

Supply Chain Resilience and Operational Performance in Indian Manufacturing Industries

Dr. M. Sasi Bhushan

Professor, Department of Management Studies, Ramachandra College of Engineering (A), Eluru, Andhra Pradesh, India

Email: [sasibhushan\[at\]rcee.ac.in](mailto:sasibhushan[at]rcee.ac.in)

Abstract: *Manufacturing supply chains face disruptions arising from demand volatility, supplier failure, logistics constraints, geopolitical uncertainty, cyber incidents, natural hazards and changing customer requirements. Supply chain resilience- the capacity to prepare for, respond to and recover from disruption- is therefore an important operational concern. This paper develops a framework linking resilience capabilities with operational performance in Indian manufacturing industries. It considers visibility, flexibility, redundancy, risk management, supplier collaboration and recovery capability, and examines delivery reliability, production continuity, quality, lead time and cost as performance dimensions. Digital visibility and supplier collaboration are considered potential enabling or moderating conditions. Drawing on supply chain resilience and dynamic capabilities literature, the paper proposes seven hypotheses and outlines a quantitative survey design for future empirical testing. Data have not been collected or analysed, so no empirical findings or hypothesis decisions are reported. The article offers a context-sensitive research agenda and practical guidance for balancing resilience investments with cost, continuity and service outcomes.*

Keywords: supply chain resilience; operational performance; manufacturing; risk management; supplier collaboration; digital visibility; India

1. Introduction

Manufacturing performance depends on coordination among suppliers, production facilities, transport providers, warehouses, distributors and customers. Interdependence creates opportunities for efficiency but also allows disruptions to spread across the network. Supply chain resilience concerns the ability to anticipate risks, prepare for disruption, respond effectively and recover critical functions.

Indian manufacturing firms operate across varied infrastructure conditions, supplier capabilities, geographic markets and levels of digital maturity. Operational performance is commonly assessed through cost, quality, delivery, speed, flexibility and asset utilisation. In disruption-sensitive settings, continuity and recovery time are also relevant.

Resilience capabilities may support performance by reducing downtime, improving information flow and enabling faster recovery. However, resilience can involve costs: inventory buffers, alternate suppliers and reserve capacity may protect continuity while increasing operating expenditure. The appropriate balance depends on product criticality, disruption exposure, lead times and the cost of failure. This paper proposes a structured study of how selected resilience capabilities relate to operational performance in Indian manufacturing. It also considers whether digital visibility and supplier collaboration strengthen these relationships. The proposed study is intended to produce evidence for managers deciding where resilience investments are most useful.

2. Scope and Approach

This manuscript presents a focused synthesis of selected supply chain resilience, operational performance and dynamic capabilities literature and develops a proposed

empirical model. It is not a systematic review: no exhaustive database search, formal screening flow or risk-of-bias assessment was conducted. The hypotheses are theoretically motivated expectations for future testing, not established findings.

The intended empirical design is a quantitative survey of manufacturing firms. The geographic and sector boundaries, sampling frame, eligibility criteria and sample-size rationale must be specified before data collection. Conclusions should be limited to the population supported by the eventual sampling strategy.

3. Literature Synthesis

3.1 Supply Chain Resilience: Meaning and Dimensions

Supply chain resilience is commonly understood as the ability to prepare for unexpected events, respond to disruptions and recover to an acceptable level of performance. Visibility supports awareness of material flows, inventory positions, supplier conditions and emerging problems. Flexibility enables changes in sourcing, production, product mix or logistics. Redundancy provides buffers such as safety stock, backup suppliers or reserve capacity. Risk management and recovery routines help firms prioritise vulnerabilities, coordinate responses and learn from incidents.

3.2 Operational Performance in Manufacturing

Operational performance is usually assessed through cost, quality, delivery, speed and flexibility. This study focuses on delivery reliability, production continuity, quality consistency, lead-time performance and cost control. These measures provide a balanced view: a firm may reduce average costs yet remain vulnerable to severe interruption, or invest in buffers that improve continuity but increase inventory expense.

3.3 Dynamic Capabilities and Resilience

The dynamic capabilities perspective explains how firms sense environmental change, seize opportunities and reconfigure resources (Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997). From this perspective, resilience is not simply a fixed stock of resources. It also depends on routines for monitoring, learning, coordination and redeployment. Firms that detect emerging risks and adjust operations may be better positioned to maintain or restore critical activities.

3.4 Flexibility, Redundancy and the Efficiency Trade-off

Flexibility can include alternative sourcing, adaptable production, interchangeable components, cross-trained employees and multiple logistics options. Redundancy may include buffers, backup capacity and alternative routes. The appropriate combination depends on disruption likelihood and impact, product criticality, recovery lead time and the cost of failure. Resilience investment should be proportionate rather than based on a universal rule that more redundancy is always better.

