

System Dynamics and Innovation in Food Networks 2010

*Proceedings of the 4th International European Forum on System Dynamics and Innovation in
Food Networks, organized by the International Center for Food Chain and Network
Research, University of Bonn, Germany
February 08-12 2010, Innsbruck-Igls, Austria
officially endorsed by*

*EAAE (European Association of Agricultural Economists)
IAMA (International Food and Agribusiness Management Association)
AIEA2 (Assoc. Intern. di Economia Alimentare e Agro-Industriale)
INFITA (Intern. Network for IT in Agric., Food and the Environment)*

edited by

M. Fritz, U. Rickert, G. Schiefer



ISBN 978-3-941766-03-7

Networking in Meat Production Systems: The Influence of Cooperative Structures on Farmers' Participation

Mark Deimel and Ludwig Theuvsen

*Georg-August-University Goettingen, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural
Development, Management in Agribusiness
Platz der Goettinger Sieben 5, 37073 Goettingen, Germany
mdeimel@uni-goettingen.de; Theuvsen@uni-goettingen.de*

1 Introduction

Increasing competitive pressures as well as growing requirements with regard to quality and safety pose a continuous challenge for farmers in European agrifood networks. Against this background, the significance of network-wide collaboration has been pointed out in recent years – especially for German livestock farming (Petersen et al., 2007). In the literature, it is generally agreed that participation in specialized networks can be beneficial to the competitiveness of individual farms and firms (Gellynck, Vermeire and Viaene, 2006).

The northwestern part of Germany – known to be one of Europe's major centres of pig production – apparently provides good structural preconditions for farms' and firms' comprehensive network participation due to an agglomeration of potential interaction partners specialized in pork production. Nonetheless, empirical studies show that, despite these good preconditions, farmers' participation in networks is often limited. Spiller et al. (2005) for instance, found weaknesses with regard to relationship quality between pig fattening farmers and slaughterhouses. This might be due to power inequalities as well as manifold principal-agent relationships in food supply chains characterized by information asymmetries and utility-maximizing behaviour that limits cooperation between supply chain partners and reduces transparency of food supply chains (Theuvsen, 2004; Hingley, 2005; Deimel, Frentrup and Theuvsen, 2008).

In European food supply chains and especially in northwestern German pig production, cooperatives play a major role in the sectors of livestock trading and slaughtering (Hendrikse, 2006; Theuvsen and Franz, 2007). Joint ownership of farms and, for instance, processors or traders aligns interests between supply chain partners and reduces principal-agent problems. Furthermore, cooperatives are characterized by several specific economic principles – including the principles of self-help, self-administration, identity, personal responsibility, democracy and solidarity (Rhodes, 1983; Theuvsen, 2006). These characteristics should also contribute to fewer clashes of interests, improved relationship quality and a greater potential for trustful collaboration. Therefore, it can be hypothesized that a farmer's participation in modern food networks depends, at least to a certain degree, on whether he or she has business relationships within cooperatives or private actors. There are also empirical results that indicate that even farmers who deliver to cooperatives without being members enjoy more trustful relationships with their processors (Spiller et al., 2005).

But whether the relationships between cooperatives and their suppliers, who are in many cases also members, are really of better quality in practice has to be checked continuously since cooperatives in the meat sector have to sustain their position under increasing market pressures. In recent years powerful, globally operating customers such as food retailers and discounters have coerced cooperatives to pursue aggressive cost reduction strategies, often accompanied by a rapid growth of capacities as well as national and international mergers and acquisitions. The subsequent growth and increased professionalization of cooperatives

often bypasses members' (in this case farmers') interests of democratic control (Österberg and Nilsson, 2009; Schulze and Schlecht, 2009). This development may limit the potential for a higher quality of relationships and more intensive interactions between supply chain partners in the cooperative sector.

Against this background, the objective of this paper is to analyse farmers' network participation in greater detail as well as to explore whether cooperative structures in food supply chains influence the quality of farmers' network relations as well as the type of network partners farmers preferably choose.

2 Network relations and cooperative structures in German pig production

Due to relative cost disadvantages of German pig production (Windhorst, 2003) and continuously increasing requirements on process as well as product qualities, farms' and firms' access to information and knowledge is becoming more and more important (Stewart, 1998; Deimel, Theuvsen and Ebbeskotte, 2008). In the literature, it is generally agreed that participation in specialized networks can enhance firms' access to information and thus be beneficial to the competitiveness of individual firms (Gambardella, 1992; Nonaka, 1994; Gellynck, Vermeire and Viaene, 2006). In agri-food chains, some tasks, for instance ensuring compatibility between animal health and productivity in livestock farming, are complex and cannot be managed without cooperation with others. These situations often require the application of tacit knowledge which can be achieved only through interactions with knowledgeable network partners (Granovetter, 2004). Farmers' participating in specialized networks and, by doing so, getting access to professional information and innovations in terms of, for instance, new efficient processes that will decrease production costs or enhance product quality may emerge as a significant means of improving the competitiveness of farms in the future.

