



ISSN: 2230-9926

Available online at <http://www.journalijdr.com>

IJDR

International Journal of  
DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH

International Journal of Development Research  
Vol. 6, Issue, 03, pp. 7057-7064, March, 2016

### Full Length Research Article

## CONTROL AND SILENCING ASYMMETRIC POWER ON TWO ENTITY RELATIONSHIP IN SUPPLY CHAIN

\*Zainur Hidayah and Tamjuddin

Indonesian Open University, Tangerang

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Received 14<sup>th</sup> December, 2015  
Received in revised form  
18<sup>th</sup> January, 2016  
Accepted 24<sup>th</sup> February, 2016  
Published online 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2016

#### Key Words:

Asymmetric power,  
Symmetric collaboration,  
And social green relational capabilities.

### ABSTRACT

Ownership or control of access to resources could give or make another organization depends on the organization. This condition causes resources owner's organization with its access to be more dominant compared to other organizations which need those resources or can be called asymmetric power. Previous studies show that asymmetric power could make both positive or negative impact to cooperative relationship. This study aims to analyze how to overcome asymmetric power so it won't make any negative impacts to cooperative relationship. Research objects of this study are shrimp fishing companies whether it engages in feeding, seeding, cultivating, processing and exporting with total respondent of 153 companies. The data is analyzed using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) with program AMOS 21. The result of the study states that to overcome the negative effects of asymmetric power to symmetric collaboration can be done by growing competence of social green relational capabilities. The escalation of symmetric collaboration will increase the organization's performance.

Copyright © 2016, Zainur Hidayah and Tamjuddin. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

### INTRODUCTION

According to Daily and Huang (2001), continuity of ecology is very important to business development in 21st century which decided by how industrial organization balancing technology, economy and protection of the natural environment. Issues about environment decline generally has increased the efforts to improved efficiency and business productivity and also efforts to maintain the business continuity inside society. Wu and Dunn (1995) also stated that in this decade issues about environment continuity has become an important business practical when since 1990s organizations has been pressured by issues about environment management. Bhushan and MacKezie (1994), stated that majority of companies in America applied an environmental approach in their business are caused by laws and rules. Although in the few years before environment power such as consumers boycott and alternative ways of new consumers' needs have influenced strategies and companies' core value. In the other side, issues about environment has had positive impacts. Killian (2006) declared that production certainty that shown by *sustainable certification process* and attentions to environment gave benefits to coffee products in Brazil. This benefits form as higher price level and smaller demand elasticity or less elastic

than conventional coffee product. Meanwhile, Bhattacharya and Sen (2004) stated that nowadays many consumers chose products from companies that paid attention to the environment and persuade the society to behave well. Seen from chain value, primary industries usually produce a bigger environmental influences than the upper industries with smaller influences (Clift and Wright, 2000). Environment management can't be charged to only one organization, but it's a responsibility to everybody as consequences of companies related to the environment in the form as another organizations as well as nature resources in production process (Beamon, 1999). For that reason, cooperation is needed between organizations so that the ongoing production process can pay attention to 3 basic aspects which are economy, social and environment. Anthony (2000) revealed that collaboration between 2 or more companies and sharing responsibilities in terms of planning, managing, and implementing as well as performance measurement information increasing success more than working independently. However, opportunistic behaviour that only thinks about themselves more than common goal within the scope of value chain can cause failure in creating a competitive advantage (Simatupang and Shidaran, 2002). Beside that, differences in ability and power between organizations could influence the relationship where organization with bigger retail and ability has power to manage the relationship between organizations (Chew and

\*Corresponding author: Zainur Hidayah  
Indonesian Open University, Tangerang.

Sun, 2009). Kumar, Scheer and Steenkamp (1995) stated that high level of dependency could cause danger for suppliers to be involved in opportunistic behaviour or using negative strategies. While the results of other studies stating that the asymmetric power positively affect the collaboration as stated by Lusch and Brown (1996), have an incentive to cooperate. Gunlach and Cadote (1994), do not perform actions that damage cooperation, LW Stern. and Reve (1980), and mutually beneficial Schepers (2007). Problems in this study refers to the gap in research on asymmetric power and collaboration, such as the previous statement and the relationship between the concerns regarding the sustainability of natural resources that will have an impact on the sustainability of the organization.

