Towards a theory of supply chain alignment enablers: a systematic literature review

Abstract

Purpose - The importance of supply chain alignment has been discussed since the birth of Supply Chain Management (SCM). Yet it remains a major challenge for supply chains. This paper aims to systematically review the cross disciplinary literature on supply chain alignment in order to identify, and develop constructs for enablers to alignment, and an associated set of hypotheses.

Design/methodology/approach - A systematic approach has been taken to the literature review which ensures it is auditable and repeatable. The selection criteria are clearly aligned with the review question ensuring all literature pertinent to the question is identified and reviewed. Relevant information is extracted from the selected papers and synthesised into a set of hypotheses.

Findings - Six main constructs for the enablers of alignment are identified and defined: organisational structure, internal relational behaviour, customer relational behaviour, top management support, information sharing and business performance measurement system. While the literature is disparate, across different disciplines there is good support for these enablers. The relationships between supply chain alignment and shareholder and customer value are also argued with the support of the literature. Though each of the enablers is argued to positively affect shareholder and customer value, their interactions with each other are not well supported in the literature, either theoretically or empirically, and therefore this could be an area for further research.

Research/practical implications - While the hypotheses remain theoretical, it is now possible to test them and understand the relative significance of the various enablers to alignment. Further, the significance of shareholder and customer alignment on the delivery of shareholder and customer value can be examined, thus moving towards a theory of supply chain alignment. This is needed since in practice companies are struggling with supply chain alignment.

Originality/value - The existing literature on supply chain alignment is disparate and multi-disciplinary as our descriptive analysis shows, with 72 papers published in 43 different journals. Moreover, most of the papers focus on particular enablers, while this paper brings together six key enablers from the literature to produce a set of hypotheses.
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1. Introduction

A supply chain consists of a chain of suppliers and customers aiming to provide a product or service to the end customers. Alignment within a supply chain is an emerging and important issue. Gattorna (1998) suggests that “there must be alignment between each firm’s supply chain strategy and those of its supply chain partners, both internal and external”. Thus supply chain alignment results in a fit in terms of objectives, structures and processes within and between different functions and members in a supply chain. The need for supply chain alignment is indisputable. Houlihan (1985) suggested that SCM is about addressing the imbalances due to conflicting objectives in marketing, sales, manufacturing, and distribution by managing the trade-offs between supply policies, economics of manufacturing and complexity. In response to issues of this nature Gattorna proposes a four-stage framework for strategic alignment (Gattorna and Walters, 1996; Gattorna, 1998, 2009) where supply chain strategy is developed to meet the requirements of customer segments, and is supported by the right culture and leadership style, aligned with four logics (based on Carl Jung’s theory).

In particular, there is a need to achieve shareholder alignment so that functional strategies and business processes used to deliver them are compatible with business strategy and shareholder expectations, such as revenue growth, working capital efficiency, operating cost reduction and fixed capital efficiency (Christopher and Ryals, 1999). This is because poor business performance is often caused by firms’ failure to align internal supply chain processes with strategic goals (Tamas, 2000).

In addition to shareholder alignment, the alignment with customers is equally critical. Since every member in a supply chain tends to maximise their own interests, optimal decisions made by one supply chain member may cause delivery delays and excessive inventories in another part of the supply chain (Lee, 2004). Ideally everyone in the supply chain should have the same objective – to deliver the best value to the end consumers. That means a supply chain has to be aligned to deliver customer value, measured in terms of customer perceived benefits gained from a product/service compared to the cost of purchase (Johnson and Scholes, 1999). The importance of customer alignment is supported by the customer-orientation literature (Anderson and Narus, 1990; Jeong and Hong, 2007) and the need for aligning the demand creation processes with the demand fulfilment or SCM processes to achieve customer responsiveness (Godsell et al., 2006). The relationship between shareholder and customer alignment in terms of the extent to which they reinforce each other, or indeed are conflicting, is however not clearly explained in the supply chain literature.

Despite general agreement on the need for supply chain alignment to achieve shareholder and customer value, SCM research and practice lacks knowledge on how exactly such an alignment can be achieved and what performance implications it has (Baier et al., 2008). A survey carried out by Tamas (2000) found that only 13% of the 80 supply chain executives questioned believed that their companies’ supply chain practices are actually fully aligned with their business unit strategies. In reality, the ability to create “seamless” or “boundary-less” connections in a supply chain (Christopher et al., 2004) is hard to achieve. Many supply chain experts agree that internal alignment is still an unresolved issue and can be more difficult than building external alliances. Indeed, breaking down silos between sales/marketing and the operations/supply chain functions is still a pervasive problem (Beth et al., 2003; Pagell, 2004; van Hoek and Mitchell, 2006). This strongly suggests the need to identify and understand enablers of supply chain alignment.

Alignment or fit has been identified as an essential antecedent of firm performance by the major business and management disciplines including strategy literature (Powell, 1992; Venkatraman, 1989), organisation literature (Nadler and Tushman, 1988; Kathuria et al., 2007), information system literature (Brown and Magill, 1994; Luftman and Brier, 1999) and manufacturing strategy literature...
(Skinner, 1969; Wheelwright, 1984; McAdam and Brown, 2001). However, at the moment the literature on supply chain alignment is fragmented and largely theoretical in nature. Given the emergent and multi-disciplinary nature of such a literature, the development of both theory and practice of supply chain alignment would benefit from a theoretical framework which “poses a degree of order on a disorderly mélange” (Starbuck, 2006). To do this, a systematic literature review (SLR) of relevant literature will allow us to perform a meta-analysis of the theories and empirical evidence. Indeed Starbuck (p. 96) believes that, as demonstrated by Kelley and Thibaut (1954), “a good literature review makes sense out of nonsense”.

