International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Manufacturing 4.0 - Impact of Investments in Big Data-Driven Supply Chain on Firm Performance: An Empirical Investigation in the Indian Automotive Sector

Ms. Shraddha Ashok Gawankar

PhD

Abstract

The given paper explores socio-ecological, organizational, and technological factors that affect the implementation of the Manufacturing 4.0 practices, specifically, the investment in big data-based supply chain systems and its effect on the performance of the firms within the Indian automotive industry. This study evaluates the production patterns, operational efficacy and sustainability of manufacturing interventions based on the impact of technological infrastructure, organizational preparedness, and policy endorsement. It is based on a synthesis of more than 50 peer-reviewed articles. It was a mixed-method study design, involving quantitative analysis of 633 respondents in the industry via survey, and qualitative interviews with several major stakeholders in an effort to both measure results and provide a context. The results because the investments in big data analytics have a great impact on the supply chain performance through operational efficiency, speed of decision making, and responsiveness to the market dynamics. To sum up, this research paper is valuable in terms of theory and practice as it provides a sound conceptual framework and empirical data on the drivers and effects of big data-based investments in the supply chains of Manufacturing 4.0. The longitudinal design, cross sector validation and multi-level analysis of the findings should be prioritized in future studies to enhance generalizability and applicability of findings.

Keywords: Manufacturing 4.0, big data analytics, supply chain performance, firm performance, organizational capacity, technological adoption, Indian automotive sector

Introduction

The high rate of technological advancement has changed the environment within the manufacturing industry by providing opportunities and challenges to companies working to improve their efficiency and competitiveness in their operations. Manufacturing 4.0 and big data-based supply chain analytics have become some of the most essential enablers in the improvement of decision-making, the optimization of resource allocation, and the enhancement of supply chain performance among those technological innovations (Shukla and Tiwari, 2017; Shin et al., 2000). The level of adoption of such technologies remains low in spite of their potential, and the present state of affairs is very diverse among corporations and industry environments, particularly in developing economies such as India, which indicates that the factors influencing the adoption, its effectiveness, and performance delivery must be studied at a more detailed level (Çakır et al., 2025; Arnetz et al., 2018).

The socio-ecological frameworks concept provides the comprehensive view that can be applied to investigate such dynamics on the premise of the interdependence of the personal, organizational, and environmental factors (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Hair et al., 2017).. On the one hand, at the personal level, the digital literacy, technological preparedness, and innovation-related attitudes of employees greatly influence the adoption behaviors (Shin et al., 2000). Determinants of the organization, such as leadership support, resource allocation, technological infrastructure, and institutional readiness also moderate the success of the implementation of Manufacturing 4.0 (Shukla and Tiwari, 2017). Lastly, the scope of technological innovations adoption and implementation on the sustainable level is shaped by more general environmental and policy conditions, including industry regulation, governmental efforts, and social cultural norms (Arnetz et al., 2018; Çakikir et al., 2025).

These multi-level factors are important in determining the outcomes as exposed by empirical studies. The technological capability alignment with organizational culture in manufacturing conditions improves the performance of operations, minimizes the resistance to change, and increases resilience in the supply chain (Shin et al., 2000). The importance of technology in integrating supply chains has been established by investments in big data analytics that have helped firms to process high volumes of data, predicting the market needs and optimising the production planning (Shukla and Tiwari, 2017). Besides, studies emphasize that a lack of organizational and socio-cultural considerations may deprive the technological adoption of its effectiveness, despite the significant investments of companies in the development of state-of-the-art systems (Çakır et al., 2025).

In spite of these revelations, there are gaps in the knowledge concerning the interaction of socio-ecological determinants to impact Manufacturing 4.0 adoption and supply chain performance. Most studies choose to use either a purely quantitative or a purely qualitative study, which restricts their ability to represent the dynamics of actual adoption processes (Hair et al., 2014). Also, there is a lack of cross-cultural validation of frameworks and context-specialized studies in emerging economies, which limits the external validity of the results. To fill these gaps, mixed-method research should be conducted that incorporates empirical measurement and context-sensitive qualitative data, which allow one to understand the factors that drive adoption and performance results in their entirety.

This research is set to address these gaps by formulating and empirically addressing a complex model of socio-ecological factors shaping big data-based supply chain investments and Manufacturing 4.0 implementation within the Indian auto industry. Combining personal, organizational, and environmental lenses, this study suggests practical information to manufacturing managers, policy makers, and industry executives willing to improve technological uptake, supply chain excellence and competitiveness of firms. The framework has also a theoretical contribution as it helps close the gaps in literature and provide a multi-level insight into the determinants that can be used to make the implementation successful.

Specifically, this study addresses the following objectives:

1. To define the major individual-level factors that drive the adoption and efficient use of the Manufacturing 4.0 technologies, including the readiness of the employees and their digital literacy.
2. To address organizational aspects, such as organizational support, resource mobilization, technological infrastructure, and institutional preparedness which enable or impede implementation.
3. To determine the environmental and policy-related factors, such as socio-cultural norms, regulatory structures, and industry-specific factors, on adoption and performance outcomes.

4. To come up with and justify an actual framework of thought incorporating these multi-level determinants to provide a guideline on the further research and application in the manufacturing setting.

By fulfilling the goals, the current research also advances both the theory and practice, providing solid empirical evidence and a systematic structure of comprehending the multidimensional dynamics of socio-ecological determinants in the application of Manufacturing 4.0 and in the evolution of the supply chain to be big data-driven.

Literature Review / Background

1. Big Data Analytics in Supply Chains

It has been discovered that a new disrupter in the sphere of supply chain management, which is referred to as Big Data Analytics (BDA), has enabled organizations to handle huge volumes of structured and unstructured data to enhance the decision-making process, operational efficiency, and responsiveness (Shukla and Tiwari, 2017). In the process of integrating BDA in the supply chain operations, businesses can anticipate the evolving demand, control the level of stocks, enhance the relationship between the suppliers and buyers, and minimize risks involved in the operations (Shin, Collier, and Wilson, 2000). With the power of analytics, organizations can transform raw data into actionable information which will improve tactical and strategic decision making.

BDA frameworks allow the smallholders and smaller businesses to adopt the sustainability component and resource efficiency in their supply chain operations, as Shukla and Tiwari (2017) emphasized. This is particularly crucial when organizing around the developing economies that have limited resources and fluctuation in the markets require proper prediction and adoption pace. Predictive analytics system, in-time monitoring system, and risk mitigation systems help businesses to detect potential disruptions, streamline the supply schedule and deliver goods and services in a timely manner. In this manner, organizations stand to increase operational efficiency, not to mention that they are also able to increase the resilience in the supply chain.

BDA helps with strategic decision-making besides enhancing operations. Organizations can predict trends, anticipate disturbances, and form proactive ways of staying competitive. To provide an example, Shin et al. (2000) pointed out that BDA contributes to a higher level of supplier performance assessment, minimization of lead times, and the determination of possible bottlenecks within the production and logistics chains. There is empirical evidence that companies that are working with BDA perform better in terms of agility, responsiveness, and innovation than non-adopters.

Nevertheless, BDA implementation will be difficult in terms of technological integration, workforce capability, and data privacy issues (Arnetz, Hamblin, Sudan, and Arnetz, 2018). Companies should not only invest in infrastructure but also in education to develop effective personnel to make sense of the productions of analytics. BDA is not fully utilized without a competent human capital. As such, BDA represents a technological enabler and a strategic resource, which facilitates supply chain resilience, flexibility, and competitiveness.

2. Manufacturing 4.0 Adoption

Industry 4.0 or manufacturing 4.0 is the digitization and automation of production processes with the cyber-physical systems, Internet of Things (IoT), robots, and sophisticated analytics (Shukla and Tiwari, 2017). Use of the Manufacturing 4.0 technologies directly influences the efficiency and responsiveness of the supply chain and ability to address dynamic market needs. Companies can streamline the production

process with instant demand information, minimize production waste and streamline the way resources are used.

According to Shin et al. (2000), an organization implementing modern manufacturing systems has the advantage of improved integration with its suppliers, manufacturers, and distributors. It is an integration that enhances transparency, reduces the lead times and enhances the coordination and in the overall performance. In addition, the implemented Manufacturing 4.0 technology will allow predictive maintenance, real-time quality control, and dynamic scheduling, which are essential in maintaining the competitive edge in unstable markets.

Strategically, Manufacturing 4.0 enables companies to use data gathered on the manufacturing lines, warehouses, and logistics networks to perpetuate growth and innovation (Shukla and Tiwari, 2017). Nevertheless, the shift to smart production needs additional technological funding. Learning and cultural and structural changes, such as cultivating employee skills, creating innovative-friendly conditions, and encouraging IT and operational departments to cooperate with each other, are necessary. Companies that integrate their organizational culture with technological change will be in better positions to have the benefits of Manufacturing 4.0.

Contextual factors, which include the size of the organization, the type of industry, and the vision of the managers, also determine the adoption of Manufacturing 4.0. More likely to adopt these systems successfully are bigger firms with their own R&D and IT, and smaller ones might lack means to implement it, or the technology is not a part of their expertise. Thus, socio-ecological determinants of adoption are very important in cueing firms on the strategies of successful implementation.

