
Guest editorial: Transforming operations, people and processes for a better world: towards a humanistic paradigm shift in operations and supply chain management?

International
Journal of
Operations &
Production
Management

553

1. Introduction

According to the [World Economic Forum \(2024, 2025\)](#), the most critical global risks today arise from geopolitical conflict, climate change, technological disruption and social fragmentation. These risks are interconnected and produce systemic vulnerabilities that challenge the traditional models of operations and supply chain management (SCM). Management systems designed for stable environments fail under conditions of complexity and uncertainty. They need to be adaptive and aligned with both organizational decision logics and the external environmental, particularly in contexts characterized by uncertainty and ambiguity ([Alexander et al., 2018](#)). In light of the current context, it is imperative that we, as operations and SCM researchers, actively engage in comprehending and addressing these issues to rebuild trust, long-term resilience and prosperity for humanity.

Recognizing that this context requires a social transformation based on novel approaches, processes and behaviours, we invited operations and SCM researchers to embark on research that considers how to transform operations, technology, processes, people and relationships. The theme of the EurOMA 2024 conference was “Transforming people and processes for a better world”. Two key dimensions in this theme are (1) the role of technology in the transformation of people and processes and (2) the role of operations and SCM to build a better world.

The rapid diffusion of digital technologies associated with Industry 4.0, such as artificial intelligence, blockchain, advanced analytics and digital platforms, is profoundly reshaping how we design and manage operations and supply chains. Further research should provide more understanding on the role of technology in the transformation of people and processes and how technology can be more efficiently implemented. Although some authors have explored how artificial intelligence and Industry 4.0 technologies are transforming operations ([Holmström et al., 2019](#); [Mithas et al., 2022](#)), more research is needed to navigate the transformation smoothly ([Calabrese et al., 2022](#)).

Operations and SCM play a critical role in building a better world by shaping how resources are produced and distributed ([Mueller et al., 2020](#)). Through the appropriate production, transportation, recycling and remanufacturing of processes, operations and SCM can contribute to reducing the environmental footprint ([Kleindorfer et al., 2005](#)). Additionally, as operations is one of the areas employing the most personnel and impacting the regional and local communities, operations management can give new opportunities to significantly contribute to social sustainability ([Longoni and Cagliano, 2015](#)). Although there is a substantial body of knowledge on sustainable operations and supply chains, further research is needed, particularly on geographically extended supply chains ([Matos et al., 2024](#); [Wilhelm et al., 2016](#)) and across diverse contexts such as the Base of the Pyramid (BoP) communities ([Lashitew et al., 2022](#)).

Taken together, these developments suggest that the transformation required in operations and SCM is not limited to the adoption of new technologies or sustainability practices. Rather, it involves a deeper reconsideration of the underlying assumptions that guide operational decision-making, governance structures, and performance logics. In the next sections, we



International Journal of Operations &
Production Management
Vol. 46 No. 4, 2026
pp. 553-560
© Emerald Publishing Limited
e-ISSN: 1758-6593
p-ISSN: 0144-3577
DOI 10.1108/IJOPM-04-2026-020

conceptualize this transformation as a potential shift from an economistic paradigm toward a more humanistic paradigm in operations and SCM.

2. Conference themes and the papers in this special issue

The conference program has 540 conference papers spanning a wide range of topics, including, for example, circular and sustainable operations and supply chains; digitalization and information-based operations; innovation and technology management; supply chain risk management; the management of inter-firm relationships in supply chains; healthcare operations management and service operations management and servitisation. Please see [Table 1](#) for the distribution of EurOMA 2024 conference paper per topic. Nevertheless, most contributions are closely aligned with the conference theme. Approximately 27% of the papers focus on circular and sustainable operations and supply chains, including circular economy and social inclusion and environmental management in operations and supply chains. A further 13% cover digitalization and information-based operations (including subjects such as artificial intelligence, big data analytics in operations and SCM, blockchain, digital manufacturing, e-business and operations and information systems in operations management). In addition, 10% concern innovation and technology management. Taken together, these contributions indicate that nearly 23% of the conference papers are concerned with issues related to technology adoption. Supply chain risk management continues to be a relevant topic, with 10% of the conference papers covering this issue. Other papers focus on global operations (7% of the papers) and inter-firm relationships (with another 7%). Around 20% of the papers cover what can be called “foundational” topics in operations: planning, control and performance management (7%), process excellence and continuous improvement (5%), healthcare operations management (5%) and service operations management and servitisation (3%). Finally, other themes such as teaching and learning in operations management (3%) and behavioural operations (2%) are also well represented.

