

Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms

Adang Haryaman (1) and Nia Riana (2) (1) Universitas Logistik dan Bisnis Internasional | (2) Universitas Widyatama, Bandung

adang@ulbi.ac.id ; Nia.riana@widyatama.ac.id

Abstract

This integrative evidence review examines supply chain collaboration and business continuity in mid-sized firms by asking how supply chain collaboration is connected to business continuity and which conditions determine whether that connection becomes operationally meaningful. The article synthesizes peer-reviewed and institutional literature relevant to customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, emphasizing mechanisms, boundary conditions, and measurement choices rather than a universal average effect. Evidence associated with Lemon et al., 2016 and Hajli, 2015 is read with the wider source set to distinguish formal adoption from effective use, short-term response from durable capability, and observed association from causal interpretation. The synthesis identifies complementary roles for market sensing and rapid experimentation, competitive intensity, and governance or coordination routines. No survey, interview, experiment, proprietary dataset, or regression estimate is represented as having been collected for this conceptual review.

Keywords: supply, chain, collaboration, business, continuity, mid-sized, firms, business, integrative review

Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms addresses a contemporary question in customer, market, channel, and business-model systems. The title implies a relationship between supply chain collaboration and business continuity, but the direction and magnitude of that relationship cannot be assumed from terminology alone. This review identifies mechanisms that plausibly connect the two, conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker, and measurements needed to evaluate them without overstating evidence. Context, timing, implementation quality, and decision rights are therefore treated as analytical variables.

1. Introduction

The introduction defines the decision problem and explains why a conditional interpretation is preferable to a deterministic one.

From a governance perspective, Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Relationship repair and switching-cost management is most credible when supported by competitive intensity and partner dependence. The article therefore

emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The synthesis treats supply chain collaboration as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business continuity. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, ecosystem coordination changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while channel maturity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms, supply chain collaboration can influence business continuity through customer-journey coordination. The pathway is conditional on brand credibility and channel maturity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal

feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Kraus et al., 2022 and Lemon et al., 2016 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce customer trust.

A recurring issue in research on Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Supply Chain Collaboration may be associated with business continuity, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when partner dependence is weak. The mechanism examined here is trust formation and risk reduction, which connects the focal practice to changes in conversion quality. Sources such as OECD, 2023 and Hajli, 2015 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

For Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking supply chain collaboration with business continuity. Market sensing and rapid experimentation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on customer heterogeneity, digital capability, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of retention.

2. Conceptual and Literature Review

The literature review organizes evidence around mechanisms, complementary capabilities, and boundary conditions.

From a governance perspective, Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Ecosystem coordination is most credible when supported

by competitive intensity and customer heterogeneity. The reviewed literature (Verhoef et al., 2021; Lemon et al., 2016) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The synthesis treats supply chain collaboration as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business continuity. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, customer-journey coordination changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while channel maturity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Kraus et al., 2022 and Hajli, 2015 and is especially relevant in mid-sized firms. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

The synthesis treats supply chain collaboration as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business continuity. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, trust formation and risk reduction changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while brand credibility shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with OECD, 2023 and Morhart et al., 2015 and is especially relevant in mid-sized firms. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

For Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking supply chain collaboration with business continuity. Market sensing and rapid experimentation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on partner dependence, customer heterogeneity, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of retention.

A recurring issue in research on Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Supply Chain Collaboration may be associated with business continuity, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when customer heterogeneity is weak. The mechanism examined here is channel integration and consistency, which connects the focal practice to changes in market access.

3. Research Method

This manuscript is a conceptual narrative draft revised through a chronological source filter. Bibliography entries dated after 31 December 2023 and sentences explicitly invoking those years have been excluded. Original pre-cutoff references have been retained, with a limited historical source context added separately. This revision does not constitute a new systematic search, a meta-analysis, or a reproducible coding exercise. The historical source cutoff is stated here so that the scope of the discussion is explicit.

