

EVALUATION OF THEORETICAL PARADIGMS OF INTERFIRM RELATIONSHIP FORMATION

Associate Professor Mohammed BELAL UDDIN

Comilla University, Bangladesh

Email: belal_137@yahoo.com

Abstract:

The aim of this paper is to check the existing theories that designate interfirm relationship formation. Transaction cost economics, resource based view, social network theory, strategic choice theory, organizational learning theory, and institutional theory designate interfirm relationship formation. These broadly used theories are included in this paper. This paper finds that while each theory is useful, each is also inadequate to confine the complexities implicated in interfirm relationship formation. Competitive advantage, learning, risk sharing, cost minimization, information sharing etc. are the reasons to join in a relationship. As a result, it is suggested that the combination of the theoretical paradigms offers a more useful way of understanding the interfirm relationship formation.

Keywords: *Interfirm relationship, Theory, Transaction cost economics, Learning, Legitimacy*

1. Introduction

Comprehensive studies and theoretical models support interfirm relationships. The interfirm relationship emphasizes the communication and integration process of firms to each other based on their experiences. To understand the way of interfirm relationship formation and techniques to maintain better interfirm settings various scholars developed several theories from their theoretical and practical point of view. The theories are presented in the management, sociology, economics, and strategic management journals. The theoretical literature on interfirm relationship advent is break up, with numerous disciplines contributing to the sphere (Koza and Lewin, 1998; Osborn and Hagedoorn, 1997). The fragmented nature of the literature reflects the complex nature of interfirm relationship formation, which often includes a mixture of reasons, intentions, and targets. This article is a review work. Author has gone through the published books, articles, conference paper, and working paper to provide a summary of the findings of theoretical and empirical literature on interfirm relationship theories. Moreover, the academic knowledge and experience of the author have been used to prepare this paper. The aim of this paper is to check the existing theories that designate interfirm relationship formation. Transaction cost economics, resource based view, social network theory, strategic choice theory, organizational learning theory, and institutional theory designate interfirm relationship formation. These broadly used theories are included in this article. The limitations of the theories have been discussed and it was also mentioned why a separate theory was not sufficient for interfirm relationships formations.

2. Theories of Interfirm Relationship Formation

2.1. *Transaction Cost Economics (TCE)*

Transaction cost economics focuses on reduction of the manufacturing and transaction associated prices. Uncertainty is arisen because of market failure. Interfirm alliances can limit this uncertainty and reduce expenses related to organizing a hierarchy (Barringer and Harrison, 2000). A theoretical framework regarding business relationships comes to existence when it comes to different key conceptions. In classical microeconomic assumption of the market, business organization and marketplace are such conceptions. In any such international, business associations is something modern and exclusive. The associations may be either poor or wonderful for the motive that of some specific circumstance related to marketplace and features of company. This relationship is supported by the approach of transaction cost economics (TCE) (Hakansson and Lind, 2007). The initial beginning depend of TCE is to recognize differences in transactional developments. Transactional traits encompass environmental and human uncertainty, asset specificity, and frequency (Williamson, 1985). The principle advocacy of TCE is that increased uncertainty and asset specificity want extra governance mechanisms. Transactional frequency i.e. extra subsequent transactions can lessen the huge cost of governance mechanisms. The utmost framework of control for an organizing form is resolute by using harmonizing the residences of the transactions scenario with the maximum cost-effective shape of governance.

TCE presents precious theoretical aid about transactional outcomes to formulate the decision in appreciates of outsourcing or in the organization's fee chain. Heide (1994) states that the most proficient governance framework for a trade relation is determined with the resource of lowering the sum of transaction costs and production charges. Williamson (1991) via manner of the use of a model of marketplace failure moreover clarifies the motives of transaction charges occurrences. Two factors, human elements and environmental elements might also make contributions to market failure. Human factors consist of restricted rationality and opportunism; but, environmental factors include uncertainty consequential from technological changes and the problem of outside market (Kim et al., 2010; Laaksonen et al., 2008). Environmental uncertainty arises through macroeconomic or natural elements and that are not the effects of interfirm relation. Alternatively, interfirm alliance related uncertainty takes place from the structural-in your price range characteristics of the partnership (Kim, et al., 2010). For protection from opportunistic conduct of companions TCE asserts vertical integration with suitable encouragement scheme for partners in interfirm alliances (Williamson, 1991). TCE depicts that interfirm cooperation can guarantee reduced transaction costs, economic performance, and transactional stability via the use of decreasing controlled bounded rationality and uncertainty. The mixture of entire market transactions and hierarchy transaction, frequently termed as hybrid (bilateral form) shape of interfirm governance results in minimized transaction costs or resolves human and environmental uncertainty (Kim, et al., 2010; Vega and Keenan, 2014). Transaction expenses related to assessment and choice of companions in every transaction can be decreased by way of the use of the formation of an Interfirm relation over transactional relationships (Bharadwaj and Matsuno, 2006).

