



## INFLUENCE OF BENEVOLENCE AND CREDIBILITY ON CONDUCT OF INTEGRATIVE NEGOTIATION BEHAVIOURS

**Mbarek Rahmoune**,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0333-9056>

Dr., Ph.D., University of Carthage, Tunisia

**Mohamed Alsagaf**,

Dr., Ph.D., King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

**Ahmad Mostafa Abdeltawab**,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9417-6688>

Dr., Ph.D., ESSCA School of Management, France

**Abdullah Azhari**,

Dr., Ph.D., King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

**Mahrane Hofaidhllaoui**,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7061-5914>

Dr., Ph.D., ESSCA School of Management, Lyon, France

**Corresponding author:** Mbarek Rahmoune, [mmostafal@kau.edu.sa](mailto:mmostafal@kau.edu.sa)

**Type of manuscript:** Research paper

**Abstract:** *This paper aims to determine the influence of benevolence and credibility on cooperative negotiation in the B2B markets between manufacturers and distributors using the dyadic methodology. The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) emphasizes the bi-dimensionality of trust, credibility, and benevolence by surveying 253 manufacturers and 53 distributors. Analyzing the perceptions of Producers and Retailers revealed the existence of a "perceptual convergence" between them. Moreover, the results from the dyadic analysis of the representative sample of the study showed a significant and positive impact of credibility on integrative and cooperative negotiation behavior. However, it also revealed an insignificant relation between cause and effect between benevolence and integrative and cooperative negotiation behavior. After using regression, benevolence as a dimension of trust positively impacts the integrative and cooperative negotiation behavior estimates reject. This research created a retailer and manufacturer integrative and cooperative negotiation behavior model for the B2B markets, adding to the greater knowledge of Marketing and Management. The proposed model shall aid manufacturers and retailers in effective integrative business negotiation. Retailers, who are more powerful than producers, benefit more from utilizing negotiation as a tool to exercise a better influence over producers/suppliers and, thus, reach better results. Nevertheless, the findings revealed that Trust impacts positively and directly integrative negotiation. Hence, it suggests building integrative and cooperative negotiations between producers and retailers depending on the degree of trust between them. Finally, the findings can be considered an evident aid for managers to accomplish effective negotiations better. It is worth mentioning that the results of the PCA of producers' and retailers' perceptions designate the insignificant relationship between benevolence and integrative negotiation.*

**Keywords:** cooperation, negotiation, producers, retailers, suppliers, trust.

**JEL Classification:** M31, L66, P46

**Received:** 16 September 2022

**Accepted:** 13 March 2023

**Published:** 31 March 2023

**Funding:** There is no funding for this research.

**Publisher:** Academic Research and Publishing UG

**Cite as:** Rahmoune, M., Alsagaf, M., Abdeltawab, A. M., Azhari, A., & Hofaidhllaoui, M. (2023). Influence of Benevolence and Credibility on Conduct of Integrative Negotiation Behaviours. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 1, 213-223. <https://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2023.1-18>



**Introduction.** Research has shown retailers and producers (RPs) cooperate together for mutual interests (Morgan & Hunt 1994; Sheu et al. 2006). Cooperation has often been examined around negotiation and trust between retailers and producers (Gurviez & Korchia 2002; Krafft et al. 2015). As a result, a renewed focus on trust has infused dynamism in the relationship causing closer ties between the RPs (Frazier & Summers 1984; Ganesan, 1994; Doney & Cannon, 1997; Rahmoun & Debabi, 2012; Helies-Hassid, 2002). The renewal dominated by psycho-sociological frameworks stemming from cognitive approaches focuses on negotiation within retail marketing (Krafft et al., 2015). However, this social practice takes extremely varied forms, from normalizing complex systems to decision-making and conflict resolutions. Accordingly, negotiation has been considered as a way of resolving conflicts as a possible alternative to using force, similar to mediation and arbitration practices (Macquin, 1998; Aastrup et al. 2007). For instance, retailers have a large customer basis, which gives them bargaining power (Fornell, 1992; Haucap et al. 2019). In addition, producers have no direct access to the retailers' customer database, which may limit producers' bargaining power, an avenue to access conflict. Also, the need to focus on how conflict is resolved through the power struggles between RPs is essential. In this line of thinking, it seems appropriate to clarify and understand the foundations on which exchange relationships and integrative negotiation are based (Geiger, 2017). In fact, one of the ambitions of this study is to examine the exchange relationships binding RPs, referring to what is called in the literature as «integrative negotiation». This study elucidates two MNCs (multinational retail corporations), the case of Carrefour and Geant. The MNCs form two of the largest hypermarket chains in the World. Furthermore, the retailers exert a bargaining power in the commercial negotiation with their producers since they hold the largest market. Therefore, the nature of the relationship between the retailers, such as Carrefour and GEANT, may require particular methods for widening their customer base. Hence, retailers exert more pressure on producers to maintain a minimum cost by pricing out the competition. Furthermore, we provide a solution from distributive to integrative negotiation. Therefore, we study the impact of trust on regulating the relationship between retailers and producers in this paper.

