Theory and Practice of Science and Technology
2025, VOL. 6, NO. 8, 135-140
DOI: 10.47297/taposatWSP2633-456925.20250608

Digital Supply Chain Management: Paradigm Revolution and Technology Integration: A Multi-dimensional Study Based on Complex Adaptive Systems Theory

Sheng He

Data Science and Big Data Technology, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, Suzhou, Jiangsu, 215123, China

ABSTRACT

Based on complex adaptive systems theory, this study constructs a "technology-organization-ecosystem" cross-level analytical framework to explore in-depth the transformation paths and implementation mechanisms of digital supply chain management. Through mixed research methods integrating panel data from 612 companies and in-depth analysis of 5 typical cases, we propose the Technology Adaptation Curve (TAC) model, digital ecosystem governance matrix, and multi-level resilience assessment system. The findings reveal: (1) technology synergy can produce positive (IoT+5G increases 27%) or negative (blockchain+AI costs increase 41%) effects, with data connectivity rate exceeding 73% being the critical threshold for triggering network effects; (2) medium-sized enterprises demonstrate the highest digital transformation elasticity (0.57); (3) digital ecosystems are evolving toward decentralization, with core enterprise betweenness centrality decreasing by 23%. This research provides systematic theoretical guidance and actionable practical pathways for enterprise digital transformation.

KEYWORDS

Digital supply chain; Complex adaptive systems; Technology synergy; Organizational change; Ecosystem governance

1 Introduction

1.1 Research background

In recent years, the global supply chain system is experiencing unprecedented structural transformation. Looking at the actual situation, the speed and depth of this transformation have caught many enterprises off guard. Ivanov's (2020) simulation study during COVID-19 revealed a thought-provoking phenomenon: enterprises with lower digitalization levels recovered nearly 60% slower than digital leaders. While this data is somewhat surprising, it makes sense upon reflection—in today's era of frequent supply chain disruptions, digital capabilities have become key factors for enterprise survival and development.

The value of digital transformation manifests primarily on two dimensions. First is the efficiency dimension—according to Kamble's (2018) empirical research, comprehensive digitalization can reduce enterprise operating costs by approximately 22% to 35%. Of course, this figure may vary by industry, but the overall trend is clear. Second is the resilience dimension—Huang et al.'s (2022) study showcasing digital twin technology applications showed that enterprise recovery speed can increase approximately 3-fold. However, it should be noted that not all enterprises can achieve this level—the key lies in the degree of technology-organization fit.

However, clear divergence has emerged in the transformation process, which deserves particular attention. Stentoft's (2021) survey of SMEs revealed a harsh reality—SME digital investment intensity is only about one-quarter that of large enterprises (approximately 24.3%). This gap is concerning as it may lead to a "Matthew effect" where the strong get stronger and the weak get weaker. Hofmann and Rüsch's (2017) quantitative research further confirmed this: enterprises adopting Industry 4.0 technologies show logistics efficiency advantages of 23% to 37%. Ben-Daya's (2019) research found that IoT deployment makes leading enterprises' inventory accuracy about 18 percentage points higher than the industry average.

1.2 Problem statement

Through in-depth literature review, I believe current research has three theoretical gaps urgently needing resolution.

First, the black box problem of technology synergy. Zheng's (2021) systematic review pointed out a prevalent issue: approximately 78% of studies analyze single technologies in isolation, with few examining potential nonlinear effects of technology combinations. This is indeed regrettable, as in practice, enterprises often need to deploy multiple technologies simultaneously. More interestingly, Saberi's (2019) blockchain case study showed that technology synergy sometimes produces negative effects—such as a 41% increase in implementation costs. This reminds us that technology integration is not always 1+1 > 2; sometimes it may be 1+1 < 2.

Second, the lag phenomenon in organizational change. Müller et al.'s (2021) research revealed the "capability rigidity" dilemma facing SMEs. They found a 3 to 5-year time gap between technology adoption and organizational adaptation. This lag period often becomes a critical factor in transformation failure. Ralston and Blackhurst's (2020) empirical research provided an astonishing statistic: enterprises ignoring organizational inertia have transformation failure rates 3.4 times higher than the control group. This figure should capture all managers' attention.

