

CHAPTER I:
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

Today's business world is an increasingly complex, interconnected environment where organisations conduct global business. It is characterised by rapid, unpredictable change resulting in turmoil that impacts all levels of an organisation. Traditional deliberate strategies, based on cycles of stability and predictability, are no longer relevant for today's business environments(Dale,2007)

This instability of environment ,characterized by the ever increasing rate of change, necessitates change in the way organisations conduct their business (Dale,2007; Heinrich & Betts, 2003). Change in terms of the way business is conducted means there is a corresponding change in business models and the business processes that support these models. As the change is a global phenomenon comes in a different manners, so Sudan became a country with a new reality after 2011, challenges and unclear economic future, this reality has resulted an economic crisis situation that may continue because of many reasons.(Almosharaf and Tian,2014).after years of continuous growth contribution of industry in Sudan GDP but in the last five years The contribution of industry has decreased(CBOS, 2015)along side with that problem more than (40%) of Manufacturing companies closed due to different reasons Related to economy and policies (Ministry of industry,2016)

however the economy performance indicators has been frustrating, and most industries have been struggling, but still there is companies and industries working and competing in Sudan, this indicate implicitly that there is a possibility for survive and continuity by adapting their business, This phenomenon is similar phenomena occurred in another economy (e.g.Spansih economy, specially footwear industry). (Fice, 2013).

The change of today's business environment acts a catalyst for the constant emergence of new Problems which is required a new business philosophy and directions . Where companies try to minimize the impacts of changes, through the adjustment strategies companies seek to optimally adapt to dynamic changes in the environment in order to optimally use the situation. There is no resistance in the company in relation to the changes. In the adjustment to externally induced changes in the environment a completely new strategic direction and complete redesign of the organizational

structure, processes and culture of the company may be demanded. (Rahimić, Kozo,2010).

The adaptation perspective considers pro-active behaviour as the best condition for innovative performance, whereas the selection perspective advances inert firm behaviour as the best alternative to achieve successful adaptation innovations (Meeus and Oerlemans, 2000). However, when looking across a number of organisations, it is difficult to find a common and acceptable innovation outcome that is not organization dependent and related to an internal culture or individual practices (Hagedoorn and Cloudt, 2003).The literature suggested that An organisation's ability to innovate is recognised as one of the determinant factors for it to survive and succeed (Wang andAhmed, 2004)

Supply chain oriented firms are proactive in establishing relationships with other supply chain entities that will result in the ability to enhance value and reduce costs assets associated with value delivery. Firms with strong SCO also recognize that operating level employees must be educated and entrusted with appropriate SCM decision-making authority (Mello, Stank, 2005)

adaptiveness in business-to-business contexts does not just come from product innovation. It is widely acknowledged that sustainable competitive advantage can no longer be achieved just by improving existing products. (Occhiocupo, 2011).

Manufacturing companies realize the necessity of managing supply chains effectively in response to the globalisation of the economy and intensifying competition, and therefore the need to adopt new strategies such as Supply Chain Management (Woo, 2010). theoretically business adaptiveness require organizational capabilities that can lead to adaptiveness as consequences of strategic directions (Reeves and Deimler (2011)

Therefore supply chain orientation can facilitate for more adaptiveness and to align their business with environment and change through create and cocreate of value with customers and suppliers, all these benefits and contribution of SCO encouraging this study for more testing and insights.

1.2 statement of the problem

SCM as a management philosophy aim toward cooperative efforts to synchronize and converge intrafirm andinterfirm operational and strategic capabilities

for organization as whole that engenders organizational performance in addition to the supply chain orientation (SCO) main aims to create more value for customers, as well as for the supply chain partners (Mentzer et al., 2001), thus improving performance not only within each organization, but also across the whole chain.(Brulhart, Uche and Btissam 2016; Esper, Defee, & et al., 2010).The observation of business practices reveal that the competition has shifted from company orientation to supply chain orientation, thus supply chain improvement has become a necessity for survival(Vonderembse, et al.,2006)also the recent shifts in supply chain management theory from total cost to customer-value market orientation driven theory (Hall, Hall and Rigsbee ,2013 ; Min, Mentzer, & Ladd, 2007).

