Beyond Buyers: The Role of Civil Society Organizations and Consumers in Promoting Buyers' Justice and Social Capital in Supply Chains

Syed Waqarul Hasan
Director QEC & Regulatory Affairs from Salim Habib University Karachi
waqarit2015@gmail.com

Shazada Azam Khan Alwi
Research Scholar, Manager Pharmacy, OMI Hospital
drazam.khan@yahoo.com

Abstract

In today's supply chain management, managing sourcing relationships has become a challenging real-world problem. To tackle social deficiencies, the study focuses on socially sustainable supply chain management (SSCM) practices such as assessment and collaboration that can encourage suppliers to act responsibly. Scholars have made considerable effort to investigate how the implementation of SSCM practices can effectively sustain suppliers' social performance. The study aims to build a framework that explores the individual impact of assessment and collaboration practices on suppliers' social performance. It also investigates whether buyers' justice, including distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, and social capital factors such as relational, cognitive, and structural capital, can complement the SSCM practices to sustain suppliers' social performance. Through survey analysis of companies in Karachi, it has been found that assessment and collaboration practices are ineffective in improving suppliers' social performance. Furthermore, buyers' justice and social capital factors showed no significant impact on the relationship between assessment and collaboration practices and suppliers' social performance. Nevertheless, this study highlights the importance of justice and social capital dimensions and calls for further research to understand their impact on SSCM and suppliers' social performance.

Keywords: Socially sustainable assessment, cooperation, Buyer Justice, Social Capital, Social Performance, Supplier Sustainability

Introduction

Organizations looking to save costs or potentially gain competitive advantages are increasingly using strategies like subcontracting to suppliers and setting up production networks in developing nations (Locke, 2009). However, owing to reputational risks arising from internal immoral activities of suppliers, such as exploiting babies or forced labour and unfair charge methods, the transfer from domestic buying strategy to international sourcing will not generally attain the desired goals (Speakman, 2004). In response to mounting pressure from consumers, alternative institutions, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the fear of supply chain disruptions, agencies have devised collaboration and assessment strategies to assist them in maintaining appropriate levels of suppliers' internal social performance (Klassen, 2012).

In order to improve supplier compliance with consumers' social needs, the assessment method—which is frequently interpreted as the length of the support—emphasizes the use of socially sustainable evaluation procedures, such as certification and auditing (Jiang, 2009). The cooperation approach focuses on the importance of socially responsible cooperation practices (SSCPs), such as supplier development, to build suppliers' capacities and improve general sustainability performance (Klassen, 2012).

Businesses frequently look to focus on their core competencies to survive in highly competitive enterprise contexts. They may also achieve significant cost savings by outsourcing some of their services and goods to suppliers (Klassen, 2012). Under pressure, suppliers—especially those who take advantage of weak regulatory environments—regularly resort to unethical practices that amount to modern slavery practices, such as toddler labour, forced labour, and health and safety concerns—in order to satisfy the growing demands of buying corporations for higher business offers related to cost reduction, better order flexibility, and shorter lead times (Alghababsheh, 2018).

The current social SSCM research shows that a few buying firms will pursue an 'arms of path wherein they right away transfer from a present violating supplier without caution ("0 tolerance") to choose an opportunity with the more extraordinary, responsible, and credible supplier (Porteous et al., 2015). However, unfavorable price–gain analyses of this path (e.g., extended seek costs and feasible deliver disruption) have shifted buying for firms' conduct toward a 'fingers-on direction wherein companies allocate assets and time to power and construct the social sustainability of current suppliers' (Klassen, 2012).

Research Questions

- How do buyers perceive how supplier's social performance is affected by assessment and collaboration practices?
- What role does buyer justice (such as distributive, procedural, and interactional) play in the buyer-supplier relationship in implementing assessment and collaboration practices?
- What role does social capital (such as relational, cognitive, and structural) play in the buyer-supplier relationship in implementing assessment and collaboration practices?

