotiations, their parties should make the necessary arrangements as to the scope, content,

form, etc. of data that may be exchanged between the negotiators. moreover, by over-developing the negotiation process by cooperating and fully trusting negotiating parties (as mentioned earlier), it may lead to information overload (redundancy), which in turn will make negotiations more difficult and eventually ineffective.

5.7. Negotiations based on trust as a process of mutual exchange

That exchange takes place on terms jointly agreed by the parties, through mutual agreements and concessions. It is favored by the differences in the hierarchy of negotiators' goals, i.e. they strive to obtain significant resources and values, giving less important, but important for other parties, in return. It concerns not only measurable resources, but also intangible ones, i.e. ideas, concepts, solutions.

Within the processes of trust-based negotiations determining the scope and conditions of a possible exchange is practically very simple due to the unlimited scope of interaction and cooperation between the parties to the negotiations and the wide range of communication between them. In an atmosphere of mutual trust it is very easy to both define and confront the preferences of the participants of the negotiations, so their expectations are not disclosed and clear as well as specify such detailed conditions of the exchange as its range, level, forms, duration, etc. Potential exchange offers are usually long lasting and focused on either material (tangible) or not material (intangible) values. The creativity of the parties in the search for the exchange of irrational assets is limited and even undesirable. It is not difficult for negotiators to find wider possibilities to meet their mutual needs. They do not reveal a tendency to formulate non-equivalent exchange proposals in order to achieve quick and short-term benefits, especially measurable ones. It is very easy to obtain and communicate complete and reliable information on the needs of the parties. Therefore, realistic proposals can be made and implemented.

However, it may happen that the exchange between the negotiators will be non-equivalent. This usually take place in two cases. Firstly, when there are differences in the bargaining power of the parties to the negotiations (which was mentioned earlier). The stronger side imposes the conditions of the exchange on the weaker side. Secondly, there may be a temporary imbalance in the exchange due to the granting of a certain credit of trust by one of the parties to the negotiations by their other participants. In fact, the granted party obtains measurable benefits on a loan in the strict sense of the word, which will be repaid in the future on agreed terms.

5.8. Negotiations based on trust as a value creation process

The interdependence of the parties and the process of mutual exchange in negotiations allow the parties to seek mutual benefits by creating additional values, which would not be possible without negotiations. These common values are the synergistic effect of the parties' cooperation. Their creation is also possible when one side has something to offer that is of little value to itself but is of great value to other participants in the negotiations - and vice versa. By exchanging these values, each side loses little, but gains a lot.

Negotiations processes supported by trust are undoubtedly characterized by substantial possibility of creating new values unreachable without negotiation. There is usually full alignment of (shared) values, their development and co-creation based on consensus. In addition, the presence of trust in negotiations is conducive to ethical actions of their participants. The parties to the negotiations apply the principle of community of values both tangible, mainly expressed by profits, and intangible, such as loyalty, solidarity, quality, reliability, perfecting the principles of cooperation, etc. and defines the potential limits of partnership in terms of their co-creation. Intangible assets may also be reflected by new concept, ideas, innovative projects etc. It is very easy for the negotiators to agree on common values that are to be the subject and effect of cooperation. It can be also seen that potential discrepancies in the assessment of the values represented by negotiations participants, expressed by the differences in their priorities, create not conflict but the possibility of reaching an agreement through the exchange of values that are beneficial to them. In the short-term, the intangible values may be of little importance to the parties to the negotiations, but they may bring benefits deferred in time. In addition, potential conflicts of values can and should be resolved by explaining their causes and convincing each other about the positive impact of different values on the negotiation process.

On the other hand, participants to the negotiations cannot exaggerate while assessing the value and importance of intangible assets. This happens when the negotiating parties overemphasize mutual trust as a fundamental negotiating platform, and especially the search for an effective agreement. Excessive concentration on those assets may lead to measurable losses in terms of material assets. Co-creation of intangible assets can be a driving force in negotiations, but it cannot replace or compensate for possible losses in tangible assets. In addition, attaching excessive importance to intangible assets may be incomprehensible or even negatively assessed in the negotiating environment, especially by the beneficiaries of the values co-created by the parties to the negotiations. Their common intangible assets may become of value only to themselves.