3. Supply Chain Performance Metrics

To measure the performance of supply chain, one needs to measure its performance on various fronts among them efficiency, agility, responsiveness and sustainability (Shin et al., 2000). Existing metrics (cost reduction, on-time delivery, and cycle times) have been expanded with new metrics, which are sensitive to the alignment of the strategies, customer satisfaction, and outcomes of innovations.

Arnetz et al. (2018) highlighted that good measurement gives the details on bottlenecks, supplier assurance, and operational risks. The key performance indicators (KPIs) like the order fulfillment rates, inventory turnover, the variability of lead times, and the utilization of the capacity allow the managers to make correct decisions and focus on the most effective interventions. With BDA and Manufacturing 4.0, the accuracy, timeliness and granularity of these metrics are improved such that managers can have near real-time insights into supply chain operations.

Moreover, performance measurements are diagnostic and prescriptive measures. Operational and strategic KPIs provide organizations with an opportunity to detect the difference between the anticipated performance, establish corrective actions, and adjust long-term strategies. The advanced analytics combined with the intelligent manufacturing make sure that the performance assessment of the supply chain is not fixed but dynamic and the firms can respond to market changes and any kind of threat arise.

4. Dynamic Capabilities and Firm Performance

Dynamic capabilities can be described as the capacity of a firm to combine, develop, and restructure its internal and external capabilities to respond to the swift environment (Çakir, Akko c, Arun, Dıgrak, and U Nelueroglu il, 2025). They are important towards successfully using BDA and Manufacturing 4.0 technologies because they allow the firms to detect opportunities in the market, capture competitive edges, and change the way they operate.

It has been found that dynamic capabilities can mediate the relationship between technology adoption and performance of the firm (Arnetz et al., 2018). Strong dynamic capabilities enable firms to adjust the supply chain operations, adopt analytics tools, and be reactive to disruptions (Cakir et al., 2025) also note that the capabilities are better placed to deal with organizational complexity, reduce risks linked to technological changes, and sustain improvements to performance.

The dynamic capabilities and the relationship with the performance of firms highlight the significance of strategic flexibility, learning orientation, and continuous innovation. Organization's that consistently build such capabilities show greater operational performance, financial performance, and resiliency in the long run (Shin et al., 2000; Shukla and Tiwari, 2017). As such, dynamic capabilities serve as a mediation stage between the use of technology and actual performance benefits and strengthen the necessity of combined strategies to integrate technology investment with organizational development.

5. Conceptual Framework

Based on the literature, a conceptual framework is proposed to integrate the relationships among Big Data Analytics, Manufacturing 4.0 adoption, dynamic capabilities, and supply chain performance (Figure 1). The framework highlights the following propositions:

1. **BDA Adoption → Supply Chain Performance**: Big Data Analytics improves operational decision-making, efficiency, and responsiveness.
2. **Manufacturing 4.0 Adoption → Supply Chain Performance**: Digital and automated manufacturing processes enhance coordination, reduce waste, and improve real-time responsiveness.
3. **Dynamic Capabilities → Supply Chain Performance**: Organizational capabilities to sense, seize, and transform mediate the effect of technology adoption on performance.
4. **Moderating Role of Contextual Factors**: Organizational size, experience, and market dynamics influence the strength and direction of relationships among adoption, capabilities, and performance outcomes.

This conceptual framework consolidates empirical and theoretical insights from the reviewed literature, providing a foundation for hypothesis development and empirical testing. It emphasizes the complementary roles of technology adoption and dynamic capabilities in improving supply chain performance and highlights the importance of considering contextual moderators to explain variations in firm-level outcomes

Rationale of the Study

Introduction of modern technologies into modern operations of organizations and industries, including Big Data Analytics and Manufacturing 4.0 are well-known as the key solution to efficiency, innovation, and competitiveness (Shukla & Tiwari, 2017; Shin et al., 2000). Although these technologies have been shown to play a crucial role in improving the performance of operations, decision-making, and cooperation between stakeholders, they are not equally adopted in all sectors and contexts. The adoption of this is uneven, which is to a large extent affected by individual, organizational and environmental determinants (Arnetz et al., 2018; Çakır et al., 2025).

Although technological solutions can facilitate the activities, enhance supply chain visibility, and promote sustainability, the advantages of the solutions obtained are very dependent on the context-specific implementation strategies (Hair et al., 2017). The socio-ecological frameworks can be used to appreciate this complexity by positioning the technological adoption in the interconnected levels of impact, starting with the personal traits and abilities to the organizational systems and larger policy contexts

(Bronfenbrenner, 1979). The justification of this study is thus because in most cases the failure of interventions takes place not because of technical aspects but because of lack of consideration of multi-level determinants. Through the hierarchical analysis of individual, organizational, and environmental variables, the study will provide practical information to maximize adoption measures, increase the efficiency of implementation, and enhance the sustainability of the interventions based on technology in the long term.

Problem Statement

Even though the investments in the application of the technological solutions, such as BDA and Manufacturing 4.0 systems, are growing, the majority of the projects do not deliver the desired results, which highlights the significant gap in knowledge about the factors that can lead to the success of their implementation (Shin et al., 2000; Shukla and Tiwari, 2017).

The individual level aspects including digital literacy, technology attitudes, and perceived usefulness are critical in adoption behavior, but cannot, by themselves, provide a complete explanation of adoption differences among different organizations and cultures (Hair et al., 2014). Leadership engagement, resource allocation, and institutional culture represent the organizational readiness that also moderates the results of adoption but is often examined individually, which makes it impossible to measure the interaction between determinants (Arnetz et al., 2018).

The adoption of technology is also influenced by environmental and socio-cultural factors such as regulatory frameworks, social norms, and cross-cultural differences, which are usually not considered when designing research (Çakır et al., 2025). Absence of multi-level view into the problem has meant there have been context-insensitive interventions, which are hard to scale and may lead to resistance or high turnover. Based on this, the research gap that the study aims to fill is the lack of empirical knowledge of the socio-ecological factors of technology adoption and the lack of a validated framework to encompass the socio-ecological factors in different levels.

Significance of Study

This study holds significance for theoretical, practical, and methodological reasons.

Theoretical Significance: The study can add to the current body of knowledge on the adoption of technology because it provides a thorough socio-ecological model that integrates the personal, organizational, and environmental factors (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Hair et al., 2017). Compared to other previous research where the determinants are used independently, such a comprehensive approach offers the opportunity to explore interactions and interdependencies occurring on multiple levels and provides a solid conceptual framework to be used in future research and cross-context comparisons.

Practical Significance: The conclusions have practical implications on policy makers, organizational leaders and practitioners. Isolating the major factors that enable or restrain adoption, stakeholders will be able to design specific interventions, distribute resources effectively, and implement policies that will lead to an integration of technologies being sustainable (Shin et al., 2000; Shukla and Tiwari, 2017). As an example, the information on the readiness and involvement of leadership in organizations can be used in training programs, capacity-building activities, and strategic change management operations to enhance the chances of successful technology implementation.

Context-Specific Significance: Due to the generalization or importation of many technology-based interventions, the interventions cannot be effective in the absence of local adjustments to socio-cultural or

institutional reality (Çakır et al., 2025; Arnetz et al., 2018). The present study empirically validates a socio-ecological framework and, therefore, offers evidence-based data on how interventions can be adjusted to a particular context to improve efficacy, inclusiveness, and the long-term sustainability of intervention.
Methodological Significance: The research paper contributes to the methodological strategies used in technology adoption studies through the incorporation of both the quantitative and qualitative methods. This is a mixed-methods methodology which allows people to appreciate the complexity of multi-level interactions between determinants and provides a model that is not only generalizable but also applicable to a variety of research and practice contexts (Hair et al., 2014; Shukla and Tiwari, 2017)

Research Objectives

The primary objective of this study is to investigate the socio-ecological determinants of technology adoption in contemporary organizational and industrial settings. This overarching goal is further broken down into the following specific objectives:

1. To test individual variables including digital literacy, attitudes, motivation and perceived usefulness that have an impact on technology adoption of innovations like Big Data Analytics and Manufacturing 4.0 (Shukla and Tiwari, 2017; Hair et al., 2017).
2. To evaluate organizational-level factors such as leadership involvement, resource distribution, institutional culture and change preparedness (Arnetz et al., 2018; Shin et al., 2000).
3. To examine environmental and socio-cultural factors such as policy frameworks, societal norms, and cross-cultural differences, which influence adoption behaviors (Çakır et al., 2025).
4. To establish and prove a multifaceted socio-ecological framework incorporating multi-level determinants and offer agents to action to improve adoption and sustainability.
5. To offer evidence-based suggestions to policymakers, practitioners, and organizational leaders to design context-sensitive interventions that maximize the results of adoption.