3.5 Digital Visibility and Information Sharing

Digital visibility is the timely availability of sufficiently accurate information about demand, inventory, production, suppliers and logistics. It may help firms identify problems earlier and coordinate responses. Technology alone does not guarantee resilience: inaccurate data, incompatible systems, cyber vulnerabilities and information overload can weaken decisions. Data quality, integration, governance and employee capability are therefore important.

3.6 Supplier Collaboration and Network Relationships

Supplier collaboration may involve demand sharing, joint forecasting, capacity discussions, supplier development, risk reviews and coordinated recovery planning. It can improve access to information and align responses across organisational boundaries. Benefits may be greatest where dependencies are significant and partners have incentives to invest in continuity. Confidentiality and reciprocal benefit should be considered.

3.7 Risk Management, Learning and Recovery

Formal risk management includes mapping critical suppliers and processes, assessing likelihood and impact, establishing contingency plans and testing response procedures. Recovery depends on preparation as well as response. Clear decision rights, communication channels and priorities help restore critical products and facilities. Reviewing disruptions and near misses can improve future planning.

3.8 Synthesis and Proposed Contribution

The literature suggests that resilience is multidimensional and that its operational value depends on the fit between capabilities, network structure and disruption exposure. The proposed study combines visibility, flexibility, risk management, supplier collaboration and recovery capability,

while considering digital visibility and supplier collaboration as enabling conditions.

4. Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

The conceptual model proposes that resilience capabilities are positively associated with operational performance. Visibility, flexibility, and risk management/recovery capability are treated as capability dimensions; supplier collaboration is considered both a resilience-related practice and a potential enabling condition. Digital visibility and collaboration may strengthen the relationship between resilience capabilities and operational outcomes. Firm characteristics and disruption exposure may explain differences across organisations.

- H1: Supply chain visibility is positively associated with operational performance.
- H2: Supply chain flexibility is positively associated with operational performance.
- H3: Risk management and recovery capability are positively associated with operational performance.
- H4: Supplier collaboration is positively associated with supply chain resilience.
- H5: Digital visibility strengthens the positive relationship between resilience capabilities and operational performance.
- H6: Supplier collaboration strengthens the positive relationship between resilience capabilities and operational performance.
- H7: The relationship between resilience capabilities and operational performance differs according to firm characteristics and disruption exposure.

These hypotheses are propositions to be tested, not findings. Depending on the literature review and sample size, resilience may be modelled as a set of related dimensions or as a higher-order construct. Cross-sectional associations alone would not establish causality.

5. Proposed Research Methodology for Future Testing

5.1 Research Design

A quantitative cross-sectional survey is proposed to examine associations among resilience practices, enabling conditions and operational performance across manufacturing firms. A later longitudinal or multi-source design could provide stronger evidence about changes over time.

5.2 Population and Unit of Analysis

The target population comprises Indian manufacturing firms. Potential respondents include supply chain, procurement, production, logistics, operations, quality and risk managers with sufficient knowledge of the firm's supply-chain practices. The unit of analysis should be defined consistently as the firm or business unit.

5.3 Sampling and Sample Size

A sampling frame may be developed from industry associations, manufacturing directories, chambers of

commerce, supplier networks or participating organisations. Probability sampling is preferable where a reliable frame exists. Sample size should be justified through power analysis based on the proposed model, expected effect sizes and planned statistical tests.

5.4 Survey Instrument and Measurement

The questionnaire should adapt validated measures where appropriate and use clear, context-specific wording. A five-point agreement scale may be used, with response anchors from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Expert review and pilot testing should identify ambiguous items and confirm that respondents interpret the constructs consistently.

5.5 Construct Operationalisation

Supply chain visibility concerns timely, accurate information about inventory, suppliers, production and logistics. Flexibility concerns the ability to change suppliers, schedules, product mix, capacity or transport. Redundancy concerns appropriate buffers, backup suppliers, reserve capacity and alternate routes. Risk management and recovery cover risk identification, contingency planning, escalation and post-event learning. Supplier collaboration covers joint planning, risk communication and coordinated response. Digital visibility concerns useful, integrated digital information. Operational performance covers delivery reliability, continuity, quality, lead time and cost. Controls may include subsector, firm size and age, supply-chain position, export orientation, product complexity and disruption exposure.

5.6 Data Collection Procedure

Before recruitment, obtain any required ethics approval and organisational permissions. Provide an information sheet, obtain informed consent and explain voluntary participation, confidentiality and intended use of responses. Store data securely and report results in a way that does not identify individual firms.