Following the conference, several papers are invited to submit a full journal paper. After the double-blind peer review process, the following ten papers are accepted. The selected papers resonate with the conference theme by addressing the transformation of people and/or processes from the operations and/or SCM perspective to achieve a better world. More specifically, six of them ([Jia et al., 2026](#); [Razak et al., 2026](#); [Ribbink et al., 2026](#); [Schilling et al., 2026](#); [Storsjö et al., 2026](#); [Shu and Di, 2026](#)) focus on circular and sustainable operations and supply chains; three of them on technology adoption ([Kalra and Lewis, 2026](#); [Pan et al.,](#)

Table 1. Distribution of EurOMA 2024 conference papers per topic

Topics	% of papers on this topic
Circular and Sustainable Operations and Supply Chains	27%
Digitalization and Information-Based Operations	13%
Innovation and Technology Management	10%
Supply Chain Risk Management	10%
Managing Inter-firm Relationships in Supply Chains	7%
Global and Networked Operations	7%
Planning, Control, and Performance Management	7%
Process Excellence and Continuous Improvement	5%
Healthcare Operations Management	5%
Service Operations Management and Servitisation	3%
Teaching and Learning in Operations Management	3%
Behavioural Operations	2%

2026; Van Dun *et al.*, 2026) and one of them on managing inter-firm relationships in supply chains (Prajogo *et al.*, 2026).

Jia *et al.*'s (2026) "From the few to the many: scaling up sustainability-oriented supplier development projects" addresses a central challenge in sustainable operations: how sustainability-oriented supplier development (SSD) initiatives can be scaled from pilot projects to entire supply bases. Using a longitudinal case of an occupational health and safety SSD project that expanded from four to over one hundred suppliers, the authors combine actor-network theory with scale-up frameworks from medical science. The study shows that effective scale-up requires integrating mechanistic, complexity-informed and relational approaches. This processual and systemic perspective advances understanding of how sustainability practices become institutionalized across complex global supply networks.

Kalra and Lewis's (2026) "Governance adaptation in technology sourcing: A dynamic problem-solving perspective" examines the evolution of technology outsourcing and governance strategies in response to dynamic technological changes. Drawing on the problem-solving perspective and a longitudinal case study of a European subsidiary of a multinational bank, it investigates how governance structures and sourcing strategies evolve across phases of outsourcing and contract management. This research contributes a novel relational-processual problem-solving perspective on technology sourcing and governance adaptation, emphasizing the iterative alignment of problem complexity, governance and sourcing strategies.

Pan *et al.*'s (2026) "Examining innovation in digital platforms: unveiling the Strategy of Zhongtai" investigates how digital platforms are developed under increasing technological and organizational complexity, with a particular focus on the interplay between product, process and organizational modularity. Drawing on an embedded case study of three AI-powered platforms within a leading Chinese e-commerce conglomerate, the authors theorize the Zhongtai strategy as a dynamic modularization approach that balances stability and flexibility during platform development. The study makes an important theoretical contribution to operations and platform research by moving beyond static views of modularity. It demonstrates how modularity evolves over time in response to rising AI complexity and how organizations deliberately align their structures with platform architectures.

Prajogo *et al.*'s (2026) "The influence of interpersonal relationships on interorganizational relationships in supply chains: The role of loyalty and conflict" examines the influence of both personal loyalty and conflict on interorganizational relationships. Using survey data obtained from 506 managers of Australian small-to-medium-sized enterprises, the authors show that the relationship between asset dedication and the benefits that suppliers derive from customer relationships is mediated by the extent of legal contracts. Additionally, the authors highlight the dual role of personal loyalty in contract formation and contract enforcement, with it strengthening the former and weakening the latter.

Razak *et al.*'s (2026) "African socio-cultural characteristics: enabling or hindering sustainability?" examines how African socio-cultural characteristics shape the implementation of sustainability requirements in global agri-food supply chains, focusing on upstream tiers in Ghana's cocoa and fruit supply chains. Drawing on social agency theory and multi-case qualitative data, the authors explain how the interplay between weak formal institutions and strong informal socio-cultural institutions generates hidden social agency problems that hinder sustainability adoption. It demonstrates that sustainability compliance depends on culturally embedded governance mechanisms, such as community leadership, trust-based engagement and translation of sustainability practices into indigenous norms.