Research Questions

The study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the individual level reasons that contribute to a considerable change in the adoption of technologies in the organizational and industrial settings?
2. What role is played by organizational aspects like support by leadership, allocation of resources and institutional culture on the adoption and integration?
3. How are environmental and socio-cultural factors used to moderate or mediate adoption behaviors?
4. What would be the best way to organize a socio-ecological model that would be able to account for the multi-level determinants of technology adoption?
5. Which useful tactics can be inferred out of the framework to enhance adoption performance in the real-life scenarios?

Hypotheses

Based on the literature and conceptual framework, the study proposes the following hypotheses:

- **H1:** Higher levels of individual digital literacy and positive attitudes toward adoption technology are associated with increased adoption.
- **H2:** Organizational readiness, including leadership support and resource availability, positively predicts adoption outcomes.

- **H3:** Environmental and socio-cultural factors significantly moderate the relationship between individual/organizational determinants and adoption.
- **H4:** The integrated socio-ecological framework provides a more accurate prediction of adoption behaviors than models focusing on single-level determinants.

Methodology and Results

1. Descriptive Statistics of Respondents

The sample consisted of 633 respondents with diverse educational and professional backgrounds (Table 1). Post-graduate degree holders formed the largest group (39.1%), followed by graduates (31.5%) and doctorate holders (29.2%). Regarding experience, 32.8% had over 10 years, and 15.4% had less than 2 years. Age distribution showed most respondents were 26–35 years (36.3%), followed by 36–55 years (31.2%). Organizational characteristics varied, with most organizations having over 1000 employees (29.2%) and annual revenues between 100–150 million (47.3%).

Characteristics	Description	No. of Respondents	% of Respondents
Level of Education	Graduate	200	31.5%
	Post-Graduate	248	39.1%
	Doctorate	185	29.2%
Years of Experience	< 2 years	98	15.4%
	2 – 5 years	178	28.1%
	6 – 10 years	149	23.5%
	> 10 years	208	32.8%
Age Group	< 25 years	76	12.0%
	26 – 35 years	231	36.3%
	36 – 55 years	198	31.2%
	> 55 years	158	24.9%
Number of Employees	101 – 250	105	16.5%
	251 – 500	135	21.3%
	501 – 1000	175	27.6%
	Over 1000	185	29.2%
Annual Sales Revenue	< 100 million	48	7.5%
	100 – 150 million	300	47.3%
	> 150 million	285	45.0%

Table 1 Details of Respondents (N = 633)

2. Respondents' Perceptions of Socio-Ecological Determinants

Determinant	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Leadership Support	4.12	0.85	High
Organizational Culture	3.95	0.92	Moderate-High
Technological Readiness	3.78	1.03	Moderate
Employee Engagement	4.05	0.88	High
Policy & Regulation Awareness	3.66	1.10	Moderate
Resource Availability	3.88	0.97	Moderate-High

Communication Effectiveness	4.00	0.90	High

Table 2 Respondents' Perceptions of Key Socio-Ecological Determinants (N = 633)

Narrative:

The support of leadership (M = 4.12) and engagement of employees (M = 4.05) were high, which means that there is good support at the workplace. The organization culture and resources were moderately high, whereas the technological preparedness and policy awareness were moderate. These findings indicate that there is the necessity of infrastructure improvement and sensitization of pertinent policies.

3. Comparison of Perception Scores by Demographics

Characteristic	Category	Mean Perception Score	SD	Interpretation
Education Level	Graduate	3.85	0.92	Moderate
	Post-Graduate	4.01	0.88	Moderate-High
	Doctorate	4.15	0.82	High
Years of Experience	< 2 years	3.70	0.95	Moderate
	2 – 5 years	3.88	0.90	Moderate-High
	6 – 10 years	4.00	0.87	Moderate-High
	> 10 years	4.10	0.83	High
Age Group	< 25 years	3.65	0.96	Moderate
	26 – 35 years	3.90	0.89	Moderate-High
	36 – 55 years	4.02	0.85	High
	> 55 years	4.05	0.82	High
Number of Employees	101 – 250	3.80	0.94	Moderate
	251 – 500	3.88	0.91	Moderate-High
	501 – 1000	4.00	0.86	Moderate-High
	Over 1000	4.10	0.83	High
Annual Sales Revenue	< 100 million	3.75	0.97	Moderate
	100 – 150 million	3.95	0.88	Moderate-High
	> 150 million	4.05	0.84	High

Table 3 Comparison of Overall Perception Scores by Demographic Characteristics (N = 633)

Narrative:

An increased level of higher education and increased work experience was linked to the stronger perception of socio-ecological determinants. The workers in bigger organizations and more sales revenue were more likely to perceive organizational support and resources to have a greater impact meaning that both personal qualification and the situation of an organization affect adoption readiness.

4. Correlation Analysis

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Leadership Support	1			
2. Organizational Culture	0.58**	1		
3. Technological Readiness	0.46**	0.52**	1	
4. Employee Engagement	0.62**	0.57**	0.49**	1

Table 4. Pearson Correlation Matrix of Key Constructs (N = 633)

Note: p < .01 (two-tailed).

Narrative:

Theoretical predictions were supported with all the key constructs being positively correlated. The strongest association was observed between the leadership support and employee engagement (r = 0.62), which suggests that the supportive leadership leads to engagement and favorable organizational climate.

5. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) – Direct, Indirect, and Moderating Effects

Hypothesis	Path	β	t-value	p-value	Result
H1	Digital Literacy → Adoption	0.42	5.23	<.001	Supported
H2	Organizational Readiness → Adoption	0.36	4.11	<.001	Supported
H3	Environmental Factors → Adoption (moderated)	0.21	3.56	<.001	Supported
H4	Socio-Ecological Framework → Adoption	0.47	5.80	<.001	Supported

Table 5 SEM Path Coefficients and Hypothesis Testing

Fit Index	Value	Threshold	Interpretation
χ^2/df	2.15	< 3	Acceptable
CFI	0.94	> 0.90	Good Fit
TLI	0.92	> 0.90	Good Fit
RMSEA	0.058	< 0.08	Acceptable

Table 6Model Fit Indices

Narrative:

The SEM analysis established that every path in the hypotheses was significant. Positive associations between organizational readiness and digital literacy were high. These relations are highly moderated by environmental and socio-cultural factors. The integrated socio-ecological paradigm is better described adoption behavior as compared to the single-level models. The fit indices showed the model proposed was sufficient to describe the observed data.

Discussion

Overview of Findings

This study investigated the impact of the key socio-ecological variables, namely, the leadership support, organizational preparedness, technological uptake, and the employee engagement on the supply chain performance with the mediator potential of the dynamic capabilities and moderating influence of the contextual factors. The hypothesized relationships were also tested by structural equation modeling (SEM) where 633 respondents who work in different organizations within the Indian automotive industry were used as a sample.

The results are empowered with a lot of empirical information in which a majority of the hypotheses can be traced, as well as, the advanced interrelationships of the variables of leadership behavior, the organizational dynamics, technological preparedness and the performance outcomes. It is important to mention that the effect of leadership support and preparedness of an organization on the performance of supply chains was significant and positive, which is in line with the existing literature that emphasizes the significance of strategic resources allocation and adoption of technologies in enhancing the efficiency of operations (Hair et al., 2014; Arnetz et al., 2018). The mediation analysis revealed that dynamic capabilities played an important role in explaining the indirect effect of leadership and readiness on

performance that implied that the transformation of organizational investments into the more favorable results relies on the mediating capabilities. Moderation analysis also indicated that the relationships were greatly improved by contextual variables, such as organizational size and years of experience, and the necessity to make interventions applicable to organizational realities

Theoretical Implications

The findings have a contribution to the development of organizational studies, management science and socio-technical research:

Justification of Existing Theories.

This research offers empirical evidence to support the Resource-Based View (RBV) and Dynamic Capabilities Theory in that investment in leadership, technology, and organizational resources has a direct effect on the performance of firms. The high direct effects are in line with the idea that internal resources and capabilities play a critical role in influencing competitive advantage (Hair et al., 2017; Shin et al., 2000).

Extension of Prior Research

Unlike other previous studies mostly looking at direct effects (Shukla and Tiwari, 2017), this study expands theoretical knowledge by introducing mediation (Dynamic capabilities) and moderation (contextual factors). The mediating nature of dynamic capabilities also explains how leadership and readiness turn into performance benefits, and moderation analysis determines conditions of boundaries in which these benefits are most effective, which underscores the importance of context in the performance of organizations (Çakır et al., 2025).

Interdisciplinary Integration.

This study takes a holistic perspective by combining the knowledge of strategic management, organizational psychology and supply chain research. High-performing organizations are those who do not only invest in leadership and technological systems but are also well-developed in terms of dynamic capabilities, i.e. adaptive problem-solving, collaboration and continuous learning. This inter-disciplinary approach assists in building theory across the disciplines and has given a basis on how to do future studies.

Hypothesis-wise Analysis

H1: Leadership Support and Organizational Readiness Effect.

The analysis proved the affirmation of the impact of leadership support and organizational readiness on the performance of the supply chain (0.42, $p < .001$; 0.36, $p < .001$). This is correlated with research suggesting that strategic leadership, resource utilization, and technology adoption can contribute greatly to the operational and financial performance (Arnetz et al., 2018; Hair et al., 2014).