2.2. Resource-Based View (RBV)

The RBV of the firm suggests that company behavior can be understood as a search for competitive gain. Inside the aggressive marketplace mechanism groups are trying to find to get control over the elements of manufacturing, the ones can provide them with an aggressive area over their closest competition (Ahuja, 2000). In strategic manipulate literature, the resource based view (RBV) of the employer acts dominating role (Halawi et al., 2005). Barney (1991) presents that the execution of value creating approach by way of a company affords a competitive benefit when it's far modern-day or capability competitors concurrently now not put in force a value creating method. This competitive gain can be sustained as much as the recognition of a stage of overall performance challenge to no longer simultaneously imitated via the by means of any present or possible competitors. Range of assets and immobility of sources are the two key postulations of the RBV of corporations (Barney, 1991; Mata et al., 1995). In step with Mata et al. (1995), resource variety (beneficial resource heterogeneity) is worried with ownership of useful resource or functionality, if several rival organizations personal the identical useful resource or functionality of the focal firm, then that resource doesn't have aggressive advantage over the competitors. The fee of attainment, development, acquisition or use of resource could be very excessive while there may be involvement of complexity of such activities and that is defined via useful resource immobility. For that reason, the sustainable aggressive benefit depends on those two postulations through supplying a structure for designing whether or not a system or technology gives an actual advantage over the market. RVB shows that studies and improvement practices, human capital control, generation management, and innovation of an agency can make contributions significantly to maintaining feasible gain and are complicated to replicate of them (Afuah, 2000; Mata et al., 1995). Therefore, the formation of beneficial useful resource range (highbrow human capital and capabilities) and beneficial aid immobility (complicated manner of building/attainment), fosters the sustainable competitive advantage formation and preservation.

2.3. Social Network Theory (SNT)

A set of relationships are contained in a network. In the social science field, enhancement processes are targeted in Social Network Theory (SNT) as an alternative of reduction method. The vicinity of social network theory is the take a look at of different ranges inclusive of small businesses to entire worldwide structures. High range of competition and new national and international departmentalization are the results of worldwide global markets and financial operations. Meanwhile, inside the worldwide market each firm desires to be competitive. Adjustments in technology and innovation inspire companies to be differentiated. Therefore, to be competitive and distinctive formation of networks is considered crucial for the companies (Alvarez et al., 2009). There are two other components of network base relationship in market-based relationship and they depict the relationship in a close interaction. Tomkins (2001) stated that individuals' role performing, overall performance evaluation, earnings-sharing and hazard management come to be greater complicated due to greater focus on trust in network. Kraatz (1998) advocated in choosing of strong networks in progressing adjustment since they accumulate high-potential data connection between agencies and quick an encouragement for data sharing. Network perception

improvement mobilizes the human sources, and those involved in network perception growing are be capable of accommodate different actors via retaining aggressive gain for managerial improvement and information sharing (Martin-Rios, 2014). Participating companies and taking part managers each are related with network perception i.e. there's the existence of interfirm trade relations (Mouzas et al., 2008). Historically, manufacturing networks and supply chain had been seen as separate research tracks, however with the globalization of operations and distributions integrate those as complementary disciplines into supply network (Rudberg and Olhager, 2003). Recently supply chain is seen as a network and it contains inter connected firms that involve in purchase, use, and transfer raw material to provide products and services (Kim et al., 2011). Choi and Hong (2002) provided a structure of supply network by considering three dimensions such as formalization, centralization, and complexity; and argued about informality and flexibility for operational purpose of supply network, because too much formality creates rigidity.