6. Conclusions

Summing up, it can be said that the occurrence of trust in conducting socio-economic negotiation processes causes the need to recognize and clarify the features of such processes and apply right methods of their implementation. Considering both the eight aspect of the interpretation of negotiations (described above) as well as the two factors characterizing the impact of trust on negotiations processes, i.e. strengths and weaknesses, the following features of those processes may be indicated, which must be considered due to this impact.

1. Well-structured and relatively simple versus occasionally too stretched out in time, detailed and laborious negotiations processes.
2. Integrative and cooperative resolution of the most important conflicts of interests versus the possibility of ignoring less important and sometimes hidden misunderstandings.
3. Very strong and determined desire to reach a deal versus the necessity to submit to the dictates of the party with greater bargaining power, imposing the terms of the agreement.
4. Positive, strong and symmetrical interdependence of the parties versus too cordial, friendly relations, more important than high-quality agreements.
5. High-quality and utility of interactive decision-making process versus the inability of avoiding risk and the possibility of early application of the rule of dominance.
6. Open and unlimited exchange of highly usable information versus the need for confidentiality concerning data of strategic importance.
7. Fully equivalent and effective exchange, satisfying the interests of all parties versus limitation of its possibilities due to the lack of resources and the need to grant "trust".
8. Effective creation of common values versus excessive concentration on intangible resources and failure to match these values to the expectations of external environment.

As it is easy to notice, the above characteristics of the discussed negotiations include many positive aspects, though at the same time indicate some difficulties and obstacles, such as the need to not overdoing the level of trust when conducting them, careful risk analysis when making choices and exchanges as well as the necessity of considering bargaining power of their parties and taking care for information security.

The concept of describing trust-based negotiations presented in the paper is an initial, largely hypothetical approach to the considered issues, since they are relatively new, not fully recognized both in theory and research, as well as in socio-economic practice. Therefore, the author will strive to enrich and broaden his concept, mainly by searching for more precise characteristics of the considered dependencies between the issue of trust and the course of negotiation processes. It is also planned to carry out empirical comparative research in order to verify the usefulness of suggested concept.

In addition, it is planned to develop the context of considerations, i.e. to create a broader concept of trust-based negotiations conditions in the current socio-economic realities, and thus to create a specific model of identification and analysis of their determinants, possibilities and limitations. As can be seen, some of the statements contained in the paper are more general in nature, going beyond the pure issue of the impact of trust on the negotiations, which allows to analyze them in a broader context. The second, promising direction of research will be to consider the more general issue of managing relations with partners under the influence of trust, and not just only negotiations with them.

Acknowledgements

The publication was financed from the funds granted to the College of Economy and Public Administration of the Cracow University of Economics, as part of a subsidy for the maintenance of research potential - the project entitled "Political Economy of Budget Processes in Poland - Structural, Institutional and Relational Aspects".

References

1. Barrientos, H. (2020). *Negotiating to Build Relationships and Trust*. Oxford Programme on Negotiation. Oxford: University of Oxford. Said Business School.
2. Chmielecki, M., Sułkowski, Ł. (2015). Problematyka zaufania w negocjacjach międzykulturowych w obliczu metafory konceptualnej - studium komparatywne. *Organizacja i Kierowanie, No. 1*, pp. 27-40.
3. Cronin, M.A., Weingart, L.R. (2005). The Differential Roles of Respect and Trust on Negotiation. IACM 18th Annual Conference. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.726183>, 4.06.2014.
4. Gracz, L., Słupińska, K. (eds.) (2023). *Negocjacje i komunikacja. Wybrane aspekty*. Warszawa: Edu-Libri.
5. Henneberg, S.C., Naude, P. (2007). Trust and Reliance in Business Relationships. *European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 41, No. 9*, pp. 1016-1032.
6. Jung, S., Kreb, P. (2019). *The Essentials of Contract Negotiation*. Vien: Springer-Verlag.
7. Kim, M-J., Wang, L., Park, M-S. (2015). Different Levels of Trust in Global Business Negotiation: A Comparative Study about Canadians and Korean Perspective on Doing Business Negotiation with Chinese. *International Commerce and Information Review, Vol. 17, No. 3*, pp. 155-176.
8. Koeszegi, S.T. (2009). Take the Risk and Trust? The Strategic Role of Trust in Negotiations. In: R. Avenhaus, G. Sjöstedt (Eds.), *Negotiated Risks*. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
9. Kong, D.T., Dirks, K.T., Ferrin, D.L. (2014). Interpersonal Trust Within Negotiations: Meta-Analytic Evidence, Critical Contingencies, and Directions for Future Research. *Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 57, No. 5*, pp. 1235-1255.
10. Kozina, A. (2018). *Zasady negocjacji*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie.
11. Lewicki, R., Polin, B. (2013a). Trust and Negotiation. In: M. Olekalns, W.L. Adair (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Negotiation*. Northampton: Elgar Publishing, Inc.

