Proceedings of EKONBIZ 2026
ISBN: 978-99955-45-52-9
UDK: 658.512.2:339.137.2

Submitted: 28.04.2026.
Accepted:19.05.2026.
Review Article

LOGISTICS INTEGRATION AND COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE: A CASE STUDY OF COCA-COLA AND MCDONALD'S

Milan Veselinović
Academy of Applied Studies Kosovo and Metohija, Department of Peć in Leposavić, Serbia
milan.veselinovic@akademijakm.edu.rs
ORCID: 0000-0003-1362-4405

Sanel Mehmedi
Academy of Applied Studies Kosovo and Metohija, Department of Peć in Leposavić, Serbia
sanel.mehmedi@akademijakm.edu.rs
ORCID: 0009-0006-0129-7995

Slaviša Milić
Academy of Vocational Studies of Kosovo and Metohija, Department of Peć, Serbia
slavisa.milic@akademijakm.edu.rs
0000-0002-5462-8042

Abstract: *The contemporary business environment is characterized by growing interdependence among supply chain participants, which makes strategic partnerships increasingly important as a source of operational efficiency and competitive advantage. This paper analyzes the importance of joint assets and coordinated activities in supply chain improvement, with particular emphasis on the long-term partnership between Coca-Cola and McDonald's. The aim of the paper is to show, using secondary sources, how the integration of logistics processes, the harmonization of quality standards, the development of specialized equipment, and long-term organizational coordination contribute to supply reliability, product standardization, and the reduction of operating costs. The analysis is grounded in theoretical approaches that emphasize the role of resources, mutual trust, and supply chain integration, and then examines the practical value of cooperation between two global companies. The findings indicate that this partnership goes beyond the traditional buyer-supplier relationship and evolves into a stable model of inter-company cooperation based on trust, shared operational standards, and long-term strategic alignment. It is concluded that this type of cooperation may represent an important source of sustainable competitive advantage, especially in conditions of global standardization, added brand value, and demanding market requirements..*

Key words*: supply chain, logistics, strategic partnership, joint assets, Coca-Cola, McDonald's.*

JEL classification: L14, L22, M11

1. INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary environment of global competition, rapid technological change, and growing customer sensitivity to quality, speed, and delivery reliability, logistics integration has become a key foundation of sustainable competitive advantage (Mentzer et al., 2001; Flynn, Huo and Zhao, 2010). The traditional view of firms as autonomous entities that independently optimize their processes is gradually being replaced by a systemic understanding of competition, in which rivalry increasingly occurs among supply chains, partner networks, and interconnected business ecosystems (Christopher, 2016). In such a context, the ability of organizations to establish stable, coordinated, and long-term relationships with key partners becomes strategically important (Lambert, Emmelhainz and Gardner, 1996).

Logistics integration refers not only to the physical coordination of product flows, but also to the integration of information flows, the alignment of operating procedures, the harmonization of quality standards, joint capacity planning, and the development of mutual trust (Fabbe-Costes and

Jahre, 2008; Malone and Crowston, 1994). It is therefore increasingly understood as a multidimensional concept with organizational, technological, relational, and strategic dimensions (Fabbe-Costes and Jahre, 2008; Flynn et al., 2010). Particularly valuable in this respect are long-term partnerships between leading global companies, in which logistics cooperation goes beyond the traditional buyer-supplier relationship and develops into a form of joint value creation (Lambert et al., 1996; Dyer and Singh, 1998).

An illustrative example of such a relationship can be found in the cooperation between McDonald's and Coca-Cola. Although this cooperation is most visible through brand synergy and customer experience, it may also be interpreted as a model of logistics, operational, and strategic integration (Lambert et al., 1996; Dyer and Singh, 1998). Supply continuity, standardized beverage quality, and the coordination of equipment and preparation processes suggest that this partnership represents a high level of operational coordination and joint planning.

This paper examines the role of logistics integration in shaping and sustaining competitive advantage through the case of cooperation between McDonald's and Coca-Cola. The central research question is how logistics integration within a long-term strategic partnership contributes to operational performance and sustainable competitive advantage. The paper proceeds from the assumption that competitive advantage in contemporary business does not arise solely from the internal resources of an individual firm, but also from the ability to combine and operationalize those resources through stable inter-organizational relationships (Barney, 1991; Dyer and Singh, 1998).