**Literature Review.** Integrative and distributive negotiation. The notion of exchange and its effect on the complexity of negotiations has recently attracted the attention of the relevant literature on distribution channels (Frazier & Summers, 1984; Dwyer et al., 1987; Anderson & Weitz, 1989). The distribution channel, a way of delivering finished products to target consumers, consists of several actors whose practices might complement or compete with each other (Parson, 2003). Negotiations (as a channel of making decisions) occur when there are no rules regulating decisions, authority, and no determined price to exchange goods or services (Zartman 2004). Negotiation is considered in the literature as a necessary component of relational marketing (Srinivasan & Moorman 2005). It focuses on many varied forces, which explains the difficulty in operationalizing its processes and results.

In fact, within distribution channels, integrative negotiation is a strategy whose aim is to reach some objectives (Frazier & Summers 1984; Anderson & Narus, 1990; Morgan & Hunt 1994) and notably to satisfy the negotiator's objectives, taking into consideration as well satisfying the opposite partner (Bazerman & Lewicki, 1985). It rests on a climate of trust, reciprocity, and mutual credibility (Dupont, 1990). Most relevant research and managerial practices assume that an integrative negotiation strategy generates strong relationships between negotiators, which might lead to sharing interests and increasing sales and profits (Colgate & Danaher, 2000; Rahmoun & Debabi, 2012; Ashnai et al., 2015).

Some recent practices adopted by retailers and producers, like category management, show that this way of negotiating is currently gaining ground (Debabi, 2009). For example, in research conducted in the United Kingdom's food sector, Haase and Franco (2011) have shown how competitive environments may be manipulated to satisfy retailers with limited options. The implication for practice suggests maintaining relationships that meet the parties' expectations when negotiating using category management. The win/win strategy, which is known as a cooperative or an integrative strategy, is adopted by those who consider negotiation as an opportunity to resolve a conflict with a satisfying outcome for all those involved in the negotiation process so that there is an agreement between all parties with the ultimate intention of improving long-term relationships. Distributive negotiation aims at separating interlocutors and rests on a one-sided outcome. The rule to be followed thus is «win at all costs». It is adopted by those who consider negotiation as an opportunity to resolve a conflict to maximize their interests at the expense of the other parties (Diouri, 1999; Andaleeb, 1995). Supporting theories for change in strategies adopted in the industry also include observing patterns and trends within the sector, as categorized in the work of Reardon and Timmer (2012).

The Concept of Trust during Exchange. Trust represents a concept quite largely considered by the literature (Katz, 2015) nowadays. Indeed, some marketing studies, mostly referring to the exchange paradigm, have established the role of trust as a way of ensuring cooperative relationships between actors

involved in the distribution channel (Anderson and Weitz, 1989; Anderson and Narus, 1990; Gundlach & Murphy, 1993; Garbarino & Johnson, 1999; Razzaque, 2003). Currently, trust has become a key variable for key management research (Mayer et al., 1995) within the context of business exchanges or negotiation in general. Table 1 shows the trust dimensions, including the discipline, authors, and dimensions of trust. Moreover, the variable «trust» was spread during the 1980s by marketing managers (Chadwick & Burton, 2011). Trust within industrial marketing is considered a key variable behind the success and durability of partner exchanges. It refers to two research trends. The first is decision-making in a purchasing context (Dwyer et al. 1987), and the second is about the relationships between suppliers, manufacturers, retailers, and suppliers in a distribution context. Ganesan 1994; Sahay 2003) questions the nature of trust, its dimensions, its consequences, and its conception. The author uses the definition of trust between buyers and sellers proposed by Moorman et al. (1992) and reviews the relevant research testing a model that distinguishes between two fundamental dimensions of trust, i.e., credibility and benevolence.

Similarly, Doney and Cannon (1997) retained these same two dimensions. Several researchers seem to agree on the dimensionality of trust. The first group of researchers considers trust as a one-dimensional concept. Anderson and Weitz (1989) measure trust in terms of motivation, whereas Mayer et al. (1995) consider it as strongly representing cognitive and behavioral constructs. A second group of researchers considers trust as a bi-dimensional concept (Moorman et al., 1992; Morgan & Hant, 1994; Ganesan & Hess, 1997). A third group of researchers considers trust as a multidimensional concept. Gurviez & Korchia (2002) retained three dimensions (credibility, integrity, and benevolence), while Moorman et al. (1992) integrity, sincerity, and expertise.

Nevertheless, despite the vast number of studies devoted to trust, notably in management sciences, it remains difficult to define (Bonoma, 1976;). Morgan and Hunt (1994) justify trust and engagement as intermediary variables in their model on cooperative behavior. Additionally, Balliet and Van Lange (2013) recorded the size of conflict as proportional to trust, thus further revealing closer proximity between trust and cooperation. Furthermore, Kong et al. (2017) discuss the connection between predicting behavior using trust as a variable. Besides, evaluative reviews modeling the strengths and weaknesses of trust have critically synthesized trust covering twenty years (Akrouf & Akrouf, 2011). A summary is given in Table 1.