Through an SLR this paper aims to identify enablers of supply chain alignment, develop constructs for them and develop a set of hypotheses which address the complex relationships between shareholder alignment/value and customer alignment/value. Through the SLR, the paper aims to answer two crucial questions: (1) What are the enablers for customer and shareholder alignment? (2) How can they be defined and how do they affect alignment and ultimately customer and shareholder value? Answers to these questions will enhance the knowledge about how exactly supply chain alignment can be achieved and its performance implications (Baier et al., 2008). Since alignment is a research topic shared by many disciplines, the SLR includes cross disciplinary literature on supply chain alignment. This paper begins with a description of the SLR methodology used in this study. The results follow with a descriptive analysis of the papers selected for review and a discussion of the emerging themes from the literature which constitute the enablers of supply chain alignment. Based on a reductionist approach, this paper further develops a set of hypotheses relating supply chain alignment enablers to shareholder and customer alignment and value. Finally the implications and limitations of this paper are discussed in the conclusions.

2. Method

To overcome the perceived weaknesses of a narrative review (Tranfield, et al., 2003) this study adopted a systematic or evidence-informed approach based on the five-step approach outlined by Denyer and Tranfield (2009). The five steps as illustrated in include: question formulation, locating studies, study selection and evaluation, analysis and synthesis, and finally reporting and using the results. Each step will now be discussed in turn.

Figure 1: Overview of the 5-step systematic literature review process (Denyer and Tranfield, 2009)
2.1 Question formulation

A clear research question is critical to provide the focus and direction for any research. It is particularly important for a systematic literature review (SLR) and hence a panel is formed to help to review and refine this question. The panel for this study included five different stakeholders, each with a different area of expertise relevant to the study, including: customer driven supply chain strategy, shareholder value, manufacturing strategy and quantitative methods.

The primary question that this study seeks to address is:

- What are the enablers to customer and shareholder alignment?

Supported by two supplementary questions:

- How can they be defined?
- How do they effect alignment, and ultimately customer and shareholder value?

2.2 Locating studies

The next step is to locate the relevant studies. There are two key decisions to make at this stage of the review; the search engine and search strings. After consultation with a database expert with significant experience of supporting faculty in conducting SLRs, two search engines were chosen: ABI Inform ProQuest and EBSCO host. Given that the context for the study is the supply chain, these were identified as the databases with the best coverage for this field.

The initial search terms used were quite broad to ensure that papers adopting alternative nomenclature were identified. Two alternative sets of search strings were used as summarised in Table 1 and resulted in the identification of 1,944 papers. The search was limited to scholarly articles, published between January 1976 and December 2010. The initial study took place as part of an Innovative Manufacturing Research Council project (IMRC 40) exploring the alignment and integration of marketing and supply chain strategy in late 2007 and this was later updated.

Table 1: Search strings and resultant number of papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search</th>
<th>Actual Search Strings</th>
<th># Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Study selection and evaluation

Given the breadth and fragmentation of the field, a decision was taken not to try and reduce the number of articles further by refining the search strings. Instead a decision was made to review the title, journal and abstracts for relevance. The selection criteria used were:

- Alignment – the paper had to be relevant to process alignment and strategic alignment with the objective of maximising shareholder and customer value
- Supply chain – whilst a broad topic, the papers had to focus on relationships and strategy alignment
- Language – the paper had to be written in English
- Journal type – top quality, double-blind peer reviewed journals

An initial sample of 50 abstracts was reviewed by two reviewers to check for inter-code reliability. The inclusion or exclusion of the abstracts was checked against the general criteria, results compared and discussed, and issues of disagreement resolved (Miles and Huberman, 1994). This exercise reduced the number of potential papers to 253.

At this stage a more robust set of quality criteria was then applied to the full text review of the 253 papers. Two sets of criteria were applied: subject matter selection and quality criteria. The subject matter criteria varied by paper type and are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Subject matter selection criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper Type</th>
<th>The papers must contain…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual / theoretical</td>
<td>Enablers (or inhibitors) and arguments in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Enablers (or inhibitors) and empirical evidence in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological</td>
<td>Causal relationships between enablers (or inhibitors)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quality criteria applied were based on the standard criteria developed for SLR at Cranfield University. As illustrated in Table 3 they include: contribution, theory, methodology and data analysis.

Table 3: Quality assessment criteria (Cranfield University SLR protocol)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements to</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
For a full paper to be accepted, it had to meet the subject matter selection criteria and satisfy at least one of the quality criteria in the ‘high band’. Similarly to the abstract read, initial samples of papers were reviewed by the two reviewers. The inclusion or exclusion of the papers was checked against the two sets of criteria, results compared and discussed, and issues of disagreement resolved (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Application of these criteria reduced the resultant number of full papers for analysis and synthesis to 72.

2.4 Analysis and synthesis

Each paper was analysed for both its descriptive and thematic content by the 2 reviewers, who both reviewed a sizeable sample of the papers discussing their findings, before splitting the papers between them. This ensured they were interpreting the content in a similar way. The descriptive analysis was more deductive in nature, and focused on the categorisation of papers by year, ABS code, country, methodology and industry.

The thematic analysis identifies and categorises emerging enablers to supply chain alignment. Its purpose was to identify the emerging constructs around the enablers to supply chain alignment. A more inductive approach was taken. Enabling factors were identified, and then grouped into a series of enabling constructs. Given that the initial study took place in 2007, the constructs were updated to include more relevant references. These were identified through a much simplified search of papers focused on supply chain alignment. This was deemed the most appropriate means to update the study as firstly, the incidence of papers was relatively low and secondly to avoid undermining the integrity of the original study. These papers are easily identifiable as they have references with a date after 2006.

2.5 Reporting and using the results

This paper is the first formal presentation of the results to an academic audience, though already presented to a practitioner workshop of 36 practitioners, by whom the results were well received. The
remainder of this paper is dedicated to reporting these results; descriptively, thematically and as a theoretical framework for application to both academia and practice.

