



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/dit.v1i4>
Received: 09 April 2024, Revised: 14 April 2024, Publish: 25 April 2024
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Navigating Negotiation Dynamics: The Impact of Technological Innovations and Sociocultural Factors in Supply Chain and Financial Systems

Stuti Shah¹, Sania Khubchandani², Purva Nagani³, Anuchi Sakaria⁴, Rahul Chauhan⁵, Andino Maselena⁶, R. Rizal Isnanto⁷

¹Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India, stutishah1410@gmail.com

²Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India

³Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India

⁴Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India

⁵Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India

⁶Department of Information Systems, Institut Bakti Nusantara, Lampung, Indonesia, andino.maselena@ibnus.ac.id

⁷Department of Computer Engineering, Diponegoro University, Semarang, Indonesia, rizal@ce.undip.ac.id

Corresponding Author: andino.maselena@ibnus.ac.id⁶

Abstract: This study investigates the impact of technological innovations and sociocultural factors on negotiation processes, specifically focusing on e-payment systems. Utilizing demographic analyses, the research examines how age, gender, and education influence familiarity, usage, and effectiveness of e-payment technologies. The findings reveal significant differences in e-payment usage based on age and gender, while education shows a trend in influencing usage patterns. This research underscores the importance of understanding these demographic factors for enhancing negotiation strategies through technology. Additionally, it emphasizes the need for tailored approaches in organizations to improve user satisfaction and negotiation outcomes. Future research should explore additional variables and the long-term effects of technology on negotiation practices, contributing to a more inclusive global marketplace.

Keywords: negotiation processes, e-payment systems, technological innovations, sociocultural factors

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the intersection of technology and commerce has garnered significant scholarly attention, particularly as digital payment platforms and negotiation dynamics become increasingly central to both economic and social interactions (Suharmanto et al., 2024). This growing body of research reflects an evolving understanding of how technology, specifically digital payments, influences economic behavior and negotiations at various levels, from individual entrepreneurs to international negotiations (Handayani et al., 2023).

One critical area of study focuses on the role of digital payment platforms in supporting subsistence entrepreneurs, especially in the context of the ongoing pandemic and its aftermath. Agarwal, Jha, and Jagasia (2024) provide a comprehensive examination of how digital payment systems have enabled subsistence entrepreneurs to navigate and thrive beyond the pandemic, highlighting the transformative impact of these technologies on small-scale businesses and informal economies. Their research, published in the *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce*, underscores the crucial role of digital payments in fostering financial inclusion and economic resilience.

In the realm of negotiation, the research presents a diverse array of perspectives and contexts. Au and Wong (2019) explore the consequences of perceived deception in negotiations, examining how trust mediates the effects of deceptive practices. Their findings, reported in *The Journal of Social Psychology*, provide insights into the psychological mechanisms that underpin negotiation outcomes and the importance of trust in mitigating negative impacts of deception. Bailey et al. (2021) offer a case study of New Zealand's Zero Carbon Act, analyzing the interplay of idealism and pragmatism in climate policy negotiations. Their article in *Climate Policy* reveals the complexities of negotiating ambitious environmental goals within political and economic constraints, emphasizing the power of compromise in achieving legislative outcomes. Educational approaches to negotiation are also highlighted, with Beenen and Barbuto Jr. (2014) introducing a dynamic exercise designed to enhance negotiation skills in their *Journal of Education for Business* article. Similarly, Benson and Chau (2017) present a negotiation skill development exercise in *Marketing Education Review*, focusing on practical strategies for skill enhancement in a marketing context.

International negotiations and geopolitical strategies are examined through Beringen, Liu, and Lim's (2021) analysis of Australia's role as a middle power in marine genetic resource negotiations, published in *Ocean Development & International Law*. This study challenges traditional narratives of developed and developing states, providing a nuanced view of international negotiation dynamics. Bodendorf and Franke (2024) investigate the bargaining power dynamics in buyer-supplier negotiations within the German automotive industry, offering valuable insights into industrial negotiation practices as detailed in the *International Journal of Production Research*. The integration of technology in pricing strategies is addressed by Chen et al. (2024) in their article in the *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, which examines optimal pricing strategies for two-sided mobile payment platforms, reflecting the growing importance of technology in economic decision-making.