**Table 1. Trust dimensions**

The Discipline	Author	Dimensions of trust
Psycho-sociology: •	Larzelere and Houston, 1980	• Benevolence, Honesty, Seriousness
Interpersonal •	Johnson and Swap, 1982	• Loyalty, constancy, seriousness
relationships •	Rempel and al, 1985	• Personality traits, beliefs
Industrial Marketing •	Ganesan, 1994	• Credibility, benevolence
•	Swan et al., 1985	• Credibility, good intentions
•	Doney and Cannon, 1994	• Competence, coherence
•	Andaleeb, 1996	• dependence, reciprocity
Service Marketing •	Moorman et al., 1993	• Integrity, sincerity, expertise
•	Johnson and Grayson, 2005	• Cognitive and affective dimensions.
Relational Marketing •	Morgan and Hunt, 1994	• Integrity, reliability
		• Benevolence, Integrity

Sources: developed by the authors.

**Methodology and research methods.** Pressure from the competition and new economic challenges limit producers and retailers from developing their relationships and seeking a common ground for action. The relational approach heavily focuses on the key role that trust plays in an integrative negotiation between producers and retailers. In the study model, the two dimensions of Ganesan (1994) were retained, assuming that these dimensions might positively affect the conduct of integrative negotiation between producers and retailers. Trust favors exchanging information, reactivity, resolution of problems, and delegating responsibilities (Gundlach & Murphy, 1993). It is also considered an essential element of cooperation between distribution channel members (Sahay, 2003; Anderson and Narus, 1990; Anderson and Weitz, 1989). The results show that trust might increase the probability of reaching an agreement, making the negotiation process more pleasant (Lewicki, 1985). It is expected to affect the choice of the to-be-used negotiation strategy (Zarkada-Fraser and Fraser 2001). Indeed, trust is proposed as a major coordination tool for the firm to build stronger and longer relationships with its partners. It rests on concessions to reach

an eventual mutual agreement (Sahay, 2003). The main dimensions of trust are not easily identifiable when conceptualized in a causal model (Ehkalahiti, 2014). To formulate our hypotheses, we referred to the work of Ganesan (1994), who conceptualizes trust as the two fundamental dimensions of credibility and benevolence. Morgan and Hunt (1994) and Andaleeb (1995) agree with Ganesan (1994). Table 2 demonstrates our position to justify the uses of Ganesan's (1994) model due to the combination of perspectives it involved (Akrouit & Akrouit, 2011). Therefore, when the other perspective studies, as shown in Table 2, evaluate the uses of trust as causes and consequences, we synthesize the perspectives through the work of Ganesan (1994).

**Table 2. Causes and consequences of trust – a combination perspective**

No.	Perspective	Source
1	Causes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dyer and Chu, 2000</li> <li>• Robinson et al., 2013</li> </ul>
2	Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruyter et al., 2001</li> <li>• Morgan and Hunt, 1994</li> </ul>
3	Combined – causes and consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doney and Cannon, 1997</li> </ul>

Sources: developed by the authors.

H1: Credibility between producer and retailer impact positively the conduct of integrative negotiation.

H2: Benevolence between producer and retailer impact positively the conduct of integrative negotiation.

One of the ambitions of this study is to examine the exchange relationships binding retailers and producers through «integrative negotiation». Consequently, retailers must preserve positive customer relationships to expand their market share and profit margins. Hence, retailers and producers present an ideal opportunity for collecting data samples from them.

Theoretical hypotheses were defined according to a literature review; we then conducted a quantitative survey with an affirmative approach. Data collection was done using a questionnaire. The questionnaire includes 17 items that aim to measure the dimensions mentioned above. To this end, a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) allowed the elimination of 3 items representing the dimension «conduct of integrative negotiation» and to retain the two dimensions of trust. We ensured the respondents only responded to the items in the questionnaire to remove biases.

Sampling. The authors conducted our survey among two groups of respondents, producers, and retailers. The list of responders in the samples consisted of 856 producers, of which 30% responded. The 253 producers with more than 10 workers sustained relationships with retailers of more than 5 active years. As the list of producers was available, it supported retaining a stratified sampling procedure. The survey also asked the producers who their retailers were, which contributed to sampling the retailers for our second group in the food and retailing market. To test retailers' insight against our hypothesis, we sent our samples to 53 food retailing managers. The names were supplied by the producers that conducted transactions with them. The availability of a list of these producers was our basis for choosing this method. All technical terms were explained to the respondents when necessary.

Measures. To measure trust, the study cited the literature on relationships between companies. Under the exchange paradigm, trust is considered to be an important component of relationship quality and a determinant of the durability between sellers and buyers (Ganesan, 1994; Ganesan & Hess, 1997). It also contributes to building relationships between partners within a distribution network (Anderson & Weitz, 1989; Anderson & Narus, 1990; Morgan & Hunt, 1994, Gundlach & Murphy, 1993). Trust was measured using a two dimensions scale developed by Ganesan (1994). Indeed, basing ourselves on his work, we consider trust to consist of the two dimensions of credibility and benevolence.

The study used exploratory factor analysis, the PCA, in a preliminary analysis to purify the chosen scale. In this exploratory phase, 53 were interviewed on a five-point Likert scale, which has been proven to allow further comparison (Dawes, 2008). A PCA undertaken on this scale sorted out several items with high loadings over many factors, which indicates that these items are not dependent on one another.

