

Trust Building Problems in Business Negotiations and Business Meetings: Interference, Stereotypes, Trust Substitutes

Kęstutis Peleckis¹, Valentina Peleckienė² & Kęstutis Peleckis³

Abstract

The article deals with the problems of confidence building in business negotiations and business meetings. It analyzes the confidence interference, stereotypes and substitutes. At the beginning of business negotiations and business meetings interlocutors are trying to decipher and understand their opponents, seeing to each other under the external image. Impressions that arise in monitoring the appearance of the interlocutor, is of great importance. First of all, it should be noted that negotiator knowing his opponent, improves himself, since he is improving his cognitive powers. On the other hand, cognitive accuracy, disclosure of internal essence of interlocutors, determines course and future results of the business meetings and business negotiations. When trying to understand the opponent or interlocutor opinion formed in advance has a very great influence. This determines how information will be accepted and interpreted. Confidence plays a positive impact on the relations in negotiating group of representative organization, on relations with other negotiating side. It liberates and mobilizes the actions of negotiator, encourages creative, innovative activity with other people, reduces uncertainty and risk, and increases possible options for action. Trust is necessary to feel that negotiating partner or interlocutor betray us, to tune working together and to plan it, to venture intentionally, to communicate securely.

Keywords: trust, trust interference, stereotypes, trust substitutes, interpersonal communication.

Introduction

All business negotiations and business meetings are associated with risk. Therefore trust in the other side of negotiations is very important. The absence of trust consists of a vacuum, which necessarily fills the alternative structure. Negotiators often will say that they are willing to negotiate honestly, but sometimes talks could collapse because each of negotiations side lack confidence on the other side of negotiations, its competence or good intentions. If one of the negotiating parties, perhaps, would like to make a concession, discount or share sensitive information in exchange for the expectation of concessions or compromise of another side of negotiations, but there is always the risk that the other side will refuse to concede, or worse - will use information obtained in his favor. Confidence is particularly weak when there is no information, when negotiating with strangers, whose bargaining power and status are greater. Confidence can occur naturally over time, but negotiators rarely have such opportunities. So sometimes it seems that the easiest way to negotiate is not risking, safely, cautiously, making agreement with a number of compromises, concessions and with exchange of some kind information. However, in order to avoid risks we can lose enormous opportunities and not to achieve optimal results.

¹ Vilniaus Gedimino technikos universitetas, Saulėtekio av.11, LT-10223 Vilnius-40, Lietuva

² Vilniaus Gedimino technikos universitetas, Saulėtekio av.11, LT-10223 Vilnius-40, Lietuva

³ Vilniaus Gedimino technikos universitetas, Saulėtekio av.11, LT-10223 Vilnius-40, Lietuva

The problem - The lack of confidence or excessive confidence in the other side of negotiations can become essential obstacle for achieving optimal results of the negotiations.

The object of research - the creation of confidence is associated with various obstacles, stereotypes, substitutes.

The aim - reveal major obstacles of negotiator confidence in the other side of the negotiations stereotypes, substitutes and to propose measures to overcome them.

Research methods - systematic, comparative, logical analysis and synthesis of scientific literature.

2. Start and possible interference of mutual understanding in business negotiations and business meetings

Beginning of business negotiations and business meetings starts with perception (*lat. perceptio*), process between interlocutors, opponents. It is a process in which the interlocutors are looking each other and from external view are trying to decipher and to understand their opponent. Impressions that arise by monitoring interlocutor's appearance play an important regulatory role (Bonn et al. 2014). First of all, it should be noted that negotiator knowing his opponent, improves himself, since he is improving his cognitive powers. On the other hand, cognitive accuracy, disclosure of the interlocutors internal essence, determines course and future results of the business meetings and business negotiations (Zhang *et al.* 2014). Research shows that the perception of interlocutor is different depending on whether we see him for the first time, or whether we are already familiar and have communicated before. It was found that in the meeting with a stranger are activated **intergroup communication mechanisms** and in communicating with familiar interface - are activated **rules of interpersonal communication**.

Intergroup communication mechanisms include processes of social stereotypes that are based on the fact that image of other person (in this case, the interviewer) is created in accordance with one or two typical schemes.