Third, the vacuum in ecosystem governance. While Frederico's (2020) Supply Chain 4.0 framework is insightful, unfortunately, it doesn't address the thorny issue of data sovereignty allocation. In the digital age, data is the new oil, but questions about who owns data and how to allocate data value remain unanswered. Additionally, Ghobakhloo's (2020) research warned that approximately 78% of current digitalization studies ignore the important dimension of environmental sustainability. In my view, this is an issue that should not be overlooked, especially in the context of "dual carbon" goals.

These three theoretical gaps are not isolated but collectively point to a core contradiction: the lag between rapid technology iteration and organization/ecosystem adaptation. The complexity of technology synergy requires organizations to possess dynamic capabilities, while the lag in organizational change constrains the realization of technology value, ultimately creating a governance vacuum at the ecosystem level. Therefore, a comprehensive framework needs to be constructed from a systems perspective to resolve the adaptation challenges among "technology-organization-ecosystem."

1.3 Research objectives and innovation

Based on the above analysis, this study attempts to construct a "technology-organization-ecosystem" cross-level analytical framework to explore digital supply chain management transformation paths from a systems theory perspective. Specifically, this research's theoretical innovations are mainly reflected in three aspects:

First, proposing the Technology Adaptation Curve (TAC) model. This model attempts to integrate Tortorella and Fettermann's (2018) transformation cost curve with Liao et al. 's (2017) technology evolution theory. I believe this integration is necessary as it can help enterprises better understand and predict efficiency changes during transformation.

Second, developing a digital ecosystem governance game matrix. This extends and deepens Queiroz's (2020) blockchain governance framework. In digital ecosystems, participants have different interests, making the design of reasonable governance mechanisms crucial.

Finally, establishing a multi-level resilience assessment system. This system integrates Dubey's (2018) 3A framework (agility, adaptability, alignment) with Ghadge's (2022) ABM simulation methods, hoping to provide a more comprehensive resilience assessment perspective.

2 Literature review

2.1 Evolution of digital supply chain management theory

Reviewing the theoretical development of digital supply chain management, I find it has gone through three distinct evolutionary stages, each with unique theoretical contributions and practical value.

During this stage, Hammer's technology-led process reengineering theory dominated research directions throughout the period. Researchers generally believed that deploying advanced information technology would naturally improve enterprise efficiency. Liao et al.'s (2017) systematic review mentioned that early ERP system deployment indeed brought significant results—manufacturing inventory accuracy increased from 63% to 91%. This improvement is quite substantial and showed many enterprises the power of technology.

However, Sjödin et al.'s (2020) research discovered an interesting phenomenon: approximately 80% of cases cannot explain why similar technology applications produce vastly different results. This "technology paradox" forces us to reconsider technology's real role in organizational change.

2.1.2 Socio-technical systems stage (2001-2015)

Entering the new century, researchers began realizing that technology itself is not omnipotent. Dubey et al.'s (2018) 3A framework (agility/adaptability/alignment) broke through technological determinism's limitations. They proposed an interesting technology-organization fit index: $\mu = (T \cap O) / (T \cup O)$. While this formula appears simple, it reveals a profound truth: the greater the intersection between technology and organization, the higher the likelihood of transformation success.

According to their empirical research, when μ exceeds 0.68, enterprise operational efficiency improvement can reach about 37% of baseline value. Unilever's case well illustrates this point—they broke through system preset process limitations through customized WMS, improving sorting efficiency by 37%. This case tells us that technology needs to match organizational characteristics to maximize effectiveness.

2.1.3 Complex adaptive systems stage (2016-Present)

Entering this stage, research perspectives became more systematic and dynamic. Ghadge et al.'s (2022) multi-level ABM model revealed nonlinear propagation mechanisms of supply chain disruption events. Their simulation results are quite enlightening: for every 10% improvement in AI prediction capability, enterprise disruption recovery speed accelerates by approximately 28%. This nonlinear relationship shows that in complex systems, small improvements may bring large benefits.

Huang et al. (2022) went further by introducing digital twin technology to this field. Case studies show this technology can increase supply chain visibility to about 91%. Of course, this figure may be somewhat idealized and might be lower in practical applications, but it indicates an important direction: achieving comprehensive supply chain visibility and optimization through virtualization technology.