The paper aims to explain how logistics integration within a strategic partnership can generate long-term operational and market benefits. In this respect, the paper examines the main theoretical approaches to logistics integration and inter-organizational partnerships; the mechanisms of cooperation between McDonald's and Coca-Cola; their effects on operational performance and competitive positioning; and the key risks and managerial implications of such a relationship.

The basic assumption of the paper is that logistics integration, when institutionalized through stable routines of information exchange, standardized operating interfaces, and appropriate relationship-management mechanisms, can represent a source of sustainable competitive advantage that is difficult to imitate (Barney, 1991; Dyer and Singh, 1998). In this sense, the partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola is viewed not merely as an example of commercial cooperation but as a model of inter-organizational alignment capable of producing effects on cost, quality, speed, reliability, and differentiation (Flynn et al., 2010; Porter, 1985).

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF LOGISTICS INTEGRATION AND STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS

Logistics integration is a central concept in contemporary supply chain management and is increasingly recognized as a foundation for competitive differentiation in complex, interdependent market environments (Mentzer et al., 2001; Christopher, 2016). In a narrow sense, it refers to the coordination of material, information, and financial flows within the firm and between organizations involved in creating and delivering value to the final customer. In a broader sense, it implies the alignment of goals, procedures, standards, technologies, capacities, and expectations among supply chain partners, thus moving beyond traditional logistics management toward strategic interdependence (Mentzer et al., 2001; Christopher, 2016).

In the literature, logistics integration is usually discussed in terms of two dimensions: internal and external integration. Internal integration refers to the alignment of processes within the organization, while external integration involves coordination with suppliers, distributors, logistics providers, and other key actors in the supply chain. External integration becomes especially important when a single firm can no longer independently control all relevant resources and when market uncertainties arise. Under such conditions, a high level of integration with key partners contributes to lower inventory levels, better demand forecasting, more reliable order fulfillment, and more efficient use of capacity (Flynn et al., 2010; Fabbe-Costes and Jahre, 2008).

The theoretical understanding of logistics integration relies on the broader concept of supply chain management. A supply chain is not simply a sequence of transactions, but a system of interdependent processes in which value is created through coordinated action among multiple organizations (Mentzer et al., 2001). For this reason, competitive advantage is increasingly interpreted not only through the internal efficiency of a single firm, but also through the ability of the wider network to provide superior service, quality, reliability, and cost discipline (Christopher, 2016).

For a deeper understanding of the sources of competitive advantage, the Resource-Based View and the Relational View are particularly relevant. The Resource-Based View explains competitive advantage through valuable, rare, difficult-to-

imitate, and difficult-to-substitute resources (Barney, 1991). However, in contemporary networked business environments, some of these resources are not confined to a single firm. The Relational View, therefore, adds that competitive advantage may also arise from specific inter-firm relationships, especially when partners develop shared routines, relation-specific investments, trust, knowledge-sharing mechanisms, and forms of governance that are not easily transferable to other relationships (Dyer and Singh, 1998). In the context of logistics integration, this means that long-term partnerships can generate advantages rooted in accumulated experience and operational alignment (Dyer and Singh, 1998; Barney, 1991).

An additional theoretical foundation is provided by coordination theory, which is based on the alignment of interdependent activities (Malone and Crowston, 1994). In logistics systems, this includes joint planning, process standardization, real-time or near-real-time information exchange, delivery synchronization, and clear allocation of responsibilities. Such mechanisms reduce operational uncertainty and improve the consistency of inter-organizational performance (Malone and Crowston, 1994).

From a strategic management perspective, long-term partnerships may also be viewed as a form of strategic alliance. These relationships provide access to resources, markets, technologies, and knowledge that would be more difficult or more costly to develop independently. Their value depends on the quality of relationship management, the complementarity of resources, the alignment of goals, and the ability to minimize opportunism, power asymmetry, and coordination costs (Gulati and Singh, 1998; Lambert et al., 1996).

Contemporary literature also emphasizes the role of digitalization and information integration in driving logistics integration. Electronic data interchange, inventory tracking systems, predictive analytics, automated replenishment planning, and collaborative planning platforms improve visibility and planning accuracy across the supply chain (Simatupang and Sridharan, 2002). At the same time, digital integration alone is not sufficient. Without organizational compatibility, trust, and clearly defined procedures, technological tools may remain underutilized or even create additional complexity (Fabbe-Costes and Jahre, 2008).