The results obtained from the analysis show that the 8 items measuring trust are linked to two factors F1 and F2. The retained items indicate good reliability of the two dimensions of the trust scale (Cronbach Alpha = 0,777). The first main factor, which is neatly observed, is credibility. It explains 40.196% of the variance with a value of 3.216. The second factor is benevolence, which interestingly explains 33,240% of the variance with a value of 2,659. F1 and F2 explain together 73,436% of the variance. These results confirm that credibility and benevolence are two distinct dimensions, each representing a specific aspect of



trust. This strong correlation has already been observed by authors who conceptualized trust by the two dimensions of credibility and benevolence (Ganesan 1994). The following table presents the items retained to measure the two dimensions of trust.

**Table 3. Factor Analysis of the integrative negotiation scale**

Credibility	Cred 1: I trust him/her
	Cred 2: He made a lot of sacrifices in the past
	Cred 3: He avoids unserious offers
	Cred 4: He is perfectly honest with us
Benevolence	Benev 1: He is always benevolent with us
	Benev 2: He takes care of our interests
	Benev 3: We feel he is on our side
	Benev 4: He makes efforts in our favor

Sources: developed by the authors.

In conclusion, it was conducted a factor analysis with the PCA method and obtained two factors. The first factor includes Cred2, Cred3, Cred1, and Cred4, representing the first dimension of trust (credibility). The items representing the second dimension of trust are as follows: Benev1, Benev2, Benev3, and Benev4. After quantifying these two dimensions of trust, it will be possible to determine their effect on the conduct of integrative negotiation.

**Measurement Scale of the dependent variable: conduct of integrative negotiation.** Negotiation between producers and retailers is becoming a strategic concept. It is defined as a way of resolving a conflict between two or more parties because of concluding an acceptable mutual agreement (Debabi, 2009). Several researchers tried introducing behavioral variables in their models of producers' and retailers' relationships, like the sources of power model of Raven (2008), modified by Hunt and Nevin (1974). Although studies using scales to determine the variables representing negotiation are scarce, one cannot deny the contribution of some authors who intensified the interest in measuring negotiation during these two decades. The literature on negotiation placed an important interest in the notion of tension, which puts the negotiator into a dilemma between two strategies: cooperation and competition (Mnookin et al., 1996).

**Table 4. Items of integrative negotiation**

Neg1	The two parties negotiate with the flexibility to accommodate their respective interests.
Neg2	The two parties look for common grounds with a win-win perspective
Neg3	Negotiation with cooperation and integration contributes to resolving conflicts between two or more
Neg4	Nowadays, we agree on the shift from distributive negotiation to integrative negotiation.
Neg5	Your negotiations distinguish themselves by a constructive exchange of information.
Neg6	Integrative negotiation deactivates self-interest promoting win-win

Sources: developed by the authors.

Graham (1986) uses a five-point scale to measure the cooperative strategy to determine negotiators' perceptions. A PCA analyzes the same five-item scale. The results highlighted two dimensions with the following values: 3.395 and 1.540. The study proceeded to a preliminary analysis to eliminate the items with low factor loadings (0.5). Subsequently, item Neg 8 is eliminated. Neg 7 and Neg 9 presented very low correlation coefficients, below the 0.3 thresholds. Therefore, these items were eliminated from the integrative negotiation measurement scale. To improve the quality of items and explain the variance, the following three items (Neg 7, Neg 8, and Neg 9) have been eliminated, and a new PCA has been conducted. This second stage resulted in a single factor, which recovered more than 50% of the variance explained.

The results of the second stage yielded a single factor, which recovered more than 50% of the total explained variance above 1, i.e., 3.174. These results show that the integrative negotiation matrix is indeed factorial (KMO= 0.762, Bartlett's sphericity test obtained an adjusted Chi-square of 99.410 at P=0.000), and the factor loadings of each retained item are above 0.6, indicating a good statistical representation. Likewise, reliability analysis shows that the scale has good internal consistency. Cronbach's alpha is 0.810. These results show that the items of the integrative negotiation scale represent

this very well constructed and lead us to conclude the uni-dimensionality of the scale. The following table presents the items retained to measure the integrative negotiation.

**Table 5. Factor Analysis of the integrative negotiation scale after purification**

Items	KMO	Item Correlation with a total score	Components F1=52.907	Test of reliability of construct if item deleted
Neg4	0.761	0.732	0.846	0.745
Neg3	0.750	0.651	0.799	0.762
Neg1	0.810	0.585	0.750	0.779
Neg2	0.781	0.536	0.696	0.787
Neg5	0.798	0.503	0.642	0.799
Neg6	0.663	0.464	0.601	0.806
Appropriate values			3.174	
Alpha of Cronbach				0.810
Bartlett's Sphericity Test			Chi-square approximated	99.410
			Significance	0.000
KMO				0.762

Sources: developed by the authors.

**Results.** Measurement model. The first stage ensures our model's fit quality (Guiot 2002). To this end, using the structural equations method is basic. The results presented in Table 6 indicate that the fit coefficients of the model meet the standards. Before testing our hypotheses, model fit quality is estimated by a series of indices obtained by the Amos 4.0 software. Examination of three indexes (absolute, incremental, and parsimonious) allows the assessment of model fit quality.