Ribbink *et al.*'s (2026) "Impact of supply chain transparency on the consumption of remanufactured consumer goods" investigates how process and product information regarding the remanufacturing process impacts consumers' intention to purchase remanufactured goods. Based on signalling theory and using a vignette-based experiment, the authors found that information about the length of return has a significant impact on consumers' intention to

purchase the remanufactured good, while who performs the remanufacturing does not impact their decision-making.

[Schilling et al.'s \(2026\)](#) "Informal digital transactions: a path to value creation in base-of-the-pyramid supply chains" challenges the dominant assumption that formal institutional voids in base-of-the-pyramid (BoP) contexts must be filled by formal mechanisms. Using survey data from 197 informal retail businesses in Pakistan, the authors show how digital platforms strengthen informal transactional arrangements to enable value creation.

[Shu and Di's \(2026\)](#) "Fostering workplace safety with a gender-diverse workforce" analyses the relationship between workforce gender diversity and operational safety outcomes. Using panel data from U.S.-listed firms, they show that higher gender diversity is associated with fewer workplace injuries. The paper demonstrates how gender diversity enhances psychological safety, enabling better communication and hazard identification in complex operational environments.

[Storsjö et al.'s \(2026\)](#) "On the grand challenge of forced displacement and how to address European refugee crises" develops a research agenda for addressing the grand challenge of the displacement of people seeking refuge in Europe. Based on a multidisciplinary literature review, secondary data sources, expert interviews, sandpit events, a panel discussion and the authors' field experience, the authors develop three pathways through which the management of service and support systems can contribute to better address this challenge and generate a positive impact for people seeking refuge.

Finally, [Van Dun et al.'s \(2026\)](#) "How leadership enhances absorptive capacity for industry 4.0 technology adoption through social integration mechanisms" describes how leadership dynamically enables social integration mechanisms that shape the adoption of Industry 4.0 technologies. It advances absorptive capacity (AC) theory by examining how leadership behaviours across organizational levels shape the adoption of Industry 4.0 technologies in operational settings. Based on an embedded longitudinal case study of a worker programme in four factories, the authors show how leadership dynamically enables social integration mechanisms that transform potential AC into realized AC.

3. Conceptualization

As highlighted in the Introduction, the challenges facing contemporary operations and SCM may not be fully addressed within existing theoretical assumptions. [Pirson and Lawrence \(2010\)](#) argue that to address the unprecedented challenges that management theory and practice face, it is key to understand the current paradigm and be able to supplant it with a new one. Their suggestion for a new paradigm is in line with Kuhn's (1962) argument that when the dominant paradigm can no longer explain new observations, a "paradigm shift", understood as a revolutionary change in the basic assumptions within a scientific field, is needed. In that sense, the authors propose a humanistic paradigm for the sustainable development of business in the future and contrast this new paradigm with the predominant *homo economicus* paradigm ([Pirson and Lawrence, 2010](#)). In the *homo economicus* paradigm, organizations are designed to fit the profit maximization imperative and are short-term and shareholder oriented. In contrast, in the humanistic paradigm, organizations are designed and managed to achieve financial, social and environmental sustainability and are long-term and stakeholder oriented. [Table 2](#) shows the most relevant assumptions under each paradigm.

If we extrapolate [Pirson and Lawrence's \(2010\)](#) framework to the operations and SCM decisions, three aspects need to be discussed: the underlying governance, the goal orientation and the management logics that shape operational decisions. From a governance perspective, a transactional orientation based on price-driven supplier sourcing in the *homo economicus* paradigm is translated into a more collaborative orientation based on long-term partnerships and responsible sourcing. Similarly, we can also find differences in goal orientation: while economic approaches prioritize cost, time, and efficiency optimization, a more humanistic interpretation adopts multi-criteria optimization that incorporates worker well-being, social