### **Symmetric and Unsymmetric Power**

Power can come from two sources, namely the context-based and resource-based (Yan and Gray, 1994). In context-based, the power of one party to another is determined by the presence or availability of alternatives to resource itself. While the ownership or control of resources is critical to be a power related to relationship between organizations as well as being a creator of power in relationship between organizations. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978), states the dependency will rise sharply when one partner has the resources needed by other colleagues for the survival of their company. This condition because most companies do not have sufficient resources to maintain the continuity of their business, especially when it is in an uncertain environment (Crook and Combs, 2007). Pfeffer and Salancik 1978, says there are three reasons that cause the resource resulted in a dependency that is, 1) is a very important resource or other necessary parties, 2) the limitations of the resource owners and 3) when the conditions 1 and 2 occur. For owners of the resource, the dependency will form the bargaining power (Crook and Combs, 2007; Lanier Jr., Wempe and Zacharia, 2010).

### **Symmetric Collaboration**

Whipple and Russell (2007), defines three types of collaboration based on 10 criteria: 1) person, 2) process, 3) technology, 4) the level of involvement of decision makers, 5) focus, 6) deadline, 7) classification of the return of the relationship, 8) the level of organization, 9) the domain of information and 10) the level of knowledge. Three types of collaboration are 1) the type of transaction collaboration, 2) type of event management, and 3) the type of process management. Of these three types, type 1 are the most common and the further the type, the fewer it gets. However, an ongoing collaborative relationship will increase with the types getting further. While Simatupang and Sridharan (2005) developed a collaboration index that measures the level of collaboration in the supply chain relationship which is based on three factors: 1) sharing information, 2) the synchronization decision, and 3) aligning incentives. Meanwhile, Lambert (2006) states that the cooperation or partnership can only occur in the form of a transaction between the organization or the so-called Arm's Length, but can also be integrated cooperation, without going through the mechanism of transfer of ownership. Geyskens *et al.* (1996) stated that the cooperative relationship symmetrical or

correspondence, will encourage the relationship and increase the obstacles to end the relationship, making the relationship of cooperation can take place in the long term (Casciaro and Piskorski, 2005). In addition, the increased equity partner relationships and the ability to use the bargaining power in an effort to improve the performance itself by reducing the concession partners will weaken and resource dependency between them will increase (Mackelprang, 2011).

Meanwhile, the existence of social capital will affect the process of cooperation or collaboration, where cooperation is preferred by people or organizations who believed (Fukuyama, 1995; Putnam, 1993; Tyler and Kramer, 1996). Social capital also gives organizations the opportunity to acquire or exchange of resources and creating new resources and encourage the creation or establishment of a network that can provide access to the organization of information, solidarity and influence (Tata and Prasad, 2008). Therefore, the diversity of social capital and network size and strength of the relationship can affect the motivation to engage in collaboration.

### **Organization's Performance**

Relationships are built on the basis of cooperation to achieve common goals better than if done without the cooperation or collaboration. avoid confusion and conflict (Simatupang and Sridharan, 2005). Ramdas and Spekman (2000) propose three forms of performance measurement refers to the reduction of transaction costs or increase efficiency. Measurement criterias used are the inventory turnover, inventory per week, the extent of damage, and level of service. While Simatupang and Sridharan (2005) refers to customer satisfaction by developing supply chain performance criteria such as the level of compliance with the request, the size of the inventory and responsiveness. However, according to Chen *et al.* (2004a) proposed supply chain performance measurement is based on the operational performance of suppliers, buyers operational performance and financial performance buyers.

Competitive supply chain capable of integrating supply and demand through collaboration will improve the performance significantly (Barratt, 2004). Increased collaboration generally has a positive effect on the performance of the supply chain. However, at a certain point, further cooperation ceased to produce benefits for the supply chain. Resources invested in the collaboration could be better spent on projects or other activities.

### **Social green relational capabilities**

The difference in strength will encourage a stronger organization to demonstrate its strength rather than a commitment to cooperation. In addition, the difference in interest can increase the growth of the conflict (Zhou, Zhuang and Yip, 2007). Powell (1988) stated that organizations can increase their competence with the competence of other parties to develop existing relationships or explore the existing competence. However, in order to improve the competence of the organization of the relationship is not easy. Kanter (1997) stated that in order to reduce failure in cooperation, it is necessary to have correspondence between the organization

through the process of adaptation to the culture, management practices, and procedures of the respective organizations which formed the partnership. The discrepancy between the organization can lead to counter-productive working relationship marked by disputes and suspicion. In addition, the alignment of goals is an important element that affects the extent to which the business orientation, ability and activity partners can be integrated successfully (Spekman *et al.*, 1998). Meanwhile, for the sustainability of cooperative relationships between organizations, not only motivation is needed, but also the driving force that can strengthen these relationships even increase it and overcome the things that can destroy the relationship. To that end, Wilson and Mummaleni (1986) stated that social content as a process that explains how the growing relationship between the two parties. Social content accelerate participation among individuals in exchange for improving communication and the flow of information that will ultimately improve the overall relationship.