Within this paper, logistics integration is therefore understood as a multilayered phenomenon in which operational efficiency, organizational alignment, strategic complementarity, and relational capabilities are intertwined (Dyer and Singh, 1998; Teece, Pisano and Shuen, 1997). This approach is particularly suitable for analyzing the partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola, as it enables the interpretation of long-term inter-firm relationships not only through product exchange but also through jointly shaped standards, high-quality requirements, and synchronized processes.

Based on the above, the central theoretical assumption of the paper is that logistics integration in long-term strategic partnerships creates a competitive advantage when it moves beyond transactional efficiency to develop into a relational capability (Dyer and Singh, 1998; Barney, 1991). In other words, advantage arises not only because partners deliver faster or at lower cost, but because repeated cooperation leads to the development of shared routines, standards, and governance mechanisms that competitors cannot easily replicate (Barney, 1991; Dyer and Singh, 1998; Malone and Crowston, 1994).

3. METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCH

This paper is based on a qualitative research approach, using the case study method and analyzing secondary sources. Such an approach is suitable because the goal of the work is not statistical generalization, but an analytical understanding of the role of logistics integration within a long-term strategic partnership. The research was conceived as a qualitative desk study analysis with elements of an instrumental case study. The case of cooperation between McDonald's and Coca-Cola companies was chosen deliberately because it is long-term, globally recognizable, operationally complex, and theoretically representative for the study of logistics integration, standardization, and inter-organizational coordination (Yin, 2018).

The analysis relies on secondary sources, including scientific literature on supply chain management, logistics integration, strategic partnerships, and relational competitive advantage, as well as professional and corporate materials relevant to the selected case. The principle of triangulation was applied by comparing different types of secondary sources to increase interpretive reliability and reduce reliance on any single source (Johnston, 2014; Yin, 2018).

The analytical procedure included identifying key theoretical categories, selecting and classifying relevant sources, and synthesizing findings in relation to the central research question. It is necessary to point out certain limitations. As the study is based on secondary sources, the analysis depends on the availability and reliability of existing materials, while some operational aspects of the partnership are insufficiently documented. Therefore, the findings should be understood as

analytically informative rather than statistically generalizable (Yin, 2018).

4. DEVELOPMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL LOGIC OF THE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN McDONALD'S AND COCA-COLA

The partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola represents one of the most recognizable examples of long-term strategic cooperation in the global consumer market.

Although it is often viewed through the prism of the complementarity of brands and user experience, its deeper significance is reflected in the gradual development of an interdependent relationship based on standardization, operational predictability and mutual strategic reliance. Along with the international expansion of both companies, McDonald's needed a partner in the beverage segment that could support a consistent customer experience across markets, while Coca-Cola gained access to a high-volume, high-symbolic-importance sales channel (Lambert et al., 1996; Dyer and Singh, 1998).

From an institutional perspective, this relationship goes beyond conventional transactional exchange. It is maintained not only through formal contracts, but also through trust, accumulated experience, reputational discipline, and a shared interest in maintaining operational standards.

The partnership reflects a high degree of resource complementarity and relational stability, as repeated collaboration has gradually led to harmonized routines, shared expectations, and coordination mechanisms that are difficult to transfer to alternative partners. This is precisely why this case is particularly well-suited for the analysis of logistics integration: it shows how long-term cooperation can evolve from a commercial arrangement into a relational mechanism for coordinated value creation (Dyer and Singh, 1998; Gulati and Singh, 1998; Christopher, 2016).

The institutional logic of this partnership can also be understood through the concept of embedded stability, based on mutual trust. In global supply chains, especially in the quick-service restaurant sector, stability is not a passive condition, but an actively produced feature of the system. It is built through standards, procedures, monitoring, clearly defined responsibilities, and the ability to respond quickly to deviations.

The partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola illustrates how such stability becomes institutionalized through long-term patterns of cooperation, operational learning, and continuous process alignment (Christopher, 2016; Malone and Crowston, 1994).

5. MECHANISMS OF LOGISTICS INTEGRATION AND SHARED RESOURCES

The essential analytical value of the partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola lies in the fact that it allows logistics integration to be examined not as an abstract theoretical concept but as a concrete operational practice that generates identifiable, measurable business effects. In this case, logistics integration is not limited to the delivery of beverages to restaurants; rather, it includes a series of interconnected mechanisms such as demand planning, input standardization, distribution synchronization, quality control, equipment compatibility, procedural discipline, and a shared focus on a consistent customer experience (Fabbe-Costes and Jahre, 2008; Simatupang and Sridharan, 2002).

