Identification of Drivers Affecting the Performance of Different Format of Retailers

Vinayak A. Drave
vinayak@iitk.ac.in
Department of Industrial and Management Engineering,
Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur

Prof. R.R.K.Sharma
rrks@iitk.ac.in
Chair Professor (Sanjay Mittal Chair),
Department of Industrial and Management Engineering,
Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur

Abstract
The aim of this paper is to identify the key drivers, i.e., enablers and disablers, which affect the functionality of and working of different format of retailers (physical stores and e-tailers). They are further classified with respect to the kind of retailers in order to have a deep understanding of the effect (positive / negative) in their presence and absence. The challenge also lies in understanding of these drivers and to control them. For that purpose dynamic SCOR Model is used as a key tool which ensures the sustainable performance for different kind of retailers.
Literature review is used to identify various retail formats. Also, secondary data is used to cover the large range of retailers who cater in the vast array of Indian market. Different drivers are identified after exhaustive literature survey. Based on the theoretical analysis this study developed interesting hypothesis relating to e-tailers, drivers, flexibility, organizational structure, outsourcing and supply chain evaluation. This paper undertakes an empirical investigation to verify the framework presented.
Keywords: Enablers, Disablers, Brick and Click, Brick and Mortar, Multi-commodity retailers, Single-commodity retailers, Organizational Structure, Supply Chain evaluation, SCOR Model, dynamic SCOR Model, Balance Score Card, Retail formats

Introduction

In modern retail environment retailers are continuously trying to restructure their supply chain to compete domestically and globally by leveraging their traditional channels along with looking for new and non-traditional alternatives. Just introducing new technologies is not sufficient as it cannot guarantee the improvement of supply chain. Retailers need to identify the enablers of supply chain from a list of variety which can be matched with the segmented structure of operations and also can be tuned with the economies of scale. Enablers of supply chain and dimensions to measure supply chain have also changed, buyer-seller relationship depends more on service and trustworthiness than price. Inter and intra firm alliances go upwards to bring the flexibility on high side and to use the synergy of alliances in expanding and capturing market share. Big players understand the need of supply chain alignment and agility which can be seen in their methods as they are well differentiating their core and non-core activities. Moreover, big retailers are going back to centralization to manage their in-house processes and small retailers are outsourcing or including third party to manage their processes due to lack of physical and technological capabilities.

By critically identifying the enablers and limiters, the retailers can use disablers in a positive way to convert them into enablers which can help the retailers to have competitive advantage over the others. Right match of technology,

The current issue and full text archive of this journal is available at
http://aocrj.org/archive/
Academy of Contemporary Research Journal
V V(II), 1-8, ISSN: 2305-865X
© Resource Mentors (Pvt) ltd (Publisher)

thinking, trend, trait of enablers and trustworthiness can help to increase the overall efficiency of supply chain.

Performance governance, control and measurement is a critical issue with respect to time and financial aspect. Also, these are the deciding factor for the long term sustainability of supply chain efficiency and the growth of retailer, product and industry as well as market share.

Performance measurement can be defined as the process of quantifying the efficiency and effectiveness of action. It is "the periodic measurement of progress toward explicit short-run and long-run objectives and the reporting of the results to decision makers in an attempt to improve program performance" (Neely et al., 1995).

There is always a need for measurement of performance at different levels of decision processing in different kind of organization (service or industry) (Bititici, Cavalieri, & Cieminski, 2005). Kaplan and Norton (1992) proposed the Balanced Score Card (BSC) for performance evaluation which help in capturing following four perspectives: the financial, the internal business process, the customer, and the learning and growth. Balance Score Card is designed to capture financial performance measures of past performance while keeping the drivers of future performance (Bhagwat and Sharma, 2007).

SCOR (Supply Chain Operations Reference) Model was developed in 1996 endorsed by Supply Chain Council (SCC) now part of APICS (Bolstorff and Rosenbaum, 2012). SCOR Model is currently used to monitor and check the performance of supply chain but with the need of segmentation of supply chain according to product and demand the SCOR model also needs to be extended for vendors and suppliers which creates need for having dynamic SCOR model in structure. Dynamic SCOR model will help in monitoring and improving the retailer-vendor relationship and trust which will bring more flexibility in the structure which is a favorable condition for segmentation.

Review of Literature

Integration in supply chain

Integration is not happening in practical. The degree of integration is still low. (Steinfield, 2004).