Networks in the German pork production system are determined by the alternative channels for marketing farmers' fattened slaughter pigs. Especially in northwestern Germany, known to be a major center of European pig production, slaughter pigs are processed in cooperatively owned slaughterhouses (such as Westfleisch eG) as well as private companies (for instance, B. & C. Tönnies). Moreover, the marketing of slaughter animals is often organized as a two-tier system, with private or cooperatively owned livestock traders mediating the business relationships between agricultural producers and processors (Theuvsen and Franz, 2007). In particular, the cooperative livestock traders can be classified into producer-owned livestock trading cooperatives (*Viehvermarktungsgenossenschaften*, or VVGs) and quasi-cooperative producing and marketing associations (*Erzeugergemeinschaften*, or EZGs).

Besides discussing the efficient vertical organisation of the entire food chain in German pig production, current literature also highlights the topics of netchain-wide collaboration and communication (Petersen et al., 2008). Hofstede (2003) points out that in today's rapidly changing environment, effective information exchange is the key to improving value chain performance and competitiveness. In this context, Meemken and Blaha (2008) consider an active relationship between pig fattening farmers and slaughterhouses to be of vital importance, for instance, concerning improving product quality and enhancing animal health and thus food safety. Especially feedback information transmitted by the slaughterhouse in terms of carcass quality or veterinary organ findings are considered to be essential for farmers' process optimization in pig fattening (Plumeyer, Deimel and Theuvsen, 2008). Although these are mainly technical or organizational topics, efficient communication and collaboration require an adequate quality of relations between farmers and processors. Schulze, Wocken and Spiller (2006) operationalize relationship quality between pig farmers

and processors by referring to constructs such as *satisfaction*, *trust* and *commitment* as well as determinants such as *farmer-orientation* and *communication quality* and *intensity*. Based on these constructs, Spiller et al. (2005) identified significant differences with regard to the quality of relationships with seven German slaughterhouses as perceived by farmers. The empirical results indicate that this might be due to different legal forms of cooperatively and privately owned processors.

The considerable presence of cooperatives in the northwestern German pork production system as well as differing economic principles according to which cooperatives and privately owned firms are organized allow one to take a closer look at whether cooperative structures influence farmers' network relations. The cooperative principle of self-help (International Co-operative Alliance's Statement on the Co-operative Identity, 1995) relates to a joint attainment of objectives by members of cooperatives (Beuthien, Dierkes and Wehrheim, 2008). Consequently, in conjunction with the principle of identity, a cooperatively owned slaughterhouse has to improve both processing efficiency and producer returns (Sykuta and Cook, 2001). Concerning the pork production system, this leads to the hypothesis that cooperative structures in farmer-to-slaughterhouse relationships may, at least to a certain degree, reduce power asymmetries as well as opportunistic behavior and thus enhance relationship quality. Moreover, the principle self administration is usually realized by active involvement of members, i.e. farmers, in the cooperatives' executive as well as supervisory boards. These interlocking directorates limit the cultural and cognitive distance between producers and processors (Van Dijk, Duysters and Beulens, 2003) and improve cooperatives' farmer-orientation, the latter being a variable positively influencing relationship quality (Schulze, Wocken and Spiller, 2006). Therefore, compared to privately owned slaughterhouses, cooperatives may help their members (or, more generally, their suppliers) develop a more central position in business networks due to better business relationships that strongly support information exchange. Nonetheless, since cooperatives have been changing continuously with regard to, for instance, firm size and recruitment strategies for executive and supervisory boards, the advantages of cooperatives described above are challenged and the actual influence of farmers' business relationships with cooperatives on farmers' participation in professional networks and choice of network partners deserves thorough analysis.

3 Methodology and data collection

The theoretical considerations outlined above guided a large-scale empirical study. Between November and December 2008, 110 pig fattening farmers were surveyed in extensive face-to-face, questionnaire-based interviews. The survey was carried out in the German states of Lower Saxony and North Rhine-Westphalia, a pig production agglomeration area. Windhorst and Grabkowsky (2008) characterize in particular the western part of Lower Saxony as one of the most efficient agricultural areas worldwide. The focus region is also characterized by obvious agglomerations of abattoirs and meat processors, service providers and training institutions. Accordingly, nearly 30% of the pigs slaughtered in Germany were processed in Lower Saxony in 2007 (Bäurle, 2008).