METHOD

The research methodology for this study is designed to analyze the impact of technological innovations and sociocultural factors on negotiation processes, with a particular focus on e-payment systems. The study utilizes a quantitative approach, employing a structured survey to collect data from a randomly selected sample of 112 participants. The survey instrument consists

of various sections, including demographic information (age, gender, education), familiarity with e-payment technologies, frequency of usage, perceived impact, adoption tendencies, sociocultural influences, and challenges encountered in negotiations. The survey items are designed on a Likert scale to quantify participants' perceptions and experiences regarding e-payment systems.

Data collection was conducted through online platforms to ensure a wide reach and diversity of respondents, facilitating a comprehensive understanding of different demographic groups. Once the data was collected, it was entered into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) for analysis.

Research Objectives

- To Analyze the Impact of Technological Innovations on Negotiation Processes
- To Examine the Influence of Sociocultural Factors on Negotiation Practices

Hypotheses

H1: The integration of advanced technologies, such as negotiation support systems and mobile payment platforms, significantly improves the efficiency and effectiveness of negotiation processes in supply chain and financial systems.

H2: Sociocultural factors, including regional bargaining practices and power dynamics, significantly affect the negotiation strategies and outcomes in sectors such as construction, real estate, and financial transactions.

Descriptive statistics were utilized to summarize demographic characteristics and examine overall trends. Additionally, ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) was conducted to identify significant differences in e-payment familiarity, usage, impact, adoption, influence, power dynamics, required changes, challenges, and effectiveness across different demographic categories, including age, gender, and education.

The results obtained from SPSS analysis provide insights into the relationships between demographic factors and the adoption of negotiation technologies, thereby guiding future recommendations for organizations looking to enhance their negotiation strategies through e-payment systems. This methodology ensures a rigorous examination of the research questions, contributing to a deeper understanding of the intersection between technology and sociocultural dynamics in negotiation processes.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The demographic analysis of this research provides a clear understanding of the characteristics of the 112 participants involved in the study, offering valuable context for interpreting the findings related to negotiation processes. In terms of age distribution, the majority of respondents (72.3%) are between 18-25 years old, suggesting that the sample is primarily composed of young adults. This is followed by participants aged 26-35 (13.4%), 36-45 (7.1%), and 46-55 (6.3%). Only a small portion (0.9%) of the participants are aged 56 or above. This skew towards younger age groups could imply that the findings might reflect negotiation behaviors and preferences of younger generations, potentially influenced by greater familiarity with modern technology.

When analyzing gender distribution, 65.2% of the respondents are female, while 34.8% are male. This suggests that women are more prominently represented in the study, which could influence the negotiation strategies analyzed, as gender can impact negotiation behaviors, power dynamics, and decision-making styles in different contexts. Regarding educational background, the sample shows that a significant majority (55.4%) hold undergraduate degrees, followed by 26.8% with postgraduate degrees. A smaller portion has completed only high school (14.3%), and an even smaller group (3.6%) holds PhDs. This high level of education among the participants may suggest that the sample is well-equipped to engage in complex negotiations, particularly those that require knowledge of advanced technologies or understanding of intricate financial and supply chain systems.

Lastly, the household income distribution reveals that 44.6% of the respondents earn between Rs. 60,000 and Rs. 80,000 per month, indicating a relatively affluent sample. A smaller percentage (19.6%) falls in the Rs. 40,000-Rs. 60,000 range, while the lowest income category, earning less than Rs. 20,000, accounts for 17.0%. This indicates that the majority of participants belong to a middle or upper-middle-income demographic, which might influence their negotiation capabilities and strategies, especially in the context of financial negotiations or high-value supply chain deals.