The remaining discussion proposes mechanisms and research questions. It does not supply new observations, estimated coefficients, or verified causal effects. Earlier reference entries retained from the source draft are retained as supplied and should be assessed against the original publications when interpreting specific claims. Sources added during this revision support only the historical context described in the dedicated source-context section.

4. Evidence Synthesis: Mechanisms

The first synthesis layer asks how the proposed relationship works in practice and which intermediate processes can be observed before the final outcome changes.

A recurring issue in research on Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Supply Chain Collaboration may be associated with business continuity, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when competitive intensity is weak. The mechanism examined here is trust formation and risk reduction, which connects the focal practice to changes in conversion quality. Sources such as OECD, 2023 and Kraus et al., 2022 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

For Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking supply chain collaboration with business continuity. Market sensing and rapid experimentation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on channel maturity, brand credibility, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of retention.

A recurring issue in research on Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Supply Chain Collaboration may be associated with business continuity, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when brand credibility is weak. The mechanism examined here is channel integration and consistency, which connects the focal practice to changes in market access.

The synthesis treats supply chain collaboration as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business continuity. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, relationship repair and switching-cost management changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while partner dependence shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

The synthesis treats supply chain collaboration as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business continuity. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, ecosystem coordination changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while customer heterogeneity shapes how

consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Hajli, 2015 and Lemon et al., 2016 and is especially relevant in mid-sized firms. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

5. Evidence Synthesis: Boundary Conditions

The second synthesis layer examines why results may differ across settings even when the focal intervention appears similar.

For Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking supply chain collaboration with business continuity. Market sensing and rapid

experimentation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on competitive intensity, channel maturity, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of retention.

A recurring issue in research on Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Supply Chain Collaboration may be associated with business continuity, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when channel maturity is weak. The mechanism examined here is channel integration and consistency, which connects the focal practice to changes in market access.

A useful starting point is to distinguish formal adoption from effective use. In Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms, supply chain collaboration can influence business continuity through relationship repair and switching-cost management. The pathway is conditional on brand credibility and digital capability; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Lemon et al., 2016 and Lemon et al., 2016 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce service recovery.

From a governance perspective, Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Ecosystem coordination is most credible when supported by partner dependence and channel maturity. The reviewed literature (Hajli, 2015; Hajli, 2015) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The synthesis treats supply chain collaboration as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business continuity. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, customer-journey coordination changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while customer heterogeneity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Morhart et al., 2015 and Morhart et al., 2015 and is especially relevant in mid-sized firms. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

6. Integrated Discussion

The integrated discussion reconciles different findings by distinguishing mechanism, context, timing, and measurement.

A recurring issue in research on Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Supply Chain Collaboration may be associated with business continuity, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when competitive intensity is weak. The mechanism examined here is channel integration and consistency, which connects the focal practice to changes in market access.

A recurring issue in research on Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Supply Chain Collaboration may be associated with business continuity, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when channel maturity is weak. The mechanism examined here is relationship repair and switching-cost management, which connects the focal practice to changes in service recovery. Sources such as Lemon et al., 2016 and Hajli, 2015 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

A recurring issue in research on Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Supply Chain Collaboration may be associated with business continuity, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when brand credibility is weak. The mechanism examined here is ecosystem coordination, which connects the focal practice to changes in commercial resilience. Sources such as Hajli, 2015 and Morhart et al., 2015 are therefore interpreted for

mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

A recurring issue in research on Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Supply Chain Collaboration may be associated with business continuity, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when partner dependence is weak. The mechanism examined here is customer-journey coordination, which connects the focal practice to changes in customer trust. Sources such as Morhart et al., 2015 and Verhoef et al., 2021

are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

Observed performance becomes interpretable only when implementation quality is separated from nominal adoption. In *Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms*, supply chain collaboration can influence business continuity through trust formation and risk reduction. The pathway is conditional on customer heterogeneity and customer heterogeneity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Verhoef et al., 2021 and Kraus et al., 2022 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce conversion quality.

7. Measurement and Decision Framework

A decision framework links leading process indicators, outcome indicators, and explicit assumptions about causality.

