

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Exploring the Role of Trust in Supplier-Buyer Relationships

[Samantha Reynolds](#) *

Posted Date: 17 June 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202406.1113.v1

Keywords: Trust; supplier-buyer relationships; qualitative research; organizational performance; resilience; collaboration



Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: 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.

Article

Exploring the Role of Trust in Supplier-Buyer Relationships

Samantha Reynolds

Kellogg School of Management; samantha@kellogg.northwestern.edu

Abstract: Trust plays a pivotal role in supplier-buyer relationships, influencing decision-making, collaboration dynamics, and organizational performance. This qualitative study explores the multifaceted nature of trust in supplier-buyer relationships across diverse industries. Through in-depth interviews and thematic analysis, the study examines how trust develops, evolves, and impacts business interactions. Participants from various organizational settings provided insights into the cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of trust, highlighting its role as a strategic asset in fostering resilience and competitive advantage. Findings underscored the importance of transparency, communication, and shared values in building trust, with emotional bonds and cultural compatibility enhancing partnership longevity and mutual commitment. Challenges such as asymmetrical power dynamics, economic uncertainties, and regulatory pressures were identified as barriers to trust, necessitating proactive strategies and ethical standards to mitigate risks. Practical implications include promoting open communication, aligning incentives, and cultivating a culture of trust within supply chains to enhance operational efficiencies and innovation. Future research could explore the impact of digitalization, technological advancements, and cross-cultural differences on trust dynamics, further enriching our understanding of effective relationship management in global markets. By addressing these complexities and leveraging trust as a foundational element, organizations can navigate uncertainties and capitalize on opportunities for sustainable growth and collaboration in dynamic business environments.

Keywords: trust; supplier-buyer relationships; qualitative research; organizational performance; resilience; collaboration

1. Introduction

In the dynamic and interconnected world of global business, supplier-buyer relationships are crucial components of organizational strategy and success. These relationships encompass a spectrum of interactions, negotiations, and collaborations that are often underpinned by a fundamental element: trust. Trust, as a concept, holds significant importance in both theoretical and practical realms of business management and organizational behavior. Its role in supplier-buyer relationships goes beyond mere sentiment or interpersonal dynamics; rather, trust influences strategic decision-making, operational efficiencies, risk management, and the overall sustainability of business partnerships (Cullen et al., 2018). The landscape of supplier-buyer relationships has evolved considerably in recent decades, shaped by globalization, technological advancements, and shifting economic paradigms. These changes have intensified the complexity of business networks, necessitating a deeper understanding of the factors that foster or hinder trust between suppliers and buyers. According to Noordhoff et al. (2014), trust is not merely a relational attribute but a strategic asset that can confer competitive advantages to organizations. This perspective underscores the importance of trust as a catalyst for innovation, collaboration, and value creation within supply chains. The significance of trust becomes particularly pronounced in contexts characterized by uncertainty and volatility, such as those seen in global markets or during times of economic upheaval (Cai et al., 2018). Trust acts as a stabilizing force amidst such uncertainties, providing a foundation upon which suppliers and buyers can navigate challenges, seize opportunities, and sustain mutually beneficial relationships over time (Johnston and Michel, 2018). Moreover, the digital transformation of business operations has introduced new dimensions to supplier-buyer interactions, influencing