Maloni and Benton (2000) studied and stated the importance of power within the supply chain. Their findings are summarized by Benton and Maloni (2005) below:

- Power plays a significant role in the supply chain, and the different sources of power have contrasting effects on inter-firm relationships in the chain. Thus, both the power source and the power target must be able to recognize the presence of power, and then reconcile supply chain strategy for power influences.
- A stronger buyer–supplier relationship will enhance performance throughout the chain. This finding offers validation for the pursuit of supply chain integration as a key driver of corporate strategy and promotes the need for a better understanding of the integration process.
- Exploitation of the supply chain by the power partner may lead to dissension and under performance, thus hurting the power holder. Likewise, a judicious use of power may serve to benefit the power holder.
- Influences of power on the buyer–supplier relationship and subsequent effects of this relationship upon supply chain performance expose the potential of power as a tool to promote integration of the chain and empower higher levels of performance. This performance benefit incites the power holders to take a second look at their positioning of power within supply chain strategy and urges a more conscious, considerate use of power.

Supply chain strategies comprise a focal firm's behavioral orientation towards collaborative partners in the chain or network and include process configurations across the key supply chain processes (e.g. Green et al., 2006; Tokman et al., 2007). As emphasized recently by Mentzer et al. (2008), supply chain strategies are concerned with optimising cross-organizational activities. The fact that inter-functional coordination has a positive effect on customer service-related performance (e.g. Ellinger et al., 2000).

Trust building in supply chain partners' relationship (Supplier – Retailer)

"A feeling of equity with the supply chain relationship no matter what power imbalances exists between the buyer–seller dyad."(Benton and Maloni, 2004)

Trust is often referred as an essential element as the relationship between supplier and retailer works as a lubricant which helps in smooth functioning of supply chain. Spekman and Davis (2004) argued that trust is at the heart of managing risk and a prerequisite (Kasperson et al., 2003) in supply chain. Agarwal and Shankar (2003) argued that one of the issue is that e-commerce system works as a complimentary system for existing supply chain as it needs to create dynamic and flexible structure for both buyer and supplier. Online trust can synergize the efficiency of both the parties and they can create strategic partnership which leads to exhaustive hold on the business.

Enablers and Disablers of E-Retailing

The exponential updating of Internet technologies have dramatically transformed many features of commerce and daily life. These Internet technologies enable consumers to search for information and purchase goods and services through direct interaction with the online store. Businesses have taken advantage of the great potential to extend their presence in the cyber-market beyond geographical boundaries and time restrictions (Park and Kim, 2003; Al-Somali et al., 2009; Ranganathan and Ganapathy, 2002). Grewal et al (2004) have discussed the list of enablers and disablers.

Some of the *Enablers* and *Disablers* from the existing literature are listed below:

Enablers	Brick and Mortar	Brick and Click
Investors' options	-	✓
IT boom	-	✓
Logistics	-	✓
Advertisements	✓	✓
Transaction Flexibility	-	✓
Exclusivity (Product, process, tie-ups)	-	✓
Product variety	✓	✓
Information explosion	-	✓
Novelty	✓	✓

Convenience	-	√
Physical facility	√	-
Trustworthy-ship	√	-
Brand loyalty	√	√
Images of impulse products	-	√
Disablers		
Lack of online trust	-	√
Lack of instant gratification	-	√
High shipping and handling cost	√	-
Customer service issue	√	√
Loss of privacy and security	-	√
Lack of stable customer base	-	√
Logistics facility	√	-
Lack of in store shopping experience	-	√
Lack of trial	-	√
Time of delivery	-	√
Interaction channel barrier	-	√
Regions not equipped with technological facilities	-	√

Table 1: Enablers and Disablers of B&M and B&C.

Core and non-core activities

In the past, corporate strategy was usually developed without involving operations strategy, leaving the operational functions (procurement, manufacturing and distribution) to simply minimize costs. However, over the past 10 years, successful industrial firms have begun to refocus on operations as a profit center. The repositioning of the operations function has become a new and effective competitive weapon. The critical elements of attitude, process improvement, waste elimination, and technology are necessary in allowing operations to provide a competitive advantage within the typical industrial firm (qtd. in Benton and Maloni, 2005).

Balanced Score Card (BSC)

In modern business time, the organizations are no longer competing on their product or services but competing each other on their value supply chain. (Lambert and Cooper, 2000). SCM is being heralded as a value driver because it has such wide ranging effect on business success or failure (Farris II and Hutchison, 2002).

Measurement system works as a hygiene factor for the performance of supply chain but in reality it is under-determined which leads to the poor performance of supply chain. (Morphy, 1999). The main motive between control of supply chain is to give management set if actions which can help in planning and enhance the performance to get a competitive edge. (Hoek, 1998). Today, organizations focus on not only evaluating the final output but they are keeping eye and calculating the performance at each level of operations.