For *Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms*, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking supply chain collaboration with business continuity. Relationship repair and switching-cost management provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on competitive intensity, partner dependence, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Lemon et al., 2016 and Morhart et al., 2015 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of service recovery.

From a governance perspective, *Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms* requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Ecosystem coordination is most credible when supported by channel maturity and digital capability. The reviewed literature (Hajli, 2015; Verhoef et al., 2021) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

A recurring issue in research on *Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms* is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Supply Chain Collaboration may be associated with business continuity, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when brand credibility is weak. The mechanism examined here is customer-journey coordination, which connects the focal practice to changes in customer trust. Sources such as Morhart et al., 2015 and Kraus et al., 2022 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled

effect.

The synthesis treats supply chain collaboration as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business continuity. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, trust formation and risk reduction changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while partner dependence shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Verhoef et al., 2021 and OECD, 2023 and is especially relevant in mid-sized firms. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

A mechanism-based reading avoids assuming that identical labels produce identical outcomes. In Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms, supply chain collaboration can influence business continuity through market sensing and rapid experimentation. The pathway is conditional on customer

heterogeneity and digital capability; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce retention.

8. Practical Implications and Research Agenda

The practical implications translate the evidence into staged actions while preserving the limits of a literature-based design.

From a governance perspective, Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Ecosystem coordination is most credible when supported by competitive intensity and customer heterogeneity. The reviewed literature (Hajli, 2015; Kraus et al., 2022) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The synthesis treats supply chain collaboration as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business continuity. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, customer-journey coordination changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while channel maturity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Morhart et al., 2015 and OECD, 2023 and is especially relevant in mid-sized firms. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

From a governance perspective, Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can

act when performance deviates from expectation. Trust formation and risk reduction is most credible when supported by brand credibility and brand credibility. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

For Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking supply chain collaboration with business continuity. Market sensing and rapid experimentation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on partner dependence, customer heterogeneity, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of retention.

The most decision-relevant question concerns the conditions under which the proposed relationship strengthens, weakens, or reverses. In Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms, supply chain collaboration can influence business continuity through channel integration and consistency. The pathway is conditional on customer heterogeneity and competitive intensity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with OECD, 2023 and Lemon et al., 2016 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce market access.

9. Conclusion

The conclusion summarizes the evidence logic and priorities for author verification and future empirical work.

A recurring issue in research on Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Supply Chain Collaboration may be associated with business continuity, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when competitive intensity is weak. The mechanism examined here is customer-journey coordination, which connects the focal practice to changes in customer trust.

The synthesis treats supply chain collaboration as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business continuity. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, trust formation and risk reduction changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while channel maturity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

For Supply Chain Collaboration and Business Continuity in Mid-Sized Firms, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking supply chain collaboration with business continuity. Channel integration and consistency provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on partner dependence, digital

capability, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by OECD, 2023 and Hajli, 2015 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of market access.

Historical source context and interpretation

The mechanism discussion is conceptual and must be read alongside the pre-cutoff works listed in References. Removing later sources does not establish a new empirical finding, a pooled effect or comprehensive coverage of the literature. Organization-specific claims require additional evidence before publication.

References

- Lemon, K. N., & Verhoef, P. C. (2016). Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 69-96. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0420>
- Hajli, N. (2015). Social commerce constructs and consumer's intention to buy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 35(2), 183-191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2014.12.005>
- Morhart, F., Malar, L., Guevremont, A., Girardin, F., & Grohmann, B. (2015). Brand authenticity: An integrative framework and measurement scale. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 25(2), 200-218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.11.006>
- Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889-901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022>
- Kraus, S., Durst, S., Ferreira, J. J., Veiga, P., Kailer, N., & Weinmann, A. (2022). Digital transformation in business and management research: An overview of the current status quo. *International Journal of Information Management*, 63, 102466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102466>
- OECD. (2023). *OECD SME and Entrepreneurship Outlook 2023*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/342b8564-en>