Table 2. Two paradigms: Economism versus Humanism

	Economism	Humanism
<i>Individual level</i>		
Model	Homo economicus	Zoon politikon
Goal	Maximization of utility	Balance of interests
Disposition	Transactional	Relational
<i>Organizational level</i>		
Organization	Nexus of contracts	Social community
Governance	Shareholder oriented	Stakeholder oriented
Leadership style	Transactional	Transformational
Time frame	Short term	Long term
Goal	Profit maximization	Financial, social and environmental sustainability
<i>Operations and SCM</i>		
Governance–Supplier management	Transactional: Price-driven sourcing and aggressive outsourcing	Collaborative: Long-term partnerships and responsible sourcing
Goal–OSCM decision logic	Cost, time, and efficiency optimization; trade-offs resolved financially	Multi-criteria optimization: cost, well-being, social impact, resilience
Management–Inventory and planning models	EOQ	Contextual planning with human and social effects considered
Source(s): Adaptation of Pirson and Lawrence (2010) to include the Operations and SCM perspective		

impact and system resilience alongside cost considerations. At the management level, these contrasting paradigms manifest in inventory and planning models, with traditional EOQ-based approaches prioritizing economic efficiency under the *homo economicus* paradigm, in contrast to contextual planning approaches that explicitly account for human, social and relational effects within supply chains in the humanistic paradigm.

4. Concluding remarks

Returning to the themes emerging from the ten selected papers, we reflect on how they collectively illuminate what it means to transform operations, people and processes in pursuit of a better world. More specifically, three main ideas can be derived that can be understood also as signals of a growing tension between the traditional economic paradigm largely present in current management theory ([Ghoshal, 2005](#); [Pirson and Lawrence, 2010](#)) and an emerging humanistic understanding of operations and SCM, as articulated by [Pirson and Lawrence \(2010\)](#). These three ideas can be summarized as follows and are presented next: (1) *operations in complex environments*, (2) *the role of relational mechanisms* and (3) *operations and SCM as socially and ethically consequential*.

4.1 Operations in complex environments

Operations are increasingly conducted in complex environments, characterized by uncertainty and ambiguity. The papers in this issue collectively challenge the notion of operations as stable, contractually governed and technologically deterministic. Taken together, [Pan et al. \(2026\)](#) and [Kalra and Lewis \(2026\)](#) highlight the importance of iterative and adaptive processes in the adoption of new technologies, showing how flexibility in organizational design and governance enables ongoing alignment between technological complexity and evolving operational contexts. Similarly, together, [Razak et al. \(2026\)](#) and [Schilling et al. \(2026\)](#) demonstrate that effective sustainability and value creation in BoP and informal contexts depend on adaptive and context-sensitive mechanisms that consider informal institutions, socio-cultural norms and relational arrangements.

Highly uncertain and complex environments define the conditions of contemporary operations, challenging the economic paradigm, which assumes relatively stable environments, contractually governed relationships and technologically deterministic systems. Under this type of context, the humanistic paradigm is more appropriate, as it conceptualizes operations and supply chains as open and adaptive social systems in which coordination depends on judgement, trust and contextual understanding. In this sense, transforming processes required transforming the way managers interpret complexity and exercise judgements within evolving technological and institutional environments.

4.2 The role of relational mechanisms

All papers in this issue study operations where formal contracts, rules or technologies alone cannot explain outcomes. Operations are embedded in institutionally incomplete environments where outcomes depend on relational, social and organizational mechanisms. For example, [Van Dun et al. \(2026\)](#) show how leadership dynamically enables social integration mechanisms that shape the adoption of Industry 4.0 technologies in operational settings. [Prajogo et al. \(2026\)](#) examine the influence of both personal loyalty and conflict on interorganizational relationships. [Razak et al. \(2026\)](#) and [Schilling et al. \(2026\)](#) demonstrate that effective sustainability and value creation in BoP and informal contexts depend largely on relational arrangements. [Kalra and Lewis \(2026\)](#) provide a novel relational-processual problem-solving perspective on technology sourcing and governance adaptation, emphasizing the iterative alignment of problem complexity, governance and sourcing strategies.

When formal contracts, rules or technologies alone cannot explain outcomes, this directly contradicts the economic view of organizations as a nexus of contracts coordinated through hierarchical control and incentive alignment. When formal structures fail, outcomes are shaped by informal governance, relational norms, shared values and organizational sensemaking, which are assumptions of the humanistic paradigm. This paradigm views organizations as social communities where effective operations depend on relational coordination and mutual accountability. Thus, transforming people is not limited to skill development but involves reshaping leadership behaviours, relational norms and mechanisms of social integration within and across organizations.