The study Mavondo and Rodrigo (2001) as well; Mohr *et al.* (1994) found that the alliance partners can maximize their profits by establishing relational norms through a commitment that includes flexibility and solidarity. Limitations of the supporting capacity of the environment and the environmental damage caused by excessive production process can encourage a shift in the organization's views on the environment (Srivastava, 2007). At first, the organization split between operating performance and environmental performance on the premise increase in operating costs. However, related to the availability of resources and the demands of external parties, organizations need to include environmental and resource management as part of the production process (Wilkerson, 2005).

Porter and van der Linde (1995) stated that the main reason for the implementation of environmental management or sustainability is to save natural resources, reduce or even eliminate waste and improve productivity. For dependent organization needed the ability to maintain the cooperative relationship. the capability to preserve the environment as one of the efforts dependent organization to increase reliance from stronger organization, as well as ensuring the availability of natural resources. Besides the ability to establish relationships with other organizations as an cooperation alternatives. This ability is what we call social green relational capabilities

### **Asymmetric Power and Symmetric Collaboration**

In a study by Scheepers (2007), the procurement manager, small and medium scale enterprises show that asymmetric power can have a positive impact on collaboration but does not have a direct impact on performance. Asymmetric power has a positive impact on performance when going through the stages of collaboration. The results of studies on the impact of asymmetric power of collaboration is also conveyed by Spekman and Kamauff (1998) in the automotive industry, shows an asymmetric power positive impact on collaboration in which large companies with strong power to encourage small firms to collaborate. It is driven by the behavior of large companies that protect (having a large market) as well as being a leader and mentor in cooperating to improve the ability of the organization both internally and with partners.

The same opinion was also expressed by Hingley (2005) of the results of his study on the food industry in the UK which showed that the weak partner is willing to cooperate with a stronger partner as long as the condition of the power difference is not destructive or still within tolerance, or cooperation conducted still provide benefits for them. In a study by Hingley (2005) and presented by Spekman and Kamauff (1998) there is an organization that acts as a leader or coordinator in cooperation built, it is as proposed by Bowersox and Closs (1996) that a strong organization can act as a leader of cooperative relationships that is built.

### **Hypothesis 1: Asymmetric Power have negative effects on Symmetric Collaboration**

#### **Asymmetric Power and SGRC**

This dependence can be a dependency on the availability of valuable resources in the form of capital, expertise, information, services or other things that can disrupt the continuity of the production process or the organization (Scheer and Stern, 1992; Maloni and Benton, 2000). Casciaro and Piskorski, (2005) stated that the asymmetric power is a difference in the strength of each actor over another. Therefore, asymmetric power relationship is a relationship in which the power of one organization over another is substantially greater than the reverse. Feldman (1998) stated that when an action which resulted in an imbalance in the exchange relations will encourage action to balance or to restore the balance when the exchange partners assumed to have a dominant role.

While organizations are actively trying to maintain a symmetrical imbalance to benefit greater share of the relations of cooperation. Dapiran and Hogarth - Scott (2003), states that when one party in a relationship appeared to have more power, then the other will attempt to balance power, look for an alternative alliance (Bretherton and Carswell, 2002), or form a coalition (Barnes *et al.* 1995). According Bevilacqua and Petroni (2002), to gain a competitive advantage, greater purchasing organizations usually have a lot of suppliers in order to disturb other suppliers.

### **Hypothesis 2: Asymmetric Power have a positive effect on SGRC**

#### **SGRC and Symmetric Collaboration**

The principle of cooperation is a principle which is a conflict between ecology and economy. Economics deals with the quantity, competition and expansion while ecology associated with quality, cooperation and conservation. The shift of mastery into a partnership is essential for a paradigm shift from mechanics to the ecological paradigm. Dwyer (2000) states that one of the benefits of the organization to build an alliance or partnership is to accelerate the pace of innovation and reduce the risk of innovation. The pace of innovation can only be achieved by increasing the ability of the organization. Anderson and Narsus (1990) states cooperation refers to the desire of both parties in a relationship intra and inter company to achieve a profit each other through a balanced, reciprocal and solidarity.