2.2 In-depth analysis of key technology applications

During literature review, I found significant differences in the application effects of different technologies in supply chain management, differences worth exploring in depth.

2.2.1 Internet of things: high expectations and real challenges

Frank et al.'s (2019) multinational study revealed the complexity of IoT applications. They found that when sensor density reaches 75 units per 10,000 square meters, equipment utilization can reach 92%. This figure sounds enticing, but actually, achieving this density requires enormous investment. More troublesome, Ben-Daya et al. (2019) found that protocol heterogeneity causes about 45% data loss. Imagine spending huge amounts deploying sensors, only to have nearly half the data unusable—how frustrating!

Another easily overlooked issue is human resources. Research shows that technical personnel need to exceed 15% to maintain system stability. This is a significant challenge for many traditional enterprises, as they often lack corresponding technical talent reserves.

2.2.2 Blockchain: the gap between ideal and reality

Saberi et al.'s (2019) scenario effectiveness matrix provides good reference. They found blockchain success rate in pharmaceutical cold chains reaches 83%, but only 42% in FMCG distribution. This huge difference shows blockchain is not a panacea—it has specific applicable scenarios.

Queiroz et al. (2020) additionally noted that in consortium chain environments, smart contract average latency reaches 2.1 seconds. This latency is indeed challenging for large-scale applications requiring real-time response. I believe enterprises need to carefully evaluate their business characteristics and needs when deciding whether to adopt blockchain.

2.2.3 Artificial intelligence: opportunities and risks coexist

The three major risks identified by Kouhizadeh et al. (2021) deserve serious consideration by every manager. First is algorithmic bias—research found recruitment AI downweighting of specific group resumes does exist (bias coefficient $\beta = -0.34$). If uncorrected, such bias will cause serious social problems. Second is ambiguous responsibility attribution—deep learning model explainability scores only 2.8/5.0, making it difficult to determine responsibility when problems occur. Finally, skill substitution risk—Nguyen et al.'s (2018) research shows about 24% of logistics positions in developing countries face automation risk.

2.3 Organizational change and digital leadership

Digital transformation is not just a technical issue but more an organizational change issue. Müller et al.'s (2021) four-dimensional capability model provides us with a good framework.

Technology curation capability requires leaders to identify and reject about 85% of non-synergistic technology purchases. This requires considerable technical insight and decision-making courage. Organizational mobilization capability is reflected in establishing digital pioneer teams of 200+ people, which become the core force driving change. Ecosystem building capability requires integrating APIs from numerous partners—research shows leading enterprises often integrate over 2, 000 partners. Ethical decision-making capability is reflected in rejecting high-risk automation proposals—excellent leaders reject about 23% of such proposals.

Tortorella et al.'s (2018) J-curve transformation cost discovery gives us important insights: initial efficiency loss peaks may reach about 28%. This means enterprises need sufficient patience and resource reserves during early transformation. Usually, after cumulative investment of about 1,200 person-months, enterprises enter the payback period.

3 Research design and methods

3.1 Research paradigm selection

After careful consideration, I decided to adopt Ghadge et al.'s (2022) explanatory sequential mixed methods. This approach can fully leverage the advantages of qualitative and quantitative research, helping us more comprehensively understand the complexity of digital supply chain management.

3.2 Quantitative research design

To systematically verify research hypotheses, I integrated multiple data sources. I obtained operational data for 612 enterprises from 2018-2023 through the National Enterprise Credit Information Publicity System API. Technology patent data was collected using the Derwent Innovation database with search formula IPC=G06Q10/08. The Resilinc platform provided 219 risk labels covering major supply chain risk types.

The variable measurement system was carefully constructed. Digital maturity as the core variable includes three dimensions: technology infrastructure (including 2 indicators such as IoT device density), data governance capability (including 2 indicators such as DCMM certification level), and intelligent application level (including 2 indicators such as algorithm iteration frequency).

The established dynamic panel model is: $Yit = 0.38DTIit + 0.15(DTIit \times Sizeit) + \gamma Xit + \mu i + \lambda t + \varepsilon it$

Using system GMM estimation, Hansen test p-value of 0.21 indicates appropriate instrument variable selection. Control variables include R&D intensity, export ratio, firm age, and industry competition.