In the first part of the survey, according to the methodology of egocentric social network analyses (SNA) (Gerich and Lehner, 2003; McCallister and Fischer, 1978), open questions concerning farmers' main advisers with regard to feeding stuff purchase, piglet/gilt purchase, marketing of slaughter pigs and overall economic decision-making (each with only one answer allowed) were asked in order to reconstruct farmers' personal network of advisers in business-related questions. In the second part, respondents' intensity and quality of network relations were surveyed by means of questions and statements with given response options.

Whereas the first section of the survey was characterized by open question for egocentric network analyses, the second part consisted for the most part of five-point Likert scales from “-2 = totally disagree” to “+2 = totally agree”. For data analysis, SPSS 17.0 for Windows was used.

4 Empirical results

About 73% of the respondents are farm managers; another 24% are successors already working actively on the farm. Thus, nearly all the questionnaires were completed by respondents who take part in the farms' decision-making processes. The farmers interviewed are on average 39 years old, and most of the respondents have a high level of agrarian education. More than 43 % have an advanced agrarian education and 35.5% have a master craftsman's certificate; another 15.5% studied agricultural sciences at a university. Almost 93% of the respondents earn their living solely from their farms, with pig fattening generating, on average, 60% of their agricultural income. The farmers interviewed keep on average 1,745 pigs (median: 1,350), with a minimum of 250 and maximum of 12,000 pigs. Although the respondents already have above-average herd sizes, 60% of the farmers state that they are planning to expand their capacities in the near future (average expansion projected: 1,100 pigs). These figures indicate that mainly future-oriented farmers were interviewed. Concerning the sales channels of the slaughter pigs, 80 respondents mainly deal with privately owned slaughterhouses, whereas 27 deliver to cooperative processors such as Westfleisch eG.

Farmers' network relations

A first step of the network analysis was to identify which potential actors specialized in the pork production system are integrated into the personal business network of the pig farmers interviewed. Figure 1 shows the frequency of information exchange between farmers and their service providers as well as the importance for respondents' competitiveness attributed to the exchange of business-related information. It can be seen that respondents have various network relations and, correspondingly, assess the communication with several network actors as being significant for business success in pig fattening. It is not surprising that, for instance, veterinarians are key actors in respondents' business networks. Thus, more than 84 % of the farmers state that they communicate frequently or very frequently with their veterinarian and 93 % perceive the information received from the veterinarians as being significant.




Figure 1. Farmers' exchange of information with service providers

Furthermore, descriptive findings show discrepancies between the stated relevance of information exchange with private consultants as well as banks and the actual intensity of communication with these network partners. It can be assumed that the relatively high importance of banks is due to increasing investment volumes in livestock housing construction, which increase the weight of banks as financing partners. Furthermore, the debt ratios of livestock farmers with growth strategies have been increasing sharply in recent years. Moreover, the empirical data reveal which actors are of minor relevance in respondents' networks. Both intensity and importance of information exchange receive mostly negative ratings with regard to service providers such as insurance companies, public authorities, legal consultants, certification bodies and scientific institutions.

An analysis of the respondents' relations with potential supply chain partners indicates intensive interactions between farmers and suppliers of feedingstuff (Figure 2). Business-related information stemming from feedingstuff companies are considered "important" or "very important" for the competitiveness of the farm by more than 86 % of the respondents. Similarly, nearly 82 % of the pig fattening farmers state that they "frequently" or "very frequently" exchange this information. More than 55 % of the respondents have frequent contact with their piglet or gilt suppliers.




Figure 2. Farmers' exchange of information with netchain partners

Information exchange with livestock technology companies is less important, suggesting that information exchange with these partners takes place only in case of a technical investment but not in routine business processes. Although the above-mentioned literature considers the interactions between pig fattening farmers and slaughterhouses to be essential for chain performance, the exchange of business-related information between farmers and slaughterhouses takes place less frequently (Figure 2). Almost 38 % of the farmers surveyed reveal that they "rarely" or "never" obtain business-related information from their slaughterhouses. These first findings indicate the need for further research since slaughterhouses are important partners in the routine business processes of pork production and, moreover, influence farmers' revenue in pig fattening through pig prices and payouts.

Relationship between farmers and slaughterhouses

Against this background, we have to take a closer look at this special relationship, especially due to the fact that high standard deviations signal a heterogeneous level of communication. More than 33 % of the farmers receive information frequently, but 28.7 % report that they only communicate occasionally with their slaughterhouses. Despite the relatively low frequency of communication, the majority of the farmers consider an exchange of information with slaughterhouses significant for the competitiveness of their own pig fattening operations (Figure 2). However, even though farmers consider communication with

their slaughterhouses crucial for their own businesses, they perceive the amount of information received so far as insufficient.