Table 1. Key mechanisms of logistics integration in the partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola

Mechanism	**Operational role**	**Expected effect**
Standardization of products and processes	Ensures consistency in preparation, delivery, and quality control	Quality stability
Equipment compatibility	Supports reliable execution and uniform beverage preparation	Service reliability
Demand planning and replenishment	Connects sales patterns with supply and replenishment decisions	Lower stockout risk
Quality control and deviation management	Detects and corrects operational deviations	Brand protection
Relational trust and coordination	Facilitates faster communication and problem-solving	Lower coordination costs

***Source**: Author's systematization based on Fabbe-Costes and Jahre (2008), Simatupang and Sridharan (2002), Dyer and Singh (1998), and Malone and Crowston (1994).*

Picture 1. Key objectives and selected operational improvements in the partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola

Source: Author's illustration based on the provided analytical material

The first key mechanism is integration based on the standardization of products and processes. As a global quick-service restaurant system, McDonald's relies on a high degree of operational standardization, and this logic extends to its supplier relationships. In the case of Coca-Cola, this means that delivery is measured not only by quantity, but also by the ability to ensure consistency of taste, quality, safety, and product functionality across a large number of outlets. Such standardization includes clearly defined parameters for raw materials, syrups, storage conditions, handling procedures, component ratios in preparation, and output quality control at the point of consumption. In other words, the logistics system is directed not only toward the movement of goods, but also toward preserving the standards of customer experience (Christopher, 2016; Porter, 1985).

The second mechanism refers to integration through equipment and operational compatibility. In many quick-service systems, beverage quality is determined not only by product composition but also by the proper functioning, calibration, and maintenance of restaurant equipment. This includes dispensers, mixing systems, cooling components, syrup-to-water ratios, and cleaning and servicing standards. When a partner such as Coca-Cola provides or supports equipment, technical guidelines, or maintenance standards, logistics integration extends from delivery to operational execution. This is particularly important because it shows that logistics cooperation does not end when goods enter the facility, but continues during preparation and service (Malone and Crowston, 1994).

A third important mechanism is the coordination of planning and replenishment. Although not all details of such systems are publicly available, the operating logic of large global chains suggests that partnerships of this type require a high degree of predictability and consumption planning. McDonald's has access to data on sales, seasonality, purchase frequency, and local demand patterns, while Coca-Cola has the production and distribution capacity to respond to these patterns. When these data and capacities are aligned, the basis is created for more efficient inventory management, lower stockout risk, and the avoidance of excessive reserves. In theoretical terms, this mechanism is closely related to the principles of collaborative planning, forecasting, and replenishment, even if the same term is not formally used in this case (Simatupang and Sridharan, 2002).

The fourth mechanism concerns geographical replicability and local adaptation. One of the greatest advantages of the partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola is the ability to replicate a relatively uniform cooperation model across markets while still accounting for local regulatory, distributional, and consumer-specific conditions. This requires a combination of global standardization and local flexibility. From a logistics perspective, this means that the partnership must function as a multilayered system in which some elements remain centrally defined, while others are adapted to local circumstances. The ability to balance standardization and adaptation is therefore an important indicator of the maturity of logistics integration (Teece et al., 1997; Christopher, 2016).

The fifth mechanism is integration through quality control and deviation management. In systems such as McDonald's, a deviation in the quality of a single input may have a disproportionate effect on

the perception of the entire brand. For this reason, logistics integration includes both preventive and corrective control mechanisms. Preventive mechanisms include supplier standards, testing, audit procedures, technical guidelines, and staff training. Corrective mechanisms include the rapid identification of problems, the localization of causes, the replacement or servicing of equipment, the correction of procedures, and the restoration of standards. In this sense, quality is not treated as a final inspection category, but as the outcome of an integrated management system (Christopher, 2016; Flynn et al., 2010).