3. Descriptive results: characterising the supply chain alignment literature

The 72 papers identified through the SLR are analysed in this section with respect to the publication year, methodology, journal and sector studied, in order to understand the trends in this body of literature relevant to supply chain alignment and the associated enablers.
The papers were published between 1985 and 2010 with sporadic publications in the 80’s and 90’s as illustrated in Figure 2. Through the late 90’s and into the early 2000’s the number of annual publications rose, peaking sharply in 2005 with 14 papers published. From 2000 through to 2010, 51 articles were published, which constitutes about 70% of the papers in this study. This indicates an increasing interest in supply chain alignment and approaches to achieving it. This could be fuelled by the persistent need to break down functional silos between sales/marketing and the operations/supply chain (Beth et al., 2003; Pagell, 2004; van Hoek and Mitchell, 2006).

The case study (35% of papers) and literature review (39% of papers) are used to a similar extent and are clearly the most frequently used methodologies, accounting for almost three quarters of the publications. Further they tend to be used consistently over the years of publication. However, the literature review is the most popular method used for this topic as researchers struggle to develop theory from existing literature. Only in recent years have there been some empirical case studies and surveys, indicating the infancy stage of the theoretical development process. Our paper aims to use a systematic approach to the literature review that is able to identify and synthesise this body of literature. This is no easy task because it is a wide ranging body of literature involving many disciplines. As evidenced by the analysis of papers by journal and the Association of Business School (ABS) categories (shown in Table 4), it has been published in a wide range of journals.

The 72 papers identified by the literature review were published in 43 different journals. Indeed 63% of the journals had only one article published on this topic. This emphasises that this topic has wide ranging relevance across many different disciplines, as might be expected. Alignment, after all, is seeking to develop consistency between all the business functions. However, 55% of the papers were published in journals within the Operations and Technology category, with many of these journals focussing on supply chain and logistics. In fact the International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management (IJPDLM) publishing the most papers (6). This reflects the fact that many of the functions which require alignment, to deliver either shareholder or customer value, are within the supply chain field: purchasing, manufacturing, logistics and operations planning. Moreover, supply chain management is often defined in terms of alignment of these functions. For example Lambert et al., (1998) cite a definition of supply chain management originally defined in
1994 and refined in 1998 by the members of the Global Supply Chain Forum: ‘supply chain management is the alignment of key business processes (Plan-Source-Make-Deliver) from customer through original suppliers that provides products, services, and information that add value for customers and other stakeholders’.

Table 4  Analysis of papers according to journal and ABS category (note: the authors categorised those papers in italics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABS Field</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>No. of articles</th>
<th>Author(Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lehtonen et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barratt and Oliveira (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rich and Hines (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scott and Westbrook (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gattorna et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supply Chain Management: An International Journal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sha et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohman and Ghanin (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soosay et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tracey et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holweg (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bagchi and Skjoett-Larsen (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barratt (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tsinosopoulos and Bell (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buyukozkan (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sabath and Whipple (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hill and Scudder (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reichhart and Holweg (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storey et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmarking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Simatupang and Sridharan (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fawcett and Cooper (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones and Riley (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production Planning &amp; Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chung and Leung (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Robertson and Barich (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Muka et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production &amp; Inventory Management Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lammus and Volakka (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>The Journal of Business &amp; Industrial Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Storbacka and Nenonen (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sabath and Whipple (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campbell (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Esper et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodraft (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher and Gattorna (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Srivastava et al. (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing Intelligence &amp; Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Groth (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academy of Marketing Science Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hoffman (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day and Fahey (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Journal of Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mahmoud et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIT Sloan Management Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Burgelman and Doz (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management Decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feurer and Chaharbaghi (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Horizons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Slater and Narver (1994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considering the geographical location of the authors’ affiliated institution, 49% of the papers originated from the USA, suggesting a strong interest in supply chain alignment in the USA. The UK accounts for the second largest proportion of papers at 19%, and other countries account for 5% or less, with 9 countries being the origin of a single paper each.

Finally it is important to determine which industrial sectors have made a contribution to the body of knowledge on supply chain alignment. Empirical data were the bases of the findings in 34 of the papers (47%) and these data were collected from four sectors: retail, manufacturing, airline and service industries. Six publications studied both the retail and the manufacturing sectors and these were counted against both. The vast majority of the empirical papers (91%) studied retail and/or manufacturing sectors while only four papers considered airline and service sectors. This is entirely consistent with the earlier observation that 55% of the papers are published in operations journals with an emphasis on supply chain management.

4. Thematic results: understanding the enablers

The SLR has identified six major enablers of alignment which are defined and explained in this section (see Table 5 for a summary of the constructs and supporting literature).

Table 5: Constructs and indicators together with supporting references, for the enablers to supply chain alignment.
### Customer relational behaviour (CR)

| CR1 | Goal sharing | Barratt and Oliviera, 2001; Sabath and Wipple, 2004 |
| CR2 | Cost sharing | Campbell, 1998; Cachon and Lariviére, 2005; Reichhart and Holweg, 2007; Sha et al., 2008; Soosay et al., 2008 |
| CR3 | Profit sharing | Fawcett and Cooper, 2001; Simatupang and Sridharan, 2004 |
| CR4 | Joint problem solving | Ellinger, 2000; Rich and Hines, 1997 |
| CR5 | Joint planning | Jones and Riley, 1985; Anderson and Narus, 1990; Auramo et al., 2004; Simatupang and Sridharan, 2004; Chen and Paulraj, 2004, Reichhart and Holweg, 2007; Soosay et al., 2008 |

### Top management support (TS)

| TS1 | Listen to employees | Heskett et al., 1994; Carrilat et al., 2004 |
| TS2 | Management involvement | Nichol, 1992; Wheelwright and Clark, 1992; Sussman and Dean, 1992; Gerbing et al., 1994; Luftman, 1998; Lee, 2004; Fawcett et al., 2006; Sandberg, 2007 |
| TS3 | Provisions of resources | Buhner, 1997; Kaplan and Norton, 2004; Storey et al., 2005 |
| TS4 | Provisions of finance | Buhner, 1997; Kaplan and Norton, 2004; Storey et al., 2005 |
| TS5 | Recognise importance of SCM | Christopher, 1998; Fassoula, 2006 |
| TS6 | Understand supply chain capabilities | Srivastava et al., 1999; Kim, 2006; Soosay et al., 2008; Tsinopoulos and Bell, 2010 |