5.7 Data Analysis Plan

Screen incomplete, duplicate and inconsistent responses using documented rules. Describe firms and respondents, assess reliability and construct validity, and inspect correlations and multicollinearity. Use multiple regression or structural equation modelling according to the model, measurement quality and sample size. Test interaction terms for digital visibility and supplier collaboration where justified. Report coefficients, confidence intervals, effect sizes and model diagnostics, not only p-values. Conduct robustness checks where feasible. Cross-sectional self-reports should be interpreted as associations rather than causal effects.

5.8 Ethical Considerations

Because managers may be reluctant to disclose supply-chain weaknesses, participation should be voluntary and reporting should avoid identifying individual firms. Minimise collection of sensitive information, protect commercial

confidentiality and disclose funding, conflicts of interest and data availability.

6. Discussion

The framework directs attention to the operational processes through which resilience may support performance. Visibility may help firms detect problems earlier; flexibility and recovery capability may provide viable response options; collaboration may improve information exchange and coordinated action. Yet these benefits depend on the quality of implementation, the nature of disruptions and the cost of maintaining alternatives. The final discussion must be revised after real results are available, including non-significant findings and alternative explanations.

7. Managerial Implications

- Map critical products, suppliers, facilities, transport routes and processes; prioritise vulnerabilities by likelihood, impact and recovery time.
- Use balanced performance measures that include delivery, quality, continuity, cost and recovery rather than focusing exclusively on average procurement cost.
- Develop contingency options for critical inputs while evaluating the cost and feasibility of alternate suppliers, safety stock and reserve capacity.
- Improve visibility through accurate, timely information and define who acts when a risk signal crosses a threshold.
- Build supplier collaboration around joint planning, risk communication and recovery exercises, with clear expectations for confidentiality and reciprocal benefit.
- Test continuity plans through simulations or tabletop exercises and record lessons from disruptions and near misses.
- Integrate cybersecurity and data governance into digital visibility investments, and tailor resilience measures to product criticality, lead times and demand volatility.

8. Policy Implications

Industry bodies and public support programmes could help manufacturing firms map supply-chain risks, develop continuity plans and strengthen supplier development. Training and advisory initiatives may build practical skills in risk assessment, information sharing, contingency planning, cybersecurity and post-disruption learning. Knowledge-sharing forums could help firms identify feasible alternatives while protecting commercially sensitive information. Interventions should be evaluated against documented outcomes rather than assuming that a technology or buffer automatically improves resilience.

9. Limitations and Future Research

A cross-sectional design cannot establish causal direction. Perceptual measures may be affected by recall error, social desirability and common-method bias. Sampling access may produce an unrepresentative mix of sectors, sizes or regions, so generalisation must match the sampling strategy. Resilience is broad; future studies may examine cyber,

financial, workforce or sustainability-related resilience, use objective operational indicators, collect data from multiple respondents and test changes over time.

Management, 28(1),
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2009.06.001>

58–71.

10. Conclusion

Supply chain resilience is important for manufacturing firms operating in uncertain and interconnected environments. Its value lies in preparing for disruption, maintaining critical functions and recovering effectively. This paper proposes a framework linking resilience capabilities with operational performance and identifies digital visibility and supplier collaboration as potential enabling conditions. Seven hypotheses and a proposed survey design provide a basis for future empirical testing. No findings are claimed because data have not been collected or analysed.

Declarations

- **Funding:** Funding status should be confirmed by the author before submission.
- **Conflict of interest:** The author should disclose any competing interests or confirm that none exist.
- **Ethics approval and consent:** No primary data have been collected for this manuscript; ethics and consent procedures must be addressed before a survey is conducted.
- **Data availability:** No dataset has been generated or analysed for this proposed empirical article.
- **Author contribution:** The author should verify the contribution statement against the target journal's requirements.

References

- [1] Ambulkar, S., Blackhurst, J., & Grawe, S. (2015). Firm's resilience to supply chain disruptions: Scale development and empirical examination. *Journal of Operations Management*, 33–34, 111–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2014.11.002>
- [2] Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
- [3] Blackhurst, J., Dunn, K. S., & Craighead, C. W. (2011). An empirically derived framework of global supply resiliency. *Journal of Business Logistics*, 32(4), 374–391. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0000-0000.2011.01032.x>
- [4] Christopher, M., & Peck, H. (2004). Building the resilient supply chain. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, 15(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09574090410700275>
- [5] Craighead, C. W., Blackhurst, J., Rungtusanatham, M. J., & Handfield, R. B. (2007). The severity of supply chain disruptions: Design characteristics and mitigation capabilities. *Decision Sciences*, 38(1), 131–156. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.2007.00151.x>
- [6] Fiksel, J. (2006). Sustainability and resilience: Toward a systems approach. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 2(2), 14–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2006.11907980>
- [7] Flynn, B. B., Huo, B., & Zhao, X. (2010). The impact of supply chain integration on performance: A contingency and configuration approach. *Journal of Operations*