The balanced scorecard (BSC) suggested by Kaplan and Norton (1996) can provide a comprehensive measurement system for supply chains by including four different perspectives while measuring performance, viz, the financial, the internal business process, the customer, and the learning and growth. Their BSC is of items that maintain a balance ‘‘between short term and long term objectives, between financial and non-financial measures, between lagging and leading indicators, and between internal and external performance perspectives. (Bhagwat and Sharma, 2007).

The four perspectives in a balanced scorecard proposed by Kaplan & Norton (1992) are given in Table 2 below

Perspective	Mission
Customer Perspective (value-adding view)	to achieve our vision by delivering value to our customer
Internal perspective (process-based view)	to promote efficiency and effectiveness in business process
Financial perspective (shareholders’ view)	to succeed financially, by delivering value to our shareholders
Learning and growth perspective (future view)	to achieve our vision, by sustaining innovation and change capabilities, through continuous improvement and preparation for future challenges “

Table 2. Four perspectives and their mission in a Balanced Score Card proposed by Kaplan and Norton (1992)

The BSC suggests that the balance is obtained by adopting performance measures from four different perspectives. The determination of SCM metrics can be a challenge and is important to explore which should be used. (Duarte et al, 2011). (Hsu and Liu, 2009) used a specific environmental BSC. In short, it seems that BSC is being compatible with lean paradigm. According to (Stenzel, 2007) “companies already using the BSC prior to embarking on lean transformation should find the BSC a useful tool for promoting lean”. Those who understand the interrelationship between the BSC and SCM will have a greater likelihood of leveraging their supply chains into a source of competitive advantage.

SCOR Model

The Supply Chain Operations Reference model was introduced by the Supply Chain Council (SCC) in 1996.

According to SCC, the SCOR-model integrates many processes at same time like Business Process Reengineering (BPR), Benchmarking, and Process Measurement into cross functional framework.

The SCOR-model version 9 has five components: Plan, Source, Make, Deliver and Return. Each of these

components is considered both an important intra-organizational function and a critical inter-organization process. This framework can be viewed as a strategic tool for describing, communicating, implementing, controlling, and measuring complex supply chain processes to achieve good performance. Li et al. (2011)

Figure 1. Supply chain decision categories mapped to the SCOR-model version 9. (source: Supply Chain Council 2009)

Huang, Sheoran and Keskar (2005) have proposed a structural framework of the SCOR model composing of the following elements:

- Standard descriptions of the individual elements that make up the supply chain processes.
- Standard definitions of key performance measures.
- Descriptions of best practices associated with each of the process elements.
- Identification of software functionality that enables best practices.

The SCOR model works as a tool to companies which allows company to evaluate their whole supply chain process and determine the weak links in the process. The steps of improvement can be designed in a manner which helps in making supply chain more efficient and value for organization (Harelstad et al., 2004). Huang et al. (2004) analyzed the strengths and weaknesses of the SCOR model and discussed how it could be used to assist managers for strategic decision-making. The SCOR provides companies with a picture of how the processes from start to finish will be improved. (Kevan, 2005). The SCOR can also be applied in developing action-oriented metrics that effectively measure the progress of supply chain projects (Bolstorff, 2004). Lambert et al. (2005) give a comparison of SCOR model with the global supply chain forum framework in four criteria—scope, intra-company connectedness, inter-company connectedness and drivers of value generation—and identified their relative strengths and weaknesses. Hwang et al. (2008) have investigated sourcing processes and their accompanied performance metrics in the SCOR model version 7.0 keeping the supply chain of thin film transistor-liquid crystal display (TFT-LCD) industry in Taiwan as the subject.

SCOR is a static tool that does not include any dynamic elements. (Persson and Nilsson, 2012). SCOR is basically used to study the static operations of a supply chain. However, there is also a need to study the dynamic effects e.g. of changes in production rate, poor quality in raw materials, and other effects related to the ''bullwhip'' behavior of a supply chain. (Persson and Araldi, 2007). Real supply chain or networks are complex and often contains special features that are difficult to model with a simulation tool that is based on SCOR. However, that criticism comes back to the SCC and the fact that the SCOR model is highly standardised and difficult to use in all instances (Persson, 2011).

Hypothesis

Kuan and Bock (2007) argue that as more young population is growing they prefer window shopping which motivates the large as well as the small retailers to go for brick and click model.