### Information sharing (IS)

| IS1 | Share relevant information | Bowersox and Daugherty, 1995; Lee et al., 1997; Frochlich and Westbrook, 2001; Soosay et al., 2008 |
| IS2 | Share accurate information | Bourland et al., 1996; Lee and Whang, 2000; Li and Lin, 2006; Lehtonen et al., 2005; Kannan and Tan, 2010 |
| IS3 | Share sufficient information | Huang et al., 2003 |
| IS4 | Timely information sharing | Bourland et al., 1996; Lee and Whang, 2000; Lehtonen et al., 2005; Osterlund and Loven, 2005; Kannan and Tan (2010) |
| IS5 | Knowledge to use shared information | Sahin and Robinson, 2002 |

### Business performance measurement system (PM)

| PM1 | Linked to strategic objectives | Maskell, 1991; Schmenner and Vollmann, 1994; Toni and Tonchia, 1996; O’Mara et al., 1998; Neely, 2002 |
| PM2 | Shared metrics | Fawcett and Cooper, 2001; Robson, 2004; Chenhall, 2005; Muratoglu, 2008 |
| PM3 | Shared targets, incentives and rewards | Morash and Clinton, 1998; Burgelman and Doz, 2001; Kannan and Tan, 2010; Lee, 2004; Simatupang and Sridharan, 2004; Yasin et al., 2005; Muratoglu, 2008 |
| PM4 | Timely reporting | Wilcox and Bourne, 2003; Franco-Santos et al., 2004 |

### 4.1 Organisational structure (OS)

The organisation literature advocates that organisation structure, in terms of formalisation, centralisation, and hierarchy, have to be aligned with strategy and the environment (Thompson, 1976; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1976). However, these generic features are not suitable for describing the process-oriented organisation structure required to achieve alignment across functions (Lambert et al., 2005). The SLR identified five characteristics of an organisational structure (labelled OS1…OS5) required for supply chain alignment and summarised in Table 5.

For effective alignment, organisational structure (OS) must be able to accommodate the evolving interdependencies among new and existing businesses (Burgelman and Doz, 2001). In order to break down barriers among functional departments there is a need to assign a business process owner (OS2) that has overall responsibility and accountability for the delivery of customer value from the process.
Process owners act as integrators whose role is to stimulate operational units to pursue complex strategic integration (Burgelman and Doz, 2001). The need for process owners with adequate authority to influence multiple functions has been recognised in operations management, quality management and business reengineering, and information system literature (Davenport, 1993; Earl, 2002; Karapetrovic and Willborn, 2002; Hammer and Champy, 1993; Lewis and Slack, 2003). The influence of other functions cannot be achieved without providing the process owner with a wider span of control (OS1) or boundary spanning width (Aldrich and Herker, 1977; Ettlie and Stoll, 1990; Sussman and Dean, 1992) and supply chain literature (Clark et al., 2001; Monczka et al., 2009). However, there is also a need to improve cross-functional knowledge (OS3) to create mutual understanding and an overview of the business processes which actually deliver value to the customers (Eng, 2006; Fawcett and Magnan, 2002). Also, cross-functional knowledge (OS3) will be improved once the focal firm is able to enable inter-departmental activity (OS5) (Danese and Romano, 2004; Ellinger, 2000; Esper et al., 2010). Finally, a process-oriented organisation structure (OS4) is needed to ensure consistency between structure and adopted solutions to meet customer needs (Kalchschmidt et al., 2003).

4.2 Internal relational behaviour (IR)

Internal relational behaviour (IR) refers to activities and manners in which these activities are performed within an organisation to facilitate the process of building up and maintaining customer relationships. It is similar to the concept of intra-organisational connectedness which refers to the degree of formal and informal direct contacts among employees across departments (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993). Internal relational behaviour is characterised by cross-functional team (IR1), mutual understanding (IR2), joint problem-solving (IR3), and joint planning (IR4). The benefits of cross-functional teams have been widely recognised (Fassoula, 2006). The use of cross-functional teams is found to enable strategic alignment of account systems (Yasin et al., 2005). To encourage cross-functional team working, a cross-departmental reward system may be used (Yasin et al., 2005). Cross-functional activities often improve mutual understanding. The existence of different goals within an organisation inhibits internal collaboration (Sabath and Whipple, 2004). Alignment of internal relational behaviour is essential to achieve mutually accepted outcomes (Pagell, 2004; O’Leary-Kelly and Flores, 2002). The lack of common terminology for operations-focused and customer-facing activities will generate misunderstanding and inhibit internal collaboration (Sabath and Whipple, 2004). The importance of joint problem-solving (Ellinger, 2000) and joint planning (Chen and Paulraj, 2004; Anderson and Narus, 1990) across functional departments has also been highlighted by many studies (Sussman and Dean, 1992).

4.3 Customer relational behaviour (CR)

Customer relational behaviour (CR) refers to customer interactions which facilitate the process of building up and maintaining customer relationships. CR is grounded in the boundary spanning literature. Boundary spanning capability is claimed to allow organisations’ processes to focus on providing superior value to external or internal customers (Day, 1994; Tracey et al., 2005). Boundary spanning activities such as market sensing, customer linking and channel bonding are essential to enhance relationships with customers. Focal firms that emphasise boundary spanning will assign roles such as liaison, task force, standing committee and integrating managers (Ettlie and Stoll, 1990; Danese and Romano, 2004; Godsell et al., 2005; George et al., 1994).

