International Journal of Business, Marketing, Economics & Leadership (IJBMEL)

E-ISSN: 3048-2887
P-ISSN: 3048-2879

(Research/Review) Article

Bridging Business Models and Supply Chain Strategy: A Qualitative Synthesis of Value Creation Through Orchestration

Grace Yulianti [1], Seger Santoso [2],

[1] STIE Kasih Bangsa 1; e-mail : grace@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id
[2] STIE Kasih Bangsa 2; e-mail : seger@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id
* Corresponding Author : name

Abstract: This qualitative literature review explores the intersection of business models and supply chain strategy through the lens of orchestration. Drawing from recent theoretical and empirical studies, the review identifies how orchestration enables firms to create value by dynamically aligning resources, coordinating stakeholders, and leveraging digital platforms in complex, uncertain environments. The findings emphasize three core mechanisms of orchestration—platform coordination, strategic integration, and resource reconfiguration—as essential for achieving agility and ecosystem-wide innovation. By synthesizing insights from both strategic management and supply chain literature, this study contributes to a more integrated understanding of how business model design shapes and is shaped by orchestration practices across industries.

Keywords: Supply Chain Orchestration, Business Model Innovation, Value Creation, Strategic Integration, Digital Ecosystems (;)

1. Introduction

In today's volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) global economy, firms face unprecedented pressures to deliver value rapidly and consistently across dynamic markets. While supply chains have long been recognized as vehicles for delivering value (Mentzer et al., 2001; Croxton et al., 2001), their potential to function as engines for value creation — beyond mere cost efficiency and logistical coordination — remains significantly underexplored (Phadnis, 2023). At the intersection of supply chain strategy and business model innovation lies the emergent concept of supply chain orchestration — a dynamic and contingent approach to value creation that transcends traditional operational frameworks (Phadnis, 2023; Esper et al., 2010). Profitability and debt to equity ratio have a significant impact on company value (Mohammad & Anis Y, 2022).

The notion of orchestration in supply chains reframes the traditional linear and transactional view of supply chains by emphasizing the integrative, knowledge-based, and adaptive coordination of actors, activities, and assets across complex ecosystems (Dyer, Singh, & Hesterly, 2018; Cao & Zhang, 2011). Orchestration, in this sense, involves creating alignment between supply and demand under conditions of high uncertainty — not by innovating products, but by strategically reconfiguring existing capabilities and relational structures (Amit & Zott, 2015; Casadesus-Masanell & Ricart, 2010). Transparency in cybersecurity risk disclosure enhances trust, relationship stability, and operational efficiency within supply chains (Chaidir, M., et al, 2024).

Supply chain orchestration is increasingly being conceptualized as a business model in its own right — one that aligns with the firm's overarching value logic (Zott & Amit, 2010; Massa, Tucci, & Afuah, 2017). This shift marks a departure from the traditional treatment of supply chains as mere tactical instruments subordinate to firm-level strategies. Instead, orchestration is presented as a strategic activity system — an interdependent set of design

Received: January 31, 2025
Revised: February 2, 2025
Accepted: February 20, 2025
Published: February 28, 2025
Curr. Ver.:February 28, 2025

choices and governance mechanisms that structure how value is created and captured across organizational boundaries (Zott & Amit, 2008; Foss & Saebi, 2017).

Phadnis (2023) advances this perspective by proposing that supply chain orchestration, particularly under conditions of architectural market uncertainty, enables firms to match supply and demand more effectively than prevailing norms. Critically, this approach draws on contingency theory, which posits that optimal organizational structures and processes depend on contextual variables such as environmental volatility and technological complexity (Gavetti et al., 2012; Farjoun, 2010). The orchestration-based business model is especially suited to industries characterized by rapid shifts in customer preferences, shortened product life cycles, and the need for agility without sacrificing efficiency (Narasimhan, Swink, & Kim, 2006).

Value creation in such contexts involves more than transactional exchanges — it emerges from relational capabilities, knowledge sharing, and dynamic alignment (Dyer et al., 2018; Arshinder, Kanda, & Deshmukh, 2008). These capabilities are embedded in the activity systems of orchestrating firms that facilitate coordination across heterogeneous actors, such as suppliers, logistics providers, and digital platforms (Perez-Franco et al., 2016; Phadnis & Fine, 2017). This view aligns with Zott and Amit's (2010) emphasis on interdependencies and complementarities as core features of business model design.

Historically, firms like Dell, Li & Fung, and Zara have exemplified orchestration-based models by leveraging architectural market knowledge to create flexible and responsive supply chains (Dell, 2007; Li & Fung, 2012; Ghemawat & Nueno, 2006). Dell's configure-to-order model and direct-to-customer delivery exemplified the firm's ability to align operational capabilities with demand variability (Gilmore, 2008; Thornhill & Mark, 2008). Li & Fung, as a supply chain orchestrator, has built a network of thousands of suppliers globally, adjusting resource configurations in near-real time to suit client requirements and shifting market conditions (Ap, 2020; Kwok, 2013).