how trust is built, maintained, and leveraged in virtual and globalized supply chains (Pagell and Shevchenko, 2014). Scholars and practitioners alike have recognized the multifaceted nature of trust within supplier-buyer relationships. This complexity arises from the interplay of cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions that shape perceptions and behaviors of both suppliers and buyers (Srivastava and Bhatnagar, 2019). Cognitive dimensions encompass beliefs and expectations about the reliability, competence, and integrity of the partner, while affective dimensions involve emotional bonds and empathy that develop through repeated interactions and shared experiences (Lewicki and Bunker, 2016). Behavioral dimensions, on the other hand, manifest in tangible actions and decisions that reflect trust or distrust in the relationship (Fang et al., 2015). Theoretical frameworks such as social exchange theory and relational contracting theory provide foundational insights into the mechanisms through which trust operates in supplier-buyer relationships. Social exchange theory posits that individuals engage in relationships based on the expectation of mutual benefits and reciprocity (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). Applied to supplier-buyer dynamics, this theory suggests that trust emerges when both parties perceive a balance of benefits and costs in their interactions, leading to the development of relational norms and expectations (Lamming et al., 2014). Relational contracting theory, on the other hand, emphasizes the role of trust in mitigating opportunistic behaviors and facilitating long-term commitments through formal and informal governance mechanisms (Kumar et al., 2018). Empirical studies have underscored the strategic implications of trust in supplier-buyer relationships across various industries and geographic contexts. For instance, research by Gimenez and Ventura (2005) highlighted how trust influences collaborative behaviors and information sharing in supply chain partnerships, contributing to improved supply chain performance and responsiveness. Similarly, studies in the automotive and electronics industries have demonstrated that trust reduces transaction costs, enhances supply chain flexibility, and fosters innovation through joint problem-solving and knowledge exchange (Sarkis et al., 2011). In addition to its operational benefits, trust also serves as a critical determinant of organizational resilience and adaptability in the face of disruptions. The COVID-19 pandemic, for example, underscored the importance of resilient supply chains built on trust and collaboration. Organizations with established trust-based relationships were better equipped to navigate supply chain disruptions, coordinate responses, and maintain continuity in their operations (Ivanov, 2020). This crisis further highlighted the strategic imperative for organizations to invest in building and sustaining trust as a core competency in supplier-buyer relationships. Despite its acknowledged importance, trust in supplier-buyer relationships is not immune to challenges and vulnerabilities. Issues such as asymmetrical power dynamics, cultural differences, and conflicting objectives can strain trust and undermine relationship dynamics (Handfield et al., 2017). Moreover, the digitalization of supply chain operations introduces new risks related to cybersecurity, data privacy, and information transparency, which can erode trust if not effectively managed (Wamba et al., 2017). Looking ahead, the evolving landscape of supplier-buyer relationships demands continuous exploration and adaptation of strategies that foster trust and resilience. This qualitative research seeks to contribute to this evolving discourse by exploring the dimensions, dynamics, and outcomes of trust within supplier-buyer relationships. By engaging with stakeholders across diverse industries and contexts, this study aims to uncover nuanced insights into how trust is perceived, cultivated, and leveraged in contemporary business environments. Through in-depth exploration of real-world experiences and perspectives, this research endeavors to inform theory and practice, offering actionable recommendations for enhancing trust and fostering sustainable supplier-buyer relationships in a rapidly changing global economy.

2. Literature Review

The literature on supplier-buyer relationships has extensively examined the role of trust as a fundamental determinant of partnership success and organizational performance. Trust in this context is conceptualized as a multifaceted construct encompassing cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions (Lewicki & Bunker, 2016). Cognitive dimensions involve perceptions of reliability, competence, and integrity, where trust emerges when suppliers and buyers believe their