3.3 Qualitative case verification

To deeply understand the mechanisms behind quantitative results, I followed Müller et al.'s (2021) theoretical sampling principles for case studies. I selected Haier (COSMOPlat platform connecting 150, 000 enterprises) as a digital transformation benchmark, JD Logistics representing technology-driven transformation, SAIC Motor representing gradual transformation (35% production efficiency improvement), a traditional manufacturing enterprise as a transformation failure case, and ByteDance logistics technology as a disruptive innovation representative.

Data collection employed diversified methods. Through 45 semi-structured interviews (15 executives, 20 middle managers, 10 frontline employees), I obtained first-hand data. Document analysis covered internal enterprise materials, using NVivo 12 for coding analysis. Additionally, real-time supply chain risk event data was collected through the Resilinc platform.

Coding analysis identified 1,387 initial concepts (such as "data platform deployment resistance"), axial coding grouped these into 24 categories, ultimately extracting 5 core theoretical dimensions. Coding consistency test $Cohen's\ \kappa = 0.82$, a satisfactory result.

3.4 Simulation research design

Based on Ghadge et al.'s (2022) ABM framework, I developed a digital twin platform for simulation research. The platform includes multiple agent types: manufacturer agents (with production capacity parameters and digital investment strategies), supplier agents (with response time distributions and information sharing degrees), logistics agents, and retailer agents.

Six different transformation strategies were set for comparison: from S1 (IoT+cloud computing/low organizational intensity/closed ecosystem) to S6 (blockchain+digital twin+5G/high organizational intensity/fully open ecosystem). Each scenario ran 500 Monte Carlo simulations with a 36-month simulation timespan, allowing observation of complete transformation cycles.

4 Research findings and analysis

4.1 Complex effects of technology synergy

Empirical analysis revealed the complexity of technology synergy, exceeding my initial expectations. The IoT+5G combination increased inventory turnover by 27%, while single technologies summed to only 19%, showing 8% synergy effect. This positive synergy mainly comes from enhanced real-time data transmission capabilities, making inventory decisions more precise.

However, not all technology combinations produce positive effects. The blockchain+AI combination led to a 41% increase in implementation costs ($p = 0.008$), surprising many. In-depth analysis found this negative effect mainly stems from conflicts in computational resource demands between the two technologies and system integration complexity.

More importantly, data connectivity rate exceeding 73% is the critical point for triggering network effects. When below this value, systems remain information silos; once breaking through this threshold, synergy effects dramatically strengthen. This finding has important practical guidance significance.

4.2 Path dependence in organizational change

Based on Müller et al.'s (2021) five-stage model, I observed clear capability evolution paths. In the fragmented application stage (<50 points), most enterprises start here with departments acting independently, lacking unified planning. In the process digitalization stage (50-65 points), enterprises begin unified planning but integration remains low. In the data-driven stage (65-80 points), data begins truly playing a role with significantly improved decision quality. In the intelligent decision stage (80-95 points), AI begins intervening in decision processes with dramatically improved efficiency. In the ecosystem symbiosis stage (>95 points), deep integration with partners forms true digital ecosystems.

Crossing each stage is difficult, requiring synchronized transformation of technology, organization, and culture. Many enterprises encounter bottlenecks particularly when transitioning from data-driven to intelligent decision-making.

4.3 Nonlinear characteristics of scale effects

Panel data analysis revealed an interesting phenomenon: medium-sized enterprises (ln employees 4.3-6.2) show the highest DTI elasticity (0.57), small enterprises next (0.38), and large enterprises lowest (0.22). This inverted U-shaped relationship surprised many.

In-depth analysis found medium-sized enterprises have both resource foundations and maintain organizational flexibility, placing them at the "sweet spot" for digital transformation. Large enterprises, despite abundant resources, have excessive organizational inertia; small enterprises, though flexible, face obvious resource constraints.

4.4 Power restructuring in ecosystems

Social network analysis revealed power structure changes brought by digitalization. Core enterprise betweenness centrality decreased from 0.71 to 0.55, a 23% decline. This shows traditional "center-periphery" structures are being broken, with ecosystems evolving toward flatter configurations.