For that we need to make adjustments to various organizations as well as reducing the potential for negative feelings and stress on the results of relations (Michie and Silbey, 1985). Meanwhile Gulati and Sytch (2007) stated that the relations of cooperation and performance is determined by relation in acts of integration, trust and quality and environment of information exchange. Meanwhile, according to Kim (1999) that the quality of partnership influenced by participation, communication, information sharing, support of top management. However, negatively influenced by age relationships and interdependence.

### **Hypothesis 3: SGRC have a positive effect on Symmetric Collaboration**

#### **SGRC and Networks**

Kopicki *et al.* (1993) and van Hoek (1999) stated that there are three approaches in the implementation of sustainability which are reactive, proactive and value-seeking. Reactive approach refers to the organization's commitment to minimize the environmental impact of the production process through the control of the final product and waste disposal. While proactive approach is done by preventing environmental impact which begins with the regulation that adopts environmental law with a commitment to design environmentally friendly products and preventing environmental impacts through product recycling and waste management. In the value-seeking approach, organizations integrate environmental activities at each operational organization, ranging from purchasing to distribution. And implementation of the ISO as a strategic initiative into its business strategy.

Internal resources are organizational skills possessed by a company to perform a transformation or a change from the received input into the output produced by the company. A company that has the optimal resource can increase its chances to find and locate the appropriate colleagues to form a variety of alliances or business relationship as a primary consideration (Caruna, 1997). While external resources owned by a company that is newly established and successfully acquired the company and will increase the company capabilities (Teece, 1987).

### **Hypothesis 4: SGRC positively related to the Network**

#### **Network and Symmetric Collaboration**

Network between stable companies will enable their members to get an access to reciprocal of resources which are controlled by their partners. By sharing resources and coordination of process production, companies can achieve economic scale and scope as well as avoiding risks from integration of organizations, such as high transaction costs and less strategical of flexibility (Antoldi, 2011). Study result by Mesquita and Lazzarini (2008) on furniture companies in Argentine showed that by collaboration horizontally with similar companies in the form of combined product innovations, sharing resources utilization as well as collaborating vertically could increase organization's productivity in the form of efficiency and access to global

market. This opinion is supported by result of study by Chetty and Agndal (2007) which stated that small and medium enterprises that have networks have opportunities to achieve international market chances. Besides, network resources can avoid risks and challenges related to decisions or regulation of international market.

### **Hypothesis 5: Network positively associated with Symmetric Collaboration**

#### **Symmetric Collaboration and Organizational Performance**

As stated by Pai and Yeh (2010), that the cooperative behavior, inter-organizational power structure and the characteristics of the supplier shall establish and affect integration in the supply chain. Gulati *et al.* (2005) emphasizes the issue of profit sharing or incentive to cooperate where the integration of the cooperation will be increased if there is a match between the provision of incentives or benefits. While Duffy and Fearne (2004) declared that the imbalance of power has a harmful effect on profit sharing partnerships. In addition, the asymmetric dependence has a negative impact on performance. But that does not mean that the incentive distribution can not be created by the joint activities of buyers and sellers.

Sheth and Parvatiyar (1995) stated that the closeness of the relationship by working in collaboration will be synergistic. for example, can add value rather than the performance alone. This opinion is supported by Cox *et al.* (2003), in which the surplus value created through interaction and joint efforts of the partners (Vlosky and Wilson, 1997). According to Sharma and Sheth (1997), and Ganesan (1994) and Buttelle (1996), this approach can lead to a sustainable strategic advantage for vertical supply chain partners, which make it difficult for competitors to duplicate the relationship. However, the threat of the difference in strength persist despite the existence of inter-organizational cooperation. In this condition, the perpetrator will still use the strategy of power (Rokkan and Haugland, 2002) either blatantly or covertly in order to realize a higher proportion of surplus value for themselves.

### **Hypothesis 6: Symmetric Collaboration positively related to Organizational Performance**

#### **Method**

This study was conducted on both shrimp fishing company in the field of feed, seeding, cultivation and exporters that are scattered throughout Indonesia as many as 440 companies. Companies' data was obtained based on the behavior profile book of shrimp companies in Indonesia. data collection techniques in the study was done through a questionnaire survey that is sent by post. The respondents in this study is the head of the company or the manager of the company. Selection of fishery business is associated with the company's dependence on environment as natural resources and the relationship between the company's supply chain. Data analysis was performed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with AMOS 21. From 440 survey respondents, 189 of the data collected and analysis is only performed on 153 while 36 other data unfit for use.