2.4. Strategic Choice Theory (SCT)

Firms cooperate no longer handiest to growth competitiveness or market supremacy, but additionally for diverse tactical intentions. The idea of strategic choice makes a specialty of the strategic situation of firms and strategic partnering. Instant efficiency or resource-primarily based rationales or any range of other factors are examples of strategic reasons for which companies might also moreover involve in interfirm alliance (Kogut, 1988). An agency will enter into an interfirm relationship if the economic benefits of doing so exceed the expenses. Managers pursue in an interfirm relationship to attain some strategic needs and a number of operational objectives (Mazzola and Perrone, 2013). Interfirm relationship policy may additionally increase the capacity of a company to provide better services and products effectively or work to lower rivalry in an enterprise (Barringer and Harrison, 2000). The perspective of strategic choice may be very extensive. Any kind of interfirm alliance and long-standing earnings maximization can be justified as enterprise strategy. Strategic choice includes all different motivating factors which can be appropriate for different perspective as well. Consistent with Barringer and Harrison (2000) a useful place to begin may be to divide strategic reasons into four issues including (1) relationships that increase market strength through the erection of get admission to boundaries or the advent of monopoly-kind effect, (2) relationships that boom political energy, or the ability to influence governing our bodies locally or across the world, (3) relationships that increase efficiency in studies, manufacturing, advertising and marketing and advertising and marketing, or other features, and (4) relationships that offer services or products differentiation. research concerning the strategic desire angle and interfirm relationships is disjointed, and very few conclusions have been validated. Including to the complexity, strategies are not equally a hit across environmental contexts (Kent, 1991).

2.5 Learning Theory (LT)

The opportunities for organizational learning is the another rationale for formation of interfirm relationships. Learning theory is involved with the approaches that cause organizational learning. A key element is absorptive capability, that is defined as a firm's capability to pick out the fee of latest know-how, comprise it, and relate it in a enterprise placing. It indicates take in as much

expertise as possible from interfirm partnering, therefore developing organizational abilities and in the long run including value to the commercial enterprise employer (Barringer and Harrison, 2000). Through advanced knowledge ensuring competitive position is another justification for creation of interfirm relationship. This argument is consistent with an increasing body of research concerning formation of interfirm alliance (Liu et al., 2015; Simonin, 1997). Typically, companies place a awesome challenge on the achievement of technical talents and other types of expertise. right here, absorption capacity (ability of learning) is very important. The companies which have a more capability to study are better located to learn from their affiliation companions. Absorption capability is a competency that may be found out and stepped forward thru schooling and different types of organizational development (Barringer and Harrison, 2000). Within the interfirm relationship literature, one of the maximum broadly referred to motives for alliance formation is the accomplishment of technological competences or new technical abilities from accomplice corporations (Hamel, 1991; Mody, 1993). Expertise transfer and sharing of statistics throughout corporations can be an effective way in interfirm alliances. Understanding pricing could be very tough because it's far often inherent. And it is often complex for a firm that does not have a selected expertise to buy it inside the market (Mowery et al., 1996). If so, formation of interfirm relationships is a superb choice. A company that wants to learn new and updated matters along with six sigma, lean production, benchmarking, kaizen costing and so forth. Take the threat formation of relationship with a company that is exemplary in that area. Trade associations are the good example of partnership for learning. Firms join in trade associations having a principal motive of learning and these are more loosely coupled interfirm relationships. Interlocking directorates additionally have an organizational gaining knowledge of component. One interpretation of the purpose of interlocks is they act as channels of verbal exchange among firms that assists the run with the course of facts on plans and techniques, networking, collaborative response, expertise transfers, and effective relationship (Martin-Rios, 2014; Uddin, 2012). A weakness of the theory is that it makes a speciality of skill development and transfers, without focusing at the fees involved. for example, a company can boom its absorptive potential through diverse forms of education, training, and palms-on alliance experience. In addition, firms that enter into gaining knowledge of alliances threat the loss of proprietary records that isn't always inside the intended scope of the alliance (Barringer and Harrison, 2000).

2.6 Institutional Theory (IT)

Institutional theory focuses on conformation of social norms and legitimacy of organizations within the institutional environments. Corporations form an interfirm alliance to obtain legitimacy or due to succumbing to isomorphic pressures via follower corporations that have installed interfirm relationships (Barringer and Harrison, 2000). A firm can increase its visibility, recognition, image, and prestige through partnerships with large, hooked up firms (Martin-Rios, 2014). Legitimacy has the power to benefit get right of entry to to critical resources and understanding. Legitimacy can be attained through formation of interfirm relationships. Institutional pressures encourage companies to sign up for in interfirm relationships for other motives (Cowan et al., 2015). As an example, club in a partnership that promotes socially suitable targets may additionally decorate a