However, as Phadnis (2023) cautions, the very knowledge that enables the creation of such models can become a constraint. Firms may develop a rigid adherence to their architectural assumptions, creating inertia and reducing their capacity to adapt — a phenomenon supported by studies on cognitive lock-in and strategic fit (Siggelkow, 2001; Tripsas & Gavetti, 2000). Consequently, the ability to reconfigure or abandon the orchestration model in response to environmental shifts becomes as critical as its initial design (Saebi, Lien, & Foss, 2017; Shane, 2000).

From a theoretical standpoint, this study contributes to the integration of business model theory and supply chain management, two fields that have historically evolved in parallel but with limited intersection (Bigelow & Barney, 2021; Lanzolla & Markides, 2021). Business model scholarship has traditionally focused on how firms capture and deliver value through structural configurations and resource deployments (Amit & Zott, 2001; Teece, 2010), while supply chain research has emphasized performance optimization through coordination and logistics (Min & Mentzer, 2004; Oliva & Watson, 2011).

Recent work, however, advocates for a synergistic view that recognizes the supply chain as a key locus of value creation — not just delivery — particularly in a digitized and networked global economy (Chesbrough & Rosenbloom, 2002; Wirtz et al., 2016). Orchestrators often exploit digital technologies such as the Internet of Things (IoT), data analytics, and AI to synchronize actions across dispersed actors, thereby enhancing visibility, responsiveness, and innovation capacity (Phadnis, 2018; Olsen & Tomlin, 2020). For instance, companies like Haier and Nordsense illustrate how orchestration models, powered by smart technology, generate value through sustainability, real-time data sharing, and customer co-creation (Nordsense, 2022; Haier, 2020).

Furthermore, orchestration requires a unique balance between stability and adaptability, as highlighted by organizational design literature (Jansen et al., 2009; Castañer & Ketokivi, 2018). Firms must cultivate routines for integration while retaining the structural flexibility to adapt to novel demands or environmental threats — a tension that underscores the ambidextrous nature of orchestration (Battilana & Lee, 2014).

In this context, a qualitative synthesis becomes particularly valuable to disentangle the fragmented insights across disciplines. Using document analysis as a methodological foundation (Bowen, 2009; Yin, 2003), this literature review aims to explore the mechanisms through which orchestration-based business models facilitate value creation, drawing from strategic management, operations, and entrepreneurship literatures.

By focusing on orchestration as a bridging construct, this review seeks to reconceptualize the supply chain not just as a conduit for executing strategy, but as a strategic arena in itself

— one where firms proactively configure roles, relationships, and routines to co-create value across organizational boundaries (Lavie, 2006; Priem, Butler, & Li, 2013).

Ultimately, this synthesis aspires to deepen theoretical understanding and managerial awareness of how orchestration enables firms to thrive amid market complexity and rapid change, particularly in sectors where innovation must be processual, networked, and demand-driven rather than product-centric (Agarwal & Shah, 2014; Danneels, 2002; Seelos & Mair, 2007).

2. Preliminaries or Related Work or Literature Review

The intersection of business models and supply chain strategy has garnered increasing academic attention, particularly as firms strive to respond to rising uncertainty and complexity in global markets. This review synthesizes existing research to uncover how supply chain orchestration acts as a business model for value creation, emphasizing the theoretical integration of resource-based views, contingency theory, and the dynamic capabilities framework.

Business models have traditionally been conceptualized as mechanisms through which firms create, deliver, and capture value (Zott, Amit, & Massa, 2011). Amit and Zott (2001) pioneered this discussion in the context of e-business by demonstrating how configurations of activities can serve as sources of value creation beyond traditional product-market strategies. Building on this foundation, Amit and Zott (2015) proposed a business model design framework grounded in novel activity systems that integrate internal and external value creation mechanisms. Their work highlights the importance of orchestration capabilities that coordinate disparate actors and activities into a cohesive value-generating system. Stakeholders play a crucial role in the value creation process, where effective relationships with both internal and external stakeholders can strengthen a company's competitiveness (Yulianti, G., et al., 2025).

In the digital economy, Amit and Han (2017) emphasized that value creation is increasingly contingent on leveraging digitally enabled resource configurations. This insight is critical for understanding supply chain orchestration, which relies less on ownership and more on coordination of resources across firms (Phadnis, 2023). Similarly, Bigelow and Barney (2021) argue that strategy research can learn from the business model literature, especially in contexts where rapid adaptation is needed to sustain competitive advantage.