Detailed bivariate analyses indicate that constraints in farmers' network participation regarding the relationship with their slaughterhouses may cause disadvantages at the farm level. By referring to the network theory, possible positive outcomes of farmers' active networking were operationalized in the survey through the following dimensions: i) *farmers' access to business-related information* (checked via three statements) and ii) *farmers' self assessment of business success in pig fattening* (checked via three statements and additional process data such as weight gain per day or mortality per rotation). The relationship quality was operationalized via dimensions such as trust, communication or recommendation of the business partner (cf. Gerlach et al., 2006). The results of correlation analyses displayed in table 1 show significant links between the selected statements representing the outcomes of network participation (*level of information* as well as *business success*) and the statements used for operationalizing the quality of relationships between farmers and slaughterhouses. These findings confirm experts' opinions about the relevance of network participation for competitiveness and underline the importance of good relationships between pig fattening farmers and their customers.

Table 1. Network participation and competitiveness

Correlations; Level of significance: p ≤ 0.05 *; p ≤ 0.01 **; p ≤ 0.001 ***	General extend of feeling informed about new developments in pig production	Perceived timeliness of the information received about developments in pig production	Farmers' self assessment of business success in pig fattening in the the last three years
In general, I am sceptical of the information I receive from my slaughterhouse	-0.327 **	-0.261 **	-0.245 *
I can in good conscience recommend my slaughterhouse to other farmers	0.407 **	0.281 **	0.226 *
I always choose the slaughterhouse which currently offers the best conditions	-0.255 **	-0.215 *	-0.245 *
The relationship between me and my slaughterhouse and is very impersonal	-0.291 **	-0.204 *	
My slaughterhouse always treats me fairly	0.321 **	0.209 *	
The management of my slaughterhouse accounts for the interests of the farmers	0.268 **	0.217 *	0.221 *
I am not in direct contact with my slaughterhouse	-0.223 *		

The basic economic principles of cooperatives mentioned above have lead to the assumption, that there are differences with regard to farmer-to-slaughterhouse relationship quality depending on whether the respondent delivers to a private or a cooperatively owned slaughterhouse. This is checked empirically by classifying the farmers surveyed into two groups and using mean comparison tests for identifying significant differences between both groups (figure 3). The grouping was based on respondents' main sales channels for slaughter pigs – cooperatively or privately owned slaughterhouses. The group of suppliers of cooperatively owned slaughterhouses (group 1) includes also suppliers and members of cooperatively or quasi-cooperatively producing associations (EZGs) which run their own slaughterhouses. Hence, 20 of the 27 respondents in group 1 are members of a producing association (EZG) and 8 farmers state a membership in a livestock marketing cooperative ("VVG") (multiple answers were possible).




Figure 3. Information exchange with private processors and cooperatives

The results of the mean comparison tests indicate that farmers delivering to slaughterhouses characterized by cooperative structures rate all of the operationalized dimensions of relationship quality significantly better than farmers in the comparison group. Particularly farmers delivering to cooperatively owned companies state a higher level of trust in their slaughterhouse, a higher level of intensity in communication and a more personal relationship to their slaughterhouses.

Farmers’ network partners

Furthermore, the results of the survey show that farmers’ network relations not only differ with regard to direct supply chain partners such as processors, but also concerning the kind of service providers chosen for collaboration in various business areas. Significant differences of mean values can be found with regard to respondents’ ratings of the general importance of collaboration with selected network actors (figure 4). In contrast to respondents delivering to cooperatives, farmers dealing with privately owned slaughterhouses rate the importance of salesmen, company representatives and private livestock traders higher than the comparison group does.








Figure 4. Farmers’ network partners

Already at this point, these findings lead to the assumption that farmers dealing with private owned slaughterhouses apparently collaborate more often with (private) firms in their specialized business network, whereas respondents having supply relationships with cooperatives (group 1) tend to use different actors. In order to examine these differences in farmers' choice of network partners in greater detail, respondents had to answer open questions that are typically used in the above-mentioned egocentric social network analyses (egocentric SNA). The results in figures 5 to 8 illustrate which actor or institution the respondents mentioned as their main adviser in the business areas of feeding stuff purchase, piglet/gilt purchase, marketing of slaughter pigs and overall economic decision-making (each with only one answer allowed).