Meanwhile, the variables in the study are consisted of five variables: asymmetric power which is measured with 10 Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Measurement indicators of asymmetric power conducted by three indicators Schepers (2007) and Ganesan (1994). SGRC is measured by five indicators developed from literature. Symmetric Collaboration is measured by three indicators based on Simatupang and Sridharan, (2005). Network is measured by three indicators from Sparrowe *et al.* (2001) and Antoldi *et al.* (2011). While the organization's performance is measured by six indicators based Gunasekaran *et al.* (2004).

## RESULTS

The test results show that the overall from the data from each business areas does not have significant differences that deserve to be processed. The analysis of each indicator in the variable gain results that 3 indicators on the performance of the organization can not be used in relation to the data distribution that is not normal. And after the transformation conducted against these indicators, the loading value factor is below 0.5 and so can not be used in a full analysis of the model. Reliability of measurement results showed that all variables in this study had good reliability with a value of more than 0.7.

Meanwhile, only indicator with loading factor of more than 0.5 were used for the analysis of a full model. The results of calculation of reliability and Analysis of Variance Extracted for each variable can be seen in the following table. While the correlation between the variables in this study can be seen in Table 2, although there is a variance extracted values of less than 0.5, but the value of the square of the correlation between variables showed the value of which is still under AVE, this condition indicates convergent or discriminant validity rather than construct (Ghozali 2008).

### Calculation of Reliabilities and AVE

Variabel	AVE	Reliability
Net Working	0.55	0.75
Organization Performance	0.46	0.71
Symmetric Collaboration	0.38	0.64
Social Green Relational Capabilities	0.38	0.75
Asymmetric Power	0.49	0.74

### Relationship between Variable

	A	B	C	D
A Net Working				
B Organization Performance	0.288			
C Symmetric Collaboration	0.397	0.397		
D Social Green Relational Capabilities	0.556	0.374	0.907	

From 6 hypothesis proposed in this study, there are five hypotheses can be received with  $\alpha = 1\%$ . namely the hypothesis of asymmetric power relationship with SGGR, SGRC with Symmetric Collaboration, SGRC with Networking, and Symmetric Collaboration with Organizational Performance. Meanwhile, at  $\alpha = 5\%$  with CR value of 2.211 is the relationship between networks and symmetric collaboration. While the hypothesis of asymmetric power and symmetric collaboration has probability value of 0.727.

So that this hypothesis can not be accepted either at  $\alpha = 10\%$ . ( $\text{RMSEA} = 0.039$ ,  $\text{GFI} = 0.905$ ,  $\text{CFI} = 0.966$ ,  $\text{NFI} = 0.845$ ) with a Chi-square value is smaller than the chi table.

### Hypothesis Test Result

Hypothesis	Effects	Coefficient	Result
1	Negative	-0.09	Rejected
2	Positive	0.85	Accepted
3	Positive	0.85	Accepted
4	Positive	0.54	Accepted
5	Positive	0.25	Accepted
6	Positive	0.43	Accepted

### Conclusions and Implications

In previous studies, the concept has not been developed in an effort to control the asymmetric power. Results of previous studies more about impacts of asymmetric power and division or source of power itself. In this study, we propose a green social relational capabilities as an attempt to control the asymmetric power so symmetric collaboration can be achieved. The results of the study hypothesis 1 is not accepted, it indicates that the asymmetric power does not have a positive or negative considering the coefficient from loading factor marked negative but insignificant.

However, the results from this study illustrate that green social relational capabilities can be mediating variable between asymmetric power relations and symmetric collaboration. In addition, social green relation capabilities also serves as the new competencies that can lead to greater network of company or organization. The next study will be devoted to agriculture and fisheries companies to compare the environmental factors as the new competencies that can reduce the power imbalance and by taking into account the size of the organization as a comparison. Besides attachment to the company in association also used as treatment or control.