In the literature of supply chain orientation (SCO) is effective management of the organisations' structure, systems and individual behaviours (Min and Mentzer, 2004; Esperet *al.* 2010; by Lynch 2015.)Whilst SCO has been linked as a business model solution there is little evidence in the previous studies which examines how and why SCO creates a business model solution for manufacturing firms and how it leads to more adaptiveness. The firm's business model encapsulates how managers create, deliver and depict value and adaptability (Oster walder and Pigneu, 2010)

Therefore deep research in SCO studies Reveal out that SCO concept by Mentzer et al. (2001) was 'stand alone' it was not set within a larger strategic management theoretic framework(Ehlers, Steffen,and Spiller,2014) SCO is a relatively new and little investigated construct therefore clearly a need for a further examination and testing of supply chain orientation and related results is necessary ,However, when it compared with another concepts in marketing literature like (market orientation) since 1990s (Tukamuhabwa , Eyaa , Derek 2011;Vieira.2010;Jaakkola1 , Santala and Vassinen 2009; Low et al; 2007, Ellis 2006; kuntonbutr2013; Narver and Slater 1990).

Nevertheless During the past decades, there has been a growing interest among researchers in the area of Supply chain in general but supply chain orientation has received a little empirical and conceptual studies some of these studies investigate the relationship between SCO concepts and organizational outcomes (e.g. Acar et al., 2017;Lynch 2015 ;Gligor 2014;Patel, Azadegan ,Ellram 2013;Tinney,2012;Corsten&Felde, 2005; Min &Mentzer, 2004).(Miocevic, Karanovic,2011) (Woo 2010, Vijayaraghavan 2008, Tucker 2011, M. Huit et al 2008,

Shin et al 2000,) but there is a little is known about Supply chain orientation and adaptiveness, nevertheless supply chain practices , supply chain management and Innovation has received much studies but there is no significance evidences of the effect of SCO on business adaptiveness (Hall, Hall and Rigsbee 2013;Bowersox et al., 2000; Min et al., 2007; Ulusoy, 2003).Arguments supporting the benefits from SCO often emphasize competitive advantages stemming from superior competence enhancing innovations, operational efficiency and effectiveness, and protection of strong market positions (Whitten G., et al ., 2012;Kampstra,Ashayri and gattorna,2006).The relationship between strategy and adaptability can be viewed through a number of different but related lenses. In the strategic choice literature, strategy is a series of adaptive choices by a dominant coalition influenced by contextual variables and by internal considerations (e.g., existing structures and politics) (Strempek, 1997). in addition generally Strategic orientation is Closely related to Business performance (Yusoff and Ashari, 2016).

In spite of the important contribution of the previous mentioned studies about SCO and business outcomes (perceived performance, firm performance)however these studies faced the performance measurement problems and the lack of linking SCO with Firm performance (Min et al. 2007; Patel et al. 2013; Griffith, Harvey, &Lusch, 2006) mentioned there is no consensus on how to define and measure performance, also Tan (2002) proposes that due to a lack of consensus regarding a valid cross-industry measure of corporate performance perhaps, it is better to use other measurements. Also there is no consensus about how SCO should be operationalized (Ehlers, Steffen, Spiller.2014)in other word the inconsistent of supply chain orientation dimensions whereas studies(Morgan, Richey, Autry, 2016; Gligor,2014; Patel, Azadega, Ellram.,2013;Tinney,2012;M ; Huit et al 2008;Min and Mentzer 2004) propose six dimensions (to measure SCO: benevolence, commitment, compatibility, credibility, cooperative norms and top management support) while other studies propose dimensions like (customer orientation, competitor orientation, supplier orientation, logistics orientation, operations orientation) beside another perspective add value-chain coordination as SCO dimension additionally some studies suggest four dimension (long term relationship, suppliers Involvement, quality focus, reduced suppliers) (Vijayaraghavan and Raju.2008., Shin et al 2000), furthermore SCO viewed

as attitudinal orientation.(Ehlers, et al.,2014).another perspective of SCO (Individual and organizational) (Lee and Nam,2016).

Morgan, Richey and Autry, 2016;Gligor,2014; Patel, Azadega, Ellram,2013;Esper, Defee and Mentzer,2010) the supply chain orientation SCO is a function of both the strategic and structural perspectives. More specifically, it proposed that the essence of SCO lies in the fit between a firm's supply chain strategy and its support for SCM performance , also (Patel, Azadega, Ellram(2013) argue that with increased dynamism in the firm's operating environment, sequential implementation of structural SCO and strategic SCO becomes more important and Thestrategy-Structure performance(SSP) framework suggests that changes to strategy need to be accompanied by an appropriate estructure in order to gain performance benefits (Wasserman, 2008).Despite of this most of the studies operationalized SCO as one variable with many dimensions(M. Huit, et al ,2008; Tinney,2012;Woo 2010; Tucker 2011;Defee,Esper , Mollenkopf,2009)instead of strategic and Structural orientation.