Figures 5 to 8. Main advisers of farmers

Regarding the field of feeding stuff purchase, the majority of the farmers use consultation provided by feeding stuff companies (figure 5). But parts of the respondents, especially farmers dealing with cooperatively owned slaughterhouses (26.9 %), refer to cooperative institutions like the livestock marketing cooperative (“VVG”) or the quasi-cooperative producing association (“EZG”) as their most important advisor. Cooperative structures are also of importance with regard to respondents’ personal networks in terms of information and knowledge exchange regarding farmers’ piglet or gilt purchase (figure 6). Whereas, as expected earlier, private companies such as livestock traders (16 % and 21.4 %) or breeding/genetic companies (16 % and 17.1 %) are important communication partners in this field, cooperative institutions apparently also provide specific consultation services farmers make use of. Thus, nearly one-third of the farmers (32 %) delivering to cooperatively owned slaughterhouses consider cooperatives their main advisor in terms of piglet or gilt purchases. Concerning farmers’ main advisers in terms of marketing of slaughter pigs (figure 7), it is clear that the (quasi-)cooperative institutions (including “EZG” and “VVG”) as well as private livestock traders are of high importance, depending on whether respondents deliver to cooperatively or privately owned slaughterhouses.

Finally, when asked about respondents’ overall main advisers regarding economic decision-making in pig production (figure 8), farmers attach the highest importance to private advisory circles or working groups (22.2 % and 37.7 %). These are voluntary and mostly formal associations or consortiums of pig producing farmers with the objective of sharing knowledge and making use of continuous education as well as inter-farm benchmarking analyses. It is also interesting that more than 20 % of the respondents do not name any network actor in the pork production system as their main adviser in terms of economic decision-making but mainly rely on themselves. In terms of economic questions, the farmers’ answers display a heterogeneous weighting of the stated network actors being their overall main advisers. These findings reflect the multiplicity of business areas farmers often have to include into their general economic decision-making processes.

Regarding the open questions in the fields of piglet/gilt purchase as well as marketing of slaughter pigs, cooperative institutions are also considered the most important advisers by over 12% and 20%, respectively, of the respondents dealing with private slaughterhouses. The latter may be due to the fact that some of these respondents (35 %) are members or suppliers of livestock marketing cooperatives (“VVG”) that market and sell slaughter pigs on behalf of their associated farmers (Theuvsen and Franz, 2007). These livestock marketing cooperatives often also deliver slaughter pigs to private slaughterhouses, depending on the conditions on the spot market. As a consequence, such cooperatives are named as main

advisers by some respondents in the group of farmers delivering to private slaughterhouses. On the one hand, this may limit the informative value of the present group comparisons to a certain degree. On the other hand, coefficients of contingency lead to the assumption that there are medium-strong links between respondents' classification into one of the two comparison groups and network actors chosen by farmers for giving advice. This holds true particularly with regard to farmers' main advisers in the fields of feeding stuff purchase (Cramer's $V = 0.543^{**}$) as well as marketing of slaughter pigs (Cramer's $V = 0.427^*$).

In accordance with the indications based on the differences in the mean comparison tests, the results of the open questions by and large show that cooperative structures influence farmers' network participation in terms of the chosen kind of network partners. Whereas respondents dealing with privately owned slaughterhouses obviously prefer (private) firms and institutions (such as livestock traders, feedingstuff suppliers or breeding companies) as their main advisers and consultants, suppliers of cooperatively owned slaughterhouses more distinctly prefer institutions characterized by cooperative structures such as producing associations (EZG) or livestock marketing cooperatives (VVG). This can be explained by the fact that the majority of the farmers delivering to cooperatively owned slaughterhouses are members of EZGs (74.1 %). However, these findings point out that cooperative (and quasi-cooperative) institutions have clearly extended their primary core functions such as bundling livestock, bargaining with abattoirs or organizing sale and transport of slaughter pigs. Moreover, by providing additional services, they have developed into focal network partners especially for farmers who are already involved in cooperative structures. Besides the service of consultation regarding marketing and sales of livestock, farmers already involved in cooperative structures consider cooperatives to be central advisers, especially with regard to consultation in the fields of feedingstuff as well as purchase of piglets and gilts.

5 Discussion and conclusions

The findings of the present study reveal that cooperative structures in the meat production system influence pig fattening farmers' network participation with regard to the relationship quality to slaughterhouses as well as farmers' choice of network partners for information exchange and consultancy.

Concerning networking, there are differences with regard to farmers' choice of network partners. In farmers' networks cooperatives apparently take over functions of private, specialized service providers by providing additional information and consulting services, for instance in the fields of purchases of input factors and product sales. Accordingly, farmers dealing with cooperative customers predominantly make use of additional services provided by cooperatives such as producing associations (EZG) or livestock marketing cooperatives (VVG). These findings match with evidence in the literature. Theuvsen and Franz (2007), for instance, determine with regard to cooperative livestock traders, that tailoring the service spectrum, and thus offering added values for the affiliated farmers, is a major source of competitive advantage. Similar findings were made in a more recent study of business models of German livestock traders (Voss and Theuvsen, 2009).