### REFERENCES

- Anderson, J.C. and J.A. Narus, 1990. A model of distributor firm and manufacturer firm working partnerships. *Journal of Marketing*, 54, 42-58.
- Anthony, T. 2000, "Supply chain collaboration: success in the new internet economy", *Achieving Supply Chain Excellence through Technology*, Montgomery Research Inc., San Francisco, CA, Vol. 2, pp. 41-4.
- Antoldi, F., Cerrato, D., dan Depperu, D. 2011. Strategic Network, Trust and The Competitive Advantage of SMEs. Export Consortia In Developing Countries Sucessfull Management of Cooperation Among SMEs. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg. P 23-43.
- Barnes, S., McGrath, M. and Pinnock, A. 1995. *The Category Management Revolution*. Institute of Grocery Distribution, Watford
- Beamon, B.M. 1999. Measuring Supply Chain Performance. *International Journal of Operation and Production Management*. 19 (3/4). P. 275-279
- Bevilacqua, M. dan Petroni, A. 2002. From traditional purchasing to supplier management: a fuzzy approach to

- supplier selection. *International Journal of Logistics*. Vol. 5 No. 3. P. 236-51
- Bhattacharya, C.B. dan Sen, S., 2004. Doing better at doing good: When, why, and how consumers respond to corporate social initiatives. *California Management Review*. 47, 9-24
- Bhushan, A., dan Mackenzie, J. 1994. 'Environmental Leadership Plus Total Quality Equals Continuous Improvement', in J. Willig (ed.), *Environmental Total Quality Management*, (New York: McGraw-Hill): 71-93.
- Bowersox, D.J., dan Closs D.J. 1996. *Supply chain relationships*. In *Logistical management: The integrated supply chain process* (3th ed., p88-114). New York: McGraw-Hill
- Bretherton, P. dan Carswell, P.. 2002. Trust me—I'm a marketing academic!: A cross-disciplinary look at trust. *Proceedings of: Academy of Marketing Annual Conference*, July 2-5,
- Buttle, F. 1996. "SERVQUAL: review, critique, research agenda", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 30 Iss: 1, pp.8 - 32
- Caruana, A.1997. Corporate reputation: Concept and measurement. *The Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 6(2), 109-118.
- Casciaro, T., Piskorski, M.J. 2005. Power Imbalance, Mutual Dependence, and Constraint Absorption: A Closer Look at Resource Dependence Theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50.
- Chen, C., Zhang, J.and Teresa, D. 2014. Quality control in food supply chain management: An analytical model and case study of the adulterated milk incident in China. *International Journal of production economics*, 1(1): 188-199
- Chetty, S. dan Agndal, H. 2007. Social Capital and its influence on Changes in Internationalization Mode among Small and Medium-size Enterprises. *Journal of International Marketing*. 15(1). P. 1-29.
- Chew, M.M. dan Sun, L.N.V.L. 2009. Retailer-Supplier Relationship in Hong Kong: Asymmetry, Power Play, and Supply Chain Management. *International Journal of Business and Management*. Vol. 4, No. 8
- Clift R. dan Wright L. 2000. *Relationships between environmental impacts and added value along the supply chain*.
- Cox, A., Lonsdale, C. and Watson, G. 2003. "The role of incentives in buyer-supplier relationships: industrial cases from a UK study", *Proceedings of the 19th Annual IMP Conference*, Lugano, 4-6 September.
- Crook, T.R., dan Combs, J.G. 2007. Sources and Cosequences of Bargaining Power in Supply Chains. *Journal of Operasian Management*. 25, 546-555