Social stereotype - a simplified, schematic, often distorted domestic point of view about any social object (group of man belonging to any society, and other). Various social groups, people communicating with each other, create certain social stereotypes. These stereotypes rarely occur from personal experience, people usually pick them up from their parents in childhood, from teachers, out of the group that owns, from the mass media sources. Stereotypes wear off, become blurred if people from the different groups start to cooperate more closely, learn more about each other, seeking common goals (Tu 2013, 2014). Well-known ethnic or national (ethnic) stereotypes are, for example, that the English are very polite, the Germans - pedantic, French - are light, Russians - wide, unpredictable soul people, and so on. Thus, the image of the interviewer, negotiation opponent is formed on the basis of stereotypes. How much is an accurate first impression of stereotypical image is complex issue. On the one hand, almost everyone adult, having an experience, can quite accurately under clothing, language, manners, behavior to describe his interviewer characteristics: psychological characteristics, age, social class, profession. However, it works most accurately on neutral situations, while in other, when people are interested in each other, higher or lower potential errors. And if the people (in this case the negotiators, the interlocutors, opponents) are more interested in each other - the higher is the probability of error (Gunia et al. 2014).

The perception of interviewer and possible errors of perception are determined by the following factors: **superiority, attractiveness and approach to us**.

Participants of business communication and business negotiations generally are not completely equal: they differ in their social status, life experience, intelligence and so on. The inequality of interlocutors and opponents, leads to perceptual errors resulting from the **advantage factor**.

This scheme is as follows: when we meet someone with some kind of advantage, we tend to assess him more positively than in the case if we would be equal in accordance with that parameter. On the contrary - if we have certain advantages against our interviewer, we underrate him and transfer our advantages to other our properties (parameters). Thus, the advantage is fixed by one parameter only, and self-overestimation (or underestimating) is moved to many properties. However, this scheme is activated only in case if there is significant advantage (Elahee, Brooks 2004; Fells 1993). How is determined advantage of other person, what criteria can be used? When we meet him for the first time, information about the participant provides: a) the clothing, the overall human image (glasses, hairstyle, jewelry); b) car, office equipment; c) behavior, manners (such as sitting, walking, language, etc.).

Attractiveness factor occurs when we evaluate the exterior - we like or do not like the other person. If we like him, we tend to keep him smarter, better, more interesting, and so on. Thus we overestimate many characteristics of the interviewer.

Approach to us factor works as follows: if the interviewer appreciates us very well, so we will evaluate him better. If the opinions and attitudes of interlocutors overlap more, the better they assess each other.

When we communicate with somebody who is already familiar - appear these interpersonal communication mechanisms: **identification, empathy and reflection**. **Identification** in business negotiations and business meetings - this is an unconscious identification with negotiator. In the case of **identification** interlocutor inserts himself mentally into the opponent's position and decides how he would behave in such a situation. Very close identification is empathy, that is, the ability to feel existence of the interlocutor, to empathize with his feelings, to enter into his inner world, to accept him all with his feelings and thoughts. Empathetic person knows how to understand others, interest in each other, to be tolerant. There are three forms of empathy: a) **emotional empathy** that is based on the projection, the ability to imitate motor and emotional reactions of another person; b) **cognitive empathy** that is based on intellectual mental processes: the search for analogies, comparison, etc.; c) **prediction empathy**, characterized by as a human's ability to anticipate another person's emotional reactions in specific situations. **Reflection** in business negotiations or business meetings is the understanding of interviewers as well as the perception of opponents. The phenomenon of reflection in business communication explains well the mirror "I" concept - that's "I", which, in my opinion I am perceived by other people. Meanwhile, the content of the actual or real "I" indicates what does the person see about himself in fact, without embellishment - capacity physical and moral qualities, behavioral goals and motives. Demonstrative "I" - is the "I" part, which we think is the best representing us. **This demonstrative "I" is beautified** with all kinds of ways and it means that person will present himself to others so as to create a favorable impression, align his behavior with interviewer desires, circumstances and environments requirements.