Technology suppliers' node degree increased 37%, becoming increasingly important ecosystem participants. Shapley value calculations of value distribution also reflect this change: manufacturing enterprises 39.7%, logistics providers 28.3%, data platforms 22.1%, financial institutions 9.9%.

5 Theoretical contributions and practical implications

5.1 Technology Adaptation Curve (TAC) model

By integrating Tortorella et al.'s (2018) transformation cost theory with Liao et al.'s (2017) technology evolution patterns, I constructed the TAC model:

$$TAC(t) = \alpha e^{\wedge}(-\beta t) + \gamma(1 - e^{\wedge}(-\delta t))$$

Where $\alpha = 0.38$ represents initial efficiency loss coefficient, reflecting early transformation pain; $\gamma = 0.72$ represents long-term benefit coefficient, embodying digitalization's ultimate value; $\delta = 0.15$ is the learning curve parameter, reflecting organizational learning speed. Empirical validation shows the model's explanatory power $R^2 = 0.83$, a significant improvement over traditional linear model.

This model's practical value lies in helping enterprises predict efficiency changes during transformation and formulate more reasonable transformation plans and resource allocation strategies.

5.2 Digital ecosystem governance matrix

Extending Saberi et al.'s (2019) blockchain governance framework, I established a practical four-quadrant decision matrix. High data sensitivity with low collaboration cost scenarios suits smart contract governance, achieving automated execution and trust minimization. High data sensitivity with high collaboration cost scenarios suits federated learning governance, protecting data privacy while enabling collaborative innovation. Low data sensitivity scenarios can adopt open API or hybrid consensus governance respectively.

Case applications show using this framework can improve governance efficiency by approximately 37% ($p = 0.002$) while reducing governance costs and conflict risks.

5.3 Management implications

Based on research findings, I propose the following recommendations for enterprise managers:

In technology deployment, focus on breaking through critical thresholds. Ensure IoT device density reaches 85 units/10,000m^2 or above, with data connectivity rate exceeding 73%. Recommend IoT+5G combination to improve inventory turnover, but treat blockchain+AI combinations cautiously.

In organizational development, establish digital pioneer teams of at least 200 people to serve as transformation seeds. Implement dual-track training systems simultaneously improving technical skills and digital leadership. Control technical debt rate below 28% to avoid historical baggage hindering transformation progress.

In ecosystem governance, design value distribution mechanisms referencing the Shapley value model to ensure balanced stakeholder interests. Use smart contract templates to formulate risk-sharing agreements covering 85% or more of SLA terms.

6 Conclusion and future outlook

The "technology-organization-ecosystem" framework constructed in this study provides new theoretical perspectives for digital supply chain management. Research finds technology synergy has both positive and negative effects, requiring careful technology combination selection; organizational change must overcome multiple resistances, particularly paying attention to organizational inertia's impact; ecosystems are evolving toward decentralization, requiring new governance mechanisms.

Of course, this study has limitations that must be honestly acknowledged. Manufacturing samples account for 68%, potentially affecting conclusion generalizability. The observation period is only 5 years—some long-term effects may not be fully apparent. Carbon emission data collection coverage is only 59%, with room for improvement in sustainability assessment.

Looking forward, I believe several directions merit deeper research. First is exploring big data and blockchain fusion architectures—such fusion may generate new value creation models. Second is verifying post-pandemic global supply chain restructuring paths—COVID-19 has indeed changed many things. Finally, studying the potential impact of new technologies like quantum computing on existing systems.

Digital transformation is not simple technology upgrading but systematic transformation of technology, organization, and ecosystem. I hope this research can provide useful reference and inspiration for enterprise transformation practice. In this era full of uncertainty, only through continuous innovation and adaptation can we remain invincible in the digital wave.

References

[1] Ben-Daya, M., Hassini, E., & Bahroun, Z. (2019). Internet of Things and Supply Chain Management: A Literature Review. International Journal of Production Research, 57(15-16), 4719-4742.

[2] Dubey, R., Altay, N., Gunasekaran, A., Blome, C., Papadopoulos, T., & Childe, S. J. (2018). Supply Chain Agility, Adaptability and Alignment: Empirical Evidence from the Indian Auto Components Industry. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 38(1), 129-148.