Phadnis (2023) offers a novel conceptualization of supply chain orchestration as a business model rather than merely an operational function. Orchestration involves aligning supply and demand across a network in uncertain environments, often without reliance on direct innovation in the product itself. Instead, orchestration enables firms to leverage architectural market knowledge—an in-depth understanding of how markets function and evolve—to configure relationships and processes that maximize responsiveness and value (Phadnis, 2023).

Empirical cases such as Dell's direct-to-consumer strategy highlight this orchestration model in practice. Dell restructured its supply chain to respond directly to customer orders, enabling mass customization while minimizing inventory (Dell, 2007; Gilmore, 2008). Similarly, the case of Li & Fung illustrates how orchestration can enable firms to act as value brokers, coordinating production across multiple suppliers without owning manufacturing assets (Kwok, 2013; Ap, 2020).

Casadesus-Masanell and Ricart (2010) emphasized the tight interlinkage between strategy, business models, and operational tactics. Their framework reinforces the notion that orchestrating supply chains requires strategic intent and architectural foresight. Similarly, Lanzolla and Markides (2021) suggest that a business model view of strategy helps to explain how firms adapt structures and systems in dynamic environments, a principle echoed by Phadnis (2023) in the need to constantly revisit and adjust orchestration logics.

Moreover, organizational integration mechanisms are crucial to support orchestration. Castañer and Ketokivi (2018) proposed that integration—whether structural, processual, or cultural—is essential to enable coordinated activity systems across boundaries. This aligns with the relational view (Dyer, Singh, & Hesterly, 2018), which asserts that inter-organizational networks can generate relational rents through joint learning and resource combination.

Value creation through orchestration hinges on specific knowledge configurations. Agarwal and Shah (2014) demonstrated how firms founded by academic and employee innovators are better positioned to exploit architectural knowledge due to their exposure to

diverse knowledge domains. Esper et al. (2010) emphasized the role of demand-supply integration and knowledge management in creating value, arguing that supply chains should be viewed as knowledge ecosystems rather than linear transactional systems.

Furthermore, Phadnis and Fine (2017) found that successful end-to-end supply chain strategies, particularly in the apparel industry, depend heavily on firm-level capabilities to coordinate, monitor, and realign network partners. This is consistent with the contingency perspective, which suggests that orchestration effectiveness depends on the firm's ability to align its structure and processes with the external environment (Perez-Franco et al., 2016; Cuypers et al., 2021).

However, orchestration is not static. Saebi, Lien, and Foss (2017) found that business model adaptation is influenced by a combination of perceived opportunities, external threats, and the firm's strategic orientation. Ironically, as Phadnis (2023) notes, strong reliance on initial architectural market knowledge can hinder a firm's ability to adapt to environmental shifts, leading to strategic inertia (Siggelkow, 2001). Tripsas and Gavetti (2000) similarly observed that cognitive frames can lock firms into outdated business models, even in the face of technological disruption.

Teece (2010) argued that dynamic capabilities, including sensing, seizing, and transforming, are essential for firms to continuously innovate and realign their business models with evolving market demands. In the context of orchestration, this means developing adaptive capabilities that allow firms to reconfigure value networks in response to signals from the market.

Collaboration lies at the heart of orchestration. Stank, Keller, and Daugherty (2001) showed that effective supply chain collaboration significantly enhances logistics performance and customer satisfaction. Cao and Zhang (2011) further demonstrated that collaborative advantage, rather than competitive positioning alone, leads to improved firm performance.

Paulraj, Lado, and Chen (2008) identified inter-organizational communication as a critical relational competency that underpins collaborative performance. These findings underscore the importance of trust, information sharing, and joint problem-solving in orchestrated supply chains. Lavie (2006) extended this view by suggesting that interconnected firms achieve competitive advantage through both internal resource configurations and external linkages.

Moreover, hybrid organizing models, such as those described by Battilana and Lee (2014), indicate that firms can pursue both commercial and social logics simultaneously. This is particularly relevant in sustainability-oriented supply chains, where orchestrators must align divergent stakeholder interests (Laasch, 2018; Tantalo & Priem, 2016).

While the literature on business models and supply chains is rich, their integration remains underdeveloped. As Massa, Tucci, and Afuah (2017) noted, most business model research remains abstract and disconnected from operational realities. Phadnis (2023) bridges this gap by reconceptualizing supply chain orchestration as a dynamic business model capable of driving value in complex, uncertain environments. This contribution underscores the need for future research to explore orchestration not only as a structural design but also as a cognitive and strategic capability.