The main factors, which rarely help, but in most cases only hinder to understand and evaluate correctly each other in business meetings, can be grouped as follows:

1. **Preliminary** (in respect of interviewer) **estimates, beliefs, attitudes**, which are derived from certain sources before the start of the business meeting. For example: „He came from Norway? So we will be uninteresting to him really, he will keep us as second-class human beings" or „And what can you say for me, with your ten year work experience, for the man, who has forty year work experience in this system? "
2. **Formed stereotype**, according to which the interviewer is assigned to a particular category of persons and those properties are sought showing the dependence precisely to that group. For example: „He reminds me the drug dealer from Gypsy encampment - I do not think we will begin with him."
3. **Seeking to make too early conclusions** about the personality of interviewer before obtaining complete and reliable information. Some people just meeting someone are making conclusions about him immediately. For example: „Well, a man with such a face, and yet with nose rings, can't achieve anything in our area."
4. **Irresponsible** structuring of the other person's personality, mean that the overall picture of the interviewer includes only certain properties, and other features are rejected.
5. **The Halo Effect**: it is created integral image on the interlocutor, by a certain property and then according to this image are assessed all his other properties. If the first overall impression is good, then some other his characteristics are assessed positively. Conversely, if the overall impression on the participant is bad, then even his doings that are good and noble are not noticeable, or seen as self-serving.
6. **Projection effect** arises where the interviewer is assigned the own characteristics and emotional functioning by analogy. A man according himself understands and appreciates the participant, based on the following logic: "All people are like me," or "All people are different than am I." A person, who is stubborn and suspicious, tends to see the same qualities in others also, while objectively they do not exist. Kind, helpful, honest man, in contrast, may look to an unfamiliar interlocutor through rose-tinted glasses and sorely be mistaken. Therefore, when a man complains that everyone around him is cruel, greedy, unscrupulous, it may be that he decides by oneself.

7. **Priority effect:** when the first information on the interlocutor, which is heard or seen, is very important and becomes entrenched in mind so much that can affect the entire communication time with this person. And even if later will be received information contradicting the original, it nevertheless will be remembered, appreciated and will be taken into account.
8. **The mood of perceiver** influences perception of interviewer: if it is bad (because of poor well-being, health, etc.), then the first impression on interviewer will be negative. In order to obtain an objective impression of the interviewer needs to be disposed.
9. Lack of desire and habits of listening to other people's opinions, always takes into consideration only personal impressions.
10. Over time does not change the perceptions and evaluations, while for different reasons many things are changed. This is the case when there remains unchanged once created perception or conclusions about the man, while there a lot of new information.
11. Latest information effect: when the last received adverse information on the interlocutor wipes all previous information.

Understanding and build trust with opponent, interlocutor is very strongly influenced by the pre-create perception. This determines how the recipient accepts and interprets information. Even human facial image can be perceived differently, depending on what you know on him for example: Is he the president of a far country? Is he criminal? Whether he is manager of the bankrupt bank? Is he discus throw champion? Experiments have shown that it is very difficult to deny wrong thoughts and the lie if the other person this justifies logically. This phenomenon (called belief sustainability) shows that beliefs can live their lives and they can survive even after destruction of the evidence. So misperception about other people or themselves may continue to survive and exist, despite disrepute. To change views are needed much stronger proof, arguments nor to create them (Van Kleef et al., 2006; Kong et al., 2014).

Already at the beginning of the business negotiation, business meeting with the interviewer it is very important to be able to take off the mask, to be open and sincere. In an open, honest communication it is impossible the trust worthy relationship. In order to better understand your business relationships characteristics with other human we have to take interest what is his reaction, what are your own deeds in specific situations, to evaluate the real consequences of your behavior, expressions. With this information - how we perceive, understand, evaluate - from different people we can see ourselves in several different mirrors and modify the behavior in further stages of the business relationship in the right direction, avoiding difficulties, confidence-building problems at the beginning of conversation (Lewicki 2006; Lennane, Weidner 2006).

What are characteristics which man emphasize and exaggerate, when he seeks to create a credible human image for surroundings? It appears that most we want to appear nice, friendly and sincere, understanding and polite, intelligent and talented, energetic, hardy, able to do everything on time as required. We also want to look honest, tolerant and even altruistic, temperate and modest, that we should be more reliable (Ross, LaCroix 1996; Sinaceur 2010).

Creating trust often gets indulging, insinuation, the interviewer praise direct or indirect approval of his opinion. If this behavior is successful, other people become enthusiastic with person, who is seeking favor, not because of the specific features and characteristics, but because of his behavior. Research shows that trust is created by the following:

1. Responsiveness to other people, taking into account their views, needs and interests;
2. Ambient pleasing behavior, though it would be contrary to your own beliefs or values;
3. Showing of respect and sympathy, but do not overdo praising as well as complimenting words;
4. The aid proposal, the provision of services;
5. Approval the opinion of the surrounding (or more);
6. The demonstration of such properties, which are assessed around and hiding those that can be evaluated negatively.