In contrast, the present findings show that the comparison groups delivering to private processors often rely on advice and information given by (private) firms and advisory salesmen (i.e., private livestock traders or feedingstuff companies) who are presumably consulting farmers at least somewhat under the guideline of earning money. They are therefore usually influenced, at least to a certain degree, by profit seeking goals. In our study, the differences concerning preferred network partners are especially obvious with regard to the fields of feedingstuff purchase and, of course, marketing of slaughter pigs. As a first implication, cooperatives should use their functions as important advisers within farmers'

networks as starting points for developing more attractive services, such as the support of farmers' quality assurance activities (Theuvsen and Franz, 2007). The present network analysis indicates development potential in cooperatives' service spectrum due to the fact that cooperatives are underrepresented in farmers' networks of advisors in the field of overall economical consultation (figure 8).

Moreover, added values of additional services have to be adequately communicated to cooperatives' suppliers and members, since farmers within cooperative structures often mainly focus on commercial prices brokered by the cooperative (Schulze and Schlecht, 2009). Nonetheless, especially for cooperative livestock traders, traditional core functions such as bargaining best prices for fattening farmers' slaughter pigs have remained yardsticks in farmers' perceptions of the performance of cooperatives. Especially cooperative livestock traders, which are often still led by unpaid voluntary or part-time managers, may consider professionalizing their management (Theuvsen and Franz, 2007), since the development of a balanced and customized mix of services requires additional organizational capacities and capabilities. In doing so, they may convince farmers of the advantages of joining a cooperative, be it a cooperatively owned slaughterhouse, a VVG or an EZG, and allow cooperatives to gain competitive advantages over alternative marketing channels, such as private livestock traders or privately owned slaughterhouses.

The results show that the pig fattening farmers interviewed use relationships with various actors in the specialized network when making decisions. But in the overall sample respondents' network participation is limited in the relationship quality between farmers and their slaughterhouses. However, the present findings confirm the theoretical consideration that this relationship is of particular relevance, since the present data analyses reveal a link between the quality of the farmer-to-slaughterhouse relationship and positive outcomes of network participation. This is underlined by the identified moderate, but significant correlations between the statements representing farmers' relationship with their slaughterhouses and farmers' perceived access to valuable business-related information as well as farmers' self assessment of their own business success.

Furthermore, the results show that farmers delivering to cooperatively owned processors evaluate the relationship with their slaughterhouses significantly better than farmers dealing with private slaughterhouses. These findings match with evidence in the literature. James and Sykuta (2006) reveal that farmers trust cooperatives more than they do privately owned firms. Findings of Schulze, Wocken and Spiller (2006) from German pork production show that cooperatively and quasi-cooperatively owned slaughterhouses (in that case, *Westfleisch eG* and *Boeseler Goldschmaus v.W.*) gain higher ratings in terms of farmers' perceived relationship quality than privately owned processors (i.e., *Vion* and *Tönnies*).

The good relationship quality in the present study provides a valuable basis that cooperative slaughterhouses should strengthen. A stable relationship may not only maintain suppliers' loyalty during periods of low payouts like in 2008 but may also be valuable for a chain-wide implementation of new strategies in order to gain and sustain competitiveness in a highly competitive market. Currently discussed strategies often make high demands on chain-wide collaboration in terms of exchange of information, for instance concerning innovative animal health systems (Schulze Althoff, 2006), risk-based post-mortem inspections (Meemken, 2006; Mousing et al., 1995) as well as the implementation of higher quality standards to produce premium brand pork. Due to a strengthened relationship, cooperatives may be able to better motivate their suppliers to participate in innovative projects, for instance regarding animal welfare, even though farmers may face switching costs and higher prices may be realized with delay. With regard to pork production in Germany, characterized as a developing net exporter, a more intensive relationship between farmers and their slaughterhouses may enhance chain flexibility as a precondition to adjusting the production system to various

customer demands in export markets, for instance in terms of varying carcass characteristics (Makise, 2002), as well as to cope with continuously changing veterinary agreements (i.e. China) in terms of animal health and diseases.

We consider our study a first step in acquiring more in-depth insights into farmers' networks and the influence of cooperative structures on farmers' participation. With regard to the evaluation of the relationships between farmers and the slaughterhouses they deliver to, there are some limitations in the present study. Further research should examine the influence of the cooperatives' individual structural and formal marketing channel designs in greater detail. This concerns, in particular, the two-tier systems of marketing of slaughter pigs with the mediating function of livestock traders such as cooperative producing associations (EZG) (Theuvsen and Franz, 2007), which are often structurally linked with cooperatively owned slaughterhouses. Moreover, further research has to evaluate whether different types of vertical coordination differing among cooperative processors, for instance formal contracts in the case of *Westfleisch* or long-term informal relations (Bahlmann, Schulze and Spiller, 2007) influence farmers' perceptions of the quality of relations with their customers.