Just click is not enough it must be accompanied by differentiation to improve bottom line (Ofek et al, 2011). For various level of structured relationship between core company and supplier whole-seller, culture harnessed by management can play a significant role in improved competitiveness, innovation, profitability, information sharing and inventory by partening firms (Prior, 2012). A network-based business model has evolved over the past few decades as companies have transitioned from an hierarchical, vertically integrated format to a much looser, even virtual, network of partnerships with key suppliers (Christopher and Juttner, 2000). With a dual responsibility of giving high quality service in a competitive cost, the companies are evolving new, customized, differentiated supply chain for different categories of product with respect to the product demand with the offering of flexible ordering and payment fullfillment system. In the age where the technology becomes obsolete very frequently and the span of loyalty relationship between supplier and buyer is becoming shorter, e-commerce is penetrating more and more population and these kind of flexibility in different mode of operations help the buyer-seller to built trustworthiship relation. Grammans et al. (2001) discuss the shift from Brand Loyalty to e-loyalty. Inter and intra firm alliances go upwards to bring the flexibility on high side and to use the synergy of alliances in expanding and capturing market share.

H1 : Brick and Click retailers have high degree of flexibility due to the infusion of Information Technology, multiple vendor assignments.

In Sears Case by Frayer (1989) it is suggested to outsource non-core activities (logistics) to get more cost saving. On the contrary, big players are coming back to centralize processes because they can integrate and leverage their physical and technological capabilities. On the other hand, small retailers outsource due to the lack of these capabilities. Alvarado and Kotzab (2001) study the importance of integration in logistics for better performance of online retailers. Logistic Service is categorized as a non-core activity but in india logistic service providers have a key role in the success of online retail supply chain. (David et. al, 2011). It is a major concern to whom and how much information can be shared, the degree of centralization in supply chain depends on the level of information sharing and the decision taken on that information. Centralization follows a pattern of concentration of power or decision making power on a single point. The repositioning of the operations function has become a new and effective competitive weapon. The critical elements of attitude, process improvement, waste elimination, and technology are necessary in allowing operations to provide a competitive advantage within the typical industrial firm (qtd. in Benton and Maloni, 2005).

That's why, big brick and click retailers as well as brick and mortar retailers are focussing and managing some of the non-core activities including logistics and reverse logistics which can help to improve and make the supply chain more efficient and effective.

H2 : Multi-commodity brick n click retailers are moving towards centralized process and managing core as well as non-core activities (enablers and disablers) to achieve supply chain flexibility where as small and medium brick and click retailers outsource or pool their non-core activities.

The objectives of performance measurement are to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of a supply chain (Beamon 1999; Gunasekaran et al. 2001). In addition, Keeber (2000) also stated that the purpose of performance measurement is to reduce operating costs and customer service in logistics activities, improve firm's revenue growth, and enhance shareholder value. Currently, the SCOR model is applied on the whole supply chain and is restricted only for the focal retailers but as the variety of product increases segmented supply chain evolves which demands to incorporate the other stakeholders (vendors – suppliers) to be a part of performance measurement. SCOR Model is used to monitor and check the performance of supply chain but with the need of segmentation of supply chain according to product and demand the SCOR model also needs to be extended for vendors and suppliers which creates need for having dynamic SCOR model in structure. Dynamic SCOR model will help in monitoring and improving the retailer-vendor relationship and trust which will bring more flexibility in the structure which is a favorable condition for segmentation.

Thus, dynamic SCOR Model is the need of hour for evaluating and improving the performance of organizations. As uncertainity is very high in the business environment and the level of uncertainity is different for different forms of retail formats, so it leads to choose a proper selection of evaluation method which can predict and control the effect of uncertainity .Whenever there is high centralization in decision processing the organization need to go for SCOR model

H3: SCOR Model is effective in evaluating supply chain of Brick and Click retailers and Dynamic SCOR Model is effective in evaluating supply chain of Pure-play retailers (e-tailers) due to uncertainity in the nature of business.

A Balanced Score Card could be used for measuring supply chain performance because it takes care of financial and non-financial measures (Brewer and Speh, 2000). The BSC enables management reports to focus on measures specifically selected to represent the organizations strategy (Kaplan, 2005). Many organizations have found the BSC to be a useful technique in performance and strategic management (Maisel, 1992; Hoffecker and Goldenberg, 1994). There is little evidence that firms have incorporated the BSC approach into their SCM practices. (Sharma and Bhagwat, 2007) developed a BSC for the SCM evaluation using an analytical hierarchy process approach. (Xiaoping and Chen, 2008) create a supply chain performance evaluation system based on the BSC and benchmarking approach. (Si- diropoulos *et al. 2004)* add a fifth environmental perspective to its BSC.