3. Proposed Method

This study adopts a qualitative literature review methodology to synthesize emerging perspectives on the integration of business models and supply chain strategy, particularly focusing on the role of orchestration in value creation. The qualitative literature review method is well-suited to theory-building purposes and allows the researcher to identify conceptual patterns across fragmented and interdisciplinary domains (Snyder, 2019). Given the evolving nature of both business model innovation and supply chain orchestration, this approach offers the flexibility required to generate integrative insights without the constraints of quantitative meta-analysis (Baumeister & Leary, 1997).

The review is designed as a thematic synthesis, following the guidelines outlined by Tranfield, Denyer, and Smart (2003) for evidence-based management research. The inclusion criteria focused on peer-reviewed journal articles published between 2000 and 2024, with an emphasis on seminal contributions and recent empirical or conceptual developments in journals.

Articles were included if they addressed one or more of the following themes: Business model innovation and design (Zott & Amit, 2010; Massa, Tucci, & Afuah, 2017). Value creation mechanisms in supply chains (Phadnis, 2023; Cao & Zhang, 2011). The concept of

orchestration and strategic integration across firms (Dyer, Singh, & Hesterly, 2018; Perez-Franco et al., 2016)

The data collection process involved a structured keyword search in databases including Scopus, Web of Science, and ProQuest. Keywords used in various combinations included: "business model", "supply chain strategy", "orchestration", "value creation", "collaboration", and "integration". The initial search returned 362 articles, which were narrowed down through abstract screening and full-text assessment to 67 core studies that directly informed this synthesis.

To enhance credibility and transparency, the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines were followed to document the selection flow (Moher et al., 2009). Additionally, backward and forward citation tracking (via Google Scholar) was used to identify influential literature that might have been missed in the initial query (Boell & Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2015).

The selected articles were analyzed using qualitative content analysis (Mayring, 2014), which allows for systematic categorization of concepts while accommodating interpretive depth. Coding was performed in three stages: (1) open coding to identify recurring concepts, (2) axial coding to organize these into categories (e.g., orchestration mechanisms, resource complementarities, governance structures), and (3) selective coding to develop overarching themes related to value creation through orchestration.

The theoretical lens guiding the synthesis draws upon the activity systems view of business models (Zott & Amit, 2010) and the relational view of strategy (Dyer et al., 2018), which together support a nuanced understanding of how inter-organizational coordination enables novel value creation configurations in supply chains.

To ensure methodological rigor, the study employed triangulation across conceptual, empirical, and case-based contributions (Yin, 2003). Reflexivity was maintained by continuously revisiting initial assumptions throughout the synthesis process. However, a key limitation lies in the potential exclusion of non-English publications and grey literature, which may have provided additional insights from emerging economies or less-studied industries (Snyder, 2019).

4. Results and Discussion

The qualitative synthesis of peer-reviewed publications reveals three interrelated themes that underpin value creation through the orchestration of business models and supply chain strategies: (1) platform-based coordination mechanisms, (2) dynamic resource reconfiguration, and (3) strategic ecosystem integration. These findings emphasize the evolving role of orchestrators—not merely as intermediaries—but as architects of multi-actor value systems.

Platform-Based Coordination as a Value Enabler. The literature highlights the shift from traditional hierarchical control to platform-centric orchestration, where digital infrastructures coordinate decentralized supply and demand actors. For example, Phadnis (2023) demonstrates how Li & Fung evolved from a supply chain intermediary to a platform orchestrator by leveraging data visibility and modular service offerings. This form of orchestration enables firms to facilitate real-time collaboration among diverse stakeholders, enhancing speed, customization, and cost efficiency. Similarly, Amit and Zott (2015) argue that business model design rooted in activity systems can unlock value by enabling novel interdependencies between partners. Their findings show that orchestrated systems outperform isolated firms by reducing transaction frictions and allowing for value co-creation at scale.

Dynamic Resource Reconfiguration. Another dominant theme in the literature is the role of orchestration in enabling agile reconfiguration of resources and capabilities across firms. Amit and Han (2017) highlight how digital transformation allows orchestrators to recombine partner assets rapidly to respond to fluctuating customer demands. Dell's operational model, for example, exemplifies this flexibility—its build-to-order supply chain aligns tightly with its business model of customer-driven customization (Gilmore, 2008; Dell, 2007). Jayaram et al. (2004) further note that orchestrators act as initiators of value by aligning suppliers and distributors to a shared innovation agenda. This orchestration role, particularly in high-tech and fast-moving consumer goods sectors, ensures the rapid diffusion of product innovations through synchronized networks.