Review of Literature

Socially sustainable supply chain control (SSCM) practices may be widely defined as the mechanisms, practices, techniques, and activities via which buying for corporations affects suppliers' moves and abilities to meet social objectives (Klassen, 2012). Our expertise in the character of social SSCM practices is guided by dominant theoretical perspectives— transaction fee economics (TCE) (Williamson, 1975) and the relational view (RV) (Dyer, 1998). Preceding social SSCM studies drawing broadly speaking on TCE have counselled that to mitigate suppliers' social problems, assessment practices (e.g., auditing) ought to be in the region (Sancha, 2015). Supplier collaboration practices mention those practices through which buyers work closely with suppliers to build their abilities if they want to successfully enhance overall performance (Klassen, 2012).

The shift from traditional supply chain management, where the point of interest is on maximizing economic price (Gunasekaran, 2004), to SSCM, wherein the emphasis is on concurrently sustaining economic, environmental, and social overall performance (Carter, 2008) has similarly multiplied the complexity of gauging supply chain performance (Ahi, 2015). While the magnitude of supply chains' financial and environmental overall performance is highly superior, the scope of social overall performance remains underdeveloped (Ahi, 2015). This in component, can be attributed to the relative significance connected to each type of overall performance and the nature of social performance per se.

The fundamental tenant of the social capital concept is that people's or corporations' networks of relationships are considered precious sources that facilitate collective movements (Adler, 2002). Two significant perspectives have emerged on the source of social capital fees within the relationship, namely the structural and relational views (Kostova, 2003). Based on social

network theory, the structural view argues that it is far from the structure of the relationship that offers cost for individuals (e.g., Baker 1990).

Hypothesis Development

Socially responsible supply chain management practices positively affect suppliers' social performance. Three dimensions of buyer's justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional) and three social capital dimensions mediate this relationship.

The forecast of the high-quality effect of the assessment practices on suppliers' social overall performance is regular with the reasoning of TCE theory. Based on TCE, firms craft contracts and set up monitoring with a view to reduce opportunism and make sure compliance with agreements (Grover, 2003).

- H1a: *Assessment practices are positively associated with suppliers' social overall performance.*
- H1b *Collaboration practices are undoubtedly related to suppliers' social overall performance.*

Buyers' Justice and Suppliers' Internal Social Performance

- H2a *Buyers' distributive justice is positively related to suppliers' internal social performance.*
- H2b *Buyers' procedural justice is positively related to suppliers' internal social performance*
- H2c Buyers' interactional justice is positively related to suppliers' internal social performance.
- H2d The higher the level of all three justice dimensions simultaneously (distributive, procedural, and interactional), the higher will be suppliers' internal social performance.
- H4a Procedural justice moderates the relationship between SSAPs and suppliers' internal socialperformance in such a fashion that the relationship becomes significant and positive when thesupplier perceives a higher level of procedural justice.

H4b Procedural justice moderates the relationship between SSCPs and suppliers' internal social performance in such a fashion that the positive effect of SSCPs on suppliers' internal social performance is stronger when the supplier perceives a higher level of procedural justice.

- H5a Interactional justice moderates the relationship between SSAPs and suppliers' internal social performance in such a fashion that the relationship becomes significant and positive

when the supplier perceives a higher level of interactional justice.

H5b Interactional justice moderates the relationship between SSCPs and suppliers' internal social performance in such a fashion that the positive effect of SSCPs on suppliers' internal social performance is stronger when the supplier perceives a higher level of interactional justice.

Research Methodology

Significant manufacturing enterprises in Pakistan represented the buyers' side of the relationship in this study. The inter-organizational connection between the buyer and the supplier is the unit of analysis. The large Pakistani manufacturers provided a suitable framework for the current study for various reasons. Working conditions and human rights issues (e.g., child labour, freedom of association, unfair payment, unpaid overtime, forced labour, working hours, and health and safety) tend to be more common and concentrated in the manufacturing sector, which is likely due to the labor-intensive nature of much of the activity within the manufacturing sector (Zorzini, 2015).

A stratified random sample of 1000 manufacturing enterprises working in various industrial sectors was selected using the Financial Analysis Made Easy (FAME) database as a sampling frame. A mail survey, accompanied by a prepaid envelope and a cover letter explaining the purpose and importance of the study, was personally addressed and administered to chief executive officers (CEOs), supply chain, procurement, operations, purchasing, and logistics managers within the selected sample, according to (Dillman, 2007) Total Design Method. Of the 1000 questionnaires distributed, 500 were returned complete and ready for analysis.