One can predict that in doing so, person must be very careful, because other people can see his behavior as a manipulation. To create and maintain confidence is necessary communication and willingness to cooperate between the relations of two (or more) participants. If one side will be inclined to trust only and the other indiscriminately will seek their goals alone, after one naive trust case will come ... distrust.

The importance of trust or distrust intensifies when two people or groups are functionally dependent, and any process error can harm them both or whole group. For trust building in business negotiations and business talks are essential the following components:

- the ability to trust (which includes all the life experience of both sides of the negotiations, which formed the ability of its members and willingness to risk by relying on others);
- perception of your and the opponent's competence (your negotiating team), evaluation of skills to compete in the current circumstances, evaluation of the opponent's (the opponent's negotiating team) capacity to compete;
- perception of the intentions of negotiators, opponents (your understanding that opponents actions, words, missions and decisions are influenced by companies, he represents rather than the opponents motives).

3. Trust substitutes and antidotes to overcome them

When confidence in business communication is busted, confidence appears in other alternative things. Do you trust in police? This is useful for private detectives agencies. You do not trust the doctors? Probably you trust more in mother, herbal tufts from neighbors or extrasensory diagnosis. Are you unsure about your appearance? You trust hairdressers, stylists, designers and friends who know how to make compliments and convince them that "now under your feet the whole world, what do you want, this you will get." Some trust substitutes are ineffective, even - harmful to personality development and negotiations. What does exchange our trust? In interpersonal communication are relevant such trust substitutes:

1. As fated destiny - this is one of the reactions that can reduce anxiety and fear somewhat, but occurring in passivity and stagnation, in decrease of individual responsibility, it is a regression. The supernatural or metaphysical force - fate, god, nature, space, death, world order - are out of control and unmanaged, so for us for small folks remains the exception to wait and see what happens.

Possible antidotes for reaction "as fated destiny" are currently in direct communication:

- Try to offer for the interviewer who constantly complains and moans that he is bad to change anything in the existing unfavorable situation. A man who believes in destiny or in any other irreplaceable thing would rather find a different listener, but will not leave his suffering agent and will not change situation.
- Firmly tell your opinion that you are not going to wait until the problem will be solved itself and ask whether the interviewer will contribute to you or will continue to wait passively a finger of fate.
- Agree with the interviewer that it is possible to wait and do nothing. Then ask him whether that waiting will help to feel secure and calmly?

2. Corruption or bribery - other confidence substitute that can cause the feeling that this chaos in which we live, we can control, that is, that gifts for some significant people can ensure their grace and privilege in our respect. Natural relationships are converted to useful contacts in return for the bribe giver and receiver, into mutual manipulation and exploitation.

Possible antidotes for corruption, bribery case:

- Directly and explicitly tell that in your organization, in system and in your society such things can't be and will not be, therefore you will not discuss either now or at a later date.
- Repeat again and specify the information that will help the person, who gives a "gift", to achieve his goals legally and without extra costs, such as: "Desired duties you will get when the necessary documents you will transmit to the personnel department and will win the competition."
- If the requests and requirements are repeated, use method of blocked plate: Repeat - this topic have nothing more to add and ask, "What else can I help you?", "What information do you still need?"
- If the request is repeated obsessively and do not stop, you can respectfully to send off interlocutor and take the next question, thus paving that bribery theme - exhausted and will not return to it.

3. Excessive alertness, harassment. If the negotiating partners do not trust each other, shaking hands are no longer enough - they are concluding excessively detailed agreements, adding even some jurists insisting guarantees and compensation after breaking the agreement with partner.

It may seem that if somebody monitors suspiciously all around, in afraid that he will be deceived, he can lose any spontaneity and joy of life. But it must be respected, such picky protection of negotiating partner - perhaps previous experience of this man requires to hedge against unexpected events, perhaps may be it is a requirement of his superiors, perhaps just for you, this agreement seems shoddy, and to another person – may be it is almost life and death question, for example, in case if he is a novice in the organization and is trying to establish itself and maintain positions.