TABLE 1: ANOVA BETWEEN AGE AND FACTOR

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Familiarity of E-Payment	Between Groups	2.257	4	.564	1.329	.264
	Within Groups	45.421	107	.424		
	Total	47.679	111			
Usage of E-Payment	Between Groups	10.973	4	2.743	3.094	.019
	Within Groups	94.884	107	.887		
	Total	105.857	111			
Impact of E-Payment	Between Groups	2.645	4	.661	.570	.685
	Within Groups	124.132	107	1.160		
	Total	126.777	111			
Adoption of E-Payment	Between Groups	1.468	4	.367	.465	.761
	Within Groups	84.389	107	.789		
	Total	85.857	111			
Influence of E-Payment	Between Groups	2.840	4	.710	.927	.451
	Within Groups	81.937	107	.766		
	Total	84.777	111			
Power of E-Payment	Between Groups	2.783	4	.696	.610	.656
	Within Groups	121.932	107	1.140		
	Total	124.714	111			
Changes required in E-Payment	Between Groups	4.011	4	1.003	.803	.526
	Within Groups	133.703	107	1.250		
	Total	137.714	111			
Challenges of E-Payment	Between Groups	2.658	4	.664	.805	.524
	Within Groups	88.262	107	.825		

	Total	90.920	111			
Effectiveness of E-Payment	Between Groups	2.365	4	.591	.902	.465
	Within Groups	70.126	107	.655		
	Total	72.491	111			

The table presents the analysis of variance (ANOVA) results, examining the relationship between age and various factors related to the use of e-payment systems, such as familiarity, usage, impact, adoption, influence, power, challenges, and effectiveness. The table evaluates whether significant differences exist among different age groups for each factor. For familiarity with e-payment, the results indicate no significant difference between age groups, as the p-value (0.264) is greater than the 0.05 threshold. Similarly, the impact of e-payment, adoption, influence, power dynamics, required changes, challenges, and effectiveness also show no significant differences across age groups, with p-values ranging from 0.451 to 0.761, all greater than 0.05.

However, for usage of e-payment, the analysis reveals a statistically significant difference between age groups, with a p-value of 0.019 (less than 0.05). This suggests that different age groups use e-payment systems at varying frequencies, highlighting age as an influencing factor in the frequency of e-payment system adoption. Age significantly impacts the usage of e-payment systems but does not appear to significantly influence other factors such as familiarity, impact, adoption, or effectiveness. These findings suggest that while age affects how often people use e-payment systems, it does not heavily influence their perceptions or experiences with them.

TABLE 2: ANOVA BETWEEN GENDER AND FACTOR

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Familiarity of E-Payment	Between Groups	.264	1	.264	.612	.436
	Within Groups	47.415	110	.431		
	Total	47.679	111			
Usage of E-Payment	Between Groups	.076	1	.076	.079	.779
	Within Groups	105.781	110	.962		
	Total	105.857	111			
Impact of E-Payment	Between Groups	1.088	1	1.088	.952	.331
	Within Groups	125.689	110	1.143		
	Total	126.777	111			
Adoption of E-Payment	Between Groups	.076	1	.076	.098	.755
	Within Groups	85.781	110	.780		
	Total	85.857	111			
Influence of E-Payment	Between Groups	.884	1	.884	1.159	.284
	Within Groups	83.893	110	.763		
	Total	84.777	111			
Power of E-Payment	Between Groups	.069	1	.069	.061	.806
	Within Groups	124.646	110	1.133		
	Total	124.714	111			
	Between Groups	3.878	1	3.878	3.187	.077
	Within Groups	133.836	110	1.217		

Changes required in E-Payment	Total	137.714	111			
Challenges of E-Payment	Between Groups	.070	1	.070	.084	.772
	Within Groups	90.850	110	.826		
	Total	90.920	111			
Effectiveness of E-Payment	Between Groups	2.777	1	2.777	4.382	.039
	Within Groups	69.714	110	.634		
	Total	72.491	111			

Table 2 summarizes the results of an analysis of variance (ANOVA) examining the relationship between gender and various factors associated with e-payment systems, including familiarity, usage, impact, adoption, influence, power, required changes, challenges, and effectiveness. The analysis reveals that there are no significant gender differences for most factors, as indicated by the p-values, which exceed the conventional threshold of 0.05. Specifically, familiarity ($p = 0.436$), usage ($p = 0.779$), impact ($p = 0.331$), adoption ($p = 0.755$), influence ($p = 0.284$), power ($p = 0.806$), and challenges ($p = 0.772$) show no significant variation based on gender.