Measurement Items

All of the scales used for measurement were established scales adopted/adapted from the literature on socially sustainable supply chain management and supplier's social performance in the light of the role of social capital (Alghababsheh, 2018) and improving performance and reducing cost in buyer-supplier relationships: The role of justice in curtailing opportunism (Luo, 2015). All social SSCM practices (such as assessment and collaboration) are first-order reflective constructs. The respondents were asked to rate the social SSCM practice implementation level with a critical supplier on a scale of "strongly disagree=1" to "strongly agree=5".

The remaining constructs' scales are based on prior research. Four, five, and five items measure distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice, respectively. We use the items to

determine the cost of governance. Supplier's social performance is a first-order reflective construct measured using three items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree = 1" to "strongly agree = 5." Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they had improved safety and working conditions, human rights compliance, and child labour employment in the supplier's facilities.

Data Analysis

We used partial least square structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) for data analysis, as it produces more accurate estimates of interaction effects than other SEM techniques and overcomes model identification and convergence issues. PLS-SEM is also useful when a research model is proposed in a domain where theory and/or data are lacking. In addition, PLS-SEM can estimate models with large sample sizes.

Table 1
Reliability and Validity

Variable	ɔnbach'sAlpha	rho_A	CR	AVE
AP*CC	1	1	1	1
AP*DJ	1	1	1	1
AP*IJ	1	1	1	1
AP*PJ	1	1	1	1
AP*RC	1	1	1	1
AP*SC	1	1	1	1
Assessment Practices	0.67	0.7	0.88	0.45
CP*CC	1	1	1	1
CP*DJ	1	1	1	1
CP*IJ	1	1	1	1
CP*PJ	1	1	1	1
CP*RC	1	1	1	1
CP*SC	1	1	1	1
Cognitive Capital	0.95	0.85	0.8	0.77
Collaboration Practices	1	1	1	1
Distributive Justice	0.5	0.65	0.7	0.5
Interactional Justice	0.6	0.75	0.7	0.5
Procedural Justice	0.65	0.60	0.7	0.6
Relational Capital	0.85	0.95	0.8	0.6
Social Practices	0.55	0.55	0.8	0.5
Structural Capital	0.65	0.75	0.8	0.7

Cronbach's alpha > 0.7, CR > 0.7, AVE > 0.5

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity is taken into account two measures that are supposed to be measuring the same construct and show that they are related. In this study, all the values of composite reliability are greater than 0.7 and all the values of AVE are greater than 0.5.

Table 2
Outer Loadings

Items	Outer Loadings
ASSESMENT PRACTICES (AP) Cronbach Alpha = 0.614, CR = 0.772, AVE = 0.459	
Developing an ethical code of conduct with a key supplier is essential for supply chain management	0.65
To use a certification program (e.g., SA8000) to recognize the supplier's corporate social responsibility capability.	0.75 0.72
To assess supplier's social performance through form evaluation using established guidelines and procedures.	DELETED
Provide suppliers with feedback about the results of such evaluation improves social performance.	0.67
COLLABORATION PRACTICES (CP) Cronbach Alpha = 1.0, CR = 1.0, AVE = 1.0	
Offer financial incentives for the supplier to improve commitment to social sustainability.	1.00
Visit Supplier's facilities to help them improve their performance.	DELETED
Provide training/education for the supplier's personnel about corporate social responsibility practices and the required skills that can enhance the supplier's sustainability.	DELETED
Developing new products/processes with our supplier to reduced health and safety hazards for employees can be useful for the supplier's social performance.	DELETED
SUPPLIER SOCIAL PERFORMANCES (SP) Cronbach Alpha = 0.501, CR = 0.748, AVE = 0.503	
Improving compliance with human rights in the supplier's facilities enhances their performance and sustainability.	0.80
Improving safety and labor conditions in the supplier's facilities helps suppliers to sustain their performance.	0.74
Improving compliance with child labor employment in the supplier's facilities sustain their social performance.	0.57
DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE (DJ) Cronbach Alpha = 0.573, CR = 0.779, AVE = 0.544	
The amount of effort and investment gain consistency in partnership of buyer-supplier.	DELETED
The roles and responsibilities commensurate the buyer-supplier partnership.	0.82