Also Researchers have pointed out numerous empirical studies that examined the relationship between Supply chain orientation with another variables like product development, Sustainability.(Defee, Esper , Mollenkopf,2009; Redfern and caroline 2003;Lundkvist&Yakhlef, 2004;Nambisan, 2002) On the other side a few studies have investigated Supply chain orientation as dependent variable in studies like (Ziggers and Jörg 2016 ; Robinson 2014; Omar et al. 2012 ; Hal, Cynthia and Carolee 2013; Sukati, Abu Bakar and fazila 2011)

Moreover these Studies are conducted in Developed countries (USA, Asian Countries, UK, and others European countries) Thus this study attempt to measure the effect of SCO on Business daptiveness in Developing Countries. Therefore this study aims to examine the impact of Supply chain orientation on business adaptiveness among Sudanese Manufacturing companies

The impact of SCO on adaptiveness has rarely been tested because of the focusing of most studies of Supply chain management. This implies that the benefits of adopting Supply chain orientation SCO may not be extensively and theoretically proven. (Woo, 2010) in addition to the nature of the relationship between SCO and adaptiveness is appeared sometimes as indirect support for the positive sum perspective of supply chain interactions, where developing a supply chain orientation

among buyers and suppliers leads to stronger customer relationships, learning and innovation.(M. Huit et al., 2008), beside that some concept related to SCO like green supply chain orientation (SGO) Firms' green orientation reflects their inclination to innovation and green oriented companies are believed to be more innovative in their process and product (Hong, Kwon and Roh 2009.;Biazzo, 2009; Routroy, 2009). On the other hand business adaptiveness recently have received increased attention as both input and output factors in business processes, While several scholars (e.g., Tuomine, Rajala, and Mollet, 2004; Zahra and Pearce, 1990;Child, 1997) have acknowledged that adaptability is a construct of strategic, market, technology, and organization-related factors, prior studies in this field have addressed only one, or at most two, adaptability factors at a time (Zahra and Pearce, 1990). Several scholars examine adaptiveness from different perspectives such as(Adaptive management practices, behavior Adaptiveness, Firm adaptiveness, Institutional Adaptiveness, Strategic Adaptiveness Relationship)(Akgün, et al., 2013; Gibbon, Kennealy, and Lavin, 2003; Reisel, Chia, Maloles,2005.;Vakratsas and Ma.2009; Casper, 2000; Nyuur, Brec'ic', Simintiras,2016: Grunsven and Hutchinson,2016)in addition business adaptiveness has no accepted construct , some scholars measured business adaptiveness as one dimension (strategic adaptiveness,) (Nyuur, Brec'ic', Simintiras,2016;Grunsven and Hutchinson,2016)a another measured adaptiveness (marketing adaptiveness) (e.g. Mohsen and eng,2016)although there is many studies on adaptiveness but most of these studies did not examined adaptiveness as multiple dimensions variable therefor this study measure adaptiveness from holistic perspective.

Furthermore examining the relationship between SCO and value co-creation.(O'Cass and LiemViet,2016) argue instead that superior performance, relationship value, and co-creation value are driven by orientation, and marketing capabilities in Creating superior customer value for B2B firms through supplier firm capabilities also(Bowersox et al., 2000;Mentzer et al., 2001; Min et al., 2007) Arguments supporting the benefits from SCO often emphasize competitive advantages stemming from superior competence enhancing innovations, operational efficiency and effectiveness, and protection of strong market positions. By integrating the demand and supply sides, SCO clearly supports customer value creation efforts. Although downstream processes have a direct impact on customer value creation, the existence

of SCO enables firms to leverage value-creating potential from upstream processes as well. Hence, the firm that implements SCO recognizes the role of its purchasing process in customer value creation. (Moeller, Fassnacht, & Klose, 2006). beside the relationship between value co-creation and strategic adaptiveness many of researchers. (Rayna, Striukova and Darlington ,2015) mentioned that Co-creation corresponds to the customer-related part of open innovation: ‘open innovating’ with consumers necessarily implies co-creating with them,