Where the degree of centralization is low in managing and processing decision and the physical interaction is high then the organization will opt for Balanced Score Card Method which captures all the parameters which help to evaluate those kind of organization. Also, this method is more useful in the environment where the uncertainity is predicted or controlled by making policies for calculated risk.

H4 : Balanced Score Card is effective in evaluating supply chain of Brick and Mortar retailers.

Retailing emerged from the dark ages in the last two centuries. Despite tremendous and enthusiastic reception for internet retailing in last few years this new channel has not performed as anticipated. There are many inherent structural and functional weaknesses of internet retailing called enablers and disablers (Grewal et. al., 2004). The retailers need to identify the enablers and disablers and classify and differentiate them as per the movement of product in its life cycle. There are multiple combinations of product and customized supply chain is available, the need of hour is to identify the enablers and link them with the product and customized supply chain. Parvinen et al (2014) identify the drivers of online engagement and redesign the supply chain structure accordingly.

Businesses have taken advantage of the great potential to extend their presence in the cyber-market beyond geographical boundaries and time restrictions (Park and Kim, 2003; Al-Somali et al., 2009; Ranganathan and Ganapathy, 2002). Grewal et al (2004) have discussed the list of enablers and disablers. Enablers and Disablers used in this study are mentioned in Table 1.

Conclusion

By taking into critical consideration of drivers (enablers, disablers) will help in reducing redundancy in the process. Also, it enhances the efficiency of the process by reducing lead-time and other constraints which create barrier in the operational structure. SCOR model is suitable for the kind of structure where the organization follows top down approach and the level of protocols is very high as compared to other organization structure. Dynamic SCOR Model helps in evaluating the structure more accurately as it considers the different stake-holders on micro level of supply-chain and where degree of centralization is high. Balanced score card is more suitable for those retails formats where the degree of centralization is low and the decision making and processing is segmented in the system Also the suitability of these models are dependent on the physical and environmental orientation of the business and the format of the business. The limitation of this study is the area where the retailers are operating is different and the scale on which retailers doing their business are different, so the results can't be generalized they can be referred and further investigated for future studies

References

i. Albert, T. C. (2003). Need-based segmentation and customized communication strategies in a complex-commodity industry: A supply chain study. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *32*(4), 281–290. Doi: 10.1016/S0019-8501(02)00204-3

ii. Alnasser, M. S. (2014). *THE IMPACT OF E-SERVICE QUALITY ON ATTITUDE TOWARD ONLINE SHOPPING*. Universiti Utara Malaysia.

iii. Alqahtani, M. a, Al-badi, A. H., & Mayhew, P. J. (2012). The enablers and disablers of e-commerce: Consumers' Perspectives. *EJISDC*, *54*(1), 1–25.