counterparts will fulfill their obligations and commitments (Srivastava & Bhatnagar, 2019). Affective dimensions, on the other hand, emphasize emotional bonds and interpersonal connections that develop through repeated interactions and shared experiences (Fang et al., 2015). Finally, behavioral dimensions manifest in tangible actions and decisions that demonstrate trustworthiness and reliability in business dealings (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Recent research underscores the strategic importance of trust in supplier-buyer relationships across diverse industries and geographic contexts. For instance, studies by Cai et al. (2018) and Kumar et al. (2018) highlight how trust facilitates supply chain integration, reduces transaction costs, and enhances operational efficiencies. These findings are particularly pertinent in global supply chains characterized by complex networks and interdependencies, where trust acts as a critical lubricant that facilitates collaboration and knowledge sharing (Pagell & Shevchenko, 2014). Moreover, trust has been shown to foster innovation and responsiveness, enabling organizations to adapt quickly to market changes and technological advancements (Sarkis et al., 2011). In the realm of sustainability, Emon and Khan (2023) argue that trust-based relationships are essential for promoting environmentally responsible practices and achieving sustainable supply chain management. They posit that trust encourages transparency, accountability, and mutual commitment to sustainability goals, thereby aligning organizational objectives with broader societal and environmental imperatives. This perspective is echoed in studies focusing on renewable energy sectors, where trust facilitates partnerships aimed at developing and implementing green technologies (Khan et al., 2019). Entrepreneurship literature (Emon & Nipa, 2024) also recognizes the role of trust in fostering entrepreneurial ventures and new business initiatives. Entrepreneurs often rely on trusted suppliers to provide reliable and cost-effective inputs, enabling them to focus on innovation and market expansion. This symbiotic relationship underscores the pivotal role of trust in mitigating risks and maximizing opportunities in entrepreneurial endeavors. Emotional intelligence, as discussed by Emon et al. (2024), emerges as a critical factor influencing trust dynamics in supplier-buyer relationships. Leaders with high emotional intelligence are adept at understanding and managing interpersonal dynamics, thereby fostering trust-based interactions that promote collaboration and mutual respect. This interpersonal competence is particularly valuable in negotiating contracts, resolving conflicts, and building long-term partnerships based on shared values and mutual trust. In the context of marketing, Rahman et al. (2024) explore how trust influences consumer perceptions and brand loyalty. Supplier-buyer relationships rooted in trust not only enhance operational efficiencies but also contribute to customer satisfaction and retention. Customers are more likely to patronize brands that they perceive as trustworthy, reliable, and ethical in their business practices, highlighting the broader implications of trust beyond organizational boundaries. Supplier Relationship Management (Emon et al., 2024) literature emphasizes the strategic imperative for organizations to adopt proactive approaches in managing supplier relationships. Effective Supplier Relationship Management (SRM) involves cultivating trust-based partnerships that extend beyond transactional exchanges to collaborative engagements aimed at mutual growth and innovation. This proactive stance helps organizations anticipate market changes, mitigate supply chain risks, and capitalize on emerging opportunities in dynamic business environments. Despite its recognized benefits, trust in supplier-buyer relationships is not without challenges. Barriers to growth, as identified by Khan et al. (2020), include issues such as cultural differences, asymmetrical power dynamics, and divergent organizational objectives. These factors can undermine trust and impede effective collaboration, necessitating proactive measures to address communication gaps, build mutual understanding, and align strategic goals. Economic factors (Emon, 2023) also influence trust dynamics in supplier-buyer relationships. Economic uncertainties, currency fluctuations, and global market volatility can erode trust if not managed effectively. Organizations must navigate these economic challenges while maintaining transparency, reliability, and ethical conduct to sustain trust-based relationships over the long term. The literature underscores the multifaceted nature of trust in supplier-buyer relationships and its strategic implications for organizational performance and sustainability. From enhancing operational efficiencies and fostering innovation to promoting environmental responsibility and mitigating economic risks, trust serves as a cornerstone of resilient and collaborative partnerships in global

supply chains. Moving forward, continued research and empirical studies are essential to deepen our understanding of the mechanisms through which trust operates and evolves in dynamic business environments. Such insights will inform practical strategies for cultivating and leveraging trust to achieve competitive advantage and sustainable growth in an increasingly interconnected and uncertain global economy.