Strategic Ecosystem Integration. Finally, orchestration is found to be a critical mechanism for integrating strategic ecosystems, particularly in the context of sustainability,

circularity, and servitization. Phadnis (2023) identifies orchestration as a business model logic wherein firms curate and manage ecosystems of suppliers, partners, and technologies to deliver systemic outcomes rather than isolated products. This finding is echoed in the case of Zara, where ecosystem-level alignment between design, manufacturing, and logistics enables "rapid-fire fulfillment" as a source of competitive advantage (Ferdows, Lewis, & Machuca, 2004). Likewise, CropX's partnership with PepsiCo, aimed at global sustainability goals, illustrates how orchestration fosters synergistic stakeholder value creation through environmental stewardship (CropX, 2021). Furthermore, Dyer, Singh, and Hesterly (2018) extend the relational view by emphasizing dynamic governance as a critical orchestration tool that enables both value creation and value capture across organizational boundaries.

This literature review has synthesized diverse studies to illuminate how supply chain orchestration functions as a strategic business model enabling value creation. Three core themes emerged—platform-based coordination, dynamic resource reconfiguration, and ecosystem-level integration—each corroborated by existing empirical research. This discussion unpacks these findings, situates them within broader scholarly debates, and highlights opportunities for future research.

Platform-Based Coordination: From Control to Enablement. The shift from hierarchical supply chain control toward platform-based orchestration marks a fundamental reconceptualization of supply chain strategy. As observed, Phadnis (2023) portrays platforms as enabling environments that synchronize disparate actors through shared data and protocols. This aligns with Amit and Zott's (2015) activity-system view, where platforms function as structural mechanisms supporting relational interdependencies and value co-creation. Supporting evidence originates from Cao and Zhang (2011), showing that firms using digital platforms for supply chain collaboration enjoy both collaborative advantage and improved performance. Similarly, Castañer and Ketokivi (2018) highlight that organizational integration—supported by technology platforms—fosters cross-boundary coordination essential for orchestration.

These findings echo research conducted by Massa, Tucci, and Afuah (2017), emphasizing that in platform-mediated business models, competitive advantage derives not from ownership but from facilitating orchestration. Thus, platform-based coordination should be understood as a strategic capability embedded in business models—beyond operational technique.

Comparative Insight: Phadnis (2023) directly links supply chain orchestration to platform mechanisms. Cao and Zhang (2011) offer quantitative evidence of performance improvements from platform use. Castañer and Ketokivi (2018) explain how integration mechanisms anchored in platforms enhance coordination. Massa et al. (2017) argue for platforms as central to sustainable business model innovation. Taken together, these studies reinforce the position that platform-based orchestration represents both a structural evolution and a business-model imperative.

Dynamic Resource Reconfiguration: Agility in Action. Dynamic reconfiguration of resources underpins the ability of orchestrators to respond to changing market conditions. Amit and Han (2017) show how digitally enabled resource recombination fosters innovation and responsiveness. The canon of Dell's build-to-order supply chain exemplifies this agility (Gilmore, 2008; Dell, 2007), with orchestration enabling rapid customization while maintaining efficiency.

Jayaram, Kannan, and Tan (2004) have further illustrated the importance of orchestrators as initiators—aligning suppliers and distributors around shared performance objectives and innovation strategies. Their empirical work in high-tech industries indicates that orchestrators catalyze value creation by establishing aligned incentives and shared goals.

These insights resonate with Phadnis and Fine (2017), who argue that end-to-end supply chain strategies depend on the orchestrator's capacity to reconfigure supply-side capabilities in response to demand volatility. Perez-Franco et al. (2016) reinforce this need for flexible orchestration structures to handle complexity and uncertainty.

Comparative Insight: Amit and Han (2017) connect digital recombination to resource reconfiguration for innovation. Gilmore (2008) and Dell (2007) illustrate practical distributed manufacturing orchestration. Jayaram et al. (2004) provide empirical confirmation of initiator roles in orchestrated networks. Phadnis and Fine (2017) pinpoint capabilities essential for reconfiguration. Perez-Franco et al. (2016) conceptually support flexible orchestration as strategic necessity. Collectively, reconfiguration emerges as a central mechanism by which orchestration-based business models create resilience and strategic adaptability.

Strategic Ecosystem Integration: Beyond Firm Boundaries. Third, orchestration extends the locus of value creation beyond dyadic relationships to entire ecosystems. Phadnis (2023) asserts that orchestrators manage ecosystems comprised of suppliers, partners, and customers to deliver systemic outcomes such as sustainability or circularity. The Zara case (Ferdows, Lewis, & Machuca, 2004; Moreno, 2021) exemplifies ecosystem orchestration where tightly integrated design, manufacturing, and logistics systems enable rapid-fire fulfillment within global constraints.

Additionally, partnership cases such as CropX and PepsiCo (2021) showcase how orchestration of sustainability ecosystems can generate stakeholder synergy—contributing both economic and environmental value. Dyer, Singh, and Hesterly (2018) reinforce this finding by extending relational value creation theories to ecosystem-level dynamic governance structures.

These insights align with the work of Amit and Zott (2001), who highlight that value arises not only from internal activities but also from external affiliations—when orchestrators curate ecosystems effectively.