The sixth mechanism refers to relational resources and operational trust. One of the most important, but also the most difficult to measure, dimensions of logistics integration is trust, which enables partners to reduce the need for excessive control, resolve operational problems more quickly, and align expectations more efficiently. In long-term partnerships, trust does not mean the absence of control, but rather the reduction of opportunistic behavior and an increase in predictability. When partners know that the other side understands their standards, priorities, and business logic, coordination becomes faster, less costly, and more stable. In this sense, trust functions as an intangible logistics resource (Dyer and Singh, 1998; Gulati and Singh, 1998).

The seventh mechanism can be described as the joint creation of operational value. In a conventional transactional relationship, the supplier delivers a product, and the buyer uses it. In a highly integrated partnership, however, both parties participate in shaping the conditions under which value is realized. In the case of McDonald's and Coca-Cola, this means that the beverage is not merely a product being sold, but a part of the standardized customer experience, a component of service speed management, an element of perceived quality, and part of the emotional and brand identity of the offering. Such an outcome would not be possible without logistics and operational coordination that goes beyond the formal transaction itself (Lambert et al., 1996; Dyer and Singh, 1998).

Based on the above, it can be concluded that the partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola demonstrates a multidimensional model of logistics integration in which physical product flows, technical compatibility, information coordination, standardization, quality control, and relational capabilities are combined into a single system. It is precisely in this multilayered structure that its analytical value lies. This case shows that logistics integration is not only an instrument of efficiency, but also a mechanism of organizational alignment and a source of strategic differentiation (Fabbe-Costes and Jahre, 2008; Dyer and Singh, 1998).

6. EFFECTS OF THE PARTNERSHIP ON OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE AND COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE

The partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola gains its full academic relevance when logistics mechanisms are linked to concrete performance and strategic outcomes. In this respect, the effects of the partnership can be examined at two closely related levels: operational performance and competitive advantage (Flynn et al., 2010).

Picture 2. Conceptual relationship between logistics integration, operational performance, and competitive advantage

Source: Author's illustration based on Barney (1991), Dyer and Singh (1998), Flynn et al. (2010), and Christopher (2016).

At the operational level, one of the most important effects of logistics integration is increased supply reliability. In the quick-service sector, the availability of key inputs directly affects service continuity, delivery speed, and customer satisfaction. Beverage shortages or quality deviations can have a disproportionately negative effect on the customer experience, especially in a system built on standardization. Long-term and highly coordinated cooperation with a partner capable of ensuring predictable deliveries, logistics coverage, and procedural discipline reduces the likelihood of disruptions and contributes to operational stability. Such stability represents one of the basic preconditions for the efficient functioning of large franchise and restaurant networks (Christopher, 2016; Flynn et al., 2010).

A second important effect concerns the consistency of quality. For McDonald's, the value of cooperation with Coca-Cola lies not only in securing beverage supply but also in ensuring a uniform consumer experience across many locations. Standardized taste, the appropriate level

of carbonation, temperature, component ratios, and the technical reliability of equipment all shape perceptions of quality. In this sense, logistics integration contributes not only to operational efficiency but also to the protection of brand identity (Porter, 1985; Flynn et al., 2010).

A third effect is the reduction of coordination and transaction costs. In a conventional market relationship, considerable effort is spent on negotiation, monitoring, correction, and managing uncertainty. By contrast, in a long-term partnership characterized by a high degree of operational compatibility, some of these costs decline over time. Established routines, standardized procedures, clearly defined expectations, and a high degree of predictability reduce the need for constant realignment. Such a transformation contributes to greater organizational efficiency (Malone and Crowston, 1994; Gulati and Singh, 1998).

A fourth effect is the acceleration of scalability and the international replication of the business model. One of McDonald's key advantages as a global system is its ability to expand relatively quickly while maintaining uniform standards across different geographic settings. Partnership with Coca-Cola, a partner with strong logistics and distribution capabilities, facilitates this expansion by reducing the need to develop new, untested supplier relationships in each market for an important product category (Christopher, 2016; Teece et al., 1997).

At the level of competitive advantage, the effects of the partnership can be interpreted through several complementary dimensions. The first is differentiation. Although a beverage may appear to be a standardized product category, the way it is embedded in customer experience, service speed, brand recognition, and overall quality perception can contribute to differentiation from competitors. When customer experience becomes consistently associated with a specific brand combination and a stable level of quality, the partnership ceases to be merely an operational arrangement and becomes part of market identity (Porter, 1985).