Breidbach, Maglio (2016) recognizes that the need to advance our understanding of the mechanisms and processes underlying value co-creation processes in complex business-to-business (B2B) systems. However, nowadays consumers are involved in generating ideas for new products, co-creating products with firms, testing finished products and in providing end user product support. Thierry (Rayna, Striukova, and Darlington ,2015) (Nambisan, 2002). In addition Consumers are no longer simply external sources of ideas (outside-in) (Berthon et al., 2007; Bogers et al., 2010; Poetz and Schreier, 2012), but can also become external paths to market (inside-out) (Baldwin and von Hippel, 2006; Shah and Tripsas, 2007). Taking this background into account, can be suggest that the process of value co-creation can facilitate company in formulating innovation strategy to adapt with change. (Taghizadeh et al.,2016) in other word Organizational innovation processes are driven by co-creation practices like co-ideation, co-valuation, co-design, co-testing, and co-launching (Russo-Spena & Mele, 2012). Despite of this still the results of some previous studies are controversial. Many researchers believe that consumer involvement enhances the success of adaptiveness (Tseng and lung 2015), but other studies point out consumer involvement cannot lead to the successful performance of new products. Some researchers (Redfern and caroline 2003; Lundkvist & Yakhlef, 2004; Nambisan, 2002) but there is no direct clear relationship with Business adaptiveness.

Due to the crucially of adaptiveness in business and to explain How companies get more adaptive (mechanism and antecedents) a Mediator variables mostly used to determine the nature of the relationship more accurately and functionally (Namazi and Namazi, 2016.) also the other reason for testing mediation is trying to understand the mechanism through which the causal variable affects the outcome in other word to

describe “Why” and “How” such effects are occurred in the relationship between independent and dependent variables (Kenny, 2014). , as (Baron and Kenny, 1986) proposed Mediator variables are typically introduced when there is an unexpectedly weak or inconsistent relation between the variables. This a situation of un consistency of findings refer to the neglected variables that have more explanatory ability for the effects of SCO on Business Adaptiveness Value co-creation has introduced as mediator variables in this relationship . in past work (Song et al, 2016; J. Zhang et al. 2015; Gelhard, Kotmann, and Leker.2014) value co-creation has been used as mediator and significant effect was founded The findings confirm that joint value creation with customers is a critical mediator enabling the conversion of firm's capabilities into superior outcome in terms of customer value, moreover (Gelhard, Kotmann, Leker.2014 ;Fang, 2008; Lee et al., 2012).customers are increasingly integrated into value creation processes to jointly develop new solutions. By means of customer co-creation firms integrate internal (developers) and external (customers) knowledge resources in the innovation process and achieve a higher degree of product and service innovativeness.

Due to the relationship complexity level and cultural distance in business relationships lead to higher levels of uncertainty(Homburg et al., 2002).Burkert, Ivens and Shan,2012) argue that to cope with this uncertainty, actors in business relationships will prefer governance mechanisms, in sense of interaction locus such as formal contracts and, to soft mechanisms, such as norms or trust. Arguably, intercultural communication is complex, and the development of soft governance mechanisms (such as norms or trust) relies on verbal and nonverbal communication. Tangible pledges in the form of written contracts and specific investments, by contrast, leave less room for (mis)interpretation (Aulakh&Gençtürk, 2008).More investigation in this study is searching for testing moderator, In the Previous studies found that most uses of relationship variable(e.g. relationship, relationship quality, relationship norms) as moderator(Starks, 2014;Terawatanavong, Whitwell and Widing,2007; Oke,Prajogo and Jayaram.2013; Fynes and Voss, 2002) was in the marketing context , in this study the soft mechanisms will be testing as moderator in term of locus of interaction on the relationship between SCO and

Value co-creation examination of previous studies that have examined the various forms of governance mechanisms shows that two contrasting approaches to governance of inter-firm relationships exist. First, formal governance mechanisms (e.g. legal contracts) specify the obligations of trading partners and play a key governance role in the transaction (Cannon & Perreault, 1999). Second, informal governance mechanisms (e.g. trust) are the most effective and cost-efficient safeguards because they advance complex exchanges, and they facilitate exchange partners to engage in value creation initiatives to help the economic exchange (Chuang., 2016). Much of the marketing literature takes an overly simplistic and deterministic view of the complex interactions that take place in value co-creation networks (Ellis & Mayer, 2001; Grönroos, 2011)

Kohtamäki, R. Rajala (2016) Based on the literature searched for this review, value creation has been studied at least on four levels: at firm-level, within dyadic relationships, as well as in networks and ecosystems (Frow et al., 2014). As value is cocreated in interaction between the actors, including buyers, sellers and other stakeholders, such as user communities, constructing understanding of the phenomenon in the real-life context calls for dyadic or multilateral analysis. (Vargo & Lusch, 2008) Several studies offer empirical evidence that the types of governance mechanisms in a specific relationship significantly affect key outcome variables (Burkert, Ivens and Shan., 2012; Chuang., 2016). The relational perspective posits that high-volume exchange between partners increases the potential to yield additional relational rents through governance mechanisms.