iv. Alvarado, U. Y., & Kotzab, H. (2001a). Supply Chain Management: The Integration of Logistics in Marketing. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *30*(2), 183–198. doi:10.1016/S0019-8501(00)00142-5
v. Alvarado, U. Y., & Kotzab, H. (2001b). Supply Chain Management: The Integration of Logistics in Marketing. *Industrial Mar*, *30*, 183–198.
vi. Anderson, C. R., & Zeithami, C. P. (2014). of the Product Business Life Cycle , and Strategy , Performancel. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *27*(1), 5–24.
vii. Armour, H. O., & Teece, D. J. (1978). Organizational Structure and Economic Performance: A Test of the Multidivisional Hypothesis. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, *9*(1), 106–122. doi:10.2307/3003615
viii. Barratt, M. (2004). Understanding the meaning of collaboration in the supply chain. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, *9*(1), 30–42. doi:10.1108/13598540410517566
ix. Bechtel, C., and Jayaram, J.: Supply Chain Management: A Strategic Perspective. International Journal of Logistics Management 8(1), 15–34 (1997).
x. Benton, W. C., & Maloni, M. (2005). The influence of power driven buyer/seller relationships on supply chain satisfaction. *Journal of Operations Management*, *23*(1), 1–22. doi:10.1016/j.jom.2004.09.002
xi. Bernstein, F., Song, J. S., & Zheng, X. (2008). "Bricks-and-mortar" vs. "clicks-and-mortar": An equilibrium analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *187*(3), 671–690. doi:10.1016/j.ejor.2006.04.047
xii. Bhagwat, Rajat and Sharma Milind Kumar (2007). Performance measurement of supply chain management: A balanced scorecard approach. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 53, 43–62.
xiii. Bhagwat, R. and Sharma, M. K., 2009, "An application of the integrated AHP-PGP model for performance measurement of supply chain management", *Production Planning & Control*, 20 (8), 678-690.
xiv. Bolstorff, P., & Rosenbaum, R. (2003). *A Handbook of Dramatic Improvement using the SCOR Model*.
xv. Bolumole, Y. A. (2007). The supply chain role of third-party logistics providers. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, *12*(2), 87–102.
xvi. .Brewer, P. C.; Speh, T. W., 2000, "Using the balanced scorecard to measure supply chain performance", *Journal of Business Logistics*, 21 (1), 75-93.
xvii. Brignall, S. (2002), "The unbalanced scorecard: a social and environmental critique", in Neely, A., Walters, A. and Austin, R. (Eds), Performance Measurement and Management: Research and Action, *Cranfield School of Management*, Cranfield.
xviii. Brun, A., & Castelli, C. (2008). Supply chain strategy in the fashion industry: Developing a portfolio model depending on product, retail channel and brand. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *116*(2), 169–181. doi:10.1016/j.ijpe.2008.09.011
xix. Bsrcik, R., & Jakubiec, M. (2004). Marketing & logistics. *Emerald Management Reviews*, *33*(6), 99–122. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/224680941?accountid=14495\nhttp://diana.uca.es:4550/resserv?genre=article&issn=14746085&title=Emerald+Management+Reviews&volume=33&issue=6&date=2004-11-01&atitle=Marketing+&+logistics&spage=99&aulast=Anonymous&sid=ProQ:P
xx. Campbell, J., & Sankaran *, J. (2005). An inductive framework for enhancing supply chain integration. *International Journal of Production Research*, *43*(16), 3321–3351. doi:10.1080/00207540500095852
xxi. Cavinato, J.: Identifying Interfirm Total Cost Advantages for Supply Chain Competitiveness. International Journal of Purchasing and Materi- als Management 27(4), 10–15 (1991).
xxii. Chen, F. (2003). Information sharing and supply chain coordination. *Handbooks in Operations Research and Management …*. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Information+Sharing+and+Supply+Chain+Coordination+¤#0
xxiii. Chen, J., & Bell, P. C. (2012). Implementing market segmentation using full-refund and no-refund customer returns policies in a dual-channel supply chain structure. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *136*(1), 56–66. doi:10.1016/j.ijpe.2011.09.009
xxiv. Chen, Y. G., Zhang, W. Y., Yang, S. Q., Wang, Z. J., & Chen, S. F. (2014). Referral service and customer incentive in online retail supply Chain. *Journal of Applied Research and Technology*, *12*(2), 261–269. doi:10.1016/S1665-6423(14)72342-9
xxv. Christopher, M., & Gattorna, J. (2005). Supply chain cost management and value-based pricing. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *34*(2 SPEC. ISS.), 115–121. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2004.07.016
xxvi. Christopher, M., & Towill, D. R. (2006). Developing market specific supply chain strategies. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, *13*(1), 1–14.
xxvii. Christopher, M., & Towill, D. R. (2008). An Integrated Model for the Design of Agile Supply Chains. *Internation Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, *31*(4), 235–246. doi:10.1108/09600030110394914
xxviii. Cai, J., Liu, X., Xiao, Z. and Liu, J., 2009, "Improving supply chain performance management: A systematic approach to analyzing iterative KPI accomplishment", *Decision Support Systems*, 46, 512–521.
xxix. Codron, J., Grunert, K., Giraud-heraud, E., Soler, L., & Regmi, A. (2003). Retail Sector Responses to Changing Consumer Preferences: The European Experience. *New Directions in Global Food Markets*, 32–46.
xxx. Cooper, M. C., & Ellram, L. M. (1993). Characteristics of Supply chain management and the implications for purchasing and logistics strategy. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, *4*(2), 13–24.
xxxi. Croom, S., Romano, P., & Giannakis, M. (2000). Supply chain management: an analytical framework for critical literature review. *European Journal of Purchasing & Supply Management*, *6*(1), 67–83. doi:10.1016/S0969-7012(99)00030-1
xxxii. Disney, S. M., Naim, M. M., & Potter, a. (2004). Assessing the impact of e-business on supply chain dynamics. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *89*(2), 109–118. doi:10.1016/S0925-5273(02)00464-4

xxxiii. Duarte, Susana, Cabrita R., and Machado V. C (2011). Exploring Lean and Green Supply Chain Performance Using Balanced Scorecard Perspective in proceedings of the 2011 *International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