Gain in relation to buyer-supplier contributed to the partnership is important as the relation with other firms in a similar business.	
I think between-party sharing of rewards or returns generated from cooperation is fair i view of buyer-supplier continued commitment to cooperation.	
PROCEDURAL JUSTICE (PJ) Cronbach Alpha = 0.708, CR = 0.809, AVE = 0.465	
Treating suppliers impartially and in a non-discriminatory way can improve relation of buyer-supplier.	
Buyer will always willing to modify its policies based on feedback they provided.	
Buyers often takes into account of buyers objections can enhance suppliers sustainabili and performance.	
Supplier's adoption of consistent policies and decision-making procedures improve social performance.	
Buyers are familiar with the situation supplier's face.	
INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE (IJ) Cronbach Alpha = 0.687, CR = 0.799, AVE = 0.4	
Friendly relationship with suppliers improves social performance of suppliers.	
Expressing criticism to suppliers can enhance their sustainability and improves performance.	
Buyer-supplier relationship is characterized with mutual respect.	
Always makes partners aware of important issues.	
Partner often explains the reasons behind relevant policies to maintain the level of a business relationship.	
RELATIONAL CAPITAL (RC) Cronbach Alpha = 0.828, CR = 0.850, AVE = 0.544	
The relationship is characterized by close interaction at multiple levels.	
The relationship is characterized by the mutual trust at multiple levels.	
The relationship is characterized by mutual respect at multiple levels.	
The relationship is characterized by mutual friendship at multiple levels.	
The relationship is characterized by high levels of reciprocity.	
COGNITIVE CAPITAL (CC) Cronbach Alpha = 0.875, CR = 0.885, AVE = 0.665	
Buyers always have a similar organizational culture /values and management style witl suppliers.	
laborassessment.	

Discriminant Validity

Fornell-Larcker Criterion

The validity of the measurement model was evaluated through the examination of convergent validity at the item level and discriminant validity at the construct level. Convergent validity was assessed by analyzing the standardized factor loadings of the items and the average variance extracted (AVE) of the construct. The results showed that all of the items had significant standardized factor loadings greater than 0.5, indicating that they shared a common feature captured by the construct. The AVE values of all constructs were greater than 0.5, suggesting that the variance explained by the constructs was greater than the measurement error variances. Therefore, all of the constructs displayed convergent validity, as shown in table 3.

Table 3
Fornell-Larcker Criterion

	AP	**CC**	**CP**	**DJ**	**IJ**	**PJ**	**RJ**	**SP**	**SC**
AP	0.7								
CC	0.3	0.8							
CP	0.3	-0.1	1.0						
DJ	0.4	0.7	-0.1	0.7					
IJ	0.5	0.7	0.0	0.6	0.7				
PJ	0.4	0.7	-0.1	0.6	0.7	0.7			
RJ	0.6	0.7	0.0	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7		
SP	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.7	
SC	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.2	0.7

Heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT)

The Heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratio method, developed by Henseler in 2015, was used to evaluate the discriminant validity of the constructs. Voorhees (2016) found that the HTMT ratio method is the most effective technique among the commonly used methods (such as Fornell and Larcker's criterion, constrained phi method, and overlapping confidence intervals) for assessing discriminant validity. The HTMT method is primarily used to assess discriminant validity in studies that use a variance-based SEM. However, PLS-SEM, being a variance-based technique, tends to overestimate factor loadings, which can lead to an increase in AVE values, making it difficult for Fornell and Larcker's criterion to detect discriminant validity violations. But according to the HTMT method, a construct can have discriminant validity if the relationships

between items within the same construct are stronger than the relationships between items across constructs, as shown in table 5. Moreover, the HTMT ratios of the constructs were less than 0.85, indicating that discriminant validity was established, as noted by Henseler (2015).