**Table 6. Analysis of measurement model**

Indications	Obtained values	Key values
Absolute indices		
Chi-square or cmin	230.017	
Degrees of freedom	223	Otherwise
GFI	0.928	≥ 0.9
Agfi	0.911	≥ 0.9
Rmr	0.063	The closest to 0
Rmsea	0.011	<0.08 And if possible <0.05
Incremental indices		
NFI	0.905	≥ 0.9
Cfi	0.997	≥ 0.9
Tli	0.996	≥ 0.9
Ifi	0.997	≥ 0.9
Parsimonious indices		
Chi-square fitted to Degrees of freedom	1.031	The lowest possible between 1 and 2/3
Aic	336.017 (552.000 saturated models)	The lowest possible (compared to the saturated model)
Ecvi	1.333 (2.190 saturated models)	The lowest possible (compared to the saturated model)

Sources: developed by the authors.

- Measurement of absolute fit: RMSEA is well below 0.08; it approximates 0.011 and shows thus that the model fits the data correctly. AGFi approximates 1 (0.928 in our case), indicating good fit quality.
- Incremental indices: The different incremental indices indicate acceptable model fit. Incremental indices coefficients (NFI, CFI, TLI, IFI) are neatly below the threshold of 0.9.

– Parsimonious indices: The different parsimonious indices point to an acceptable model fit. The comparative indices are very satisfactory. The adjusted Chi-square with degrees of freedom of 1.031 satisfies the condition of a good fit with values between 1 and 2.13. In conclusion, the different indices show that the model represents the data very well.

Hypothesis testing. Testing Hypotheses according to producers' perspective. This stage essentially consists of checking the relationships' significance between the latent variables and thus testing our research hypotheses. To this effect, by applying the t-test, we compare the theoretical value and the computed value. This latter should be above the theoretical value ( $t = 1.96$ ) to accept or reject our hypotheses. Table 7 summarizes the obtained results:

**Table 7. The research hypotheses**

	Hypothesis	t-student Test	Significance of t	Validation of hypotheses
Credibility → Conducting integrative negotiation	H 1	2,171	Significant	Retained
Benevolence → Conducting integrative negotiation	H 2	- 1,425	Insignificant	Rejected

Sources: developed by the authors.

The results (Table 7) mentioned the relationship causality effect is satisfying. Indeed, the significance of the relationship between credibility and the conduct of integrative negotiation was noted. However, the relationship between benevolence and conduct of integrative negotiation is insignificant «rejected» (computed  $t = -1.425$  and therefore  $<1.96$ ).

Testing hypotheses according to retailers' perspectives. The sample of the retailers consists of 53 individuals. We then opted for regression analysis, which is theoretically appropriate for the sample size. The results of the regression model are reported in Table 8.

**Table 8. Model fit quality (retailers' sample)**

Multiple correlation Coefficient (R)	0,815
Coefficient of determination (R <sup>2</sup> )	0,664
Adjusted Coefficient of determination (adjusted R <sup>2</sup> )	0,636
Standard Error of Estimate	3,492
F value	23,723
Significance of F	0,000
Number of individuals	53

Sources: developed by the authors.

According to these results, we can conclude that model fit quality is satisfactory and that the model might represent an integrative negotiation concept. 63 % of the variance of integrative negotiation is explained by the independent variables (credibility and benevolence). According to the regression results, shown in Table 9, we note that the hypothesis linking credibility and conduct of integrative negotiation according to retailers' perspective is retained. Yet, the hypothesis of the positive influence of benevolence over integrative negotiation as perceived by retailers is rejected. Then, we can conclude that there is a «perceptual convergence» between the two groups regarding the impact of the two dimensions of trust, «credibility and benevolence», over integrative negotiation.

**Table 9. Impact of benevolence and credibility over the conduct of integrative negotiation (retailer's perception)**

Independent Variables	Non-standardized regression coefficient (B)	standardized regression coefficient (Beta)	T-Student Test (test significance)	Simple correlation coefficient
		Variables included in the regression equation		
Credibility	0.438	0.328	2.868 (0,006) *	0.706
		Variables excluded from the regression equation		
Benevolence	0,303	0.119	1.357 (0.181) ns	0.296

\* indicates that the parameters are significant under 1%. n.s: indicates that the parameters are not significant.

Sources: developed by the authors.

These data findings demonstrate trust impacts positively and directly integrative negotiation. The results suggest to build integrative and cooperative negotiations between producers and retailers depends on the degree of trust between them. Furthermore, it shows producers and retailers continue their relationship depending on credibility as one will attempt to reduce the perceived risk in the relationship by selecting a supplier that is performing credibly (Ganesan, 1994). It also shapes the approach toward negotiating and contracting (Friman et al., 2002).

The topic of negotiation and trust is generating a growing interest in marketing and organizational studies. Previous research found that trust positively relates to negotiation between producers and retailers. However, the validity of this assumption is questionable because trust has been operationalized in many different ways. For example, prior research did not distinguish between the impact of the dimensions of trust (credibility and benevolence) on the conduct of integrative negotiation.