Back to what has been reviewed the problem of this study can be formulated as follows: What is the relationship between Supply chain orientation, Value co creation and strategic adaptiveness? Does locus of interaction moderate the relationship between Value co creation and strategic adaptiveness?

In Sudan, there is a lack of studies that test the level of practices and the outcome of the supply chain and supply chain orientation. (Hamid, 2013) Therefore the primary research question comes up from previous mentions, what are the 'performance implications' of adopting a supply chain orientation?

1.3 Research questions

In order to fill some of the above research gaps, this study addresses the following questions:

1. What is the relationship between the strategic supply chain orientation and Business Adaptiveness?
2. What is the relationship between the structural supply chain orientation and Business Adaptiveness
3. What the relationship between Strategic SCO and value Co-creation?
4. What the relationship between structural SCO and value Co-creation
5. Strategic SCO Is it effect on Structural SCO in Sudanese manufacturing companies?
6. Do value co-creation effect on Business adaptiveness?
7. Does the Value Co-creation mediate the relationship between Structural supply chain orientation and Business Adaptiveness?
8. Does the Structural supply chain orientation mediate the relationship between strategic supply chain orientation and Business Adaptiveness?
9. Does the Locus of Interaction moderate the relationship between structural supply chain orientation and Value Co-creation?
10. What is the level of strategic supply chain orientation of Sudanese industrial companies?
11. What is the level of structural supply chain orientation of Sudanese industrial companies?
12. What is the level of Business Adaptiveness in Sudanese industrial companies?
13. What the level of value co-creation?
14. What the level of locus of interaction?

1.4 Research Objectives

It will be very beneficial to researchers and practitioners should Supply chain orientation empirically supported have direct effects on Business Adaptiveness

. Therefore, the main objectives of this research are:

1. To examine the Relationship between supply chain strategic orientation and Business Adaptiveness
2. To examine the Relationship between structural supply chain orientation and Business Adaptiveness

3. To Investigate the Relationship between strategic Supply chain Orientation and Value Co-creation
4. To Investigate the Relationship between structural Supply chain Orientation and Value Co-creation.
5. To examine the Relationship between strategic Supply chain orientation and structural.
6. To Test the mediating role of structural Supply chain Orientation on the Relationship between supply chain strategic orientation and business adaptiveness.
7. To Test the mediating role of Value Co-creation on the Relationship between supply chain structural orientation and Business Adaptiveness .
8. To investigate the moderating effect of Locus of Interaction on the relationship between structural Orientation and Value Co-creation .
9. To determin the relationship between Value Co-creation And business adaptiveness?
10. To measure the level of strategic supply chain orientation in Sudanese industrial Companies.
11. To measure the level of structural supply chain orientation in Sudanese industrial Companies.
12. To measure the level of Sudanese industrial Companies Adaptiveness
13. To determine the level of value co-creation
14. To determine the level of locus of interaction

1.5 Significance of the study

This study has both academic and practical values. By using Dynamic Capabilities Theory resource Based View theory and strategic choice theory, and also this study has developing a theoretical model of driver –supply chain- orientation.

1.5.1 Theoretical Contribution

This study is expected to add to the following areas of knowledge about supply chain orientation:

1. This study expands the domains of Strategic supply chain and industrial marketing by integrating an important marketing industrial with Strategic supply chain theory. The findings might stand out the role of SCO as a business philosophy that lead to the adaptability and creating more value to the customers' diverse expectations and achieving superior performance. moreover,

this cross-disciplinary study highlights the importance of SCO concepts to Industrial marketing (Esper et al. 2010).