Despite its importance, existing supply chain literature fails to define the characteristics of CR. The SLR has enabled the identification of five key characteristics. Since a conflicting objective is
often the main obstacle to customer responsiveness, the SLR suggests goal sharing (CR1), cost sharing (CR2) and profit sharing (CR3) as crucial indicators for CR in supply chains. The lack of shared goals is one of the inhibitors of collaboration in planning, forecasting and replenishment (Barratt and Oliveira, 2001; Chung and Leung, 2005). Very often any transaction or joint effort in improving a supply chain will incur costs and these costs are often unevenly distributed. Supply chain members that choose to push additional costs to other members often inhibit alignment efforts. It is also possible to devise profit-sharing contracts to share rewards (Fawcett and Cooper, 2001; Simatupang and Sridharan, 2004) and further encourage long-term collaboration. Even though the benefits of cost-sharing and profit-sharing contracts have been confirmed by numerous mathematical models in the academic literature (Simatupang and Sridharan, 2004; Reichhart and Holweg, 2007; Sha et al., 2008; Soosay et al., 2008), they are still very hard to achieve in practice, due to the asymmetric information and interests among suppliers and customers (Cachon and Lariviere, 2005).

The sharing of goals, cost and profits is only part of CR. At an operational level, focal firms need to jointly solve problems (CR4) and plan (CR5) with the customers to improve delivery performance (Auramo et al., 2004). Scott and Westbrook (1991) suggested that closer collaboration with suppliers increases supply chain integration and performance. Rich and Hines (1997) describe the use of a “supplier association” for joint problem-solving. The association extends from the focal purchasing organisation, and jointly determined supply chain improvements can be shared between the focal customer organisation and the group of suppliers. According to Rich and Hines this ensures that the efforts of each and every supplier are aligned to the changing requirements of the consumer market. As early as 1985, Jones and Riley proposed that the key to efficiently managing a supply chain is to plan and control the inventories and activities as an integrated single entity. The use of programmes such as Collaborative Planning, Forecast and Replenishment (CPFR) can also be effective (Barratt and Oliveira, 2001; Chung and Leung, 2005). The cooperation between supply chain members (Campbell, 1998) in joint planning allows decision synchronisation (Simatupang and Sridharan, 2004; Reichhart and Holweg, 2007; Soosay et al, 2008) and collaborative value analysis (Hartley, 2000) hence ensuring alignment.

4.4 Top management support (TS)

Managerial commitment to SCM is required for achieving collaboration breakthrough (Akkermans et al., 1999; Lummus and Vokurka, 1998) and customer responsiveness (Storey et al., 2005). According to Fawcett et al. (2006), top management support, broad-based functional support, channel support, and infrastructure/governance support are needed to achieve the highest levels of supply chain success. To align business strategy with supply chain strategy and business processes, it is important for top management to fully support the internal communication department by being accessible, serving as a model for communication, and expecting other managers in the organisation to be strong communicators (Powers, 1996). Alignment often involves a two-way communication process between management and employees. Thus, it is essential for top management to listen to the employees (TS1) as leaders who listen (Heskett et al., 1994) will be more likely to enable change (Carrilat et al., 2004).

Top management support can also be demonstrated by participation of top management in employees’ daily operations and decision-making processes. Gerbing et al. (1994) suggest that management participation has two dimensions – involvement and influence (TS2). Management involvement in goal setting, environment scanning, evaluation of the internal capabilities, generation of strategic alternatives, strategic selection and supply chain activities are critical to the success of internal and external alignment. Functional support may be demonstrated by getting middle management involved in the planning process (Nichol, 1992) as managerial influence is essential for
aligning conflicting objectives and interests. As such, management can demonstrate visible support and involvement, by participating in key supply chain decision-making activities (Wheelwright and Clark, 1992; Sussman and Dean, 1992; Luftman, 1998; Lee, 2004; Fawcett et al., 2006).

The most obvious ways of demonstrating management support are the provisions of resources (TS3) and finance (TS4) to collaboration efforts’, showing full commitment from top management (Storey et al., 2005). Another aspect of top management support is recognising the importance of SCM (TS5) as firms that do not discuss supply chain issues in the boardroom will be more internally oriented and less customer oriented. To achieve customer alignment, it is essential to demonstrate ambition and a sense of urgency and commitment from top management (Hamel and Prahalad, 1989; Bessant et al., 1994) and the embracing of SCM (Christopher, 1998; Fassoula, 2006). Awareness of supply chain (Tsinopoulos and Bell, 2010) capabilities (TS6) will help determine what is required to achieve customer and shareholder alignment (Kim, 2006; Soosay et al., 2008; Srivastava et al., 1999).

4.5 Information sharing (IS)
The SLR identifies information-sharing as a crucial enabler for supply chain alignment (Frohlich and Westbrook, 2001; Tarn et al., 2002; Soosay et al., 2008). The lack of transparency and visibility across supply chains is the main obstacle to internal and external alignment (Christopher and Gattorna, 2005) and collaborative planning (Barratt, 2003; Holweg, 2005). The lack of alignment between Information Technology (IT) and Information Systems (IS) with business strategy has long been recognised as a major inhibitor to organisational success (Luftman, 1998). Incompatible information systems, standards and operating procedures often inhibit collaboration across independent enterprises (Houlihan, 1985). Information sharing helps to improve visibility (Lethonen et al., 2005) and therefore improves the allocation of inventory (Lee et al., 1997), production scheduling and knowledge transfer process (Bagchi and Skjoett-Larsen, 2003; Barratt and Oliveira, 2001; Simatupang and Sridharan, 2004).

It is not enough to simply share information – it is crucial to share quality information. Quality of information is achieved by sharing relevant (IS1), accurate (IS2) and sufficient information (IS3) in a timely manner (IS4). For example, the sharing of information on operations cost will help in making effective cost trade-off decisions (Bowersox and Daugherty, 1995; Frohlich and Westbrook, 2001) and the sharing of order creation information will reduce the bullwhip effect (Lee et al., 1997). Relevant information facilitates demand management (Lummus and Vokurka, 1999) whereas relevant but delayed information can result in amplified demand (Lee et al., 1997). Thus, the importance of sufficient, accurate and timely information has been mentioned in several studies (Bourland et al., 1996; Lee and Whang, 1998; Huang et al., 2003; Li and Lin, 2006; Lehtonen et al., 2005; Kannan and Tan, 2010). Early capture of demand information (Campbel and Sankaran, 2005; Buyukozkan, 2004) and early notification of change (Osterlund and Loven, 2005) will often improve customer responsiveness and reduce cost. Further, in today’s information-rich supply chains, it is essential for a focal firm to acquire just enough information and not be overloaded by too much information. One of the least studied areas of information system research is the information processing capability. Without this, it is hard to capture the value of shared information (IS5). Thus, it is essential to understand the value of information and how shared information (Sahin and Robinson, 2002) may be processed to improve supply chain performance.