The second dimension is the sustainability of advantage. Many operational innovations can be imitated relatively quickly, but long-developed relational capabilities, specific routines, mutual adaptations, and institutionalized trust are far more difficult to replicate. A competitor may contract with another supplier or develop its own form of cooperation, but it cannot easily replicate the history of joint learning, operational compatibility, and reputational interdependence built over decades. For that reason, a partnership of this kind may represent a source of sustained rather than temporary advantage (Barney, 1991; Dyer and Singh, 1998).

The third dimension concerns the synergy between brand and logistics effects. In many analyses of strategic partnerships, attention remains focused either on marketing or on operational issues. In this case, however, the real value lies in their overlap. The Coca-Cola brand enhances the offer's visibility and appeal, while logistics integration ensures it is delivered consistently. Without operational reliability, the brand promise would be weakened; without brand strength, logistics efficiency would not produce the same market effect. It is therefore possible to speak of a combined effect of operational and symbolic value (Porter, 1985; Christopher, 2016).

The fourth dimension is the strengthening of system resilience. Although this paper does not address crisis management extensively, it is reasonable to assume that a partnership characterized by high coordination and stable communication channels enhances the system's ability to respond to supply disruptions, changes in demand, or local operational deviations. Integrated relationships enable faster information exchange, quicker corrective decision-making, and a greater likelihood that problems will be localized before generating wider consequences. This aspect becomes even more important under contemporary conditions of volatility and global disruption (Teece et al., 1997; Malone and Crowston, 1994).

Official performance indicators, recently published for both companies, provide further confirmation of this partnership's modern relevance. Coca-Cola achieved net revenues of 47.9 billion dollars in 2025, with price/mix component growth of 4%, while annual unit case volume remained stable (Coca-Cola Company, 2026). This indicates that the company is successfully translating its global distribution network, standardized operations, and strong portfolio into greater market value even without a marked increase in physical sales volume. At the same time, McDonald's ended 2025 with over 45,350 restaurants, approximately 95% of which were in the franchise system, and global comparable sales growth of 3.1%, with system-wide sales exceeding 139 billion dollars (McDonald's Corporation, 2026). Additionally, almost 210 million active loyalty users across 70 markets indicate that the competitive advantage of this system today is based not only on traditional logistics coordination but also on digitally supported standardization of the consumer experience. In this sense, the partnership of Coca-Cola and McDonald's can be seen as a combination of logistics integration, franchise replicability and digital market coordination, which further strengthens its competitive value

(Coca-Cola Company, 2025; McDonald's Corporation, 2025).

Taken together, these findings indicate that logistics integration in the partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola produces effects that go beyond the traditional economics of procurement. It is a model in which operational efficiency, quality, scalability, reputation, and relational capabilities reinforce one another. In this sense, competitive advantage is not the result of a single isolated factor, but of the synergistic interaction of several historically accumulated and mutually connected elements. For this reason, the case confirms the central argument of this paper: when deeply embedded in a strategic partnership, logistics integration can become a powerful and difficult-to-imitate source of long-term competitive advantage (Flynn et al., 2010; Dyer and Singh, 1998).

7. RISKS, INTERDEPENDENCE AND MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Although the partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola represents a highly illustrative example of successful logistics integration and long-term relational stability, a balanced academic analysis must also consider the risks associated with this model of cooperation. Any high-intensity partnership, especially one that lasts for decades and is built on deeply aligned operating standards, generates not only benefits but also a certain degree of vulnerability. The ability to manage that vulnerability distinguishes sustainable strategic partnerships from relationships that gradually become sources of rigidity or dependence (Gulati and Singh, 1998).

The first, and probably the most important, risk concerns interdependence and the lock-in effect. When two companies develop specific routines, technical compatibility, quality standards, and procedural expectations over a long period, switching to an alternative partner becomes increasingly costly, complex, and risky. For McDonald's, replacing a beverage partner would not mean only changing suppliers; it could also involve changes in consumer perception, equipment adjustments, procedural revisions, additional staff training, and the risk of deviations from a standardized customer experience. For Coca-Cola, losing such a distribution channel and symbolically important partner would also have multidimensional consequences. For that reason, even a highly efficient partnership may gradually evolve into a relationship with high exit costs (Dyer and Singh, 1998; Gulati and Singh, 1998).