xxxiv. Enders, A., & Jelassi, T. (2000). The converging business models of Internet and bricks-and-mortar retailers. *European Management Journal*, *18*(5), 542–550. doi:10.1016/S0263-2373(00)00043-8

xxxv. Fearne, A., & Hughes, D. (1999a). Success factors in the fresh produce supply chain: insights from the UK. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, *4*(3), 120–131. doi:10.1108/13598549910279567

xxxvi. Fearne, A., & Hughes, D. (1999b). Success factors in the fresh produce supply chain: insights from the UK. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, *4*(3), 120–131. doi:10.1108/13598549910279567

xxxvii. Gosling, J., Purvis, L., & Naim, M. M. (2010). Supply chain flexibility as a determinant of supplier selection. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *128*(1), 11–21. doi:10.1016/j.ijpe.2009.08.029

xxxviii. Groznik, A., & Heese, H. S. (2010). Supply chain interactions due to store-brand introductions: The impact of retail competition. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *203*(3), 575–582. doi:10.1016/j.ejor.2009.08.014

xxxix. Gunasekaran, A., Patel, C., & Tirtiroglu, E. (2001). Performance measures and metrics in a supply chain environment. *International Journal of Production and Operations Management*, 21(1/2), 71–87.

xl. Gunasekaran, A., Patel, C., Ronald, E., & McGaughey, R. (2004). A framework for supply chain performance measurement. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 87(3), 333–348.

xli. Hsiao, M. J., & Purchase, S. (2002). The impact of buyer-supplier relationship and purchasing process on the supply chain performance : a conceptual framework. *IMP Proceedings*, (Stewart 1995), 1–24.

xlii. Hsu, Y. and Liu, C., 2009, "Environmental performance evaluation and strategy management using balanced scorecard", *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, December, Springer Science.

xliii. Hyun-cheol Paul Choi. (2010). Information Sharing in Supply Chain Management: A Literature Review on Analytical Research. *California Journal of Operations Management*, *8*(1), 110–116.

xliv. Integration, S. C., Divide, L., Stories, T., Editorial, S., The, S., Logistics, B.,Florida, W. (2014). News and Views Supply Chain Integration : Crossing the Marketing and Logistics Divide Like this Article ?, 1–3.

xlv. Johnson, M. E. (2006). Supply chain management: Technology, globalization, and policy at a crossroads. *Interfaces*, *36*(3), 191–193. doi:10.1287/inte.1060.0214

xlvi. Johnson, M. E., & Whang, S. (2002). E-Business and Supply Chain Management: an Overview and Framework*. *Production and Operations Management*, *11*(4), 413–423. doi:10.1111/j.1937-5956.2002.tb00469.x

xlvii. Jüttner, U., Christopher, M., & Baker, S. (2007). Demand chain management-integrating marketing and supply chain management. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *36*(3), 377–392. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2005.10.003

xlviii. Jüttner, U., Christopher, M., & Godsell, J. (2010). A strategic framework for integrating marketing and supply chain strategies. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, *21*(1), 104–126. doi:10.1108/09574091011042205

xlix. Kabanda, S. K., & Brown, I. (2015). E-commerce enablers and barriers in Tanzanian small and medium enterprises. *EJISDC*, *67*(7), 1–24.

l. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard-measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 70(1), 71–79.

li. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). The balanced scorecard: Measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review* (January–February), 71–79.

lii. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action. Boston, MA: *Harvard Business School Press*.

liii. Knox, S. (1998). Loyalty-based segmentation and the customer development process. *European Management Journal*, *16*(6), 729–737. doi:10.1016/S0263-2373(98)00049-8

liv. Laeequddin, M., Sahay, B. S., Sahay, V., & Waheed, K. A. (2012). Trust building in supply chain partners relationship: an integrated conceptual model. *Journal of Management Development*, *31*(6), 550–564. doi:10.1108/02621711211230858

lv. Lambert, D., Stock, J., and Ellram, L., eds. (1998) The Global Supply Chain Forum, in Fundamentals of Logistics Management, Irwin-McGraw Hill, Boston, , p 504.

lvi. Laroche, M., Yang, Z., McDougall, G. H. G., & Bergeron, J. (2005). Internet versus bricks-and-mortar retailers: An investigation into intangibility and its consequences. *Journal of Retailing*, *81*(4), 251–267. doi:10.1016/j.jretai.2004.11.002

lvii. Lee, H. L., & Whang, S. (2001). E-Business and Supply Chain Integration. *Integration The Vlsi Journal*, 1–20. doi:10.1108/17410390810866619

lviii. Liker, J. K., & Choi, T. Y. (2004). Building deep supplier relationships. *Harvard Business Review*, *82*(12), 104–113+149. doi:Article

lix. Linton, T. (2011). Don ' t Let Your Supply Chain Control Your Don ' t Let Your Supply Chain Control Your Business. *Electronics*, (DECEmBER).