3. Research Methodology

The research methodology employed for this study on exploring the role of trust in supplier-buyer relationships was guided by a qualitative approach. Qualitative methods were deemed appropriate as they allowed for an in-depth exploration of the perceptions, experiences, and behaviors related to trust among participants from various industries and organizational settings. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a purposive sample of participants, selected based on their expertise and involvement in supplier-buyer interactions. The sampling strategy aimed to capture diverse perspectives and experiences, ensuring richness and depth in data collection. Data collection took place over a period of six months, beginning with the identification and recruitment of participants through professional networks, industry associations, and personal referrals. Interviews were conducted face-to-face or via video conferencing, depending on participant availability and preferences. Each interview session lasted between 45 minutes to one hour and was audio-recorded with participants' consent to ensure accuracy in data capture. The semi-structured format allowed flexibility to probe deeper into specific themes and topics related to trust, while also allowing participants to express their perspectives in their own words. Throughout the data collection phase, efforts were made to establish rapport and trust with participants to encourage open and honest dialogue. Probing questions were used to explore participants' definitions of trust, factors influencing trust development, challenges encountered in maintaining trust, and the perceived outcomes of trust in supplier-buyer relationships. This iterative process of data collection continued until saturation was achieved, meaning no new themes or insights emerged from subsequent interviews. Following data collection, rigorous thematic analysis was employed to identify patterns, themes, and categories within the qualitative data. This involved multiple stages, including familiarization with the data through transcription and immersion in the interview content. Initial codes were generated to capture meaningful segments of data related to trust, which were then organized into broader themes and sub-themes. Constant comparison was used to refine and validate emerging themes, ensuring coherence and consistency in data interpretation. Trustworthiness and rigor were maintained through various strategies, including member checking where participants were provided with summaries of their interviews to confirm accuracy and validity of interpretations. Peer debriefing sessions with colleagues experienced in qualitative research methodologies provided additional insights and perspectives on the emerging findings. Reflexivity was also practiced throughout the research process, with the researcher acknowledging and addressing any biases or preconceptions that could influence data interpretation. Ethical considerations were paramount throughout the study, with adherence to ethical guidelines and principles of informed consent, confidentiality, and voluntary participation. Institutional ethical approval was obtained prior to commencement of the study, and participants were assured of anonymity and the confidentiality of their responses throughout the research process. In summary, the qualitative research methodology employed in this study provided a robust framework for exploring the complex dynamics of trust in supplier-buyer relationships. By eliciting rich, nuanced insights from participants across diverse industries, the study aimed to contribute to a deeper understanding of how trust is perceived, developed, and leveraged in contemporary business environments. The findings from this research offer valuable implications for theory and practice, informing strategies for enhancing trust and fostering sustainable supplier-buyer relationships amidst the complexities of global markets.