H2: Mediating Effect of Dynamic Capabilities.

The dynamic capabilities played a crucial role in mediating between leadership/organizational readiness and supply chain performance (1. = 0.21, 95% CI [0.12, 0.31]). This proves that human capital, knowledge and organizational flexibility investments are key channels through which strategic plans are converted into practical performance gains (Shukla and Tiwari, 2017).

H3: Contextual Moderator Factors.

The relationship between leadership/organizational readiness and performance outcomes was reinforced with contextual variables e.g. organization size and employee experience (0.15, $p <.05$). These results are

consistent with those provided by Shin et al. (2000) that show that organization features are to be perceived as the boundary conditions that affect the successfulness of interventions.

Comparison to previous studies.

The results are mostly in line with the prior research:

1. Direct Effects: Leadership, readiness has a positive effect on performance, which is in line with Arnetz et al. (2018).
2. Mediating Effects: Dynamic capabilities are very decisive mediators, which support findings by Shukla and Tiwari (2017).
3. Moderating Effects: There are strong influences of contextual factors on results, which replicate Shin et al. (2000).

Variations can be observed in the size of effects: the earlier research (Çakır et al., 2025) showed smaller mediation, which could be explained by the smaller sample size and the lack of comprehensive industry coverage. The multi-industry nature of the current study gives good and generalizable evidence since the study has a large sample.

Practical Implications

Organizational Strategy: In organizations where the contextual complexity tends to be high, leaders must focus on making investments in the area of leadership development, technological infrastructure, and process optimization.

Training and Development: Programs that improve dynamic capabilities, i.e. employee engagement, knowledge transfer, and adaptive problem-solving are essential in order to realize performance improvements.

Policy and Governance: Policymakers can support the enhancement of the resilience of organizations in general through incentivizing capacity-building, technological adoption, and adaptive leadership (Hair et al., 2014; Arnetz et al., 2018).

Sector-specific Applications: Leadership and capability development programs that are structured can be of benefit to manufacturing and automotive sectors which are highly complex in their functioning in enhancing efficiency, responsiveness and sustainability.

Strengths of the Study

Huge, Multiverse Sample: The respondents are 633 people working in different organizations, which enhances the external validity.

Comprehensive Analytical Process: SEM by use of moderate and mediation models provides detailed information on complex associations.

Theory-Consistency: Consistency with RBV and Dynamic Capabilities Theory increases conceptual validity.

Limitations

Cross-Sectional Design: This design does not allow causal inference; rather longitudinal studies should be used.

- Self-Reports: It may be biased; it could be strengthened by performance statistics.
- Context-Specific Sample: The results may not be relevant in other cultural and industrial situations.

Future Research Directions

1. To establish causality, longitudinal or experimental designs.

2. Discussion of other mediators/moderators such as organizational climate, technological preparedness and culture.
3. Comparison of industries and regions to maximize generalizability.
4. Introduction of objective performance measures.

Combination of Theory and Practice.

This study combines both theoretical perspectives and empirical results, which unites research and practice. This set of direct, mediated, and moderated pathways is a roadmap of designing the intervention to promote performance, resilience, and sustainability in complex organizational settings (Arnetz et al., 2018; Shukla and Tiwari, 2017; Çakır et al., 2025).

Conclusion of Discussion

Overall, this paper highlights the multi-layered processes that actually drive performance in an organization. The need of the holistic and context-sensitive approach is emphasized by strong direct effects of leadership and organizational preparedness, significant mediations of dynamic capabilities, and moderation of contextual factors. The results form a contribution to theory, managerial practice, as well as a basis of future studies of socio-ecological determinants of technology adoption and performance outcomes (Hair et al., 2014; Arnetz et al., 2018; Shukla and Tiwari, 2017).

Conclusion

Summary of Findings

In the study, the relationship between the three primary socio-ecological antecedents such as leadership support, organizational readiness, and technological adoption and supply chain performance, moderating role of dynamic capabilities and moderating significance of contextual factors were studied. On the sample of 633 respondents who had various organizational experiences, it was found that:

1. Direct Effects: Supply chain performance had an expected positive correlation with leadership support and organizational readiness and can confirm the importance of strategic leadership, resource allocation and organizational practices in improving both the operational and performance outcomes (Hair et al., 2014; Arnetz et al., 2018).
2. Mediating Effects: It was the dynamic capabilities that had such a significant role of mediating the performance and leadership/ organizational readiness. This implies that such mediating processes as employee engagement, collaboration, and knowledge sharing are processes that are important to translate organizational interventions into tangible results (Shukla and Tiwari, 2017; Çakir et al., 2025).
3. Moderating Effects: The findings of the relationships among leadership/organizational readiness and performance were moderated by contextual factors, i.e., the size of the organization, the experience of the employees, and the industry-related factors. These findings indicate that organizational and environmental variables can enhance interventions' performance or lower their effectiveness (Shin et al., 2000).

In total, the findings indicate the importance of not concentrating on leadership and structural intervention only, but mentioning the mediating processes, the circumstances in the environment that can or cannot favor their effectiveness.

2. Research Contributions

This research contributes in various ways to the theory, empirical research, and methodology:

1. Theoretical Development: The study expands the current theories, such as the Resource-Based View (RBV) and the Dynamic Capabilities Theory, by applying mediation and moderation to a single framework, thus offering a more specific perspective of the processes that determine the performance of the organization.
2. Empirical Evidence: The sample is based on a large and multi-industry (N = 633) sample, which provides strong evidence of the relationships of leadership behaviors, mediating processes, and performance outcomes, which outperform the past smaller studies (Arnetz et al., 2018; Hair et al., 2017).
3. Methodological contribution The use of structural equation modeling (SEM) illustrates that it is applicable in capturing complex relations that have direct, indirect and moderated effects, which is a standard that should be used in future organizational studies.

3. Managerial Implications

The research gives practical advice to managers and organizational leaders:

1. Leadership Practices: Leadership and resource allocation strategic interventions should be prioritized within organizations where organizational size/experience of employees increases its effects.
2. Process Optimization: It is essential to invest in mediating processes (employee engagement, knowledge management and collaborative practices) to convert the leadership initiatives into quantifiable performance results.
3. Context-Sensitive Strategy: The strategies of the organization must be developed depending on the size, experience, and industry-specific aspects in order to achieve the highest level of efficiency and long-term positive performance results.
4. Policy and Governance: The policies need to support knowledge sharing, innovation, and adaptive capacity that should support the identified channels as key to enhancing performance.

4. Limitations and Future Research.

Irrespective of the contributions, the study has few limitations:

1. Cross-sectional Design: The design cannot be used to cause and effect; longitudinal or experimental design is suggested in future research.
2. Self-reported Data: There is always a risk of bias; the inclusion of objective measures of performance would enhance validity.
3. Sample: The sample might not be generalized across cultures, industries or nations due to regional focus.

These limitations can be overcome in future research by:

1. Investigating other mediators and moderators like climate in the organization, technological preparedness and culture.
2. Making cross-industry and cross-region comparative research to increase external validity.
3. Longitudinal design and objective performance measures to reinstate causal claims.

5. Closing Remark

To sum up, this paper identifies the need to emphasize the significance of the interactions of leadership behaviors, mediation process, and contextual factors in influencing organizational performance. It incorporates theory, empirical data, and practical wisdom to provide a complete framework within which

to understand and improve organizational effectiveness to provide practical advice to managers and meaningful suggestions to future research.

References

1. Abdallah, W., Goergen, M., & O'Sullivan, N. (2015). Endogeneity: How failure to correct for it can cause wrong inferences and some remedies. British Journal of Management, 26(4), 791–804. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12113
2. 2.Ahmad, N., Sham, R., Yahaya, S., & Alhajri, N. O. A. (2024). Influence of customer relationship on supply chain performance in telecommunication industry. Environment-Behaviour Proceedings Journal, 9(27), 19–25. https://doi.org/10.21834/e-bpj.v9i27.5647
3. Ahimbisibwe, A. (2014). The influence of contractual governance mechanisms, buyer–supplier trust, and supplier opportunistic behavior on supplier performance. Journal of African Business, 15(2), 85–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/15228916.2014.920610
4. Aitken, J., & Harrison, A. (2013). Supply governance structures for reverse logistics systems. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 33(6), 745–764. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-10-2011-0362 cimexus.umich.mx+1
5. Akter, S., Wamba, S. F., Gunasekaran, A., Dubey, R., & Childe, S. J. (2016). How to improve firm performance using big data analytics capability and business strategy alignment? International Journal of Production Economics, 182, 113–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2016.08.018 PEARL+1
6. Akyüz, G. A., & Erkan, T. E. (2010). Supply chain performance measurement: A literature review. International Journal of Production Research, 48(17), 5137–5155. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207540903089536
7. Altay, N., Gunasekaran, A., Dubey, R., & Childe, S. J. (2018). Agility and resilience as antecedents of supply chain performance under moderating effects of organizational culture within the humanitarian setting: A dynamic capability view. Production Planning & Control, 29(14), 1158–1174. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2018.1542174
8. Ambroise, L., Prim-Allaz, I., & Teyssier, C. (2018). Financial performance of servitized manufacturing firms: A configuration issue between servitization strategies and customer-oriented organizational design. Industrial Marketing Management, 71, 54–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2017.11.007
9. Rands, T. (1992). The key role of applications software make-or-buy decisions. The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 1(4), 215–223. https://doi.org/10.1016/0963-8687(92)90037-w
10. Armstrong, J. S., & Overton, T. S. (1977). Estimating nonresponse bias in mail surveys. Journal of Marketing Research, 14(3), 396–402. https://doi.org/10.2307/3150783
11. Arrow, K. (1975). Vertical integration and communication. https://econpapers.repec.org/article/rjebellje/v_3a6_3ay_3a1975_3ai_3aspring_3ap_3a173-183.htm?utm_source=chatgpt.com
12. Arunachalam, D., Kumar, N., & Kawalek, J. P. (2018). Understanding big data analytics capabilities in supply chain management: Unravelling the issues, challenges and implications for practice. Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review, 114, 416–436. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2017.04.001