12. Lewicki, R., Polin, B. (2013b). The Role of Trust in Negotiation Processes. In: R. Bachmann, A. Zaheer (Ed.), *Handbook of Advances in Trust Research*. Northampton: Elgar Publishing, Inc.
13. Lewicki, R.J., Barry, B., Saunders, D.M. (2018). *Zasady negocjacji*. Poznań: Dom Wydawniczy Rebis.
14. Lopez-Fresno, P., Savolainen, T.M., Miranda, S. (2018). Role of Trust in Integrative Negotiations. *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management, Vol. 16, No. 1*, pp. 13-22.
15. Lua, S.C., Kongb, D.T., Ferrina, D.L., Dirks, K.T. (2017). What are the determinants of interpersonal trust in dyadic negotiations? Meta-analytic evidence and implications for future research. *Journal of Trust Research, Vol. 7, No. 1*, pp. 22-50.
16. Malhorta, D. (2004). Risky Business: Trust in Negotiations. *Negotiation, Vol. 2, No. 7*, pp. 12-21.
17. Malik, Z., Bouguettaya, A. (2009). *Trust Management for Service-Oriented Environments*. New York: Springer.
18. Milaszewicz, D. (2016). Zaufanie jako wartość społeczna. *Studia Ekonomiczne. Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Katowicach, No. 259*, pp. 80-88.
19. Osika, G. (2013). Zaufanie – kapitał negocjacyjny. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Seria: Organizacja i Zarządzanie, Vol. 65, No. 1897*, pp. 293-305.
20. Peterson, J., Covey, S.M.R., Kaplan, D.A. (2016). *The 10 Laws of Trust: Building the Bonds That Make a Business Great*. New York: Amacom.
21. Robinson, D.A., Yannakou, K. (2016). Building Trust and Agreement in Negotiations. *Business Review Cambridge, Vol. 24, No. 2*, pp. 15-20.
22. Rockmann, K.W., Langfred, C.W., Cronin, M.A. (2020). *Negotiation: Moving from Conflict to Agreement*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.
23. Ross, W., LaCroix, J. (1996). Multiple Meanings of Trust in Negotiation Theory and Research: A Literature Review and Integrative Model. *The International Journal of Conflict Management, Vol. 44, No. 7*, pp. 314-360.
24. Solomon, R.C., Flores, F. (2001). *Building Trust in Business, Politics, Relationships, and Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc.
25. Sztompka, P. (2007). *Zaufanie. Fundament społeczeństwa*. Kraków: Znak.
26. Thompson, L. (2013). *The Truth About Negotiations*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
27. Towalski, R. (2017). Zaufanie jako kluczowy zasób w prowadzeniu dialogu społecznego. *Studia z Polityki Publicznej, Vol. 15, No. 3*, pp. 47-63.
28. Tu, Y.T. (2013). The Relationships between Trust and Unethical Negotiation. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology, Vol. 3, No. 3*, pp. 45-52.
29. Tu, Y.T. (2014). Trust Affecting on Negotiation Styles. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, Vol. 4, No. 1*, pp. 259-267.

30. Vanzant, I. (2017). *Trust: Mastering the Four Essential Trusts: Trust in Self, Trust in God, Trust in Others*. New York: Random House Publishing Book.
31. Ward, A., Smith J. (2003). *Trust and Mistrust. Radical Risk Strategies in Business Relationships*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
32. Weiss, J.N. (2020). *The Book of Real-World Negotiations: Successful Strategies from Business, Government, and Daily Life*. New York: Jon Wiley & Sons Inc.
33. Whipple, J.M., Griffis, S.E., Daugherty, P.J. (2013). Conceptualizations of Trust: Can We Trust Them? *Journal of Business Logistics*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 117-130.