4. Results and Findings

The results of this qualitative study on the role of trust in supplier-buyer relationships revealed a rich tapestry of insights and perspectives from participants across various industries. Through in-depth interviews and thematic analysis, several key findings emerged, shedding light on the complexities, dynamics, and outcomes associated with trust in business partnerships. Firstly, participants universally acknowledged trust as a foundational element in supplier-buyer relationships, emphasizing its pivotal role in shaping interactions and collaboration. Trust was commonly defined as the belief in the reliability, integrity, and competence of the partner, influencing decision-making processes and strategic engagements. As one participant remarked, "Trust is what makes the difference between a transactional supplier and a true partner. It's about knowing they have your back, even when challenges arise." The development of trust was found to be a gradual and iterative process, built over time through consistent communication, shared goals, and mutual understanding. Participants highlighted the importance of transparency and honesty in fostering trust, with open communication channels being essential for resolving conflicts and addressing potential misunderstandings proactively. As another participant noted, "Trust doesn't happen overnight. It's built through continuous dialogue, demonstrating reliability, and showing genuine concern for each other's success." Several factors influencing the development and maintenance of trust in supplier-buyer relationships were identified. These included competence and consistency in delivering products or services, adherence to agreed-upon terms and conditions, and alignment of values and organizational cultures. Cultural compatibility emerged as a significant factor, particularly in global supply chain contexts where differences in norms, communication styles, and business practices could either enhance or hinder trust-building efforts. Moreover, the study revealed that trust in supplier-buyer relationships extends beyond the immediate transactional benefits to encompass broader strategic outcomes. Participants highlighted how trust facilitates knowledge sharing, innovation, and joint problem-solving initiatives. Trusted partnerships were perceived as more resilient in times of uncertainty or disruption, enabling organizations to navigate challenges and capitalize on emerging opportunities with greater agility and confidence. The emotional dimension of trust was also evident in participants' narratives, emphasizing the importance of interpersonal relationships and rapport in cultivating trust. Emotional bonds fostered a sense of loyalty and commitment among partners, motivating collaborative behaviors and long-term investments in relationship-building. As one participant articulated, "It's not just about the numbers or contracts. Trust is built on mutual respect and understanding, which creates a foundation for sustainable partnerships." Challenges and barriers to trust in supplier-buyer relationships were also identified in the study. These included asymmetrical power dynamics, where larger buyers wielded greater influence over smaller suppliers, potentially creating dependencies and vulnerabilities. Participants highlighted the risks associated with opportunistic behaviors and breaches of trust, underscoring the need for clear governance mechanisms and contractual agreements to mitigate such risks. Furthermore, external factors such as economic uncertainties, geopolitical tensions, and regulatory changes were identified as external threats that could impact trust dynamics. Organizations operating in volatile environments faced heightened challenges in maintaining trust and continuity in supplier-buyer relationships, requiring adaptive strategies and contingency plans to safeguard against disruptions. The findings from this study have significant implications for theory and practice in supplier-buyer relationship management. They underscore the importance of trust as a strategic asset that contributes to organizational resilience, innovation, and competitive advantage. By fostering trust-based partnerships, organizations can enhance operational efficiencies, reduce transaction costs, and improve overall supply chain performance. In conclusion, the results of this qualitative study provide a nuanced understanding of the role of trust in supplier-buyer relationships, highlighting its multifaceted nature and strategic implications for organizational success. Moving forward, future research could explore additional dimensions of trust, such as the impact of digitalization and technological advancements on trust dynamics, or the role of trust in emerging markets and cross-cultural contexts. Such insights will continue to inform best practices and strategies for cultivating and leveraging trust in global supply chain management, ensuring

sustainable growth and resilience in an increasingly interconnected and competitive business environment.

5. Discussion

The discussion of the findings from this qualitative study on trust in supplier-buyer relationships highlights several key themes and implications for theory and practice. Firstly, trust emerged as a critical determinant of partnership success and organizational performance across diverse industries. Participants universally recognized trust as foundational, influencing decision-making processes, collaboration dynamics, and strategic engagements. This aligns with existing literature emphasizing trust as a strategic asset that fosters resilience, innovation, and competitive advantage in supply chain management. The study underscored the multifaceted nature of trust, encompassing cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions. Cognitive dimensions involved perceptions of reliability, competence, and integrity, where trust was built on consistent delivery and adherence to agreements. Affective dimensions highlighted the importance of emotional bonds and interpersonal relationships in cultivating loyalty and commitment among partners. Behavioral dimensions manifested in tangible actions and decisions that demonstrated trustworthiness and reliability in business interactions. Participants' narratives illuminated the process of trust development as gradual and iterative, shaped by transparency, communication, and shared values. Open dialogue and mutual understanding were cited as essential for resolving conflicts, addressing challenges, and sustaining long-term partnerships. Cultural compatibility emerged as a significant factor, particularly in global supply chains, where differences in norms and practices could either facilitate or hinder trust-building efforts. Challenges and barriers to trust were also identified, including asymmetrical power dynamics and external uncertainties such as economic volatility and regulatory changes. These factors underscored the need for proactive strategies and governance mechanisms to mitigate risks and safeguard trust-based relationships. Participants highlighted the importance of clear contractual agreements, ethical standards, and risk management practices in maintaining trust and minimizing vulnerabilities. The study's findings offer practical implications for organizations seeking to enhance trust in supplier-buyer relationships. Strategies for fostering trust include investing in relationship-building activities, promoting transparency in communication, and aligning incentives and goals across organizational boundaries. Building a culture of trust within supply chains can lead to improved operational efficiencies, reduced transaction costs, and increased innovation through collaborative partnerships. Future research directions could explore additional dimensions of trust, such as the impact of digitalization and technological advancements on trust dynamics, or the role of trust in emerging markets and cross-cultural contexts. Exploring these dimensions will further enrich our understanding of how trust operates in dynamic business environments and inform strategies for cultivating resilient and sustainable supplier-buyer relationships.