4.6 Business performance management system (PM)
The SLR indicated that a performance measurement system (PM) would either enable or inhibit alignment. Melnyk et al. (2004) suggested that performance measurement system is ultimately
responsible for maintaining alignment and coordination. PM can enable alignment by motivating staff and ensuring alignment in strategy and process (Waggoner et al., 1999; Gunasekaran et al., 2001; Holmberg, 2000; Chan et al., 2003; Morgan, 2004). Also, PM helps decision-making by indicating how well an organisation/supply chain has performed, where they currently are and where they need to be. To do this effectively PM would need to be relevant and linked with strategic objectives (PM1) and the measures have to be agreed and shared by the users (PM2) especially when they involve different groups and organisation units (Fawcett and Cooper, 2001; Chenhall, 2005). Often the current approaches to PM encourage functional sub-optimisation by driving the wrong organisational behaviours in supply chains (Storey et al., 2005; Morash et al., 1996). PM can be inhibiting when it lacks relevance to organisational goals and strategic objectives (Schmenner and Vollmann, 1994) or lacks useful metrics which can be changed as necessary to match changing strategic intent (Neely, 2002; O’Mara et al., 1998; Toni and Tonchia, 1996; Maskell, 1991). For performance, an individual has no direct control; PM has to be designed to act as a communication mechanism which encourages teamwork, establishes accountability and priorities Robson (2004). This would make PM a reflection of strategic goals, representation of complex relationships amongst partners, and a concern for both internal and external stakeholders (Chan et al., 2003; Gunasekaran et al., 2001; Maku et al., 2005). A lack of training and understanding of this potentially complex link can lead to decisions that are made based on measurement that are not aligned with strategy.

Essentially, the performance target is a statement of strategic intent and strategic intent is a target setting exercise. Inappropriate target setting (PM3) may lead to narrow focus, sub-optimisation and conflicting goals (Neely, 2002). This means that employees are provided with incentives to improve certain measures without taking a broader scope, hence not creating holistic ‘improvements’ and ultimately leading to tensions between functions (Muratoglu, 2008). This view is supported by Storey et al. (2005) who found that SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely) targets and the desire for individual accountability have contributed to functional sub-optimisation. They proposed that an effective performance measurement needs to balance the requirements of the individual with the requirements of the organisation and wider supply chain. Yasin et al. (2005) proposed the use of a cross-departmental reward system as a means of overcoming this. Overall the effect desired of an aligning PM would be one that provoked the timely provision of feedback (PM4) which would, in turn, facilitate decision-making for continual improvement (Wilcox and Bourne, 2003; Franco-Santos et al., 2004) thus allowing the appropriate course of action to be taken.

5. Theoretical hypotheses for supply chain alignment

The six constructs for enablers developed (Table 5) are essential for achieving both shareholder and customer alignment. Taking these results as a starting point this section establishes a set of hypotheses for the relationships between the six enablers and alignment (shareholder and customer) and value (shareholder and customer).

5.1 Relationships between enablers and shareholder and customer alignment

Before establishing the impacts of supply chain alignment there is a need to clarify the concepts of shareholder and customer alignment. Shareholder alignment is achieved when business strategy, supply chain strategy and employees’ expectations are aligned with shareholder objectives, and the business strategy is well defined to ensure organisational change to meet shareholder objectives. Customer alignment is the state where business strategy and supply chain strategy are aligned to meet customer expectations, and the business and supply chain strategies are designed to adjust the supply
Table 6. Hypotheses relating enablers to alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomena Influenced</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shareholder alignment (SA)</td>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Organisation structure (OS) positively affects shareholder alignment (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Internal relational behaviour (IR) positively affects shareholder alignment (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>Customer relational behaviour (CR) positively affects shareholder alignment (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H4a</td>
<td>Top management support (TS) positively affects shareholder alignment (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H5a</td>
<td>Business performance measurement system (PM) positively affects shareholder alignment (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H6a</td>
<td>Information sharing (IS) positively affects shareholder alignment (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer alignment (CA)</td>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Organisation structure (OS) positively affects customer alignment (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Internal relational behaviour (IR) positively affects customer alignment (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>Customer relational behaviour (CR) positively affects customer alignment (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H4b</td>
<td>Top management support (TS) positively affects customer alignment (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H5b</td>
<td>Business performance measurement system (PM) positively affects customer alignment (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H6b</td>
<td>Information sharing (IS) positively affects customer alignment (CA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to achieve shareholder alignment there is a need to make organisational structures compatible with business strategy and shareholder expectations (Thompson, 1976; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1976). The SLR affirms a more process-oriented organisational structure with the ability to enable/support cross-functional knowledge exchange and inter-departmental activities to achieve cost effectiveness (Davenport, 1993; Lewis and Slack, 2003; Ettlie and Stoll, 1990). A process-oriented organisational structure which facilitates inter-functional collaboration is also necessary for meeting customer needs. Organisations with functional silos are often blamed for the inability to respond to various customer demands (Beth et al., 2003, Pagell, 2004; van Hoek and Mitchell, 2006). However, when an organisation is segmented and aligned to processes which focus on different value streams, then it is more likely to meet customer needs with the same resources (Godsell et al., 2006). Furthermore, appropriate process owners with a wider control span are able to stimulate complex strategic integration (Burgelman and Doz, 2001). These arguments suggest the above-mentioned characteristics of organisational structure are effective in meeting shareholder alignment, especially in terms of capital efficiency and customer alignment, and delivery service, leading to the formulation of hypotheses H1a and H1b.