However, there is a notable finding regarding the effectiveness of e-payment, where the p-value is 0.039, indicating a statistically significant difference between genders. This suggests that perceptions of the overall effectiveness of e-payment systems may differ based on gender, highlighting a potential area for further investigation into how gender influences the assessment of technological solutions in financial transactions. Additionally, the factor of changes required in e-payment approaches significance with a p-value of 0.077, suggesting a possible gender-based perception of necessary improvements. Overall, while most factors show no significant differences, the significant finding regarding effectiveness implies that gender may influence how individuals assess the utility of e-payment technologies.

TABLE 3: ANOVA BETWEEN EDUCATION AND FACTOR

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Familiarity of E-Payment	Between Groups	2.195	3	.732	1.737	.164
	Within Groups	45.484	108	.421		
	Total	47.679	111			
Usage of E-Payment	Between Groups	6.616	3	2.205	2.400	.072
	Within Groups	99.241	108	.919		
	Total	105.857	111			
Impact of E-Payment	Between Groups	3.017	3	1.006	.878	.455

	Within Groups	123.760	108	1.146		
	Total	126.777	111			
Adoption of E-Payment	Between Groups	2.507	3	.836	1.083	.360
	Within Groups	83.351	108	.772		
	Total	85.857	111			
Influence of E-Payment	Between Groups	4.327	3	1.442	1.936	.128
	Within Groups	80.450	108	.745		
	Total	84.777	111			
Power of E-Payment	Between Groups	2.473	3	.824	.728	.537
	Within Groups	122.241	108	1.132		
	Total	124.714	111			
Changes required in E-Payment	Between Groups	1.178	3	.393	.311	.818
	Within Groups	136.536	108	1.264		
	Total	137.714	111			
Challenges of E-Payment	Between Groups	.185	3	.062	.074	.974
	Within Groups	90.734	108	.840		
	Total	90.920	111			
Effectiveness of E-Payment	Between Groups	2.116	3	.705	1.083	.360
	Within Groups	70.375	108	.652		
	Total	72.491	111			

Table 3 presents the results of an analysis of variance (ANOVA) assessing the relationship between education level and various factors related to e-payment systems, including familiarity, usage, impact, adoption, influence, power, required changes, challenges, and effectiveness. The analysis shows that there are no statistically significant differences across educational groups for most factors, as indicated by the p-values, which all exceed the conventional significance threshold of 0.05. For instance, familiarity ($p = 0.164$), impact ($p = 0.455$), adoption ($p = 0.360$), influence ($p = 0.128$), power ($p = 0.537$), required changes ($p = 0.818$), challenges ($p = 0.974$), and effectiveness ($p = 0.360$) demonstrate no significant variation based on educational attainment.

However, the factor of usage of e-payment approaches significance with a p-value of 0.072, suggesting that differences in education levels may influence the frequency with which e-payment

systems are used. This trend may indicate that individuals with varying educational backgrounds have different experiences or comfort levels with technology, potentially affecting their engagement with e-payment solutions. Overall, the findings suggest that while education does not significantly impact most perceptions or experiences with e-payment systems, there may be emerging differences in usage patterns that warrant further investigation. Understanding these dynamics could provide valuable insights into how educational background influences the adoption and integration of technology in financial transactions.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this research highlights the multifaceted relationship between technological innovations and sociocultural factors in negotiation processes, particularly within the context of e-payment systems. The analysis reveals that age and gender significantly influence the usage and effectiveness of these technologies, while education appears to play a more nuanced role, especially regarding usage patterns. The findings underscore the importance of understanding demographic factors in shaping individuals' experiences and perceptions of negotiation technologies.