- Daily and Huang. 2001. Achieving sustainability through attention to human resource factors in environmental management. International journal operation & production management Vol.21. No 12.
- Dapiran, G.P. dan Hogarth-Scott, S. 2003 'Are co-operation and trust being confused with power? An analysis of food retailing in Australia and the UK', *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*. Vol. 31, No. 5, pp.256-267
- Duffy, R. dan Fearne, A. 2004. The Impact of Supply Chain Partnerships on Supplier Performance. *International Journal Logistic Management*. 15(4). P. 57-71
- Dyer, J.H., dan Nobeoka, K. 2000. Creating and managing a high-performance knowl- edge-sharing network: the Toyota case. *Strategic Management Journal*. 21 (3),P. 345-367.
- Feldman, L.J. 1998. Industry viewpoint: relational interdependency and punctuated equilibrium. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*. Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 288-93.
- Fukuyama, F., 1995. Trust: Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity. Hamish Hamilton, London.
- Ganesan S. 1994. Determinants of Long Term Orientation in Buyer-Seller Relationships. *Journal of Marketing*. 58 (2). P. 1-19.
- Geyskens, I., Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M., Scheer, L. K., dan Kumar, N. 1996. The effects of trust and interdependence on relationship commitment: A trans-Atlantic study. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. 13 (4), p303-317.
- Ghozali I. 2008. Model Persamaan Struktural: Konsep dan Aplikasi dengan Program AMOS 16. Semarang : BP Universitas Diponegoro
- Gulati Ranjay dan Paul R. Lawrence Phanish Puranam. 2005. Adaptation In Vertical Relationships: Beyond Incentive Conflict. Forthcoming: *Strategic Management Journal*
- Gulati, R. dan Sytch, M. 2007. Dependence Asymmtry and joint Dependence in Interorganizational Relationship: Effects of Embeddedness on a Manufacture's Performance in Procurement Relationship. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52.
- Gunasekaran, A., Patel, C., dan McGaughey, R.E. 2004. A Framework for Supply Chain performace Measurement. *International Journal of Production Economics*. 87 (3). P. 333-348.
- Gundlach, G. T. dan Cadotte, E.R. 1994. Exchange Interdependence and Interfirm Interaction: Research in a Simulated Channel Setting. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 31. P. 516-532
- Hingley. 2005. Power Imbalance Relationship: Chase from UK Fresh Food Supply. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*. 33 (8). P. 551-569.
- Kanter, R. M., 1997. The power of partnering. *Sales and Marketing Management* 149(6), 26-28
- Kilian B. et al. 2006. Is sustainable agriculture a viable strategy to improve fram income in central America? Case Studi on Coffe. *Journal of Business Research*. 59
- Kim, SW. 2006. Effect of Supply Chain Management Practice Integration and Competition Capability on Performance. *Supply Chain Management International Journal*. 11(3). P. 241-248.Kopicki et al. (1993)
- Kumar, N., Scheer, L.K., dan Steenkamp J.B.E.M. 1995. The Effect of Perceived Interdependence on Dealer Attitudes. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 32. P. 348-356
- Lambert, D.M. 2006. Supply Chain Management: Processes, Partnerships, Performance, 3rd edition. Supply Chain Management Institute
- Lanier Jr. D., Wempe, W.F., dan Zacharia, Z.G. 2010. Concentrated supply chain membership and financial performance: chain- and firm level perspectives. *Journal of operations management*. Vol. 28.2010, 1, p. 1-16