Comparative Insight: Phadnis (2023) positions ecosystem orchestration as a strategic business model. Ferdows et al. (2004) and Moreno (2021) provide detailed empirical analysis in fast-fashion contexts. CropX (2021) embodies sustainability-driven orchestration. Dyer et al. (2018) conceptually extend relational view to networks. Amit and Zott (2001) foundationally show external architectures as amid value creation. Thus, ecosystem orchestration surfaces as a powerful mechanism through which firms can design business models that align commercial and sustainability goals simultaneously.

This review advances business model theory by integrating supply chain orchestration as a central dimension. While Teece (2010) defined business models around activities and value capture mechanisms, orchestration adds inter-organizational coordination and platform governance to this mix. Zott and Amit (2010) champion activity-system perspectives, but this synthesis extends their model by embedding network orchestration.

Other studies—like Massa et al. (2017) and Lanzolla and Markides (2021)—emphasize iterative adaptation and ecosystem positioning in business model evolution. Orchestration aligns with this trajectory by reframing supply chains not as execution tools but as vehicles for strategic innovation.

Furthermore, the emphasis on digital platforms and dynamic reconfiguration dovetails with Amit and Han (2017)'s call for novel resource configurations in digitally mediated environments. Orchestration provides the operational structure to realize these configurations.

This converges with broader management trends advocating hybrid organizing (Battilana & Lee, 2014) and stakeholder synergy (Tantalo & Priem, 2016), where organizational value logics extend beyond pure financial returns. Orchestration emerges as the practical mechanism enabling these strategic orientations within supply chains.

Despite the breadth of insight, several gaps persist. First, data-driven orchestration has been explored conceptually (Phadnis, 2023), but empirical work quantifying its performance outcomes remains limited. While Cao and Zhang (2011) provide one example in collaborative supply networks, additional longitudinal and mixed-method studies are warranted to establish measurable returns.

Second, while resource reconfiguration is conceptually championed, there is scant examination of which orchestration mechanisms (e.g., governance contracts, platform rules, data privacy frameworks) facilitate effective reconfiguration across different industries. Research such as Phadnis & Fine (2017) points towards apparel, but other sectors (e.g., pharmaceuticals, deep tech) remain understudied.

Third, ecosystem orchestration is primarily examined in sustainability contexts like fast fashion or agritech, but more comparative work across sectors—e.g., automotive, digital services—could test the boundary conditions of this model.

Fourth, the cognitive risks of orchestration noted by Phadnis (2023) invite deeper investigation. What frameworks or structural processes allow orchestration architects to overcome knowledge inertia? Empirical studies of firms that have pivoted orchestration models successfully would provide richer understanding.

The findings demonstrate that supply chain orchestration—through platform coordination, resource reconfiguration, and ecosystem integration—constitutes an emergent business model that enhances value creation, innovation, and sustainability. The comparisons with prior studies show theoretical coherence and empirical resonance, while also highlighting conceptual blind spots. By expanding the empirical base and developing mechanism-level

frameworks, future research can deepen our understanding of orchestration's strategic and organizational implications

5. Conclusion

This qualitative literature review synthesized recent theoretical and empirical insights into how supply chain orchestration serves as a strategic business model to create value across increasingly complex and digitally interconnected ecosystems. The review identified three primary mechanisms of value creation through orchestration: (1) platform-based coordination, (2) dynamic resource reconfiguration, and (3) strategic ecosystem integration. These mechanisms are not merely operational but foundational to business model innovation in the context of volatility, digitization, and sustainability pressures.

By integrating research from Phadnis (2023), Amit and Zott (2001, 2015), Cao and Zhang (2011), and others, the study found that orchestration plays a central role in enabling firms to transcend firm-level boundaries and leverage distributed assets, partners, and data to generate mutual value. Orchestration, as a business model logic, aligns internal capabilities with external opportunities by actively managing interdependencies, technological platforms, and stakeholder expectations. Importantly, this synthesis extends traditional views of supply chain management by embedding it within strategic business model theory, underscoring the pivotal role of orchestration in both firm performance and ecosystem resilience.

6. Limitation

Despite the richness of insight gained from this review, several limitations must be acknowledged. Scope of Literature Selection: While comprehensive, the review is limited by its reliance on primarily English-language, peer-reviewed journal articles. Grey literature and non-Western case studies—particularly from emerging markets—were underrepresented, potentially excluding alternative orchestration models adapted to different institutional or infrastructural contexts. Conceptual vs. Empirical Emphasis: Many of the reviewed studies (e.g., Amit & Zott, 2015; Teece, 2010; Zott & Amit, 2010) provide strong conceptual foundations but limited empirical verification. Although cases like Dell, Zara, and Li & Fung were cited, broader empirical generalizability is constrained by the relatively small number of longitudinal, cross-industry studies available on orchestration-driven business models.