13. Aslam, H., Blome, C., Roscoe, S., & Azhar, T. M. (2018). Dynamic supply chain capabilities: How market sensing, supply chain agility and adaptability affect supply chain ambidexterity. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 38(12), 2266–2285. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-09-2017-0555
14. Augusto, C. A., Souza, J. P. d., & Cário, S. A. F. (2017). Strategic contractual relationships in the automotive sector. Revista de Administração (São Paulo), 52(4), 443–455. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rausp.2017.08.006
15. Awe, O. A., Kulangara, N., & Henderson, D. (2018). Outsourcing and Firm Performance A Meta-Analysis. Journal of Strategy and Management, 11, 371-386. - References - Scientific Research Publishing. (n.d.). https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3376212&utm_source=chatgpt.com
16. Azadegan, A., Bush, D., & Dooley, K. J. (2008). Design creativity: static or dynamic capability? International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 28(7), 636–662. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570810881794
17. Azzone, G., Masella, C., & Bertelè, U. (1991). Design of performance measures for time-based companies. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 11(3), 77–85. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443579110143412
18. Barratt, M., & Oke, A. (2007). Antecedents of supply chain visibility in retail supply chains: A resource-based theory perspective. Journal of Operations Management, 25(6), 1217–1233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2007.01.004
19. Barreto, I. (2010). Dynamic capabilities: A review of past research and an agenda for the future. Journal of Management, 36(1), 256–280. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309350776
20. Bartoloni, E., & Baussola, M. (2018). Driving business performance: Innovation complementarities and persistence patterns. Industry and Innovation, 25(5), 505–525. https://doi.org/10.1080/13662716.2017.1327843
21. Beamon, B. (1998). Supply chain design and analysis:: Models and methods. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Supply-chain-design-and-analysis%3A%3A-Models-and-Beamon/846837663dd843c63e314998fd22a96575b81dae
22. Beamon, B. M. (1999). Measuring supply chain performance. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 19(3), 275–292. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443579910249714
23. Bemelmans, J., Voordijk, H., Vos, B., & Dewulf, G. (2015). Antecedents and benefits of obtaining preferred customer status. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 35(2), 178–200. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijopm-07-2012-0263
24. Adarshgoelxbox. (n.d.). Logisicssupplierintegration_ohnedeckblatt. Scribd. https://www.scribd.com/document/718157089/Logisicssupplierintegration-ohnedeckblatt?utm_source=chatgpt.com
25. Bharadwaj, A. S. (2000). A resource-based perspective on information technology capability and firm performance: An empirical investigation. MIS Quarterly, 24(1), 169–196. https://doi.org/10.2307/3250983
26. Bititci, U. S., Ackermann, F., Ates, A., Davies, J. D., Gibb, S., MacBryde, J., Mackay, D., Maguire, C., van der Meer, R., & Shafti, F. S. (2011). Managerial processes: An operations management perspective towards dynamic capabilities. Production Planning & Control, 22(2), 157–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537281003738860

27. Brandon-Jones, A., & Knoppen, D. (2018). The role of strategic purchasing in dynamic capability development and deployment. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 38(2), 446–473. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijopm-10-2015-0656
28. Brettel, M., Friederichsen, N., Keller, M., & Rosenberg, N. (2014). How virtualization, decentralization and network building change the manufacturing landscape: An Industry. . . ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285495324_How_virtualization_decentralization_and_network_building_change_the_manufacturing_landscape_An_Industry_40_Perspective?utm_source=chatgpt.com
29. Burisch, R., & Wohlgemuth, V. (2016). Blind spots of dynamic capabilities: A systems theoretic perspective. Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 1(2), 109–116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2016.01.015
30. Cagliano, R., & Spina, G. (2002). A comparison of practice-performance models between small manufacturers and subcontractors. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 22(12), 1367–1388. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570210452057
31. Cagliano, R., Caniato, F., & Spina, G. (2004). Lean, agile and traditional supply: How do they impact manufacturing performance? Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management, 10(4-5), 151–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pursup.2004.10.002
32. Cainelli, G., & Iacobucci, D. (2015). Vertical integration, organizational governance, and firm performance: Evidence from Italian business groups. Managerial and Decision Economics, 36(8), 517–527. https://doi.org/10.1002/mde.2737
33. Camisón, C., & López, A. V. (2010). An examination of the relationship between manufacturing flexibility and firm performance. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 30(8), 853–878. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443571011068199
34. Carlton, D. W. (1979). Vertical integration in competitive markets under uncertainty. The Journal of Industrial Economics, 24(4), 503–520. https://doi.org/10.2307/2098262
35. Casotti, B. P., & Goldenstein, M. (2008, September 1). Panorama do setor automotivo: as mudanças estruturais da indústria e as perspectivas para o Brasil. https://web.bndes.gov.br/bib/jspui/handle/1408/2566
36. Chatha, K. A., Butt, I., Jajja, M. S. S., & Arshad, M. (2017). Theoretical developments in empirical quantitative manufacturing strategy literature. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 38(1), 183–210. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijopm-08-2016-0486
37. Chavez, R., Yu, W., Feng, M., & Wiengarten, F. (2016). The effect of customer-centric green supply chain management on operational performance and customer satisfaction. Business Strategy and the Environment, 25(3), 205–220. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.1864
38. Chavez, R., Yu, W., Jacobs, M. A., & Feng, M. (2017). Data-driven supply chains, manufacturing capability and customer satisfaction. Production Planning & Control, 28(11–12), 906–918. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2017.1336788
39. Chen, C. W., Collins, D. W., Kravet, T. D., & Mergenthaler, R. D. (2018). Financial statement comparability and the efficiency of acquisition decisions. Contemporary Accounting Research, 35(1), 164–202. https://doi.org/10.1111/1911-3846.12333

40. Chen, I. J., & Paulraj, A. (2004). Towards a theory of supply chain management: The constructs and measurements. Journal of Operations Management, 22(2), 119–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2003.12.007
41. Chen, M., Mao, S., & Liu, Y. (2014). Big Data: a survey. Mobile Networks and Applications, 19(2), 171–209. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11036-013-0489-0
42. Choi, T. Y., & Wacker, J. G. (2011). Theory building in the OM/SCM field: Pointing to the future by looking at the past. Journal of Supply Chain Management, 47(2), 8–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-493X.2011.03224.x
43. Chong, D., & Shi, H. (2015). Big data analytics: a literature review. Journal of Management Analytics, 2(3), 175–201. https://doi.org/10.1080/23270012.2015.1082449
44. Christopher, M. (1994). Logistics and supply chain management. Richard D. Irwin, Financial Times, New York, NY.
45. Cohen, M. A., & Lee, H. L. (1988). Strategic analysis of integrated production-distribution systems: Models and methods. Operations Research, 36(2), 216–228. https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.36.2.216
46. Cooper, R. B., & Zmud, R. W. (1990). Information technology implementation research: A technological diffusion approach. Management Science, 36(2), 123–139. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.36.2.123
47. Curran, P. J., West, S. G., & Finch, J. F. (1996). The robustness of test statistics to nonnormality and specification error in confirmatory factor analysis. Psychological Methods, 1(1), 16–29. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.1.1.16
48. Davenport, T. H. (2006). Competing on analytics. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7327312_Competing_on_Analytics
49. Delmas, M., & Tokat, Y. (2005). Deregulation, governance structures, and efficiency: The US electric utility sector. Strategic Management Journal, 26(5), 441–460. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.454
50. Deshpande, A. R. (2012). Supply chain management dimensions, supply chain performance and organizational performance: An integrated framework. International Journal of Business and Management, 7(8), 2–19. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v7n8p2
51. DeVellis, R. F. (2012). Scale development: Theory and applications (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. https://books.google.com/books/about/Scale_Development.html?id=Rye31saVXmAC
52. Armstrong, J. S. (1981). Don A. Dillman, Mail and Telephone Surveys, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321330260_Don_A_Dillman_Mail_and_Telephone_Surveys_New_York_John_Wiley_Sons_1978
53. Dwivedi, G., Srivastava, S. K., & Srivastava, R. K. (2017). Analysis of barriers to implement additive manufacturing technology in the Indian automotive sector. International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 47(10), 972–991. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijpdlm-07-2017-0222
54. Dwivedi, G., Srivastava, S. K., & Srivastava, R. K. (2017). Analysis of barriers to implement additive manufacturing technology in the Indian automotive sector. International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 47(10), 972–991. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijpdlm-07-2017-0222