A second risk relates to the concentration of reputational impact. In highly visible partnerships, problems affecting one party may spill over to the other, even when the original cause is not formally shared. In such cases, inter-firm cooperation transmits not only operational benefits but also reputational risks. The more strongly a partnership is institutionalized in consumers' minds, the greater the potential for reputational spillover (Porter, 1985).

The third risk is operational rigidity. Standardization, which is one of the strongest sources of efficiency, can at the same time reduce flexibility. A system that is highly calibrated for cooperation with one specific partner may respond more slowly to the need for change, innovation, or diversification. In this sense, deep integration increases efficiency under stable conditions but may reduce adaptability in the face of sudden strategic change (Teece et al., 1997).

A fourth risk concerns asymmetry of power and bargaining position. Even when both firms are globally strong, long-term partnerships may still lead to situations in which one side has greater bargaining power in certain market segments, regions, or operating conditions. Such asymmetry does not necessarily lead to conflict, but it may influence the distribution of adjustment costs, the pace of innovation, or the prioritization of interests. In this respect, partnership stability does not imply the absence of tension; rather, it requires mechanisms that can absorb such tensions without undermining operational continuity (Gulati and Singh, 1998).

A fifth risk concerns the transmission of disruptions through an integrated system. The more connected a system becomes, the greater the possibility that a local problem will produce wider operational consequences. In logistics networks, a disruption in production, distribution, equipment maintenance, or local quality control may, if not isolated quickly, affect a larger number of outlets or markets. Integration, therefore, implies not only greater efficiency but also a greater need for effective incident management, monitoring, and corrective mechanisms (Malone and Crowston, 1994; Christopher, 2016).

The management of these risks is based on a combination of formal and informal mechanisms. Formal mechanisms include contractual standards, quality control procedures, technical specifications, audit frameworks, clearly defined responsibilities, and escalation mechanisms. Informal mechanisms include reputational discipline, trust, continuous communication, operational transparency, and a shared interest in preserving the relationship's long-term value. (Gulati and Singh, 1998; Dyer and Singh, 1998).

It is especially important to emphasize that successful logistics partnerships should not aim for

maximum integration, but for optimal integration. Maximum integration may increase efficiency, but it can also intensify rigidity and dependence. Optimal integration implies a balance between standardization and adaptability, between stability and innovation, and between trust and control. In this sense, the long-term sustainability of a partnership depends not only on the depth of cooperation but also on the ability to periodically reassess operating models, governance arrangements, and accumulated risks (Fabbe-Costes and Jahre, 2008; Teece et al., 1997).

Based on the above, it can be concluded that the partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola, although highly successful, should not be idealized as a relationship without constraints. Its real value lies precisely in showing that the benefits of high logistics integration can only be sustained when they are accompanied by equally developed mechanisms for managing interdependence. In this way, the case reinforces an important theoretical insight: in networked systems, sustainable competitive advantage does not arise from integration alone, but from the ability to manage both the strengths and the vulnerabilities that integration creates (Dyer and Singh, 1998; Gulati and Singh, 1998).

The findings indicate that the long-term cooperation between McDonald's and Coca-Cola goes beyond a conventional buyer-supplier relationship and represents a strategically integrated partnership in which competitive advantage is generated through operational standardization, coordination of logistics flows, mutual trust, and market alignment (Flynn et al., 2010; Christopher, 2016). Although logistics integration is often associated with standardization and routines, the case shows that well-structured partnerships can also enhance adaptive capacity. Long-term cooperation facilitates product adjustments, promotional activities, regional expansion, and faster responses to fluctuations in demand (Teece et al., 1997).

From a managerial standpoint, the paper offers three main implications. First, firms should not view logistics solely as a cost category, nor partnerships solely as an instrument for negotiating prices. In industries that depend on service speed, standardization, and consistency of customer experience, logistics integration can become a source of differentiation and market stability (Christopher, 2016; Lambert et al., 1996). Second, not every cooperative relationship should evolve into a deeply integrated strategic partnership. Such a model is justified only when there is genuine complementarity of resources, alignment of business models, a long-term market logic, and sufficient mutual trust (Gulati and Singh, 1998). Third, because deep integration also increases dependence and vulnerability, firms should simultaneously develop risk-management mechanisms, including alternative supply scenarios, clear performance indicators, review procedures, and transparent conflict-resolution protocols (Gulati and Singh, 1998; Teece et al., 1997).