company's reputation (Crawford and Gram, 1978). This kind of legitimacy method is often utilized by excessive-profile charitable groups. Within the context of interfirm relationship formation, institutional principle is prospectively treasured in supporting explain why firms perform the system they act. Along with looking to acquire legitimacy as a way of escalating a firm's goodwill or demonstrating social worthiness, companies are also advocated to genuinely in shape as a manner of recognition and lifestyles (Oliver, 1991). One strategy for recognition and survival is to honestly comply with the environment. This strategy often rivets imitating industry norms. Many firms may join in interfirm relationships sincerely due to the fact different successful firms in their industries are doing so. The pervasiveness of interfirm relationships in some industries could be very high. Powell et al. (1996) made the observation in his look at of the biotech enterprise that companies without partnerships are getting rare, and that the everyday company has more than one partnership. If participation in interfirm relationships becomes an embedded norm in a populace, then firms will participate in interfirm relationships as a means of variation and survival (Atler and Hage, 1993). One of the obstacles of institutional principle is that it's miles a slim and behavioral orientated idea. it's miles tough through institutional principle to explain why unique styles of alliances and networks exist, especially when they range from the popularity quo (Barringer and Harrison, 2000). In addition, from a RBV, if each business enterprise is imitating everybody else, there will be little opportunity to create from interfirm relationships any resources of sustainable competitive benefit (Osborn and Hagedoorn, 1997).

3. Conclusion

The six theories defined on this paper fall along a conceptual framework from a dependence on an economic justification for interfirm relationships to a dependence on a behavioral justification. Transaction cost economics (TCE) and resource-based view (RBV) represent economic justification for interfirm relationship formation, at the same time as institutional idea falls on the behavioral cease of the framework. Organizational gaining knowledge of idea (learning theory), even as largely a behavioral subject, has economic undertones stemming from the potential of an organization to apply obtained information to reduce expenses or in other ways beautify sales and profitability. Institutional theory (IT) is solely a behavioral paradigm. Social network theory (SNT) and strategic choice theory (SCT) fall inside the middle. Strategic preference is based totally on a typically financial convention however is an increasing number of frequent as behavioral theories. Social network offers first with relationships; however, authors on the subject often flip to economics as a source for debate and theoretical purpose. Those six paradigms offer a very particular belief on the formation of interfirm relationships. Researchers and scholars ought to do not forget every of the paradigms whilst designing studies and formation of interfirm relationships as well. Consequently, combination of the theoretical paradigms may additionally provide a truthful extra useful method of expertise the formation of interfirm relationships.

The interfirm relationships formation may be justified from diverse theoretical backgrounds as transaction cost economics (that is grounded in economics), resource-base view (that is grounded on aggressive gain), social network theory (which is grounded in social alternate theory), learning theory (that's grounded in

sociology), and institutional theory (which is grounded in sociology) says plenty about the theoretical soundness of interfirm relationships. The theories of interfirm relationship formation aren't whole by themselves. They've one of a kind perspectives regarding formation of interfirm relationships. So, its miles desired to recall a couple of views as new theories to be developed and tested. for instance, organizational learning seems crucial to minimizing transactions costs. Also, resource-based view is a number one motivator of the introduction of social networks. The strategic choice attitude may be broadened to include concepts of transactions prices economics, resource-based totally view, organizational getting to know. Eventually, institutional idea may help explain why agencies enter partnership that might be taken into consideration inappropriate from a number of the opposite perspectives. Those are really examples of the type of mixing which could show useful inside the improvement of recent theories (Barringer and Harrison, 2000).

Even though the regions of insurance of six theoretical paradigms regarding interfirm relationship formation are broader, they're no longer exhaustive. There are other reasons that interfirm relationships form. Some enterprise relationships form because of personal ties between the pinnacle managements. in that case, self-serving mangers might also be part of in a commercial enterprise partnership to boom their personal private visibility, other than the impact on their company. Further, a few potentially attractive alliances may be prevented because of personality variations among the pinnacle managers of the respective companies or due to the fact one firm has unfounded suspicions of any other (Barringer and Harrison, 2000). The six theoretical paradigms which can be reviewed therein aren't all of the theories concerning interfirm courting formation. There are different reasons yet to be appropriately explored. Social anthropology is every other area that could offer methods and theories to recognize cultural perspectives and socioeconomic affairs of actors within interfirm relationships.

REFERENCES

- Afuah, A., 2000. How Much Do Your 'Co-Opetitors" Capabilities Matter in the face of Technological Change? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(3), 387-404.
- Ahuja, G., 2000. The Duality of Collaboration: Inducements and Opportunities in the Formation of Interfirm Linkages. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(3), 317-343.
- Alvarez, I., Marin, R., Fonfria, A., 2009. The role of networking in the competitiveness of firms. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 76, 410-421.
- Atler, C., Hage, J., 1993. *Organizations working together*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Barney, J.B., 1991. Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Barringer, B.R., Harrison, J.S., 2000. Walking a Tightrope: Creating Value Through Interorganizational Relationships. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 367-403.