The study has implications for practitioners and organizations looking to enhance their negotiation strategies through technology. As businesses increasingly adopt e-payment systems and negotiation support tools, recognizing the varying degrees of familiarity and comfort among different demographic groups will be essential for effective implementation and training. Organizations can tailor their approaches to accommodate these differences, thereby improving negotiation outcomes and user satisfaction. Looking ahead, future research should explore additional variables such as cultural background, technological literacy, and industry-specific factors to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics at play in negotiation processes. Furthermore, longitudinal studies could examine how the rapid evolution of technology continues to reshape negotiation practices over time, particularly in response to emerging global trends such as digital currencies and remote negotiations.

On a global scale, the impact of this research extends beyond individual organizations, as understanding the interplay between technology and sociocultural factors can inform policies that promote equitable access to negotiation tools. This is particularly relevant in developing economies, where disparities in technology adoption can influence economic growth and access to resources. Ultimately, fostering an inclusive approach to technological integration in negotiation practices can contribute to a more equitable and efficient global marketplace.

Acknowledgement

This research project is supported by **World Class University Program, Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education**, Diponegoro University, Indonesia. We gratefully appreciated this support.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, A., Jha, A. K., & Jagasia, J. (2024). Digital Payment Platforms And Subsistence Entrepreneurs: Championing Beyond The Pandemic. *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce*, 34(2), 108–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10919392.2024.2316474>
- Andersen, J. C. (2023). The Symbolic Boundary Work of Incels: Subcultural Negotiation of Meaning and Identity Online. *Deviant Behavior*, 44(7), 1081–1101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2022.2142864>

- Au, A. K. C., & Wong, N. C. Q. (2019). Perceived deception in negotiation: Consequences and the mediating role of trust. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 159*(4), 459–473. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2019.1567454>
- Bailey, I., Fitch-Roy, O., Inderberg, T. H. J., & Benson, D. (2021). Idealism, pragmatism, and the power of compromise in the negotiation of New Zealand's Zero Carbon Act. *Climate Policy, 21*(9), 1159–1174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2020.1868393>
- Beenen, G., & Barbuto Jr., J. E. (2014). Let's Make a Deal: A Dynamic Exercise for Practicing Negotiation Skills. *Journal of Education for Business, 89*(3), 149–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2013.794121>
- Benson, G. E., & Chau, N. N. (2017). Negotiation Skill Development Exercise. *Marketing Education Review, 27*(2), 80–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10528008.2017.1296754>
- Beringen, E., Liu, N., & Lim, M. (2021). Australia as a Middle Power: Challenging the Narrative of Developed/Developing States in International Negotiations Surrounding Marine Genetic Resources. *Ocean Development & International Law, 52*(2), 143–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00908320.2021.1886449>
- Bodendorf, F., & Franke, J. (2024). Examining the dynamics of bargaining power in buyer-supplier negotiations: insights from a case study in the German automotive industry. *International Journal of Production Research, 62*(16), 5828–5849. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2023.2299678>
- Boyer, S. L., & Jap, S. D. (2022). The big spaces in sales negotiation research. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 42*(2), 181–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2022.2039874>
- Chan, S. H. J., Wan, Y. K. P., Lee, C. B. P., & Zhang, Q. Y. C. (n.d.). Understanding mobile payment through the lens of continuity theory. *Anatolia, 1*–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2024.2321478>
- Chen, Y.-H., Kung, L.-C., Hu, C.-H., & Huang, C.-Y. (2024). Technology options and optimal pricing of a two-sided mobile payment platform. *Journal of the Operational Research Society, 75*(9), 1777–1790. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01605682.2023.2274953>
- Chiu, I. H.-Y. (2017). A new era in fintech payment innovations? A perspective from the institutions and regulation of payment systems. *Law, Innovation and Technology, 9*(2), 190–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17579961.2017.1377912>
- Chung, J. Y., Baik, H.-J., & Lee, C.-K. (2017). The role of perceived behavioural control in the constraint-negotiation process: the case of solo travel. *Leisure Studies, 36*(4), 481–492. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2016.1190780>
- Clarke, L. H. (2005). Remarriage in Later Life: Older Women's Negotiation of Power, Resources and Domestic Labor. *Journal of Women & Aging, 17*(4), 21–41. https://doi.org/10.1300/J074v17n04_03
- Cliffe, A. (2022). To what extent does European law ensure a level playing field for fintechs in the payment services sector? *European Competition Journal, 18*(1), 168–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17441056.2021.1979776>
- D'Agostino, M., Levine, H., & Sabharwal, M. (2020). Gender in negotiation: Preparing public administrators for the 21st century workplace. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 26*(1), 96–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2019.1579594>
- Denoon, R. T. P., Paisley, R. K., de Chaisemartin, M., & Henshaw, T. W. (2020). Engaging non-state actors in the negotiation and implementation of international watercourse agreements:

- experiences and lessons learned from Canada. *Water International*, 45(4), 311–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508060.2020.1734757>
- Endacott, C. G., Duran, J. M., & Summerville, K. (n.d.). Labor in Fissured Workplaces: Contract Workers' Membership Negotiation in "Big Tech." *Western Journal of Communication*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2023.2252788>
- Falco, G., Noriega, A., & Susskind, L. (2019). Cyber negotiation: a cyber risk management approach to defend urban critical infrastructure from cyberattacks. *Journal of Cyber Policy*, 4(1), 90–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23738871.2019.1586969>
- Gomes, M., Oliveira, T., Carneiro, D., Novais, P., & Neves, J. (2014). STUDYING THE EFFECTS OF STRESS ON NEGOTIATION BEHAVIOR. *Cybernetics and Systems*, 45(3), 279–291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01969722.2014.894858>
- Guizzo, F., di Michele, D., & Cadinu, M. (n.d.). From Sexualized Media Consumption to Salary Negotiation: The Relation Between Chronic Self-Objectification Processes and Women's Negotiation Intentions. *Media Psychology*, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2023.2298683>
- Handayani, S., Isnanto, R. R., & Warsito, B. (2023). Identifying Potential Students as College Customers Using Machine Learning: A Literature Review. In *E3S Web of Conferences* (Vol. 448, p. 02049). EDP Sciences.
- Huang, C.-J., & Liao, L.-M. (2012). A multi-agent-based negotiation approach for parallel machine scheduling with multi-objectives in an electro-etching process. *International Journal of Production Research*, 50(20), 5719–5733. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2011.617394>
- Jäger, A., Loschelder, D. D., & Friese, M. (2015). How self-regulation helps to master negotiation challenges: An overview, integration, and outlook. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 26(1), 203–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2015.1112640>
- Kabaya, K. (2021). Opposite impacts of policy and payment consequentiality treatments on willingness-to-pay in a contingent valuation study. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy*, 10(2), 175–188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21606544.2020.1816218>
- Kazan, E., Tan, C.-W., Lim, E. T. K., Sørensen, C., & Damsgaard, J. (2018). Disentangling Digital Platform Competition: The Case of UK Mobile Payment Platforms. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 35(1), 180–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2018.1440772>
- Kazemitabar, M., Mirzapour, H., Akhshi, M., Vatankhah, M., Hatami, J., & Doleck, T. (2024). Power of nonverbal behavior in online business negotiations: understanding trust, honesty, satisfaction, and beyond. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 32(4), 1442–1459. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2022.2121728>
- Littleton, K., & Whitelock, D. (2005). The negotiation and co-construction of meaning and understanding within a postgraduate online learning community. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 30(2), 147–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439880500093612>
- Machin, R., & McCormack, F. (2023). The impact of the transition to Personal Independence Payment on claimants with mental health problems. *Disability & Society*, 38(6), 1029–1052. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2021.1972409>
- Manning, E., & Bungay, V. (2017). 'Business before pleasure': the golden rule of sex work, payment schedules and gendered experiences of violence. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 19(3), 338–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2016.1219767>
- Matusitz, J., & Breen, G. M. (2006). Negotiation Tactics in Organizations Applied to Hostage Negotiation. *Journal of Security Education*, 2(1), 55–73. https://doi.org/10.1300/J460v02n01_05