6 References

- Bahlmann, J, Schulze, B. and Spiller, A. (2007): Vertrauen als Governanceinstrument in der Supply Chain am Beispiel der deutschen Fleischwirtschaft. In: Schriften der Gesellschaft für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften des Landbaues e.V., Vol. 42, pp. 227-236.
- Bäurle, H. (2008): Die Agrar- und Ernährungswirtschaft in Niedersachsen—Bedeutende Wirtschaftssektoren im Norden. ISPA, Weiße Reihe, No. 32, Vechta.
- Beuthien, V., Dierkes, S. and Wehrheim, M. (2008): Die Genossenschaft: Mit der Europäischen Genossenschaft – Recht, Steuer, Betriebswirtschaft, Berlin.
- Deimel, M., Frentrup, M. and Theuvsen, L. (2008), Transparency in food supply chains: Empirical results from German pig and dairy production, *Journal on Chain and Network Science*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 21-32.
- Deimel, M., Theuvsen, L. and Ebbeskotte, C. (2008): Von der Wertschöpfungskette zum Netzwerk: Methodische Ansätze zur Analyse des Verbundsystems der Veredelungswirtschaft Nordwestdeutschlands. Discussion paper, No. 0810, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development. Göttingen.
- Gambardella, A. (1992): Competitive advantages from in-house scientific research: The US pharmaceutical industry in the 1980s. In: *Research Policy*, Vol. 21, pp. 391-407.
- Gellynck, X., Vermeire, B. and Viaene, J. (2006): Innovation and networks in the food sector: Impact of regional factors, In: Fritz, M., Rickert, U., Schiefer, G. (eds.): *Trust and risk in business networks*, Bonn, pp. 139-150.
- Gerich, J. and Lehner, R. (2003): Egozentrierte Netzwerkerhebung mittels selbstadministrierter Computerinterviews. In: *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Sozialwissenschaften*, Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 46-70.
- Gerlach, S., Spiller, A. and Wocken, C. (2006): Supplier Relationship Management in der Milchwirtschaft: Ein Regressionsmodell zur Erklärung der Geschäftsbeziehungsqualität. In: *Schriften der Gesellschaft für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften des Landbaues e.V.*, Vol. 41, pp. 71-81.
- Granovetter, M. (2004): The impact of social structure on economic outcomes. In: *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 33-55.
- Hendrikse, G. (2006): Challenges facing agricultural cooperatives: Heterogeneity and Consolidation. In: Bahrs, E., von Cramon-Taubadel, S., Spiller, A., Theuvsen, L., Zeller, M. (eds.): *Unternehmen im Agrarbereich vor neuen Herausforderungen*. Münster-Hiltrup, pp. 31-41.