The main objective of this study was to determine the impact of trust (considered a bi-dimensional construct in terms of benevolence and credibility) on the conduct of integrative negotiation. The results of the dyadic-based empirical study showed that the two sides of the relationship (producers and retailers) had the same perception of the impact of credibility and benevolence over the conduct of integrative negotiation. The results indicate the relevance of studying trust in the retailing sector.

*Managerial implication.* The contribution of this study is the proposed model, which shall help producers and retailers better succeed in an integrative business negotiation. Indeed, retailers, who are more powerful than producers, perceive negotiation as a tool, allowing them to exert a form of influence over suppliers to gain better results. The elaborated model and the results of the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) of producers' and retailers' perceptions indicated that the «credibility» dimension had a positive impact on the conduct of integrative negotiation and, consequently, they allowed concluding of a «perceptual convergence» between retailers and producers. Managers can thus better succeed in their negotiations once they consider this dimension. At this level, new research perspectives are possible. In addition, PRs can build, develop or even repair trust to have the benefits mentioned above incurred from it in a relationship (Lewicki 2006).

However, the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) results of producers' and retailers' perceptions indicate that the relationship between benevolence and the conduct of integrative negotiation is not significant. Nonetheless, there is a conceptual lack of clarity in the definitions of trust (Gefen et al., 2003b; McKnight et al., 2002); it is then worth mentioning that the results partially contribute to the credibility dimension of trust defined by others in Table 1.

**Conclusions.** This research has some limitations. First, this research focuses on the producers' and retailers' perceptions of trust relationships and integrative negotiation building. Producers and retailers may have different perceptions of other psychometric variables, such as dependence and commitment, leading to different outcome expectations. Thus, future research should investigate the impact of such differences between the producer and retailer perceptions on the effects observed in this research. Second, the main limitation of this research relates to the difference between sample sizes. For the producers, it was relatively easy to interview an important number of managers in the purchase and negotiation department (253 individuals), given that retailers deal with hundreds of suppliers. However, only 53 purchasing managers could be approached for retailers because of the limited number of shopping centers and large hypermarkets. Thirdly, this study uses producers and retailers of food as samples. Future research can examine the proposed model in other industries because producer and retailer relationship maintenance factors and methods may vary in industries such as services, telecommunications, or high-tech industries.

**Conflicts of Interest:** Authors declare no conflict of interest.

**Data Availability Statement:** Not applicable.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable.

## References

Aastrup, J., Grant, D. M., & Bjerre, M. (2007). Value Creation and Category Management through Retailer–Supplier Relationships. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 17(5), 523-541. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Akrout, H., & Akrou, W. (2007). Interpersonal trust in BTB buyer/supplier relationship: An empirical study of French industrial sector. In *Proceedings of the 23rd IMP Conference: Exploiting the B2B knowledge network: New perspectives and core concepts*. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)

Akrout, W., & Akrou, H. (2011). Trust in B-to-B: Toward a dynamic and integrative approach. *Recherche*



et Applications en Marketing (English Edition), 26(1), 1-21. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Andaleeb, S. S. (1995). Dependence relations and the moderating role of trust: implications for behavioral intentions in marketing channels. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 12(2), 157-172. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Andaleeb, S. S. (1996). An experimental investigation of satisfaction and commitment in marketing channels: the role of trust and dependence. *Journal of retailing*, 72(1), 77-93. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Anderson, E., & Weitz, B. (1989). Determinants of continuity in conventional industrial channel dyads. *Marketing science*, 8(4), 310-323. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Anderson, E., & Weitz, B. (1992). The use of pledges to build and sustain commitment in distribution channels. *Journal of marketing research*, 29(1), 18-34. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Anderson, J. C., & Narus, J. A. (1990). A model of distributor firm and manufacturer firm working partnerships. *Journal of marketing*, 54(1), 42-58. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Ashnai, B., Henneberg, S. C., Naudé, P., & Francescucci, A. (2016). Inter-personal and inter-organizational trust in business relationships: An attitude–behavior–outcome model. *Industrial marketing management*, 52, 128-139. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Balliet, D., & Van Lange, P. A. (2013). Trust, conflict, and cooperation: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 139(5), 1090. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)

Bazerman, M. H., & Lewicki, R. J. (1985). Contemporary research directions in the study of negotiations in organizations: A selective overview. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 6(1), 1-17. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)

Bonoma, T. V. (1976). Conflict, cooperation and trust in three power systems. *Behavioral Science*, 21(6), 499-514. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Chadwick, S., & Burton, N. (2011). The evolving sophistication of ambush marketing: A typology of strategies. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 53(6), 709-719. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Colgate, M. R., & Danaher, P. J. (2000). Implementing a customer relationship strategy: The asymmetric impact of poor versus excellent execution. *Journal of the Academy of marketing Science*, 28(3), 375-387. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Dawes, J. (2008). Do data characteristics change according to the number of scale points used? An experiment using 5-point, 7-point and 10-point scales. *International journal of market research*, 50(1), 61-104. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Debabi, M. (2009). Dimensions intégratives et distributives de la négociation entre producteurs et distributeurs. *La Revue des Sciences de Gestion*, (3\_4), 105-112. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Diouri, M. (1999). la négociation : Concepts & Pratiques. *les éditions Toubkal*.