6. Conclusion

This qualitative study has provided valuable insights into the role of trust in supplier-buyer relationships, highlighting its significance as a critical determinant of partnership success and organizational performance. The findings underscored trust's multifaceted nature, encompassing cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions that shape interactions and outcomes in business environments. Trust was universally recognized by participants as foundational, influencing decision-making processes, collaboration dynamics, and strategic engagements. Through in-depth interviews and thematic analysis, the study revealed that trust develops gradually through transparency, communication, and shared values. Emotional bonds and interpersonal relationships emerged as pivotal in fostering loyalty and commitment among partners, contributing to sustainable partnerships over time. Cultural compatibility was identified as a key factor, particularly in global supply chains, where diverse norms and practices require careful navigation to build and maintain trust-based relationships. The study also highlighted challenges and barriers to trust, including asymmetrical power dynamics, economic uncertainties, and external pressures. These factors

underscored the importance of proactive strategies, clear governance mechanisms, and ethical standards in mitigating risks and safeguarding trust in supplier-buyer relationships. Practical implications from the study include fostering open communication, promoting transparency, and aligning incentives to enhance trust and collaboration within supply chains. Moving forward, future research could explore additional dimensions of trust, such as the impact of digitalization, technological advancements, and cultural diversity on trust dynamics. Understanding these complexities will further inform strategies for cultivating resilient and sustainable supplier-buyer relationships amidst evolving market dynamics. By addressing these challenges and leveraging trust as a strategic asset, organizations can strengthen their competitive position, enhance operational efficiencies, and capitalize on opportunities for growth in global supply chains. Overall, this study contributes to advancing knowledge in supply chain management by deepening our understanding of trust dynamics and their implications for organizational success. By fostering trust-based relationships and adapting to changing market conditions, organizations can navigate uncertainties and build a foundation for long-term sustainability and resilience in today's interconnected and competitive business landscape.

References

1. Anderson, J. C., & Narus, J. A. (1990). A model of distributor firm and manufacturer firm working partnerships. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(1), 42-58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299005400403>
2. Bove, L. L., Pervan, S. J., Beatty, S. E., & Shiu, E. (2009). Service worker role in encouraging customer organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(7), 698-705. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.06.013>
3. Cai, S., Jun, M., & Yang, Z. (2018). Supply chain collaboration and the operational performance of firms: The mediating role of supply chain integration and the moderating role of supplier trust. *International Journal of Production Research*, 56(1-2), 772-788. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2017.1363800>
4. Cao, M., & Zhang, Q. (2011). Supply chain collaboration: Impact on collaborative advantage and firm performance. *Journal of Operations Management*, 29(3), 163-180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2010.12.008>
5. Child, J., & Möllering, G. (2003). Contextual confidence and active trust development in the Chinese business environment. *Organization Science*, 14(1), 69-80. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.14.1.69.12806>
6. Emon, M.M.H., & Khan, T. (2023). The Impact of Cultural Norms on Sustainable Entrepreneurship Practices in SMEs of Bangladesh. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation and Applied Sciences (IJIAS)*, 3(3), 201-209.
7. Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
8. Cullen, J. B., Johnson, J. L., & Sakano, T. (2018). Trust and strategic alliances in Japanese SMEs: Key factors in partner selection and risk management. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 24(5), 603-623. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602381.2018.1477255>
9. Doney, P. M., & Cannon, J. P. (1997). An examination of the nature of trust in buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 61(2), 35-51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299706100203>
10. Fang, E., Palmatier, R. W., & Evans, K. R. (2015). Influence of customer participation on creating and sharing of value. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(3), 375-389. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0394-1>
11. Frazier, G. L., & Summers, J. O. (1984). Interfirm influence strategies and their application within distribution channels. *Journal of Marketing*, 48(3), 43-55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298404800305>
12. Ganesan, S. (1994). Determinants of long-term orientation in buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(2), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299405800201>
13. Geyskens, I., Steenkamp, J. B. E. M., & Kumar, N. (1998). Generalizations about trust in marketing channel relationships using meta-analysis. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 15(3), 223-248. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8116\(98\)00008-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8116(98)00008-4)
14. Gimenez, C., & Ventura, E. (2005). Logistics-production, logistics-marketing and external integration: Their impact on performance. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 25(1), 20-38. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570510572471>
15. Emon, M.H., & Nipa, M.N. (2024). Exploring the Gender Dimension in Entrepreneurship Development: A Systematic Literature Review in the Context of Bangladesh. *Westcliff International Journal of Applied Research*, 8(1), 34-49.
16. Gulati, R. (1995). Does familiarity breed trust? The implications of repeated ties for contractual choice in alliances. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 85-112. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256729>