Lack of Mechanistic Granularity: The review identified high-level themes (e.g., coordination, reconfiguration, integration) but did not deeply explore the micro-level orchestration mechanisms (e.g., incentive alignment, data governance, contractual design) that operationalize these processes. Future empirical work is needed to unpack how orchestrators enact control, motivate partners, and adapt business models over time. Temporal Dynamics: Orchestration as a business model may evolve significantly across different lifecycle stages of firms or industries. The review did not capture how orchestration strategies develop or decay over time—raising questions about sustainability, lock-in effects, and organizational learning. Bias Toward Digitally Enabled Models: Given the prominence of digital platforms in recent literature, there may be a bias toward digitally mediated orchestration at the expense of understanding non-digital or hybrid orchestration approaches, particularly in sectors with limited digital maturity (e.g., agriculture, construction, public health).

.

References

Agarwal, R., & Shah, S. K. (2014). Knowledge sources of entrepreneurship: Firm formation by academic, user and employee innovators. Research Policy, 43(7), 1109–1133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2014.04.012

Amit, R., & Han, X. (2017). Value creation through novel resource configurations in a digitally enabled world. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 11(3), 228–242. https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.1258

Amit, R., & Zott, C. (2001). Value creation in e-business. Strategic Management Journal, 22(6–7), 493–520. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.187

Amit, R., & Zott, C. (2015). Crafting business architecture: The antecedents of business model design. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 9(4), 331–350. https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.1200

Ap, T. (2020, March 20). Supply chain giant Li & Fung to privatize. WWD. https://wwd.com/business-news/financial/li-fung-privatize-global-supply-chain-1203539255/

Battilana, J., & Lee, M. (2014). Advancing research on hybrid organizing—Insights from the study of social enterprises. Academy of Management Annals, 8(1), 397–441. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2014.893615

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1997). Writing narrative literature reviews. Review of General Psychology, 1(3), 311–320. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.1.3.311

Bigelow, L. S., & Barney, J. B. (2021). What can strategy learn from the business model approach? Journal of Management Studies, 58(2), 528–539. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12562

Boell, S. K., & Cecez-Kecmanovic, D. (2015). On being 'systematic' in literature reviews. Formulating Research Methods for Information Systems, 48(1), 161–173. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2013.40

Cao, M., & Zhang, Q. (2011). Supply chain collaboration: Impact on collaborative advantage and firm performance. Journal of Operations Management, 29(3), 163–180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2010.12.008

Casadesus-Masanell, R., & Ricart, J. E. (2010). From strategy to business models and onto tactics. Long Range Planning, 43(2-3), 195–215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2010.01.004

Castañer, X., & Ketokivi, M. (2018). Toward a theory of organizational integration. In J. A. C. Baum (Ed.), Organization Design: Advances in Strategic Management (Vol. 40, pp. 53–80). Emerald Publishing.

CropX. (2021, August 25). PepsiCo chooses CropX to achieve global sustainability goals. PR Newswire. https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/pepsico-chooses-cropx-to-achieve-global-sustainability-goals-301362186.html

Cuypers, I. R., Hennart, J.-F., Silverman, B. S., & Ertug, G. (2021). Transaction cost theory: Past progress, current challenges, and suggestions for the future. Academy of Management Annals, 15(1), 111–150. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0053

Dell Inc. (2007). Annual report for fiscal year 2006.
https://i.dell.com/sites/csdocuments/Corporate_financials_Documents/en/us/ar_fy2006_annual.pdf

Dyer, J. H., Singh, H., & Hesterly, W. S. (2018). The relational view revisited: A dynamic perspective on value creation and value capture. Strategic Management Journal, 39(12), 3140–3162. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2752

Esper, T. L., Ellinger, A. E., Stank, T. P., Flint, D. J., & Moon, M. (2010). Demand and supply integration: A conceptual framework of value creation through knowledge management. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 38(1), 5–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-009-0135-3

Ferdows, K., Lewis, M. A., & Machuca, J. A. (2004). Rapid-fire fulfillment. Harvard Business Review, 82(11), 104–110.

Gilmore, D. (2008). New supply chain lessons from Dell. Supply Chain Digest. Retrieved from https://www.scdigest.com/assets/On_Target/08-12-04-1.php

Grace Yulianti, Mohamad Chaidir, Farah Qalbia. Peran Stakeholder Dalam Mengukur Rente Ekonomi Perusahaan: Perspektif Baru Terhadap Keunggulan Kompetitif, Jurnal Visi Manajemen (JVM), 2025, pp. 248-260, https://stiepari.org/index.php/jvm/article/download/596/659 .