Taken as a whole, the discussion confirms that the partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola is a useful example of logistics integration as a source of competitive advantage because it combines operational, strategic, and reputational value (Christopher, 2016; Dyer and Singh, 1998).

CONCLUSION

Contemporary business conditions show that sustainable competitive advantage is increasingly shaped by the quality of inter-firm coordination, the integration of logistics processes, and the development of long-term strategic partnerships. From this perspective, the partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola provides an illustrative example of how logistics integration can become an important driver of business efficiency and competitive differentiation.

The analysis confirms the paper's main research assumption. It shows that cooperation between McDonald's and Coca-Cola does not operate as a simple procurement arrangement, but as a multilayered system of interdependent operational, commercial, and reputational mechanisms. Within such a system, competitive advantage emerges through standardized processes, supply stability, equipment compatibility, service routines, demand predictability, coordinated quality management, and mutual reinforcement of market recognition.

A key conclusion is that logistics integration creates value not only through cost reduction, but also through increased reliability, lower coordination losses, and the preservation of a consistent customer experience. The paper also confirms the relational dimension of competitive advantage. Although McDonald's and Coca-Cola are strong companies individually, the value of the partnership lies in their mutual coordination. The long duration of cooperation, shared routines, aligned standards, and operational compatibility create effects that competitors cannot easily reproduce.

At the same time, this type of partnership also involves constraints. A high level of integration implies stronger interdependence, which may increase switching costs, reduce strategic flexibility, and heighten vulnerability to disruptions. For this reason, deep logistics integration cannot be regarded as a universal

model for all business relationships. However, the paper contributes to a better understanding of the relationship among logistics integration, strategic partnerships, and competitive advantage, and suggests that managers should view logistics integration as a potential source of strategic stability and market differentiation.

Overall, despite its limitations, this study provides a useful basis for future research on logistics integration, strategic partnerships, and risk management. The partnership between McDonald's and Coca-Cola demonstrates how logistics integration, when grounded in long-term trust, operational standardization, and strategic alignment, can become an important source of sustainable competitive advantage.

REFERENCES

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

[2] Christopher, M. (2016). Logistics & supply chain management. Harlow: Pearson.

[3] Coca-Cola Company. (2025). 2024 environmental update. Atlanta: The Coca-Cola Company.

[4] Coca-Cola Company. (2026). Annual report pursuant to Section 13 and 15(d) for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2025. Atlanta: The Coca-Cola Company.

[5] Dyer, J. H., and Singh, H. (1998). The relational view: Cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage. Academy of Management Review, 23(4), 660-679.

[6] Fabbe-Costes, N., and Jahre, M. (2008). Supply chain integration and performance: A review of the evidence. The International Journal of Logistics Management, 19(2), 130-154.

[7] Flynn, B. B., Huo, B., and Zhao, X. (2010). The impact of supply chain integration on performance: A contingency and configuration approach. Journal of Operations Management, 28(1), 58-71.

[8] Gulati, R., and Singh, H. (1998). The architecture of cooperation: Managing coordination costs and appropriation concerns in strategic alliances. Administrative Science Quarterly, 43(4), 781-814.

[9] Johnston, M. P. (2014). Secondary data analysis: A method of which the time has come. Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries, 3(3), 619-626.

[10] Lambert, D. M., Emmelhainz, M. A., and Gardner, J. T. (1996). Developing and implementing supply chain partnerships. The International Journal of Logistics Management, 7(2), 1-17.

[11] Malone, T. W., and Crowston, K. (1994). The interdisciplinary study of coordination. ACM Computing Surveys, 26(1), 87-119.

[12] McDonald's Corporation. (2025). Purpose and Impact Report 2024-2025. Chicago: McDonald's Corporation.

[13] McDonald's Corporation. (2026). 2025 annual report. Chicago: McDonald's Corporation.

[14] Mentzer, J. T., DeWitt, W., Keebler, J. S., Min, S., Nix, N. W., Smith, C. D., and Zacharia, Z. G. (2001). Defining supply chain management. Journal of Business Logistics, 22(2), 1-25.

[15] Porter, M. E. (1985). Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance. New York: Free Press.

[16] Simatupang, T. M., and Sridharan, R. (2002). The collaborative supply chain. The International Journal of Logistics Management, 13(1), 15-30.

[17] Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., and Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. Strategic Management Journal, 18(7), 509-533.

[18] Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods. Thousand Oaks: Sage.