Table 4
Heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT)

	AP	**CC**	**CP**	**DJ**	**IJ**	**PJ**	**RC**	**SP**	**SC**
AP									
CC	0.4								
CP	0.3	0.1							
DJ	0.5	0.7	0.2						
IJ	0.8	0.7	0.1	0.9					
PJ	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.9	0.9				
RC	0.5	0.6	0.1	0.8	0.9	0.9			
SP	0.9	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.3		
SC	0.8	0.4	0.1	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.4	

Discussion & Conclusion

This study explores the impact of sustainable supply chain management (SSCM) practices on suppliers' social performance. It found that there was no significant improvement in suppliers' social internal performance when buyers used assessment and collaboration practices. The study suggests that buyers primarily use assessment practices to obtain detailed information about current social issues without also precipitating effective actions such as training or financial support to understand and resolve them. This study also investigated the moderating role of social capital dimensions on the relationship between SSCM practices and suppliers' social performance. However, the study found that social capital dimensions have no significant moderating impact on suppliers' internal social performance when buyers use collaboration practices.

Supply chain managers are under constant pressure from stakeholders to contribute to the improvement under which their outsourced items are manufactured. Managing the social issues of suppliers, especially those in remote locations, is a critical task. Our approach has several practical implications for supply chain managers who want to better understand and manage socially sustainable supply chains. To initiate, it appears that addressing suppliers' social deficiencies through assessment practices such as heavy auditing of suppliers' operations, requiring suppliers

to obtain third-party certification, and/or providing self-assessment reports is ineffective. Engaging in collaborative practices, on the other hand, has the potential to improve the social conditions within suppliers' internal environments by initiating supplier development and training programs, as well as through joint efforts, knowledge exchange, and committing to relationship-specific resources. Second, supply chain managers can increase the potential of assessment practices and thus make observable improvements in the social conditions at suppliers' workplaces when mutual trust and frequent social interactions are established with suppliers, and they can increase the efficacy of collaboration practices when trust and shared understanding are prevalent with suppliers.

To ensure the productive and reliable execution of socially SSCM practices, supply chain managers should actively encourage the development of all justice dimensions (i.e., distributive, procedural, and interactional justice) and social capital dimensions (relational, cognitive, and structural capital) with suppliers rather than being selective. Supply chain managers should work to build trust, respect, and friendship with their suppliers, as well as work regularly to align their values and goals and develop a mutual understanding of their business environments, operations, and processes. To derive the significance of the relationship of assessment practice and collaboration practices with suppliers' internal social performance, we propose three-justice dimensions (i.e., distributive, procedural and interactional) and three social capital dimensions (i.e., relational, cognitive, and structural) that create moderating effect on the relationship. But unfortunately, result analysis does not favor theoretical implications as described in this study. Therefore, this study complicates the proposed research model and cannot be recommended for any managerial source.

References

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 267– 299). *New York: Academic Press*.

Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S. W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review, 27(1), 17–40*.

Alghababsheh, M. (2018). The implementation of socially sustainable supply chain management in the UK manufacturing sector: A social capital perspective, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation,*Brunel University London, London, United Kingdom*.

Alghababsheh, M., Gallear, D., & Rahman, M. (2018). Balancing the scales of justice: Do perceptions of buyers' justice drive suppliers' social performance? *Journal of Business Ethics*.https://doi. org/10.1007/s10551-018-3993-0

Ansari, Z. N., & Kant, R. (2017). A state-of-art literature review reflecting 15 years of focus on

sustainable supply chain management. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 142,* 2524–2543.

Armstrong, S., & Overton, T. (1977). Estimating nonresponse bias in mail surveys. *Journal of Marketing Research, 14(3),* 396–402.

Awaysheh, A., & Klassen, R. D. (2010). The impact of supply chain structure on the use of supplier socially responsible practices. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 30(12),* 1246–1268.

Baker, W. E. (1990). Market networks and corporate behavior. *American Journal of Sociology,* 96(3), 589–625.

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120.*

Barrientos, S. (2013). Corporate purchasing practices in global production networks: *A socially contested terrain. Geoforum, 44, 44–51.*

Beugré, C. D., & Acar, W. (2008). Offshoring and cross-border interorganizational relationships: *A justice model. Decision Sciences, 39(3),* 445–468.

Blancero, D., & Ellram, L. (1997). Strategic supplier partnering: A psychological contract perspective. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 27(9/10),*616–629.