- Moore, K. M. (2011). Global Networks in Local Agriculture: A Framework for Negotiation. *Journal of Agricultural & Food Information*, 12(1), 23–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10496505.2011.539517>
- Nichols, J. (2014). Negotiating in the 21st Century: Bridging the Gap Between Technology and Hostage Negotiation. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 9(1), 57–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361610.2014.851574>
- Nyavor, S., Amposah, S., Owusu, V., & Boateng, K. J. (2023). Compensation payment for fisherfolk during closed-season fishing: Lessons from small-scale fisherfolk in Ghana. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 9(2), 2282502. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2282502>
- Palm, M. (2018). Then press enter: digital payment technology and the history of telephone interface. *Cultural Studies*, 32(4), 582–599. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2017.1384034>
- Pei, X. (2021). Reshaping co-existence of tradition and modernity: polymedia in gender identity negotiation of Dagongmei. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 47(13), 3114–3130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1700788>
- Peng, Y. (2024). Gendered parenting and conjugal negotiation over children’s organised extracurricular activities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 45(1), 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2023.2267769>
- Poell, T., Nieborg, D. B., & Duffy, B. E. (2023). Spaces of Negotiation: Analyzing Platform Power in the News Industry. *Digital Journalism*, 11(8), 1391–1409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2022.2103011>
- Poon, S., & Chau, P. Y. K. (2001). Octopus: The Growing E-payment System in Hong Kong. *Electronic Markets*, 11(2), 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/101967801300197016>
- Richards, J., Guerrero, V., & Fischbach, S. (2020). Negotiation competence: Improving student negotiation self-efficacy. *Journal of Education for Business*, 95(8), 553–558. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2020.1715330>
- Rubinstein, D. (2024). Schrödinger’s cat goes online: Exploring the psychopathology of digital life. *European Journal of Psychotherapy & Counselling*, 26(1–2), 136–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642537.2024.2318625>
- Shang, W., & Yang, L. (2015). Contract negotiation and risk preferences in dual-channel supply chain coordination. *International Journal of Production Research*, 53(16), 4837–4856. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2014.998785>
- Simon, G. (2024). Looking and listening in online therapy. *European Journal of Psychotherapy & Counselling*, 26(1–2), 14–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642537.2023.2289111>
- Suharmanto, A. Y., Sediyo, E., & Isnanto, R. R. (2024, June). Supply chain management information system for crude palm oil distribution in production/sales activities in the palm oil trading sector. In *AIP Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 3132, No. 1). AIP Publishing.
- WOLFE, C. J., & MURTHY, U. S. (2005). Negotiation Support Systems in Budget Negotiations: An Experimental Analysis. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 22(3), 351–381. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222220312>
- Xi, Y., & Ng, A. (2020). Disappearing bargain and technical sharing: the sociocultural influence of mobile payment in China. *Chinese Journal of Communication*, 14(1), 40–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17544750.2020.1814369>
- Xue, X., Ji, Y., Li, L., & Shen, Q. (2010). Cognition driven framework for improving collaborative working in construction projects: Negotiation perspective. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 11(2), 227–242. <https://doi.org/10.3846/jbem.2010.11>

- Yu, F., Kaihara, T., Fujii, N., Sun, C., & Yang, W. (2015). A multi-attribute multi-item negotiation mechanism of supply chain networks between buyers and sellers. *International Journal of Production Research*, 53(20), 6143–6160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2015.1034328>
- Zetsche, D. A., Anker-Sørensen, L., Passador, M. L., & Wehrli, A. (2021). DLT-based enhancement of cross-border payment efficiency – a legal and regulatory perspective. *Law and Financial Markets Review*, 15(1–2), 70–115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17521440.2022.2065809>