Possible antidotes for exaggerated vigilance, harassment:

- Accept that you can gain credibility not immediately. In advance determine as many possible contradictions. Prepare for the meeting more than ever before. Introduce gradually the new ideas or changes in terms of the contract, contradictions can be just delaying tactic, the usual resistance to change or interviewer's personality characteristic, so do not take suspicions of dishonesty as a personal attack.
- If the negotiator openly expresses distrust encourage him to substantiate the allegations with the facts. Ask to lay out clear facts that cause mistrust, by providing examples and the dates.
- Make sure that you allow to speak. After a pause, when the alert speaker stops to breathe the air and say, "I'd say your opinion - is there anything else I should know before?"
- Take care that you will enable to speak. After a pause, when the alert speaker stops to breathe the air say, "I'd say my opinion - is there anything else I should know before?"
- Show respect for alert and cautious person evaluating these valuable properties. Use words that imply respect to interviewer's awareness: "As you know... , you guessed it... , you have already dealt with ...".
- For suspected interviewer keep in analysis data. Refer to rules, regulations, statutes and procedural references, manuals, statistics, certifications, quality standards, and all other possible data.
- Ask openly this vigilance interviewer: "How can I convince you? What additional facts or documents you need, which would allow to be sure in my words of justice?"
- If your alert interlocutor presented new terms and conditions, which, in your opinion, basically does not change anything (but free of charge), be patient - maybe you'll be the only one who will win his personal confidence over the past ten years. Therefore praise him for clarifications and new ideas, which, of course, will be taken into account.

4. Dissociation: "You are not peculiar". In the alien, unsafe or threatening environment for us is typical closure and attachment to their small groups - ethnic, religious, tribe or family. In this way, the willingness to isolate from the outside world, we can reduce feelings of insecurity and anxiety. So we say: "I trust in peculiar and do not want to have affairs with others."

Possible antidotes of direct communication:

- Show an understanding that a person needs time to decide that it is - not a one-day issue.
- Demonstrate and emphasize similarity of your experiences to the interviewer.
- Ask: "What are the facts of my life and professional experience which could convince you that we have a common similarities?", „What are requirements which you raise for the person with whom you will cooperate?". When you will know what interlocutor expects from you, it will be easier to choose the appropriate facts to strengthen his confidence.

5. Paternalistic: the cult of authority (ruler or clan, for example, Law firm). During maturing of general distrust, anxiety of the future, people are beginning to rely on strong autocratic leaders who will remove all the obstacles out of the way, such leader often becomes blind trust object.

Possible antidotes of direct communication:

- Do not argue. Accept that you can learn a lot from other person's authority and you also respect this person.
- Recite thoughts of leader mentioned by interlocutor, indicate his achievements, show that you are interested in things important for interlocutor also.
- Allow yourself to think aloud, what about your conversation would say the interviewer mentioned authority: by whom is he support. What things the interviewer Guru would doubt?

6. Externalization: the search for confidence on the outside, abroad, in other type of people. When there is a lack of trust in their own (politicians, institutions, leaders, products) people tend to direct their confidence, for example, to leaders of other countries, which may become a panacea for all problems ("He - from America, so listen to what he's talking about business... "), organizations ("that's the Swedish police - it's not ours, even when the fuel is limited ... ") or products ("Lithuanian TVs will never reach the level of imported, although the latter - coming from the same China"). Other people, organizations, or things are often easier to idealize because of the distance, a lack of information or its one-sided perception. Therefore we trust in German economy, American democracy and the quality of Japanese cars until ... we face with the reality, and we see that not everything is so ideal. Such confidence in distant, little known and achievable things are well described by saying - it is a good place where we are not.

Possible antidotes of direct communication:

- Do not argue. Accept the interviewer mentioned authority that you can learn a lot and also can respect this person, country, brand and see significant benefits.
- Asking the interviewer what the above-mentioned examples of things are the most credible.
- Bring yourself to the trust deserving (in the eyes of the interviewer) things (for example: "For five years I worked for the Swedish company, so I had a good opportunity to adjust their experience in Lithuania.").

7. Belief in quick success and wonders - distrust of the system, state institutions can be expressed in peril and blindly trusting in what is believed will bring quick success, for example - doubtful banks, promising high interest rates for loans - as well as belief in various games and lotteries.

Possible antidotes of direct communication:

- Give understanding that you know a lot of cases, have known a number of intelligent and educated people who are sorely mistaken, if ignited in such rapid business ideas.
- Ask the interviewer what he was going to do in case of failure? Is there anticipated fallback?
- Agree with the recipient, that all of these ideas, creating illusions and dreams are charming and lightening, but the risks can take away all the fun...
- Laugh: "If this is done, it is done together, but ... not now and not in this business."The order is backed by such trust substitutes. Justice and stability is temporary.