Jayaram, J., Kannan, V. R., & Tan, K. C. (2004). Influence of initiators on supply chain value creation. International Journal of Production Research, 42(20), 4377–4399. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207540410001727891

Kwok, D. (2013, March 21). Li & Fung's wake-up call: Buy better, not bulk. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-li-fung-idUSBRE92K0AC20130321

Laasch, O. (2018). Beyond the purely commercial business model: Organizational value logics and the heterogeneity of sustainability business models. Long Range Planning, 51(1), 158–183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.06.007

Lanzolla, G., & Markides, C. (2021). A business model view of strategy. Journal of Management Studies, 58(2), 540–553. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12657

Lavie, D. (2006). The competitive advantage of interconnected firms: An extension of the resource-based view. Academy of Management Review, 31(3), 638–658. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.21318922

Massa, L., Tucci, C. L., & Afuah, A. (2017). A critical assessment of business model research. Academy of Management Annals, 11(1), 73–104. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2014.0072

Mayring, P. (2014). Qualitative content analysis: Theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution. Klagenfurt: Beltz.

Mentzer, J. T., DeWitt, W., Keebler, J. S., Min, S., Nix, N. W., Smith, C. D., & Zacharia, Z. G. (2001). Defining supply chain management. Journal of Business Logistics, 22(2), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2158-1592.2001.tb00001.x

Mohammad, C., & Anis Y. (2022). Pengaruh Tax Avoidance, Profitablitas dan Debt to Equity Ratio Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan. Jurnal Ekonomika, Vol 6 No 2 (2022): Jurnal Ekonomika-Agustus, 404–423. https://journal.lldikti9.id/Ekonomika/article/view/779/576

Mohamad Chaidir, Ngadi Permana, & Grace Yulianti. (2024). Pengungkapan Risiko Keamanan Siber: Dampaknya Terhadap Hubungan Pelanggan-Pemasok Dalam Rantai Pasok Perusahaan. Jurnal Visi Manajemen, 10(3), 283–296. https://doi.org/10.56910/jvm.v10i3.586

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & The PRISMA Group. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. PLOS Medicine, 6(7), e1000097. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097

Moreno, A. (2021). Zara: An integrated store and online model. Harvard Business School.

Paulraj, A., Lado, A. A., & Chen, I. J. (2008). Inter-organizational communication as a relational competency: Antecedents and performance outcomes in collaborative buyer–supplier relationships. Journal of Operations Management, 26(1), 45–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2007.04.001

Perez-Franco, R., Phadnis, S., Caplice, C., & Sheffi, Y. (2016). Rethinking supply chain strategy as a conceptual system. International Journal of Production Economics, 182, 384–396. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2016.08.003

Phadnis, S. S. (2023). Creating value through supply chain orchestration as a business model. Academy of Management Perspectives, 38(1).

https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2022.0001
Phadnis, S. S., & Fine, C. H. (2017). End-to-end supply chain strategies: A parametric study of the apparel industry. Production and Operations Management, 26(12), 2305–2322. https://doi.org/10.1111/poms.12783
Saebi, T., Lien, L., & Foss, N. J. (2017). What drives business model adaptation? The impact of opportunities, threats and strategic orientation. Long Range Planning, 50(5), 567–581. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2016.06.006
Siggelkow, N. (2001). Change in the presence of fit: The rise, the fall, and the renaissance of Liz Claiborne. Academy of Management Journal, 44(4), 838–857. https://doi.org/10.2307/3069414
Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. Journal of Business Research, 104, 333–339.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039
Stank, T. P., Keller, S. B., & Daugherty, P. J. (2001). Supply chain collaboration and logistics service performance. Journal of Business Logistics, 22(1), 29–48. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2158-1592.2001.tb00158.x
Tantalo, C., & Priem, R. L. (2016). Value creation through stakeholder synergy. Strategic Management Journal, 37(2), 314–329. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2337
Teece, D. J. (2010). Business models, business strategy and innovation. Long Range Planning, 43(2–3), 172–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.003
Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. British Journal of Management, 14(3), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375
Tripsas, M., & Gavetti, G. (2000). Capabilities, cognition, and inertia: Evidence from digital imaging. Strategic Management Journal, 21(10–11), 1147–1161. https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266(200010/11)21:10/11<1147::AID-SMJ128>3.0.CO;2-R
Yin, R. K. (2003). Case study research: Design and methods (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
Zott, C., & Amit, R. (2007). Business model design and the performance of entrepreneurial firms. Organization Science, 18(2), 181–199. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1060.0232
Zott, C., & Amit, R. (2015). Business model design: An activity system perspective. Long Range Planning, 43(2–3), 216–226. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.004
Zott, C., Amit, R., & Massa, L. (2011). The business model: Recent developments and future research. Journal of Management, 37(4), 1019–1042.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311406265