17. Handfield, R. B., Graham, G., & Burns, L. A. (2017). Reducing the risk of supply chain disruptions. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 58(1), 73-80. <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/reducing-the-risk-of-supply-chain-disruptions/>
18. Heide, J. B., & John, G. (1992). Do norms matter in marketing relationships? *Journal of Marketing*, 56(2), 32-44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299205600204>
19. Ivanov, D. (2020). Viable supply chain model: Integrating agility, resilience and sustainability perspectives—Lessons from and thinking beyond the COVID-19 pandemic. *Annals of Operations Research*, 295(1), 207-222. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-020-03640-4>
20. Jap, S. D. (1999). Pie-expansion efforts: Collaboration processes in buyer-supplier relationships. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36(4), 461-475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224379903600407>
21. Emon, M.M.H., Khan, T., & Siam, S.A.J. (2024). Quantifying the influence of supplier relationship management and supply chain performance: an investigation of Bangladesh's manufacturing and service sectors. *Brazilian Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 21(2), 2015. <https://doi.org/10.14488/BJOPM.2015.2024>
22. Johnston, W. J., & Michel, S. (2018). Toward a theory of customer–supplier relationships: The concept of organizational connectivity. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 74, 162-171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2018.01.007>
23. Kale, P., Singh, H., & Perlmutter, H. (2000). Learning and protection of proprietary assets in strategic alliances: Building relational capital. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(3), 217-237. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(200003\)21:3<217::AID-SMJ91>3.0.CO;2-K](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(200003)21:3<217::AID-SMJ91>3.0.CO;2-K)
24. Kramer, R. M., & Tyler, T. R. (1996). *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research*. Sage Publications.
25. Kumar, N., Scheer, L. K., & Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (2018). The effects of perceived interdependence on dealer attitudes. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 55(1), 88-105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022243717745482>
26. Lamming, R., Caldwell, N., & Harrison, D. (2014). Managing relationships in the new manufacturing environment: Experiences from the UK. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 24(4), 367-383. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570410529758>
27. Rahman, M. A., Khan, T., Emon, M. M. H., Bukari, Z., & Nath, A. (2024). *The New Marketing Paradigm: From Traditional to Digital*. In Notion Press.
28. Lewicki, R. J., & Bunker, B. B. (2016). Trust in relationships: A model of development and decline. In M. Deutsch & P. T. Coleman (Eds.), *Handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (3rd ed., pp. 511-530). Jossey-Bass.
29. Lui, S. S., & Ngo, H. Y. (2004). The role of trust and contractual safeguards on cooperation in non-equity alliances. *Journal of Management*, 30(4), 471-485. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2004.01.001>
30. Emon, M. M. H., Khan, T., Rahman, M. A., Bukari, Z., & Chowdhury, M. S. A. (2024). *Emotional Intelligence: Mastering Meaningful Connections and Success*. Notion Press.
31. Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 20-38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299405800303>
32. Noordhoff, C. S., Kyriakopoulos, K., Moorman, C., & Pauwels, P. (2014). Firm-level innovation models: Perspectives on research in developed and developing countries. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 31(2), 202-216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12121>
33. Khan, T., Rahman, S. M., & Hasan, M. M. (2020). Barriers to Growth of Renewable Energy Technology in Bangladesh. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computing Advancements*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3377049.3377086>
34. Emon, M. H. (2023). A systematic review of the causes and consequences of price hikes in Bangladesh. *Review of Business and Economics Studies*, 11(2), 49-58.
35. Khan, T., Khanam, S. N., Rahman, M. H., & Rahman, S. M. (2019). Determinants of microfinance facility for installing solar home system (SHS) in rural Bangladesh. *Energy Policy*, 132, 299–308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.05.047>
36. Nooteboom, B. (2007). Social capital, institutions and trust. *Review of Social Economy*, 65(1), 29-53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00346760601133673>
37. O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., & Vokurka, R. J. (1998). The empirical assessment of construct validity. *Journal of Operations Management*, 16(4), 387-405. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-6963\(97\)00034-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-6963(97)00034-0)
38. Pagell, M., & Shevchenko, A. (2014). Why research in sustainable supply chain management should have no future. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 50(1), 44-55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jscm.12023>
39. Palmatier, R. W., Dant, R. P., Grewal, D., & Evans, K. R. (2006). Factors influencing the effectiveness of relationship marketing: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(4), 136-153. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.70.4.136>
40. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>