- Bharadwaj, N., Matsuno, K., 2006. Investigating the antecedents and outcomes of customer firm transaction cost savings in a supply chain relationship. *Journal of Business Research*, 59, 62-72.
- Choi, T.Y., Hong, Y., 2002. Unveiling the structure of supply networks: case studies in Honda, Acura, and DaimlerChrysler. *Journal of Operations Management*, 20, 469-493.
- Cowan, K., Paswan, A.K., Steenburg, E.V., 2015. When inter-firm relationship benefits mitigate power asymmetry. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 48, 140-148.
- Crawford, R. L., Gram, H. A., 1978. *Social responsibility as interorganizational transaction*. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 18, 62–82.
- Das, T.K., Teng, B-S., 2000. A Resource-Based Theory of Strategic Alliances. *Journal of Management*, 26(1), 31-61.
- Kent, D. H., 1991. Joint ventures vs. non-joint ventures: An empirical investigation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12, 387–393.
- Kim, K.K., Park, S.H., Ryoo, S.U., Park, S.K., 2010. Inter-organizational cooperation in buyer-supplier relationships: Both Perspective, *Journal of Business Research*, 63(8), 863- 869.
- Kim, Y., Choi, T.Y., Yan, T., Kevin Dooley, K., 2011. Structural investigation of supply networks: A social network analysis approach. *Journal of Operations Management*, 29, 194-211.
- Kogut, B., 1988. Joint ventures: Theoretical and empirical perspectives. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9, 310–332.
- Koza, M. P., Lewin, A. Y., 1998. The co-evolution of strategic alliances. *Organization Science*, 9, 255–264.
- Hakansson, H., Lind, J. 2007. *Accounting in an Interorganizational Setting*. *Handbook of Management Accounting Research*, 2, 885-902.
- Halawi, L.A., Aronson, J.E., McCarthy, R.V., 2005. Resource-Based view of Knowledge Management for Competitive advantage. *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 3(2), 75-86.
- Hamel, G., 1991. Competition for competence and inter-partner learning within international strategic alliances. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12, 83–103.
- Heide, J.B., 1994. Interorganizational Governance in Marketing Channels. *The Journal of Marketing*, 58(1), 71-85.
- Laaksonen, T., Pajunen, K., Kulmala, H.I., 2008. Co-evolution of trust and dependence in customer-supplier relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 37, 910-920.
- Liu, X., Gao, L., Lu, J., Wei, Y., 2015. The role of highly skilled migrants in the process of inter- firm knowledge transfer across borders. *Journal of World Business*, 50(1), 56-68.

- Martin-Rios, C., 2014. Why do firms seek to share human resource management knowledge? The importance of inter-firm networks. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(2), 190-199.
- Mata, F. J., Fuerst, W. L., & Barney, J. B. (1995). Information technology and sustained competitive advantage: A resource-based analysis. *MIS Quarterly*, 19(4), 487.
- Mazzola, E., Perrone, G., 2013. A strategic needs perspective on operations outsourcing and other inter-firm relationships. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 144(1), 256- 267.
- Mody, A., 1993. Learning through alliances. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 20, 151–170.
- Mouzas, S., Henneberg, S., Naude, P., 2008. Developing network insight. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 37, 167-180.
- Mowery, D. C., Oxley, J. E., Silverman, B. S., 1996. Strategic alliances and interfirm knowledge transfer. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 77–91.
- Oliver, C., 1991. Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 145–179.
- Osborn, R. N., Hagedoorn, J., 1997. The institutional and evolutionary dynamics of interorganizational alliances and networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(2), 261– 278.
- Powell, W. W., 1990. Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, 295–336.
- Powell, W. W., Koput, K. W., Smith-Doerr, L., 1996. Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 116–145.
- Rudberg, M., Olhager, J., 2003. Manufacturing networks and supply chains: an operations strategy perspective. *Omega*, 31, 29-39.
- Simonin, B. L., 1997. The importance of collaborative know-how: An empirical test of the learning organization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 1150–1174.
- Tomkins, C., 2001. Interdependencies, trust and information in relationships, alliances and networks. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 26, 161-191.
- Uddin, M.B., 2012. Interfirm Cooperation and Information Sharing Through Interlocking Directorates. *Management and Marketing*, 10(2), 205-214.
- Vega, D.C., Keenan, R.J., 2014. Transaction cost theory of the firm and community forestry enterprises. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 42, 1-7.
- Williamson, O.E., 1985. *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism*. New York, Free Press.
- Williamson, O.E., 1991. Comparative Economic Organization: The Analysis of Discrete Structural Alternatives. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(2), 269-296.