lx. Malmi, T. (2001), "Balanced scorecards in Finnish companies: a research note", *Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 12, pp. 207-20.

lxi. Mukhopadhyay, S. K., Yao, D. Q., & Yue, X. (2008). Information sharing of value-adding retailer in a mixed channel hi-tech supply chain. *Journal of Business Research*, *61*(9), 950–958. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.10.027

lxii. Naylor, J. ., Naim, M. ., & Berry, D. (1999). Leagility: Interfacing the lean and agile manufacturing paradigm in the total supply chain. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *62*, 107–18.

lxiii. New, S. (2010). Operations: The Transparent Supply Chain. *Harvard Business Review*, *88*(10), 76–82.

lxiv. Pedroso, M. C., & Nakano, D. (2009). Knowledge and information flows in supply chains: A study on

pharmaceutical companies. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *122*(1), 376–384. doi:10.1016/j.ijpe.2009.06.012

lxv. Prater, E., Frazier, G. V., & Reyes, P. M. (2005). Future impacts of RFID on e-supply chains in grocery retailing. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, *10*(2), 134–142. doi:10.1108/13598540510589205

lxvi. Prior, D. D. (2012). The effects of buyer-supplier relationships on buyer competitiveness. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *27*(2), 100–114. doi:10.1108/08858621211196976

lxvii. Rogers, D. S., Lambert, D. M., Croxton, K. L., Sebastian, C., & Garcia-Dasgute, J. (2006). The Returns Management Process. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, *13*(2), 1–18.

lxviii. Shin, H., Collier, D. a, & Wilson, D. D. (2000). Supply management orientation and supplier r buyer performance. *Journal of Operations Management*, *18*(1), 317–333.

lxix. Shun-Hsing Chen, Ching-Chow Yang and Jiun-Yan Shiau, (2006),"The application of balanced scorecard in the performance evaluation of higher education", *The TQM Magazine*, Vol. 18 Iss 2 pp. 190 – 205

lxx. Sidiropoulos, M., Mouzakitis, Y., Adamides, E. and Goutsos, S., 2004, "Applying Sustainable Indicators to Corporate Strategy: the Eco-balanced Scorecard", *Environmental research, engineering and management*, 1 (27), 28-33

lxxi. Simatupang, T. M., Wright, A. C., & Sridharan, R. (2002). The knowledge of coordination for supply chain integration. *Business Process Management Journal*, *8*(3), 289–308. doi:10.1108/14637150210428989

lxxii. Stephens, S. (2001). Supply Chain Operations Reference Model Version 5.0: A New Tool to Improve Supply Chain Efficiency and Achieve Best Practice. *Information Systems Frontiers*, *3*(4), 471–476. doi:10.1023/A:1012881006783

lxxiii. Stenzel, J., 2007, Lean Accounting: best practices for sustainable integration, *John Wiley & Sons, Inc.*, Hoboken, New Jersey.

lxxiv. Tek, O. B. (n.d.). MARKETING FUNCTION and LOGISTICS REVISITED : Revised Dual Sub-functional Model Approach, 51–66.

lxxv. Weatherspoon, D. D., & Reardon, T. (2003). The Rise of Supermarkets in Africa: Implications for Agrifood Systems and the Rural Poor. *Development Policy Review*, *21*(3), 333–355. doi:10.1111/1467-7679.00214

lxxvi. Xiaoping, X. and Chen, L., 2008, "The Supply Chain Performance Evaluations Indicator System Based on Benchmark Balanced Scorecard", *Proc. of 4th International Conference on Wireless Communications, Networking and Mobile Computing*, 12-14 October, Dalian, China, 1-4.

lxxvii. Yadav, P., Lydon, P., Oswald, J., Dicko, M., & Zaffran, M. (2014). Integration of vaccine supply chains with other health commodity supply chains: A framework for decision making. *Vaccine*, *32*(50), 6725–6732. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.10.001

lxxviii. Yusuf, Y., Gunasekaranb, A., & Abthorpe, M. S. (2004). Enterprise information systems project implementation: A case study of ERP in Rolls-Royce. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 87, 251–266.

lxxix. Zhang, Q. (2008). Essentials for Information Coordination in Supply Chain Systems. *Asian Social Science*, *4*(10), 55–59.