In addition, internal relational behaviour encompassing the ability to achieve mutual understanding and support joint planning among functions, is essential for improving cost effectiveness (O’Leary-Kelly and Flores, 2002; Pagell, 2004; Anderson and Narus, 1990). Internal relational behaviour is also essential for meeting customer needs. Customer delivery performance can be improved when suppliers cooperate with customers to re-align order penetration points (Auramo et al., 2004). It is argued that internal integration is the central link between customers and an organisation’s responses to changes in the market (Flynn et al., 2010). The improvement of cross-functional relationships and the use of cross-functional teams often promote mutual understanding towards a more customer responsive culture (Godsell et al., 2006) and mutually accepted objectives (Pagell, 2004). Without a close internal relationship, it is very difficult for top management to implement any strategy. Therefore, we argue that internal relational behaviour is an enabler for customer alignment as well as shareholder alignment. These arguments suggest internal relational behaviour is required to achieve
shareholder alignment and customer alignment, leading to the formulation of hypotheses H2a and H2b.

The next enabler – customer relational behaviour – facilitates goal/cost/profit sharing, and joint planning and problem-solving with customers to ensure customer loyalty and eventually revenue growth, and subsequently creates shareholder alignment (Day, 1994; Auramo et al., 2004; Tracey et al., 2005). Customer relational behaviour is crucial for the alignment of customer demand with production planning and replenishment (Lee and Whang, 1998; Barratt and Oliviera, 2001) to lower inventory (working capital) cost and at the same time maintain delivery performance. Thus, customer relational behaviour is perhaps one of the most significant enablers for customer alignment. However, it is also crucial for achieving shareholder alignment because one way firms align their customers’ interests with their own is by redefining the terms of their relationships so that firms share risk, costs, and rewards equitably (Lee, 2004). Such an alignment is required to ensure that everyone in the chain has the same objective, i.e. to deliver the best service to the end consumers (Lee, 2004). This means that customer relational behaviour may be able to influence the customers such that shareholders’ interests are safeguarded. These arguments suggest internal relational behaviour is required to achieve shareholder alignment and customer alignment, leading to the formulation of hypotheses H3a and H3b.

Top management is the crucial channel between shareholders and employees because they translate shareholders’ goals into business strategies and support employees to achieve business strategies (Tamas, 2000). Top management who listens to employees invests in human assets through the provision of training leading to a better shareholder alignment (Buhner, 1997). Also, top management’s participation in operational issues and encouragement of open communication helps to align employees’ behaviour (Gerbing et al., 1994). Brown et al. (2007) argue that involving manufacturing/operations managers in the strategic planning process helps align manufacturing and business strategy, and this alignment is associated with higher manufacturing performance. Furthermore, top management support in supply chain management is crucial in aligning employees’ behaviour in contributing to cost saving and customer service improvement, leading to customer alignment. Top management not only have the authority to provide resources, but also to direct the supply chain and business unit strategies towards meeting customer needs. These arguments suggest top management support is required to achieve shareholder alignment and customer alignment, leading to the formulation of hypotheses H4a and H4b.

Information sharing is argued to have a significant impact on shareholder and customer alignment. Increased intensity of organisational connectivity due to information sharing often decreases production cost (Clark et al., 2001) and increases customer service because accurate information (Bourland et al., 1996; Lee and Whang, 1998) combined with the capability to use shared information (Sahin and Robinson, 2002) is required to plan production and inventory effectively. During the strategy formulation and implementation information sharing across the hierarchy, it is essential to achieve buy in and therefore alignment between business strategy and employees. These arguments suggest information sharing is required to achieve shareholder alignment and customer alignment, leading to the formulation of hypotheses H5a and H5b.

People act according to incentives which are often related to performance targets. Thus, business performance management systems, if properly aligned with shareholders’ objectives, will act as catalysts for change and allow employees to contribute to shareholders’ objectives (Schmenner and Vollmann, 1994; Gunasekaran et al., 2001; Morgan, 2004), leading to the formulation of hypothesis
H6a. Furthermore, employees act according to rewards and performance targets and if these are not aligned to business strategies and customer needs, then there will be a greater tendency to sub-optimise, which may adversely affect customer delivery performance. Finally, when employees act upon accurate and timely customer demand information, they will be able to respond to customer needs more accurately and quicker. Furthermore, by using shared information systems it is possible to achieve full potential in developing flexible pricing strategies and tailored offerings for individual customers (Clemons and Weber, 1994). Thus, we take the view that supply chain alignment is required to deliver value to the customer (Christopher, 1998) in an efficient manner that will also deliver shareholder value (Christopher and Ryals, 1999), leading to the formulation of hypothesis H7 and H8.

Even though the above discussion supports positive relationships between supply chain alignment enablers and shareholder and customer alignment, it is recognised that supply chain alignment efforts cost money and they may disturb the customer service process. Firms which are not skilful in implementing supply chain alignment may find themselves encumbered with high costs and low customer service and therefore be unable to achieve shareholder and customer alignment. Thus, for some firms, we might find insignificant or even negative correlations between supply chain alignment enablers, and shareholder and customer alignment.

5.2 Relationships between shareholder and customer alignment and value

Based on the literature, hypotheses about the complex relationships between shareholder and customer alignment and value are developed. The relationship between shareholder alignment and shareholder value is straightforward. When the business unit and supply chain strategies and employees are aligned to meet shareholders’ objectives, such as working capital efficiency and revenue growth, then it is more likely for an organisation to provide higher earnings per share, leading to hypothesis H7. Similarly, for customer alignment and customer value, when the business unit and supply chain strategies are aligned to meet customer needs, it is then more likely to meet customer needs, supporting hypothesis H8.