Blonska, A., Storey, C., Rozemeijer, F., Wetzels, M., & de Ruyter, K. (2013). Decomposing the effect of supplier development on relationship benefits: The role of relational capital. *Industrial Marketing Management, 42(8),* 1295–1306.

Boyd, D. E., Spekman, R. E., Kamauf, J. W., & Werhane, P. (2007). Corporate social responsibility in global supply chains: A procedural justice perspective. *Long Range Planning,40(3), 341–356.*

Brockner, J. (2002). Making sense of procedural fairness: How high procedural fairness can reduce or heighten the influence of outcome favorability. Academy of Management Review,27(1), 58–76.

Carey, S., Lawson, B., & Krause, D. R. (2011). Social capital configuration, legal bonds, and performance in buyer-supplier relationships. *Journal of Operations Management, 29(4),* 277–288.

Carter, C. R., & Washispack, S. (2018). Mapping the path forward for sustainable supply chain management: *A review of reviews. Journal of Business Logistics, 39(4), 242–247.*

Chang, K. H., & Gotcher, D. F. (2007). Safeguarding investments and creation of transaction value in asymmetric international subcontracting relationships: The role of relationship learningand relational capital. *Journal of World Business, 42(4), 477–488.*

Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. In G. A. Marcoulides (Ed.), Modern methods for business research (pp. 295–336). *Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.*

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3),* 386–400.

Crane, A. (2013). Modern slavery as a management practice: Exploring the conditions and

capabilities for human exploitation. Academy of Management Review, 38(1), 49–69.

Dawson, J.F . (2014). Moderation in management research: What, why, when, and how. *Journal of Businessand Psychology, 29(1), 1–19.*

Dillman, D. A. (2007). Mail and internet surveys - the tailored design method (2nd ed.). *New York: Wiley.*

Dubey, R., Gunasekaran, A., Childe, S. J., & Papadopoulos, T. (2018). Skills needed in supply chain-human agency and social capital analysis in third-party logistics. *Management Decision,56(1), 143–159.*

Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues, 31(3),* 137–149.

Dufy, R., Fearne, A., Hornibrook, S., Hutchinson, K., & Reid, A. (2013). Engaging suppliers in CRM: The role of justice in buyer–supplier relationships. *International Journal of Information Management, 33(1), 20–23.*

Fassin, Y. (2005). The reasons behind non-ethical behavior in business and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics, 60(3),* 265–279.

Fearne, A., Dufy, R., & Hornibrook, S. (2005). Justice in UK supermarket buyer-supplier relationships: An empirical analysis. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management,33(8), 570–582.*

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics. Journal of Marketing Research, 18(3), 382–388.

Gualandris, J., & Kalchschmidt, M. (2016). Developing environmental and social performance: The role of suppliers' sustainability and buyer-supplier trust. *International Journal of ProductionResearch, 54(8),* 2470–2486.

Gu, F. F., & Wang, D. T. (2011). The role of program fairness in asymmetrical channel relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management, 40(8),* 1368–1376.

Guide, V. D. R., & Ketokivi, M. (2015). Notes from the Editors: Redefining some methodological criteria for the journal. *Journal of Operations Management*, 37, 5–8.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). A primer on partial leastsquares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). *Thousand Oaks: Sage*.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of MarketingScience, 43(1), 115–135.*

Hofer, A. R., Knemeyer, A. M., & Murphy, P. R. (2012). The roles of procedural and distributive justice in logistics outsourcing relationships. *Journal of Business Logistics, 33(3),* 196–209.

Homans, G. (1961). Social Behaviour: Its Elementary Forms. London: *Routledge & Kegan Paul*.

Hughes, M., & Perrons, R. K. (2011). Shaping and re-shaping social capital in buyer-supplier relationships. *Journal of Business Research, 64(2),* 164–171.

Huikkola, T., Ylimäki, J., & Kohtamäki, M. (2013). Joint learning in R&D collaborations and

facilitating relational practices. *Industrial Marketing Management, 42(7),* 1167–1180.

Liu, Y., Huang, Y., Luo, Y., & Zhao, Y. (2012). How does justice matter in achieving buyer–supplier relationship performance? *Journal of Operations Management, 30(5),* 355–367.