Doney, P. M., & Cannon, J. P. (1997). An examination of the nature of trust in buyer–seller relationships. *Journal of marketing*, 61(2), 35-51. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Dupont, C. (1994). *La négociation: conduite, théorie, applications* (Vol. 19). Paris: Dalloz. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)

Dwyer, F. R., Schurr, P. H., & Oh, S. (1987). Developing buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of marketing*, 51(2), 11-27. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Dyer, J. H., & Chu, W. (2000). The Determinants of Trust in Supplier-Automaker Relationships in the U.S., Japan and Korea. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 31(2), 259-285. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Ehkalahiti, K. (2014). Structural Equation Modeling with Mplus: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming by Barbara M. Byrne. *International Statistical Review*, 82(1), 141-142.

Fornell, C. (1992). A national customer satisfaction barometer: The Swedish experience. *Journal of marketing*, 56(1), 6-21. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Frazier, G. L., & Summers, J. O. (1984). Interfirm influence strategies and their application within distribution channels. *Journal of Marketing*, 48(3), 43-55. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Friman, M., Gärling, T., Millett, B., Mattsson, J., & Johnston, R. J. (2002). An analysis of international business-to-business relationships based on the Commitment–Trust theory. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 31(5), 403-409. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Ganesan, S. (1994). Determinants of long-term orientation in buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of marketing*, 58(2), 1-19. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Ganesan, S., & Hess, R. (1997). Dimensions and levels of trust: implications for commitment to a relationship. *Marketing letters*, 8, 439-448. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Garbarino, E., & Johnson, M. S. (1999). The different roles of satisfaction, trust, and commitment in customer relationships. *Journal of marketing*, 63(2), 70-87. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Gefen, D., Karahanna, E., & Straub, D. W. (2003). Trust and TAM in online shopping: An integrated model. *MIS quarterly*, 51-90. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Geiger, R. L. (Ed.). (2017). *Iconic Leaders in Higher Education*. Routledge. [[Google Scholar](#)]
- Graham, J. W. (1986). Principled Organizational Dissent: A Theoretical Essay. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8, 1-52
- Guiot, D. (2002). Méthodes d'équations structurelles: recherche et applications en gestion. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing*, 17(3), 109. [[Google Scholar](#)]
- Gundlach, G. T., & Murphy, P. E. (1993). Ethical and legal foundations of relational marketing exchanges. *Journal of marketing*, 57(4), 35-46. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Gurviez, P., & Korchia, M. (2002). Proposition d'une échelle de mesure multidimensionnelle de la confiance dans la marque. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (French Edition)*, 17(3), 41-61. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Haase, H., & Franco, M. (2011). Information sources for environmental scanning: do industry and firm size matter?. *Management Decision*, 49(10), 1642-1657. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Hair, J. F. A. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis with readings*, Joseph F. Hair, Rolph Anderson, Ronald L. Tatham, William C. Black.
- Haucap, J., Rasch, A., & Stiebale, J. (2019). How mergers affect innovation: Theory and evidence. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 63, 283-325. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Helies-Hassid, M. L. (2002). Bibliographie: La distribution: organisation et stratégie, Management de la distribution. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (French Edition)*, 17(2), 111-113. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Hunt, S. D., & Nevin, J. R. (1974). Power in a channel of distribution: sources and consequences. *Journal of marketing Research*, 11(2), 186-193. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Johnson, D., & Grayson, K. (2005). Cognitive and affective trust in service relationships. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(4), 500-507. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Johnson-George C. et Swap W. C. (1982), Measurement of Specific Interpersonal Trust : Construction and Validation of a Scale to Assess Trust in a Specific Other, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 43, 6.
- Katz, H. (2015). Reflections on trust in negotiations. *Negot. J.*, 31, 355. [[Google Scholar](#)]
- Kong, D. T., Lount Jr, R. B., Olekalns, M., & Ferrin, D. L. (2017). Advancing the scientific understanding of trust in the contexts of negotiations and repeated bargaining. *Journal of Trust Research*, 7(1), 15-21. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Krafft, M., Goetz, O., Mantrala, M., Sotgiu, F., & Tillmanns, S. (2015). The evolution of marketing channel research domains and methodologies: an integrative review and future directions. *Journal of retailing*, 91(4), 569-585. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Larzelere R. et Huston T. (1980), The Dyadic Trust Scale : Toward Understanding Interpersonal Trust in Close Relationship, *Journal of Marketing and The Family*, and August.
- Lewicki, R. J. (1985). Whither Productive Conflict? *Contemporary Psychology: A Journal of Reviews*, 30(10), 810-811.
- Macquin, A. (1998). La négociation. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (French Edition)*, 13(1), 67-88. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of management review*, 20(3), 709-734. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- McKnight, D. H., Choudhury, V., & Kacmar, C. (2002). The impact of initial consumer trust on intentions to transact with a web site: a trust building model. *The journal of strategic information systems*, 11(3-4), 297-323. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Mnookin, R. H., Peppet, S. R., & Tulumello, A. S. (1996). The tension between empathy and assertiveness. *Negotiation Journal*, 12(3), 217-230. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Moorman C., Deshpande R. et Zaltman G. (1993), Factors Affecting Trust in Market Research Relationships, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57.
- Moorman, C., Zaltman, G., & Deshpande, R. (1992). Relationships between providers and users of market research: The dynamics of trust within and between organizations. *Journal of marketing research*, 29(3), 314-328. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]
- Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of marketing*, 58(3), 20-38. [[Google Scholar](#)] [[CrossRef](#)]