4. How to strengthen the confidence of business negotiations, business meetings?

Confidence in business negotiations, business meetings can be strengthened in the following ways:

- **Use elementary, precise and convincing concepts.** Confidence is raised by understandable words. Credibility is very easy to drown in the multitude of words, terminology, international or other words, especially if they are not clear to the interviewer opponent.
- **Avoid negative expressions and formulations.** Negative expressions and formulas should be modified into phrases which predisposes positively.
- **Talk about the interviewer desires, interests and needs.** This means that you have to talk with your interlocutor about that what he would like to hear. This does not mean that you have to indulge him. Just other person wants to talk with you about: his goals, interests, and benefits and wish that you will understand and accept all this.

Try to avoid the following wording:	Change the wording as follows:
"I would like ..."	"You want to ..."
"For me, this looks interesting ..."	"You will be interested to know ..."
"I came to the conclusion ..."	"You probably could say that ..."

- **Use words that represent trust.** To create the compelling text is not difficult - you just need to tie with so-called trust words. These words have not meaning and value solely, but they express or cause emotions for us also.
- **Provide numbers and specific facts.** The numbers in your language will provide the reliability and feasibility.

Trust can be described as an assumption that others will behave the way you expect. In other words, it means that other people, institutions or organizations will meet your expectations. When we trust, we hope that we will get the results desired. When we have confidence in other people, we give them greater freedom of action. When our trust is too low or when it is total absence, then we are trying hard to control all business conversations and relations.

Trust always involves some risk in deciding what is worth trust. Being entrusting we are like betting thereon how will behave other people, and what will be the consequences of their activities. In cases when the behavior of trust objects do not meet the expectations, we are losing a bet. Decision to trust may facilitate, for example, the behavior of confidence objects in the past, in other words, their reputation. Often we rely just on facts: if man promised and made good on something, then it's quite responsible. And when he complied with words more than one or two times he has to be trusted. Genuine confidence is being developed at regular and long-term business relations. But what does sustainability mean? In the business relations cannot be created rules: "Sign the contract only in the fifth meeting, talk about the real needs and desires only after two hours of business communication", "Put aside advance payments for up to one year cooperation...". But the benefits of trust are unambiguous: only relying on each other during negotiations and business communication, it will be possible to achieve common goals. You need to look for confidence not only in other people but also in yourself. Refer to what you already know – to your personal characteristics, especially those in which you can be proud of and you would like to develop.

Trust is a precondition for successful cooperation and the result. Confidence plays a positive impact on the confident person, relationship in negotiating group, organization represented, for relations with the other negotiating side. It liberates and mobilizes the negotiator actions, encourages creative, innovative activity towards others, it reduces uncertainty and risk and increases the possible options for action. Trust is necessary in order to feel that negotiating partner or interlocutor will not betray us, that we could work and schedule the work together, would risk and communicate securely.

Conclusions

1. All business negotiations are concerned with risk. Therefore it is very important confidence in the other side of the negotiations. Confidence is particularly weak when it is a lack of information, when it is negotiations with strangers, who have greater bargaining power and status. Confidence can occur naturally over time, but negotiators rarely have time and opportunity to afford such a luxury. So sometimes it seems the easiest way is to negotiate without risk, safely and carefully, making agreement, with a few compromises, multiple rates and with a slight exchange of information. However, in order to avoid risks we can lose enormous opportunities, not to achieve the optimal results.
2. Negotiators, like all other people, are characterized by stereotypes. Stereotypes rarely emerge from personal experience. Often people pick them up in childhood from parents, teachers, from people of the group they belong, from media sources. Stereotypes are polished, blurred if people from different groups come into close cooperation by discovering more about each other in order to achieve common goals. Thus, the images of the interviewer, negotiations opponent is formed on the basis of stereotypes. How much is accurate stereotypical image of the first impression it's quite difficult question. On the one hand, almost every adult having experience can describe such characteristics of his interviewer quite accurately by clothing, language, manners and behavior: psychological characteristics, age, social class, profession. However, this operates accurately in neutral situations, while in others, where people are interested in each other, there is the potential for higher or lower error.
3. Inequality of negotiation opponents, interlocutors is causing comprehension errors, arising from the advantage factor. This scheme is as follows: when we meet with someone, having some kind of advantage, we tend to treat him more positively than it would be if we were equal under that parameter. And on the contrary - if we have certain advantages against our interlocutor, then our own advantage we move to our other properties (parameters). Thus, the advantage is fixed by only one parameter, and self-overestimation (or underestimating) is transferred to many properties. However, this scheme is activated only when there is a significant advantage, but not small.
4. The pre-formed opinion has a very significant impact on the development of an opponent's, the interviewer's understanding and trust. This determines how the recipient accepts and interprets information. It is found that is very difficult to refute false ideas, untruth, if the interviewer this justifies logically. This phenomenon (called belief sustainability) shows that beliefs can live their life and even after the destruction of evidence they can survive.