Locke, R., Amengual, M., & Mangla, A. (2009). Virtue out of necessity? Compliance, commitment, and the improvement of labor conditions in global supply chains. *Politics & Society, 37(3), 319–351.*

Lu, R. X., Lee, P. K., & Cheng, T. C. E. (2012). Socially responsible supplier development: Construct development and measurement validation. *International Journal of Production Economics, 140(1), 160–167.*

Lund-Thomsen, P. (2008). The global sourcing and codes of conduct debate: Five myths and five recommendations. *Development and Change, 39(6),* 1005–1018.

Lund-Thomsen, P., & Lindgreen, A. (2014). Corporate social responsibility in global value chains: Where are we now and where are we going? Journal of Business Ethics, 123(1), 11–22.

Montabon, F., Pagell, M., & Wu, Z. (2016). Making sustainability sustainable. Journal of Supply Chain Management, 52(2), 11.

Narasimhan, R., Narayanan, S., & Srinivasan, R. (2013). An investigation of justice in supply chain relationships and their performance impact. *Journal of Operations Management, 31(5),* 236–247.

Peng, D. X., & Lai, F. (2012). Using partial least squares in operations management research: A practical guideline and summary of past research. *Journal of Operations Management, 30(6),* 467–480.

Podsakof, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakof, 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.

Sancha, C., Gimenez, C., & Sierra, V. (2016). Achieving a socially responsible supply chain through assessment and collaboration. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 112(3),* 1934–1947. (Sancha, 2015)

Sancha, C., Gimenez, C., Sierra, V., & Kazeminia, A. (2015). Does implementing social supplier development practices pay of? Supply Chain Management: *An International Journal, 20(4),* 389–403.

Son, B. G., Kocabasoglu-Hillmer, C., & Roden, S. (2016). A dyadic perspective on the retailer–supplier relationships through the lens of social capital. *International Journal of Production Economics, 178, 120–131.*

Spekman, R. E., & Davis, E. W. (2004). Risky business: Expanding the discussion on risk and the extended enterprise. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management,34(5),* 414–433.

Shockley, J., & Turner, T. (2016). A relational performance model for developing innovation and long-term orientation in retail franchise organizations. *Journal of Retailing and*

ConsumerServices, 32, 175–188.

Soundararajan, V., & Brown, J. A. (2016). Voluntary governance mechanisms in global supply chains: Beyond CSR to a stakeholder utility perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 134(1), 83–102.*

Ting, S. C. (2011). The role of justice in determining relationship quality. *Journal ofRelationship Marketing, 10(2), 57–75.*

Tourangeau, R., Rips, L. J., & Rasinski, K. (2000). The psychology of survey response. Cambridge, UK: *Cambridge University Press.*

Trada, S., & Goyal, V. (2017). The dual effects of perceived unfairness on opportunism in channel relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management, 64, 135–146.*

Tsai, W., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital and value creation: The role of intraframe networks. *Academy of Management Journal, 41(4),* 464–476.

Unal, B., & Donthu, N. (2014). Role of absorptive capabilities in outsourcing the headquarters selling task in the United States. *Industrial Marketing Management, 43(6),* 1079–1084.

Wiengarten, F., & Longoni, A. (2018). How does uncertainty affect workplace accidents?

Exploring the role of information sharing in manufacturing networks. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 38(1),* 295–310.

Yawar, S. A., & Seuring, S. (2018). The role of supplier development in managing social and societal issues in supply chains. Journal of Cleaner Production, 182, 227–237.

Yim, B., & Leem, B. (2013). The effect of the supply chain social capital. IndustrialManagement & Data Systems, 113(3), 324–349.

Zhang, M., Guo, H., & Zhao, X. (2017a). Effects of social capital on operational performance: Impacts of servitization. *International Journal of Production Research, 55(15),* 4304–4318.

Zhang, M., Pawar, K. S., & Bhardwaj, S. (2017b). Improving supply chain social responsibility through supplier development. *Production Planning & Control, 28(6–8),* 500–511.

Zorzini, M., Hendry, L. C., Huq, F. A., & Stevenson, M. (2015). Socially responsible sourcing: Reviewing the literature and its use of theory. *International Journal of Operations & ProductionManagement, 35(1), 60–109.*