2. This study also aims to identify key Supply Orientations contributing to Business Adaptiveness. This study thus offers evidence of the critical role of strategic orientations in deploying Business adaptiveness, as well as of their mutual effects. antecedents may be important for understanding how firms respond to adaptiveness challenges and
3. The study will examine mediating effect of structural SCO on the relationship between Strategic SCO and business adaptiveness. This will contribute resource based view by demonstrating how SCO transform into adaptiveness and competitive advantages. Also structural SCO might provide more interpretation to how Strategic SCO resulting business adaptiveness
4. another main contribution of this research is the testing of Value Co-creation as mediator variable on the relationship between Supply chain orientation and Business Adaptiveness. This ought to expand RBV from the point of view of value co-creation and how SCO lead to co-creation of value.
5. The study will clarify the locus of interaction as moderator variable on the relationship between Structural SCO and Business adaptiveness. This might make highlight on RDT theory, This can contribute to knowledge from perspective of RDT on how the relationship between structural supply chain orientation as internal culture and value co-creation require frequent and intense interactions between buyers and suppliers to respond to the fast changing environment.
6. The study may enrich theories from supply chain Orientation (SCO) in under developing countries perspective.
7. The study also valued the theory by using RBV and RDT theory

1.5.2 Practical Contribution

A number of key managerial implications are offered as well from a practical contribution perspective, the study is expected to enhance the knowledge and performance of managers in business in the following ways:

1. The study aim to provide a framework for the relationship of Strategic Supply chain orientation, structural supply chain orientation, value co-creation, and moderating effects of locus of interaction and business adaptiveness of manufacturing companies in Sudan This framework can help as a practical guide for managers by enhancing their understanding of the mechanism of supply chain orientation to result in more adaptability .
2. the study can advance manager’s understanding about the importance of supply chain orientationto Business Adaptiveness.
3. The results of this study are expected to help managers of industrial firms to recognize the importance of Value Co-creationin enhancing Business Adaptiveness.
4. The results of this study are expected to help managers of industrial firms to recognize the Role of Supply chain orientation on Creating Value of the Business.

1.6 Operationalization Definition

Table 1.1 Operationalization Definition

Term	Definition	Sources
Supply chain orientation	organization’s ability to build and maintain philosophy (Top Management support, Organizational Compatibility ,commitment) and Structural behavior(Cooperative Norms, Benevolence, Creditability) and that supports relationships with supply chain partners	(Esper et al. 2010; Min &Mentzer, 2004)
Organizational Compatibility	Objectives consistent with supply chain members; sharing similar philosophy with supply chain members	(Robinson,2014
Top management support	Top management attitudes to adaptation to SCM; long-term relationship with supply chain members; sharing information, risks and rewards with supply chain members; offering education opportunities about SCM	Patel, Azadegan, Ellram,,2013
Commitment	Being patient with supply chain members ;being protective to outsiders	Min <i>etal.</i> (2007)
Structural	A shared value and belief system with the appropriate behavioural norms needed inside the firm to strategically manage the firm’s supply chain	
Cooperative norms	Willingness to make cooperative changes; working together for success	Woo (2010)
Credibility	Being reliable; being knowledgeable;openness; not making false claims	Woo (2010)

Benevolence	Being concerned about welfare; mutual understanding; being dependent on supply chain members' support	Woo (2010)
value. Co-creation	process that includes actions by both the supplier and customer of reciprocal knowledge exchange	(Frow& Payne,2011).
Marketing Adaptiveness	the firm's ability to identify and capitalize on emerging marketing opportunities its ability to align internal resources with external demand	Nyuur, Simintiras 2016 , Mohsen and Eng 2016
Operational adaptiveness	respond to new situations and unexpected challenges by making quick, effective changes in how they are organized and operated.	
Strategic adaptiveness	the firm's ability to align internal resources and capabilities with over external change	Homburg,p.workman,Jensen 2002-Karri ,2001
Locus of interaction	The soft mechanisms and power that govern the relationship	Zhang, 2010

1.7 STRUCTURE OF THIS THESIS

This thesis consists of Six chapters .chapter One Introduction Construct from(Introduction, Statement of the problem, Questions, Objectives, Significance of the study). Chapter 2 provides a structured literature review of general This review classifies and analyses literature published on Supply Chain Orientation, Business adaptiveness, value Co-creation, and locus of Interaction.

Chapter 3 reviews will present the research framework and the hypotheses that will test ,the section in methodology highlights the sampling procedures ,the measurements of variables , the development of research instrument , the administration of data collection , and the statistical techniques that used

Chapter 4 contains research methodology, Population and sample of the study, designing questionnaire, pretest and variables measurement and Data Analysis Techniques

Chapter 5 presentsa analysis of the collected data from the survey and the presentations of the results

The study ends with Chapter Six that provides discussion of research implications, managerial insights, and directions for future research. The literature review is the focus of next chapter.

Summary of the chapter

The chapter present the phenomena under the study, problem statement, research questions, research objectives, theoretical and practical contribution, operationalization definition of terms, these structure

The following chapter consist the literature review of the study.