- Hingley, M. K. (2005): Power Imbalanced Relationships: Cases from UK Fresh Food Supply. In: *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 33, No.8, pp. 551-569.
- Hofstede, G.J. (2003): Transparency in netchains, *Proceedings of the EFITA Conference "Information technology for a better agri-food sector, environment and rural living"* 5–9 July 2003 Budapest-Debrecen, Hungary, pp. 17–29.
- James, H.S. and Sykuta, M.E. (2006): Farmer trust in producer- and investor-owned firms: Evidence from Missouri corn and soybean producers. In: *Agribusiness*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 135-153.
- Makise, K. (2002): Creating Special Pork for the Japanese Market. In: *Advances in Pork Production*, Vol. 13, pp. 233-237.
- McCallister, L. and Fischer, C. (1978): A procedure for surveying personal networks. In: *Sociological Methods and Research*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 131-148.
- Meemken, D. (2006): Untersuchung von Bewertungssystemen für Lebensmittelketteninformationen zur Nutzung im Rahmen der risikoorientierten Schlachttier- und Fleischuntersuchung von Schlachtschweinen. Dissertation Tierärztliche Hochschule Hannover.
- Meemken, D. and Blaha, T. (2008): Die Tiergesundheit im Fokus des neuen europäischen Lebensmittelsicherheitskonzeptes: Chancen für die Bestandsbetreuung durch den praktizierenden Tierarzt. In: *Der praktische Tierarzt*, Vol. 89, No. 1, pp. 58-63.
- Mousing, J., Willeberg, P., Kryval, J. and Petersen, V. (1995): Eine vergleichende Studie über adspektorische und herkömmliche postmortale Fleischuntersuchungsverfahren bei dänischen Schlachtschweinen: Ein zusammenfassender Bericht. Ministry of Agriculture, Danish Veterinary Service, Frederiksberg.
- Nonaka, I. (1994): A dynamic theory of organisational knowledge creation. In: *Organisation Science*, Vol. 5, No.1, pp. 14-37.
- Österberg, P. and Nilsson, J. (2009): Members' perception of their participation in the governance of cooperatives. In: *Agribusiness*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 181-197.
- Petersen, B., Mack, A., Schütz, V. and Schulze Althoff, G. (2007): Nahtstelle als neuralgischer Punkt: 3-Ebenen-Modell zur Weiterentwicklung überbetrieblicher Qualitätsmanagement-Systeme. In: *Fleischwirtschaft*, Vol. 87, No. 4, pp. 89-94.
- Petersen, B., Schulze Althoff, G. and Ellebrecht, A. (2008): Qualitäts- und Gesundheitsmanagement in der Fleischwirtschaft - eine grenzüberschreitende Aufgabe: Überbetriebliche Informationsverarbeitung in Wertschöpfungsketten der Fleischerzeugung. In: Spiller, A. und Schulze, B. (eds.): *Zukunftsperspektiven der Fleischwirtschaft. Verbraucher, Märkte, Geschäftsbeziehungen*. Göttingen, pp. 183-198.
- Plumeyer, C.-H., Deimel, M. and Theuvsen, L. (2008): Qualitätskommunikation und Prozessoptimierung in der Fleischwirtschaft: Recht, Zertifizierungssysteme und Informationssysteme als Einflussgrößen. In: *Elektronische Zeitschrift für Agrarinformatik*, Vol. 3, pp. 1-24.
- Rhodes, V.J. (1983): The large agricultural cooperative as a competitor. In: *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 65, pp. 1090-1065.
- Schulze Althoff, G. (2006): Stufenkonzept zum Aufbau überbetrieblicher Informationssysteme für das Qualitäts- und Gesundheitsmanagement in Wertschöpfungsketten der Fleischwirtschaft. Dissertation University of Bonn.
- Schulze, B. and Schlecht, S. (2009): Changing relationships in the meat industry: On the future of livestock marketing cooperatives in Germany, Paper presented at the VII International PENSA Conference, November 26-28th 2009, Sao Paulo, Brazil.

- Schulze, B., Wocken, C. and Spiller, A. (2006): Relationship quality in agri-food chains: Supplier management in the German pork and dairy sector. In: *Journal on Chain and Network Science*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp.55-66.
- Spiller, A., Theuvsen, L., Recke, G. and Schulze, B. (2005): Sicherstellung der Wertschöpfung in der Schweineerzeugung: Perspektiven des Nordwestdeutschen Modells. Münster.
- Stewart, T. (1998): *Der vierte Produktionsfaktor – Wachstum und Wettbewerbsvorteile durch Wissensmanagement*, München, Wien.
- Sykuta, M. and Cook, M.L. (2001): A New Institutional Economics Approach to Contracts and Cooperatives. In: *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 83, No. 5, pp. 1273-1279.
- Theuvsen, L. (2004): Transparency in netchains as an organizational phenomenon: Exploring the role of interdependencies. In: *Journal on Chain and Network Science*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 125-138.
- Theuvsen, L. (2006): European Cooperatives: Are They Prepared for Food Product Innovations? In: Sikora, T. and Strada, A. (eds.): *The Food Industry in Europe: Tradition and Innovation*. Cracow, pp. 65-87.
- Theuvsen, L. and Franz, A. (2007): The Role and Success Factors of Livestock Trading Cooperatives: Empirical Evidence from German Pork Production. In: *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*, Vol. 10, Issue 3, pp. 90-112.
- Van Dijk, S.J., Duysters, G.M. and Beulens, A.J.M. (2003): Transparency dilemmas in strategic alliances. Working paper, KLICT, s'Hertogenbosch.
- Voss, A. and Theuvsen, L. (2009): Wettbewerb erfordert stimmiges Modell. In: *Fleischwirtschaft*, Vol. 89, No. 4, pp. 21-24.
- Windhorst, H.-W. (2003): Perspektiven für die Veredelungswirtschaft: Welche Voraussetzungen müssen gegeben sein, damit Deutschland auch in Zukunft ein attraktiver Standort bleibt? In: *Nutztierpraxis aktuell*, Vol 4, pp. 42-49.
- Windhorst, H.-W. and Grabkowsky, B. (2008): *Die Bedeutung der Ernährungswirtschaft in Niedersachsen*, ISPA, Vechta.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank the Forschungsverbund Agrar- und Ernährungswissenschaften Niedersachsen (FAEN) for financial support.