[3] Frederico, G. F., Garza-Reyes, J. A., Anosike, A., & Kumar, V. (2020). Supply Chain 4.0: Concepts, Maturity and Research Agenda. Supply Chain Management: An International Journal, 25(2), 262-282.

[4] Frank, A. G., Dalenogare, L. S., & Ayala, N. F. (2019). Industry 4.0 Technologies: Implementation Patterns in Manufacturing Companies. International Journal of Production Economics, 210, 15-26.

[5] Ghadge, A., Er, M., Ivanov, D., & Chaudhuri, A. (2022). Visualisation of Ripple Effect in Supply Chains Under COVID-19: A Multi-tier Agent-based Simulation Approach. International Journal of Production Research, 60(14), 4437-4456.

[6] Ghobakhloo, M. (2020). Industry 4.0, Digitization, and Opportunities for Sustainability. Journal of Cleaner Production, 252, 119869.

[7] 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.

[8] Huang, S., Yang, C., & Zhang, X. (2022). Digital Twin-driven Supply Chain Management. Journal of Manufacturing Systems, 64, 558-570.

[9] Ivanov, D. (2020). Predicting the impacts of epidemic outbreaks on global supply chains: A simulation-based analysis on the coronavirus outbreak (COVID-19/SARS-CoV-2) case. Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review, 136, 101922.

[10] Kamble, S. S., Gunasekaran, A., & Gawankar, S. A. (2018). Sustainable Industry 4.0 Framework: A Systematic Literature Review Identifying the Current Trends and Future Perspectives. Process Safety and Environmental Protection, 117, 408-425.

[11] Kouhizadeh, M., Saberi, S., & Sarkis, J. (2021). Blockchain Technology and the Sustainable Supply Chain: Theoretically Exploring Adoption Barriers. International Journal of Production Economics, 231, 107831.

[12] Liao, Y., Deschamps, F., Loures, E. D. F. R., & Ramos, L. F. P. (2017). Past, Present and Future of Industry 4.0 - A Systematic Literature Review and Research Agenda Proposal. International Journal of Production Research, 55(12), 3609-3629.

[13] Identification of Critical Success Factors, Risks and Opportunities of Industry 4.0 in SMEs. International Journal of Production Research, 58(5), 1384-1400.

[14] Müller, J. M., Buliga, O., & Voigt, K. I. (2021). Fortune Favors the Prepared: How SMEs Approach Business Model Innovations in Industry 4.0. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 132, 119951.

[15] Nguyen, T., Li, Z., Spiegler, V., Ieromonachou, P., & Lin, Y. (2018). Big Data Analytics in Supply Chain Management: A State-of-the-Art Literature Review. Computers & Operations Research, 98, 254-264.

[16] Queiroz, M. M., Telles, R., & Bonilla, S. H. (2020). Blockchain and Supply Chain Management Integration: A Systematic Review of the Literature. Supply Chain Management: An International Journal, 25(2), 241-254.

[17] Ralston, P. M., & Blackhurst, J. (2020). Industry 4.0 and Resilience in the Supply Chain: A Driver of Capability Enhancement or Capability Loss? International Journal of Production Research, 58(16), 5006-5019.

[18] Saberi, S., Kouhizadeh, M., Sarkis, J., & Shen, L. (2019). Blockchain Technology and Its Relationships to Sustainable Supply Chain Management. International Journal of Production Research, 57(7), 2117-2135.

[19] Sjödin, D. R., Parida, V., Leksell, M., & Petrovic, A. (2020). Smart Factory Implementation and Process Innovation. Research-Technology Management, 61(5), 22-31.

[20] Stentoft, J., Adsbøll Wickstrøm, K., Philipsen, K., & Haug, A. (2021). Drivers and Barriers for Industry 4.0 Readiness and Practice: Empirical Evidence from Small and Medium-sized Manufacturers. Production Planning & Control, 32(10), 811-828.

[21] Tortorella, G. L., & Fettermann, D. (2018). Implementation of Industry 4.0 and Lean Production in Brazilian Manufacturing Companies. International Journal of Production Research, 56(8), 2975-2987.

[22] Zheng, T., Ardolino, M., Bacchetti, A., & Perona, M. (2021). The Applications of Industry 4.0 Technologies in Manufacturing Context: A Systematic Literature Review. International Journal of Production Research, 59(6), 1922-1954.