- Lusch, R. F. dan Brown, J. R. 1996. *Interdependency, Contracting, and Relational Behavior in Marketing Channels*. *The Journal of Marketing*. Vol. 60, No. 4 P. 19-38
- Mackelprang, A. 2011. *Beyond Firm Boundaries: Exploring The Interdependence Between Supply Chain Partner*. Unpublished Dissertation. Bussiness Administration Moore School Business University of South Carolina.
- Maloni M. and Benton W.C. 2000. Power Influences In The Supply Chain. *Journal of Business Logistics*, vol.21,no.1, 49-73
- Mavondo, F.T. dan Rodrigo, E.M 2001. The effect of relationship dimensions on interpersonal and interorganizational commitment in organizations conducting business between Australia and China. *Journal of Business Research*, 52, P. 111-121.
- Mesquita, L.F., dan Lazzarini, S.G. 2008. Horizontal and Vertical Relationships in Developing Economies: Implications for SMEs' Access to Global Markets. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(2): 359-380
- Michie, Donald A. and Stanley D. Sibley (1985), "Channel Member Satisfaction: Controversy Resolved," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 13 (2), 188-205
- Mohr, J. dan Spekman, R.E. 1994. "Characteristics of partnership success: partnership attributes, communication behavior, and conflict resolution techniques", *Strategic Management Journal*. Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 135-52
- Pai Fan-Yun dan Yeh Tsu-Ming. 2010. The Effect of Inter-Firm Power and Supply Partner Assessment on Supply Chain Integrationt. *Affrican Journal of Business Management* Vol. 4 (7). Pp 1308-1319
- Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G.R. 1978. *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York. Harper and Row
- Porter M.E., dan Van Der Linde C. 1995. Toward a New Conception of Environment Competitiveness Relationship. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 9. P. 97-118
- Powell, Walter W. 1988. "Institutional effects on organizational structure and performance." In *Institutional Patterns and Organizations: Culture and Environment*, 115-36, Lynne G. Zucker, ed. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Putnam, R. (1993). *Making democracy work: civic tradition in modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Ramdas, K., Spekman, R.E., 2000. Chain or chackles: understanding what drives supply-chain performance. *Interfaces* 30 (4), 3-21.
- Rokkan, A.I and Haugland, S.A, 2002. Developing relational exchange: Effectiveness and power. *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 36 Iss: 1/2, pp.211 - 230
- Scheer, L.K. dan Stern, L.W. 1992. The Effect of Influence Type and Performance Outcomes on Attitude Toward Influencer. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 29. P. 128-142
- Schepers W. 2007. *The Effect of Power Asymmetry on Buyer-Supplier Collaboration and Supply Chain Performance*. Unpublished Thsesis. Faculty of Economics and Business Administration Universiteit Maastricht
- Schepers W. 2007. *The Effect of Power Asymmetry on Buyer-Supplier Collaboration and Supply Chain Performance*. Unpublished Thsesis. Faculty of Economics and Business Administration Universiteit Maastricht
- Sharma, A. and Sheth, J.N. 1997. Supplier Relationship "Emerging Issues and Chalenges". *Industrial Marketing Management* 26, 91-100
- Simatupang, T.M. dan Sridharan, R. 2002. "The collaborative supply chain", *International Journal of Logistics Management*, Vol. 13 No. 1, P. 15-30.
- Simatupang, T.M., dan Sridharan, R. 2005. An Inttegratif Framework for Supply Chain Collaboration. *International Journal of Logistics and Management*. 16 (2). P. 257-274
- Sparrowe, R.T., Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., dan Kraimer, M.L. 2001. Social Networks and the Performance of Individuals and Groups *The Academy of Management Journal* Vol. 44, No. 2 (Apr., 2001), pp. 316-325.
- Spekman R. E., Salmon, D. J., dan Lambe, C.J. 1997. Consesus and Collaboration: Norm Regulated Behaviour in Industri Marketing Relationships. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31 (11/12).
- Spekman, R. E., dan Kamauff Jr, J. W. 1998. An empirical investigation into supply chain management. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 28 (8). P. 630-650.
- Srivastava S.K. 2007. Green Supply Chain Management: A State-of-The-Art Literature Review. *International Journal Management Review*, Vol. 9 P. 53-80
- Stern LW. dan Reve T. 1980. Distribution Channel as Political Ekonomies: A Framework for Comparative Analysis. *Journal Marketing* 44. No. 3. P 52-64.
- Tata, J dan Prasad. S. 2008. Social Capital, Collaborative Exchange, and Micro-Enterprise Performance: Role of Gender. *International Journal Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, Vol. 5 No. ¾. P. 373-388
- Teece, D.J. 1987. Profiting from Tecgnological Inovation: Implication for Integration Collaboration Licensing and Public Policy. In D.J. Teece (Ed). The Competitive Chalange: Strategies for Industrial Inovation and Renewal. 18. P. 509-533.
- Tyler, T. R., dan Kramer, R. M. 1996. Whither trust? In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research: 1-15*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Van Hoek, R.I. 1999. From reversed logistics to green supply chains. *Supply Chain Management*, 4, 129–135.
- Vlosky, R. and Wilson, E.J. 1997. "Partnering and Traditional Relationships in Business Marketing: An Introduction to the Special Issue." *Journal of Business Research*. 39(1):1-4.
- Wagner, B.A. 2003. Learning and Knowledge Transfer in Partnering: an Empirical Case Study. *Journal Knowledge Management*, 7(2). P. 97-113
- Whipple, J. M., dan Russell, D. 2007. Building supply chain collaboration: a typology of collaborative approaches. *International Journal of Logistics Management*. 18(2): P. 174-196.
- Wilkerson, T. 2005. Can One Green Deliver Another? Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation (available at: <http://www.supplychainstrategy.org/>).
- Wilson, D.T. dan Mummaleni, V., 1986, 'Bonding and Commitment in Buyer-seller Relationships: A Preliminary Conceptualization. *Industrial Marketing and Purchasing*, Vol. 1, No. 3, P. 44-58

- Wu, H. J., dan Dunn, S. C. 1995. Environmentally responsible logistics system. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 25, 20-39.
- Yan, A. and Gray, B. 1994. Bargaining Power, Management Control, and Performance in United States-China Joint Ventures: A Comparative Case Study. *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 6 (Dec., 1994), pp. 1478-1517
- Zhou, N., Zhuang, G., dan Yip, L. S.C. 2007. Perceptual difference of dependence and its impact on conflict in marketing channels in China: An empirical study with two-sided data. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36 (3), P. 309-321

\*\*\*\*\*