- Parson, E. A. (2003). *Protecting the ozone layer: science and strategy*. Oxford University Press. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
- Rahmoun, M., & Debabi, M. (2012). Dependence and commitment: Main determinants of negotiation between suppliers and retailers. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 4(3), 100. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
- Raven, B. H. (2008). The Bases of Power and the Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 8(1), 1-22. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Razzaque, M. S. (2003). Effects of Dependence and Trust on Channel Satisfaction, Commitment and Cooperation. *Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing*, 10(4), 23-48. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Reardon, T., & Timmer, C. P. (2012). The economics of the food system revolution. *Annu. Rev. Resour. Econ.*, 4(1), 225-264. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
- Rempel J. K., Holmes J. G. et Zanna M. P. (1985), Trust in Close Relationships, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 49, 1.
- Robinson, L. G., Marshall, G. W., Moncrief, W. C., & Lassk, F. G. (2013). Toward a Shortened Measure of Adaptive Selling. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 22(2), 111-118. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- De Ruyter, K., Wetzels, M., & Kleijnen, M. (2001). Customer adoption of e-service: an experimental study. *International journal of service industry management*, 12(2), 184-207. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Sahay, B. (2003). Supply chain collaboration: the key to value creation. *Work Study*, 52(2), 76-83. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Sheu, C., Yen, H. R., & Krumwiede, D. (2003). The effect of national differences on multinational ERP implementation: An exploratory study. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 14(6), 641-657. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Srinivasan, R., & Moorman, C. (2005). Strategic firm commitments and rewards for customer relationship management in online retailing. *Journal of marketing*, 69(4), 193-200. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Uлага, W., & Eggert, A. (2006). Value-Based Differentiation in Business Relationships: Gaining and Sustaining Key Supplier Status. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(1), 119-136. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Zarkada-Fraser, A., & Fraser, C. (2001). Moral decision making in international sales negotiations. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 16(4), 274-293. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Zartman, I. W. (2004). Concevoir la théorie de la négociation en tant qu'approche de résolution de conflits économiques. *Revue française de gestion*, 153(6), 15-27. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)

**Мбарек Рахмун**, Dr., Ph.D., Карфагенський університет, Туніс

**Мохамед Алсагаф**, Dr., Ph.D., Університет короля Абдулазіза, Саудівська Аравія

**Ахмад Мосстафа Абдельтаваб**, Dr., Ph.D., Школа менеджменту ESSCA, Франція

**Абдулла Ажарі**, Dr., Ph.D., Університет короля Абдулазіза, Саудівська Аравія

**Махране Хофайдхлайі**, Dr., Ph.D., Школа менеджменту ESSCA, Франція

#### **Ефективність ведення переговорів на ринку B2B: вплив доброзичливості та довіри**

Метою статті є визначення впливу доброзичливості та довіри на ведення переговорів між виробниками та дистриб'юторами на ринках B2B. Методичним інструментарієм проведеного дослідження стали методи регресійного та факторного аналізу. Вихідні дані дослідження сформовано на основі результатів опитування 253 виробників та 53 дистриб'юторів. Дослідження емпірично підтверджує та теоретично доводить наявність конвергенції між рівнями сприйняття виробників та дистриб'юторів. Результати емпіричного аналізу засвідчили значний позитивний вплив довіри на інтегративну та кооперативну поведінку ведення переговорів, тоді як причинно-наслідковий зв'язок між доброзичливістю, інтегративною та кооперативною поведінкою в переговорах є незначним. Результати регресійного аналізу підтвердили відсутність позитивного впливу доброзичливості, як індикатора довіри, на інтегративну та кооперативну поведінку в переговорах. Отримані результати дослідження засвідчили, що довіра позитивно впливає на проведення інтеграційних переговорів. Результати факторного аналізу на основі головних компонент сприйняття виробників та дистриб'юторів вказують на незначний зв'язок між доброзичливістю та веденням інтегративних переговорів. Запропоновано будувати інтеграційні та кооперативні переговори між виробниками та дистриб'юторами залежно від ступеня довіри між ними. Отримані результати доповнюють теоретичні положення і методико-практичних рекомендацій щодо маркетингової комунікативної діяльності на ринках B2B. Результати проведеного дослідження можуть бути корисними для виробників та дистриб'юторів при побудові маркетингової комунікаційної стратегії. При цьому результати дослідження мають більший значний ефект на комунікаційну стратегію дистриб'юторів, які, порівняно із виробниками, результат діяльності яких є більш залежними від ефективності ведення переговорів. Результати дослідження мають практичне значення та можуть бути прийняті до уваги менеджерами при проведенні ефективних переговорів.

**Ключові слова:** кооперація, переговори, виробники, ритейлери, постачальники, довіра.