Table 6: Hypotheses relating shareholder and customer alignment to each other and customer and shareholder value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomena Influenced</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impacts of shareholder alignment</td>
<td>H7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts of customer alignment</td>
<td>H8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint impacts of shareholder and customer alignment</td>
<td>H12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenge comes when shareholder alignment/value and customer alignment/value are considered simultaneously. The SLR reveals that shareholder value has hardly been considered together with customer value in the past. For example, the value chain theory of Porter (1985) focuses on the building blocks by which a firm creates a product valuable to its buyers, taking shareholder value for granted. Day and Fahey (1990) mentioned the importance of alignment between business unit strategies and shareholder value. Only since the mid-1990s has some literature started to consider both
shareholder and customer value (Bourguignon, 2005). Still, there is debate in the literature over which of these values should take priority. Some argue that organisations are in business primarily to maximise shareholder value (Cornelius and Davies, 1997; Rappaport, 1987) and can do so by also delivering customer value and therefore maintaining competitiveness. Frohlich (2002) argued that the lack of alignment between business models and practices and customer needs will have an adverse effect on shareholder alignment. Under this perspective, shareholder alignment and customer alignment appear to reinforce each other, meaning that shareholder alignment positively affects customer alignment and vice versa, leading to hypotheses H9a and H9b.

Others have argued that customer alignment comes first because a business is more likely to achieve its goals when it organises itself to meet the current and potential needs of customers more effectively than its competitors (Doyle, 1994; Drucker, 2001; Copulsky, 1991; Laitamaki and Kordupleski, 1997). An alternative to this trade-off perspective is that organisations need to be able to balance between the two (Feurer and Chaharbaghi, 1994; Cleland and Bruno, 1997) as they can be conflicting and can destroy each other.

In a way customer value ensures customer loyalty and thus promises continuous revenue and contributing to shareholder value, and shareholder value promises continuous investment which supports the implementation of the business unit and supply chain strategies to meet customer need (Slater and Narver, 1994; Kaplan and Norton, 2004). Thus, we argue that both shareholder alignment and customer alignment are reinforcing each other (hypotheses H10 and H11) and both alignments are required to contribute to both customer and shareholder value (hypothesis H12). Marquez and Blanchar (2006) emphasise the importance of connecting customer value with business targets, thus suggesting the joint effects of customer alignment and shareholder alignment on shareholder and customer value (hypothesis H12).

5.3 Relationships between supply chain alignment enablers

As indicated by the previous section on supply chain alignment enablers (section 4), potentially causal relationships could exist between the enablers. The relationships among these enablers are tenuous and complex and not well supported in the literature, either theoretically or empirically. Nonetheless it would be valuable to understand such relationships. The literature review suggests that organisational structure and top management support are two enablers which significantly reinforce other enablers. A process-oriented organisation with a greater span of control given to a supply chain manager as well as appropriate top management support is likely to improve internal relational behaviour, customer relational behaviour and information sharing within the supply chain. This will be further enhanced by performance measurement systems with share metrics, targets and incentives designed to encourage these behaviours. Furthermore, top management support is required to change the organisational structure and performance measurement system so that internal relational behaviour, external relational behaviour and information sharing are aligned with the shareholder and customer value. In terms of analysis, that means it is likely to find positive relationships among all these enablers, and is more likely to find top management support, performance management system and organisation structure as the main predictors of internal relational behaviour, customer relational behaviour and information sharing.

Indeed a more complex relationship among these enablers has been reviewed. For example, it is found that information sharing enables functional integration and co-alignment among organisation structure, information technology and organisation planning (Pollalis, 2003). This study, though valuable, is inadequate for forming the foundation of a more concrete theoretical model. However,
such an important understanding, if achieved, will certainly provide a significant contribution to theory and practice.

6. Conclusion

Based on a systematic literature review, this paper identifies, and develops the constructs for, six enablers of supply chain alignment: organisational structure, internal relational behaviour, customer relational behaviour, top management support, information sharing and business performance measurement system. A set of hypotheses are developed, which posit the positive impacts of the six enablers on shareholder and customer alignment, and the complex relationships between shareholder alignment/value and customer alignment/value. The paper culminates in a series of hypotheses, which are grounded in the literature and together form the basis for developing a theoretical model. This is succeeded by a systematic approach in reviewing publications from journals across operations and technology, general management, marketing, information management, organisation management, accounting and strategy. The main contribution of this literature review is that it brings together the theoretical arguments and findings from a disparate and multi-disciplinary body of literature (where 72 papers span 43 journals) and synthesises them into a set of enablers and hypotheses of supply chain alignment, which takes into account both shareholder and customer value.

While the proposed hypotheses remain theoretical, it is now possible to test them on a population of companies (residing within supply chains) and understand the relative significance of the various enablers to alignment; this can also be related to contextual factors such as sector, position in supply chain and company size. Further, the significance of shareholder and customer alignment on the delivery of shareholder and customer value can be examined leading to the development of a theory of supply chain alignment. In practice, companies are struggling with supply chain alignment. Increasingly, they are required to align their business functions, and supply chains are required to align their constituent companies, to become more customer oriented and deliver increased levels of customer value. The identified enablers and proposed hypotheses have the potential to provide practical guidance on how to improve both shareholder and customer alignment. They could be used to assess the current state of existing enablers in the company, and wider supply chain, in order to identify practices that need improvement. They could be further used by practitioners to benchmark supply chain alignment practices in a particular supply chain.

As with any study there are limitations to this paper. Customer and shareholder alignment is emphasised, because a supply chain should always aim to be aligned with final customers’ needs and shareholders objectives, as discussed in the introduction. Alignment with suppliers is not considered to the same extent, although every member of a supply chain, practises customer relational behaviour, therefore supplier relations are included indirectly. Further, information sharing covers sharing of information with internal functions, customers and suppliers. On a separate point, the hypotheses suggest causal relationships between the enablers, alignment (shareholder and customer) and value (shareholder and customer). However, these relationships were rarely made explicit in the literature and there is a lack of empirical evidence. Moreover, we focus on the role of enablers in customer and shareholder alignment but there may be many other inhibitors. Inhibitors can be real or imaginary, utility or psychic, and not all managers are conscious of their own perceptions of the inhibitors or enablers (Groth, 1994). Finally, the interactions between the enablers are only briefly discussed, and could be an area for further research. Thus, the further testing of the hypotheses established in this paper should take this into account during data collection.
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