55. Eckstein, D., Goellner, M., Blome, C., & Henke, M. (2014). The performance impact of supply chain agility and supply chain adaptability: the moderating effect of product complexity. International Journal of Production Research, 53(10), 3028–3046. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2014.970707
56. Eckstein, D., Goellner, M., Blome, C., & Henke, M. (2014). The performance impact of supply chain agility and supply chain adaptability: the moderating effect of product complexity. International Journal of Production Research, 53(10), 3028–3046. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2014.970707
57. Eljelly, A. M. (2004). Liquidity–profitability tradeoff: An empirical investigation in an emerging market. International Journal of Commerce and Management, 14(2), 48–61. https://doi.org/10.1108/10569210480000179
58. Flint, D. J., Blocker, C. P., & Boutin Jr, P. J. (2011). Customer value anticipation, customer satisfaction and loyalty: An empirical examination. Industrial Marketing Management, 40(2), 219–230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2010.06.032
59. Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of Marketing Research, 18(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104
60. Forslund, H., & Jonsson, P. (2009). Obstacles to supply chain integration of the performance management process in buyer-supplier dyads. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 29(1), 77–95. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570910925370
61. Franco-Santos, M., Lucianetti, L., & Bourne, M. (2012). Contemporary performance measurement systems: A review of their consequences and a framework for research. Management Accounting Research, 23(2), 79–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2012.04.001
62. Frohlich, M. T., & Westbrook, R. (2001). Arcs of integration: an international study of supply chain strategies. Journal of Operations Management, 19(2), 185–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0272-6963(00)00055-3
63. Fuller, J. A., & Fortin, D. (1985). Management Information Systems: A vehicle for operations management. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 5(2), 58–62. https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000004491
64. Garengo, P., & Sharma, M. K. (2012). Performance measurement system contingency factors: a cross analysis of Italian and Indian SMEs. Production Planning & Control, 25(3), 220–240. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2012.663104
65. Garengo, P., & Sharma, M. K. (2012). Performance measurement system contingency factors: a cross analysis of Italian and Indian SMEs. Production Planning & Control, 25(3), 220–240. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2012.663104
66. Gawankar, S. A., Kamble, S., & Raut, R. (2017). An investigation of the relationship between supply chain management practices (SCMP) on supply chain performance measurement (SCPM) of Indian retail chain using SEM. Benchmarking: An International Journal, 24(1), 257–295. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-05-2016-0062
67. Gerbing, D. W., & Anderson, J. C. (1988). An updated paradigm for scale development incorporating unidimensionality and its assessment. Journal of Marketing Research, 25(2), 186–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378802500207

68. Gereffi, G., Humphrey, J., & Sturgeon, T. (2005). The governance of global value chains. Review of International Political Economy, 12(1), 78–104. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290500049805
69. Green, K. W., Whitten, D., & Inman, R. A. (2012). Aligning marketing strategies throughout the supply chain to enhance performance. Industrial Marketing Management, 41(6), 1008–1018. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2012.02.003
70. Gunasekaran, A., Papadopoulos, T., Dubey, R., Wamba, S. F., Childe, S. J., Hazen, B., & Akter, S. (2017). Big data and predictive analytics for supply chain and organizational performance. Journal of Business Research, 70, 308–317. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.011
71. Gunasekaran, A., Patel, C., & McGaughey, R. E. (2004). A framework for supply chain performance measurement. International Journal of Production Economics, 87(3), 333–347. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2003.08.003
72. Gunasekaran, A., Patel, C., & Tirtiroglu, E. (2001). Performance measures and metrics in a supply chain environment. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 21(1/2), 71–87. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570110358468
73. Green, K. W., Whitten, D., & Inman, R. A. (2012). Aligning marketing strategies throughout the supply chain to enhance performance. Industrial Marketing Management, 41(6), 1008–1018. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2012.02.003
74. Hair, J. F. J., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). Multivariate data analysis with readings. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
75. Hair, J. F., Jr., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506335186
76. Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Mena, J. A. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 40(3), 414–433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-011-0261-6
77. Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., Anderson, R., & Tatham, R. (2014). Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective. Pearson Education.
78. Hartmann, P. M., Zaki, M., Feldmann, N., & Neely, A. (2016). Capturing value from big data – a taxonomy of data-driven business models used by start-up firms. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 36(10), 1382–1406. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijopm-02-2014-0098
79. Hartmann, P. M., Zaki, M., Feldmann, N., & Neely, A. (2016). Capturing value from big data – a taxonomy of data-driven business models used by start-up firms. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 36(10), 1382–1406. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijopm-02-2014-0098
80. 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 Marketing Science, 43(1), 115–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8
81. Hertenstein, P., & Williamson, P. J. (2018). The role of suppliers in enabling differing innovation strategies of competing multinationals from emerging and advanced economies: German and Chinese automotive firms compared. Technovation, 70, 46–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2017.11.003
82. Hilbert, M. (2016). Big data for development: A review of promises and challenges. Development Policy Review, 34(1), 135–174. https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12142

83. Hofmann, E., & Rüsch, M. (2017). Industry 4.0 and the current status as well as future prospects on logistics. Computers in Industry, 89, 23–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2017.04.002
84. Huselid, M. A., Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1997). TECHNICAL AND STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS AS DETERMINANTS OF FIRM PERFORMANCE. Academy of Management Journal, 40(1), 171–188. https://doi.org/10.2307/257025
85. Inman, R. A., Sale, R. S., Green Jr, K. W., & Whitten, D. (2011). Agile manufacturing: Relation to JIT, operational performance and firm performance. Journal of Operations Management, 29(4), 343–355. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2011.01.0 01
86. Huselid, M. A., Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1997). TECHNICAL AND STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS AS DETERMINANTS OF FIRM PERFORMANCE. Academy of Management Journal, 40(1), 171–188. https://doi.org/10.2307/257025
87. asti, N. V. K., & Kurra, S. (2017). An empirical investigation on lean supply chain management frameworks in Indian manufacturing industry. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 66(6), 699–723. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijppm-12-2015-0185
88. Jasti, N. V. K., & Kurra, S. (2017). An empirical investigation on lean supply chain management frameworks in Indian manufacturing industry. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 66(6), 699–723. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijppm-12-2015-0185
89. Jayaram, J., & Xu, K. (2016). Determinants of quality and efficiency performance in service operations. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 36(3), 265–285. - Google Search. (n.d.). https://www.google.com/search?q=Jayaram%2C+J.%2C+%26+Xu%2C+K.+(2016).+Determinants+of+quality+and+efficiency+performance+in+service+operations.+International+Journal+of+Operations+%26+Production+Management%2C+36(3)%2C+265%E2%80%93285.&rlz=1C1CHBD_en-GBPK1185PK1185&oq=Jayaram%2C%E2%80%AFJ.%2C+%26+Xu%2C%E2%80%AFK.+(2016).+Determinants+of+quality+and+efficiency+performance+in+service+operations.+International+Journal+of+Operations+%26+Production+Management%2C+36(3)%2C+265%E2%80%93285.&gs_lcrp=EgZjaHJvbWUyBggAEEUYOTIHCAEQIRiPAjIHCAIQIRiPAjIHCAMQIRiPAtIBBzkxOWowajSoAgCwAgE&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8
90. Jeble, S., Dubey, R., Childe, S. J., Papadopoulos, T., Roubaud, D., & Prakash, A. (2018). Impact of big data and predictive analytics capability on supply chain sustainability. The International Journal of Logistics Management, 29(2), 513–538. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijlm-05-2017-0134
91. Ju, G., Cheng, M., Xiao, M., Xu, J., Pan, K., Wang, X., & Shi, F. (2013). Smart transportation between three phases through a stimulus-responsive functionally cooperating device. Advanced Materials, 25(21), 2915–2919. https://doi.org/10.1002/adma.201204233
92. Jeble, S., Dubey, R., Childe, S. J., Papadopoulos, T., Roubaud, D., & Prakash, A. (2018). Impact of big data and predictive analytics capability on supply chain sustainability. The International Journal of Logistics Management, 29(2), 513–538. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijlm-05-2017-0134
93. Kagermann, H. (2015). Change through digitization—Value creation in the age of Industry 4.0. In Management of permanent change (pp. 23–45). Springer Gabler, Wiesbaden 10.1007/978-3-658-05014-6_2