So misperception about other people or about ourselves may continue to live, to exist, despite disrepute. To change opinion is needed much stronger evidence and arguments than to create it.

5. It is very important to be able to take off the mask, to be open and sincere with the interviewer at the beginning of the business negotiation, business meeting. In the open, honest communication it is impossible trust worthy relationship. To better understand the peculiarities of our business relationship with another man we need to take interest in his reaction to our behavior in specific situations, the ability to assess the real consequences of our deeds, expressions. With this information - how we are perceived, understood and valued by different people - we can see ourselves in several different faces and modify our behavior in subsequent stages of the business relations in the right direction, avoiding the problems of starting conversation and confidence-building.

References

- Bonatti, Piero; Oliveira, Eugenio; Sabater-Mir, Jordi; Sierra, Carles; Toni, Francesca (2014) „On the integration of trust with negotiation, argumentation and semantics“, *The Knowledge Engineering Review*, Vol. 29 Iss, 1, pp.31-50.
- Gunia, Brian C.; Brett, Jeanne M.; Nandkeolyar, Amit K.; Kamdar, Dishan (2011) „Culture, trust, and negotiation consequences“, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 96(4), pp.774-789. doi:10.1037/a0021986
- Elahee, Mohammad; Brooks, Charles M. (2004) "Trust and negotiation tactics: perceptions about business-to-business negotiations in Mexico", *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 19 Iss: 6, pp.397 – 404. doi: 10.1108/08858620410556336
- Fells, R. E. (1993) "Developing Trust in Negotiation", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 15 Iss: 1, pp.33 – 45. doi: 10.1108/01425459310024910
- Van Kleef, Gerben A.; De Dreu, Carsten K. W.; Manstead, Antony S. R. (2006) „Supplication and appeasement in conflict and negotiation: The interpersonal effects of disappointment, worry, guilt, and regret“, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol 91 Iss1, pp.124-142. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.91.1.124
- Koeszegi, Sabine T. (2004) "Trust-building strategies in inter-organizational negotiations", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 19 Iss: 6, pp.640-660. doi: 10.1108/02683940410551534
- Kong, Dejun Tony; Dirks, Kurt T.; Ferrin, Donald L. (2014) „Interpersonal Trust within Negotiations: Meta-Analytic Evidence, Critical Contingencies, and Directions for Future Research“, *Journal ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT* Vol.57, Iss 5, pp.1235-1255.
- Lennane, Michael T. ; Weidner, Laura E. (2006) „In Each Other We Trust: The Importance of Relationship Building in Cross-Cultural Negotiations „: In *Cross Cultural Negotiation for U.S. Negotiators* / Edited by Kristen Blankley, pp.47-70. http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/programs/adr/docs/cross_cultural_negotiation.pdf
- Lewicki, Roy J. (2006) „Trust and Distrust“: In *The negotiator's Fieldbook* / Editors: Andrea Kupfer Schneider, Christopher Honeyman, pp.191-202.
- Ross, William; LaCroix, Jessica (1996) "MULTIPLE MEANINGS OF TRUST IN NEGOTIATION THEORY AND RESEARCH: A LITERATURE REVIEW AND INTEGRATIVE MODEL", *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 7 Iss: 4, pp.314 – 360. doi: 10.1108/eb022786
- Sinaceur, Marwan (2010) „Suspending judgment to create value: Suspicion and trust in negotiation“, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 46 Iss: 3, pp.543-550. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2009.11.002
- Tu, Yu-Tu (2014) „Trust Affecting on Negotiation Styles“, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp.259-267.
- Tu, Yu-Tu (2013) „The Relationships between Trust and Unethical Negotiation“, *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp.45-52.
- Zhang, Jian-Dong; Liu, Leigh Anne; Liu, Wu (2014) „Trust and Deception in Negotiation: Culturally Divergent Effects“, *Management and Organization Review*, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/more.12028/pdf>.