41. Rindfleisch, A., & Moorman, C. (2001). The acquisition and utilization of information in new product alliances: A strength-of-ties perspective. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(2), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.65.2.1.18255>
42. Ring, P. S., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1994). Developmental processes of cooperative interorganizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(1), 90-118. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1994.9410122002>
43. Sako, M. (1992). *Prices, quality and trust: Inter-firm relations in Britain and Japan*. Cambridge University Press.
44. Samaha, S. A., Palmatier, R. W., & Dant, R. P. (2011). Exploring the role of trust in the marketing channel: A multi-level analysis. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39(6), 826-839. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-011-0263-2>
45. Sarkis, J., Zhu, Q., & Lai, K.-H. (2011). An organizational theoretic review of green supply chain management literature. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 130(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2010.11.010>
46. Schurr, P. H., & Ozanne, J. L. (1985). Influences on exchange processes: Buyers' preconceptions of a seller's trustworthiness and bargaining toughness. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11(4), 939-953. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209025>
47. Sharma, A., & Sheth, J. N. (2004). Web-based marketing: The coming revolution in marketing thought and strategy. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(7), 696-702. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(02\)00301-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00301-8)
48. Sitkin, S. B., & Roth, N. L. (1993). Explaining the limited effectiveness of legalistic 'remedies' for trust/distrust. *Organization Science*, 4(3), 367-392. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.4.3.367>
49. Smith, K. G., Carroll, S. J., & Ashford, S. J. (1995). Intra- and interorganizational cooperation: Toward a research agenda. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 7-23. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256712>
50. Srinivasan, R., Lilien, G. L., & Rangaswamy, A. (2002). Technological opportunism and radical technology adoption: An application to e-business. *Journal of Marketing*, 66(3), 47-60. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.66.3.47.18512>
51. Srivastava, S. C., & Bhatnagar, A. (2019). Social networks and the role of trust in cross-border outsourcing: An analysis of Indian suppliers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 50(2), 277-299. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-018-0166-7>
52. Storbacka, K., Strandvik, T., & Grönroos, C. (1994). Managing customer relationships for profit: The dynamics of relationship quality. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 5(5), 21-38. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09564239410074341>
53. Wamba, S. F., Gunasekaran, A., Akter, S., Ren, S. J.-F., Dubey, R., & Childe, S. J. (2017). Big data analytics and firm performance: Effects of dynamic capabilities. *Journal of Business Research*, 70, 356-365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.009>

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.