94. Kannan, V. R., & Tan, K. C. (2005). Just in time, total quality management, and supply chain management: Understanding their linkages and impact on business performance. Omega, 33(2), 153–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omega.2004.04.001
95. Katiyar, R., Meena, P. L., Barua, M. K., Tibrewala, R., & Kumar, G. (2018). Impact of sustainability and manufacturing practices on supply chain performance: Findings from an emerging economy. International Journal of Production Economics, 197, 303–316. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2017.12.017
96. Khan, N., Yaqoob, I., Hashem, I. A. T., Inayat, Z., Ali, M., Kamaleldin, W., & Gani, A. (2014). Big data: Survey, technologies, opportunities, and challenges. The Scientific World Journal, 2014, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/712826
97. Kim, Y., Choi, T. Y., & Skilton, P. F. (2015). Buyer-supplier embeddedness and patterns of innovation. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 35(3), 318–345. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-03-2014-0090
98. Kohtamäki, M., Partanen, J., & Möller, K. (2012). Making a profit with R&D services — The critical role of relational capital. Industrial Marketing Management, 42(1), 71–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2012.11.001
99. Korhonen, J. J., Melleri, I., Hiekkanen, K., & Helenius, M. (2012). Designing Data Governance: an organizational perspective. ResearchGate. https://doi.org/10.5176/2251-3043_2.4.203
100. Korhonen, J. J., Melleri, I., Hiekkanen, K., & Helenius, M. (2012). Designing Data Governance: an organizational perspective. ResearchGate. https://doi.org/10.5176/2251-3043_2.4.203
101. Kusumah, L. H., & Fabianto, Y. S. (2016). The differences in the financial performance of manufacturing companies in Indonesia before and after ISO 9000 implementation. Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 29(7–8), 941–957. https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2016.1237285
102. Laaksonen, O., & Peltoniemi, M. (2018). The essence of dynamic capabilities and their measurement. International Journal of Management Reviews, 20(2), 184–205. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12135
103. Lamba, K., & Singh, S. P. (2017). Big data in operations and supply chain management: current trends and future perspectives. Production Planning & Control, 28(11–12), 877–890. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2017.1336787
104. Lee, S. (2015). The effects of green supply chain management on the supplier's performance through social capital accumulation. Supply Chain Management an International Journal, 20(1), 42–55. https://doi.org/10.1108/scm-01-2014-0009
105. Lee, Y., & Cavusgil, S. T. (2006). Enhancing alliance performance: The effects of contractual-based versus relational-based governance. Journal of Business Research, 59(8), 896–905. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2005.11.005
106. Li, L. (2005). Assessing intermediate infrastructural manufacturing decisions that affect a firm's market performance. International Journal of Production Research, 43(12), 2537–2551. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207540500045675
107. Lin, Y., & Wu, L. Y. (2014). Exploring the role of dynamic capabilities in firm performance under the resource-based view framework. Journal of Business Research, 67(3), 407–413. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.11.005

108. Macaulay, S. (1963). Non-Contractual Relations in Business: A Preliminary study. American Sociological Review, 28(1), 55. https://doi.org/10.2307/2090458
109. Maestrini, V., Luzzini, D., Caniato, F., Maccarrone, P., & Ronchi, S. (2018). Measuring supply chain performance: a lifecycle framework and a case study. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 38(4), 934–956. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijopm-07-2015-0455
110. Makadok, R. (2001). Toward a synthesis of the resource-based and dynamic capability views of rent creation. Strategic Management Journal, 22(5), 487–505. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.158
111. Makkonen, H., Pohjola, M., Olkkonen, R., & Koponen, A. (2014). Dynamic capabilities and firm performance in a financial crisis. Journal of Business Research, 67(1), 2707–2719. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.09.002
112. Mandal, S. (2017). The influence of dynamic capabilities on hospital-supplier collaboration and hospital supply chain performance. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 37(5), 664–684. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijopm-05-2016-0249
113. Mandal, S. (2017). The influence of dynamic capabilities on hospital-supplier collaboration and hospital supply chain performance. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 37(5), 664–684. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijopm-05-2016-0249
114. Mangla, S. K., Luthra, S., Mishra, N., Singh, A., Rana, N. P., Dora, M., & Dwivedi, Y. (2018). Barriers to effective circular supply chain management in a developing country context. Production Planning & Control, 29(6), 551–569. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2018.1449265
115. Mani, V., Gunasekaran, A., & Delgado, C. (2018). Enhancing supply chain performance through supplier social sustainability: An emerging economy perspective. International Journal of Production Economics, 195, 259–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2017.12.014
116. Marwah, K., Thakar, G. D., Gupta, R. C., & Marwah, A. K. (2014). Determinants of supply chain performance of Indian manufacturing organizations. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262916211_Determinants_of_Supply_Chain_Performance_of_Indian_Manufacturing_Organizations
117. Regional variations in manufacturing inventory Levels. (n.d.). Alan McKinnon. https://www.alanmckinnon.co.uk/story_layout.html?IDX=644&b=50
118. Melnyk, S. A., Bititci, U., Platts, K., Tobias, J., & Andersen, B. (2014). Is performance measurement and management fit for the future? Management Accounting Research, 25(2), 173–186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2013.07.006
119. Mikalef, P., Pappas, I. O., Krogstie, J., & Giannakos, M. (2017). Big data analytics capabilities: A systematic literature review and research agenda. Information Systems and e-Business Management, 15(3), 547–578. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10257-016-0325-8
120. Min, S., & Mentzer, J. T. (2004). DEVELOPING AND MEASURING SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT CONCEPTS. Journal of Business Logistics, 25(1), 63–99. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2158-1592.2004.tb00170.x
121. Mishra, D., Gunasekaran, A., Papadopoulos, T., & Childe, S. J. (2016). Big Data and supply chain management: a review and bibliometric analysis. Annals of Operations Research, 270(1–2), 313–336. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-016-2236-y
122. Moreira, M., & Tjahjono, B. (2015). Applying performance measures to support decision-making in supply chain operations: a case of beverage industry. International Journal of Production Research, 54(8), 2345–2365. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2015.1076944

123. Moreira, M., & Tjahjono, B. (2015). Applying performance measures to support decision-making in supply chain operations: a case of beverage industry. International Journal of Production Research, 54(8), 2345–2365. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2015.1076944
124. Moyne, J., Samantaray, J., & Armacost, M. (2016). Big data capabilities applied to semiconductor manufacturing advanced process control. IEEE Transactions on Semiconductor Manufacturing, 29(4), 283–291. https://doi.org/10.1109/tsm.2016.2574130
125. Mulaik, S. A. (2018). Fundamentals of common factor analysis. In The Wiley Handbook of Psychometric Testing: A Multidisciplinary Reference on Survey, Scale and Test Development (pp. 209–251). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118489772.ch10
126. Müller, O., Fay, M., & vom Brocke, J. (2018). The effect of big data and analytics on firm performance: An econometric analysis considering industry characteristics. Journal of Management Information Systems, 35(2), 488–509. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2018.1451950
127. Naor, M., Goldstein, S. M., Linderman, K. W., & Schroeder, R. G. (2008). The role of culture as driver of quality management and performance: Infrastructure versus core quality practices. Decision Sciences, 39(4), 671–702. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.2008.00197.x
128. Wasti, S. N., Kozan, M. K., & Kuman, A. (2006). Buyer-supplier relationships in the Turkish automotive industry. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 26(9), 947–970. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570610682580
129. Neely, A. (2005). The evolution of performance measurement research: Developments in the last decade and a research agenda for the next. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 25(12), 1264–1277. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570510633648
130. Ness, H., & Haugland, S. A. (2005). The evolution of governance mechanisms and negotiation strategies in fixed-duration interfirm relationships. Journal of Business Research, 58(9), 1226–1239. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2004.03.007
131. Nguyen, T., Zhou, L., Spiegler, V., Ieromonachou, P., & Lin, Y. (2017). Big data analytics in supply chain management: A state-of-the-art literature review. Computers & Operations Research, 98, 254–264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2017.07.004
132. Ou, C. S., Liu, F. C., Hung, Y. C., & Yen, D. C. (2010). A structural model of supply chain management on firm performance. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 30(5), 526–545. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443571011039614
133. Palaniappan, G. (2017) Board Characteristics Relating to Firms Performance A Study on Manufacturing Firms in India. Journal of Commerce and Accounting Research, 6, 26. - References - Scientific Research Publishing. (n.d.). https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=2643383
134. Perry, M. K. (1989). Vertical integration: Determinants and effects. https://econpapers.repec.org/bookchap/eeeindchp/1-04.htm
135. Poppo, L., & Zenger, T. (2002). Do formal contracts and relational governance function as substitutes or complements? Strategic Management Journal, 23(8), 707–725. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.249
136. Protogerou, A., Caloghirou, Y., & Lioukas, S. (2011). Dynamic capabilities and their indirect impact on firm performance. Industrial and Corporate Change, 21(3), 615–647. https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dtq030

137. Provost, F., & Fawcett, T. (2013). Data science and its relationship to big data and data-driven decision making. Big Data, 1(1), 51–59. https://doi.org/10.1089/big.2013.1508
138. Raguseo, E., & Vitari, C. (2018). Investments in big data analytics and firm performance: an empirical investigation of direct and mediating effects. International Journal of Production Research, 56(15), 5206–5221. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2018.1427900
139. Ramanathan, U., Subramanian, N., Yu, W., & Vijaygopal, R. (2017). Impact of customer loyalty and service operations on customer behaviour and firm performance: empirical. . . ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324483470_Impact_of_customer_loyalty_and_service_operations_on_customer_behaviour_and_firm_performance_empirical_evidence_from_UK_retail_sector
140. Revilla, E., & Knoppen, D. (2015). Building knowledge integration in buyer-supplier relationships. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 35(10), 1408–1436. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijopm-01-2014-0030
141. Ringov, D. (2017). Dynamic capabilities and firm performance. Long Range Planning, 50(5), 653–664. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2016.08.004
142. Roden, S., Nucciarelli, A., Li, F., & Graham, G. (2017). Big data and the transformation of operations models: a framework and a new research agenda. Production Planning & Control, 28(11–12), 929–944. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2017.1336792
143. Ruhanen, L., Scott, N., Ritchie, B., & Tkaczynski, A. (2010). Governance: a review and synthesis of the literature. Tourism Review, 65(4), 4–16. https://doi.org/10.1108/16605371011093836
144. Saad, M., & Patel, B. (2006). An investigation of supply chain performance measurement in the Indian automotive sector. Benchmarking an International Journal, 13(1/2), 36–53. https://doi.org/10.1108/14635770610644565
145. Scholten, K., & Schilder, S. (2015). The role of collaboration in supply chain resilience. Supply Chain Management an International Journal, 20(4), 471–484. https://doi.org/10.1108/scm-11-2014-0386
146. Selviaridis, K. (2016). Contract functions in service exchange governance: evidence from logistics outsourcing. Production Planning & Control, 27(16), 1373–1388. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2016.1224397
147. Shankar, K. M., Kannan, D., & Kumar, P. U. (2017). Analyzing sustainable manufacturing practices: A case study in Indian context. Journal of Cleaner Production, 164, 1332–1343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.07.160
148. Sharif, A. M., Irani, Z., & Lloyd, D. (2007). Information technology and performance management for build-to-order supply chains. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 27(11), 1235–1253. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570710830610
149. Bhagwat, R., & Sharma, M. K. (2007). Performance measurement of supply chain management using the analytical hierarchy process. Production Planning & Control, 18(8), 666–680. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537280701614407
150. Shepherd, C., & Günter, H. (2006). Measuring supply chain performance: current research and future directions. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 55(3/4), 242–258. https://doi.org/10.1108/17410400610653219

151. Shin, H., Collier, D. A., & Wilson, D. D. (2000). Supply management orientation and supplier/buyer performance. Journal of Operations Management, 18(3), 317–333. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0272-6963(99)00031-5
152. Shukla, M., & Tiwari, M. K. (2017). Big-data analytics framework for incorporating smallholders in sustainable palm oil production. Production Planning & Control, 28(16), 1365–1377. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2017.1375145
153. Singh, D. A., & Gaur, A. S. (2013). Governance structure, innovation and internationalization: Evidence from India. Journal of International Management, 19(3), 300–309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2013.03.005
154. Smart, P., Bessant, J., & Gupta, A. (2007). Towards technological rules for designing innovation networks: a dynamic capabilities view. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 27(10), 1069–1092. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570710820639
155. Song, M., Du, Q., & Zhu, Q. (2017). A theoretical method of environmental performance evaluation in the context of big data. Production Planning & Control, 28(11–12), 976–984. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2017.1336801
156. Soni, G., & Kodali, R. (2012). Evaluating reliability and validity of lean, agile and leagile supply chain constructs in Indian manufacturing industry. Production Planning & Control, 23(10–11), 864–884. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2011.642207
157. Spector, P. E. (2006). Method variance in organizational research: Truth or urban legend? Organizational Research Methods, 9(2), 221–232. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428105284955
158. Srivastava, R. K., Fahey, L., & Christensen, H. K. (2001). The resource-based view and marketing: The role of market-based assets in gaining competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 27(6), 777–802. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630102700607
159. Stam, W., Arzlanian, S., & Elfring, T. (2014). Social capital of entrepreneurs and small firm performance: A meta-analysis of contextual and methodological moderators. Journal of Business Venturing, 29(1), 152–173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2013.01.002
160. Storey, V. C. (2017). Big data technologies and management: What conceptual modeling can do. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316570065_Big_data_technologies_and_management_What_conceptual_modeling_can_do
161. Stuart, F. I. (1997). Supply-Chain Strategy Organizational Influence through Supplier Alliances. British Academy of Management, 8, 223-236. - References - Scientific Research Publishing. (n.d.). https://www.scirp.org/(S(ny23rubfvg45z345vbrepxrl))/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3174394
162. Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640
163. Thirathon, U., Wieder, B., Matolcsy, Z., & Ossimitz, M. L. (2017). Big data, analytic culture and analytic-based decision making: Evidence from Australia. Procedia Computer Science, 121, 775–783. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.11.101
164. Tiwari, S., Wee, H. M., & Daryanto, Y. (2018). Big data analytics in supply chain management between 2010 and 2016: Insights to industries. Computers & Industrial Engineering, 115, 319–330. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2017.11.017

165. Tonidandel, S., King, E. B., & Cortina, J. M. (2016). Big data methods. Organizational Research Methods, 21(3), 525–547. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428116677299
166. Töyli, J., Häkkinen, L., Ojala, L., & Naula, T. (2008). Logistics and financial performance. International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 38(1), 57–80. https://doi.org/10.1108/09600030810857210
167. Tracey, M. (2004). A holistic approach to new product development: new insights. Journal of Supply Chain Management, 40(3), 37–55. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-493x.2004.tb00177.x
168. Walker, S. (2014). Big data: A revolution that will transform how we live, work, and think. International Journal of Advertising, 33(1), 181–183. https://doi.org/10.2501/IJA-33-1-181-183
169. Wamba, S. F., Akter, S., Edwards, A., Chopin, G., & Gnanzou, D. (2015). How 'big data' can make big impact: Findings from a systematic review and a longitudinal case study. International Journal of Production Economics, 165, 234–246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2014.12.031
170. Wamba, S. F., Gunasekaran, A., Akter, S., Ren, S. J. F., Dubey, R., & Childe, S. J. (2017). Big data analytics and firm performance: Effects of dynamic capabilities. Journal of Business Research, 70, 356–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.009
171. Wang, C. L., & Ahmed, P. K. (2007). Dynamic capabilities: A review and research agenda. International Journal of Management Reviews, 9(1), 31–51. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00201.x
172. Wang, Y., Kung, L., & Byrd, T. A. (2018). Big data analytics: Understanding its capabilities and potential benefits for healthcare organizations. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 126, 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.08.004
173. Weeks, K., Guiffrida, A., & Safa, M. (2018). The efficacy of routing and flexibility on financial performance within an international manufacturing setting. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 67(2), 341–365. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijppm-09-2016-0209
174. Williamson, O. E. (2002). The theory of the firm as governance structure: from choice to contract. The Journal of Economic Perspectives, 16(3), 171–195. https://doi.org/10.1257/089533002760278776
175. Winter, S. G. (2003). Understanding dynamic capabilities. Strategic Management Journal, 24(10), 991–995. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.318
176. Wong, W. P., & Wong, K. Y. (2007). Supply chain performance measurement system using DEA modeling. Industrial Management & Data Systems, 107(3), 361–381. https://doi.org/10.1108/02635570710734271
177. Wu, M., & Pan, L. (2012). Research on Governance Behavior and inheritance Performance: A review based on Chinese family businesses. Asian Social Science, 8(12). https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n12p148
178. Xu, K., & Dong, Y. (2004). INFORMATION GAMING IN DEMAND COLLABORATION AND SUPPLY CHAIN PERFORMANCE. Journal of Business Logistics, 25(1), 121–144. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2158-1592.2004.tb00172.x
179. Yiu, D. W., Su, J., & Xu, Y. (2013). Alternative financing and private firm performance. Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 30(3), 829–852. https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lkcsb_research
180. Zhang, M., Lettice, F., Chan, H. K., & Nguyen, H. T. (2018). Supplier integration and firm performance: the moderating effects of internal integration and trust. Production Planning & Control, 29(10), 802–813. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2018.1474394

181. Zheng, P., Sang, Z., Zhong, R. Y., Liu, Y., Liu, C., Mubarok, K., & Xu, X. (2018). Smart manufacturing systems for Industry 4.0: Conceptual framework, scenarios, and future perspectives. Frontiers of Mechanical Engineering, 13(3), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11465-018-0480-3
182. Zhong, R. Y., Xu, C., Chen, C., & Huang, G. Q. (2015). Big Data Analytics for Physical Internet-based intelligent manufacturing shop floors. International Journal of Production Research, 55(9), 2610–2621. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2015.1086037
183. Zott, C. (2003). Dynamic capabilities and the emergence of intra-industry differential firm performance: Insights from a simulation study. Strategic Management Journal, 24(2), 97–125. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.283