4.3 Operations and SCM as socially and ethically consequential

Operations are not neutral: they actively shape social and ethical outcomes. These studies position operations not only as efficiency-generating systems but also as mechanisms through which firms shape inclusion, safety and sustainability. [Jia et al. \(2026\)](#), [Schilling et al. \(2026\)](#) and [Razak et al. \(2026\)](#) study how to extend sustainability along the supply chain. More specifically, [Jia et al. \(2026\)](#) address how SSD initiatives can be scaled from pilot projects to entire supply bases, whereas [Schilling et al. \(2026\)](#) study how digital platforms enable value creation in BoP contexts and [Razak et al. \(2026\)](#) examine how African socio-cultural characteristics shape the implementation of sustainability requirements in global agri-food supply chains. Three other papers have also considered how to contribute to building a better world: [Shu and Di \(2026\)](#) study the relationship between workforce gender diversity and operational safety outcomes. [Storsjö et al. \(2026\)](#) develop a multidisciplinary transformative research agenda for positive impact for those seeking refuge. [Ribbink et al. \(2026\)](#) investigate how process and product information regarding the remanufacturing process impacts consumers' intention to purchase remanufactured goods. Ultimately, transforming operations also entails recognizing that operational decisions shape societal outcomes and therefore require ethical reflection alongside technical optimization.

The economic paradigm treats operational decisions as technically neutral, with social and environmental consequences considered externalities. In contrast, the recognition that operations actively contribute to sustainable outcomes challenges this assumption and reframes operations management as a field more aligned with a humanistic paradigm.

This special issue highlights an important inflection point for operations and SCM research. Across diverse empirical contexts and theoretical lenses, the selected papers move beyond assumptions of efficiency maximization, stability and contractual control that characterize the economistic paradigm to complexity, relational coordination and the social and ethical consequences of operational decisions, positioning operations and SCM as social systems shaped by human actors, institutions and societal challenges. Thus, resonating more strongly with the humanistic paradigm proposed by [Pirson and Lawrence \(2010\)](#). This pattern suggests that our field may be undergoing a transformation, not only of specific practices or technologies but also of the underlying logic that shape operations, people and processes towards a more humanistic paradigm.

Looking ahead, this special issue points to several promising directions for future research. First, there is a need for more processual, longitudinal and context-sensitive studies that capture how operations evolved in complex and uncertain environments. Second, greater attention should be paid to the relational and informal mechanisms (e.g. leadership, trust and cultural embeddedness) that enable coordination when formal structures are not sufficient. Finally, researchers are encouraged to more explicitly engage with the ethical and social implications of operations and SCM, recognizing their relevant role in shaping sustainable, inclusive and resilient systems.

Overall, the contributions in this special issue not only advance existing debates in the field but also signal a gradual yet meaningful shift in the field. Embracing this humanistic paradigm offers the potential to enhance both the theoretical development and societal relevance of operations and SCM research.

Cristina Giménez-Thomsen and Cristina Sancha

ESADE Business School, Universitat Ramon Llull, Barcelona, Spain

References

- Alexander, A., Kumar, M. and Walker, H. (2018), "A decision theory perspective on complexity in performance measurement and management", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 38 No. 11, pp. 2214-2244, doi: [10.1108/IJOPM-10-2016-0632](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-10-2016-0632).
- Calabrese, A., Dora, M., Ghiron, N.L. and Tiburzi, L. (2022), "'Industry's 4.0 transformation process: how to start, where to aim, what to be aware of'", *Production Planning and Control*, Vol. 33 No. 5, pp. 492-512, doi: [10.1080/09537287.2020.1830315](https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2020.1830315).
- Ghoshal, S. (2005), "Bad management theories are destroying good management practices", *The Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 75-91, doi: [10.5465/AMLE.2005.16132558](https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2005.16132558).
- Holmström, J., Holweg, M., Lawson, B., Pil, F.K. and Wagner, S.M. (2019), "The digitalization of operations and supply chain management: theoretical and methodological implications", *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 65 No. 8, pp. 728-734, doi: [10.1002/joom.1073](https://doi.org/10.1002/joom.1073).
- Jia, M., Stevenson, M., Wilhelm, M. and Hendry, L.C. (2026), "From the few to the many: scaling up sustainability-oriented supplier development projects", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 561-586, doi: [10.1108/IJOPM-11-2024-1018](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-11-2024-1018).
- Kalra, J. and Lewis, M. (2026), "Governance adaptation in technology sourcing: a dynamic problem-solving perspective", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 587-610, doi: [10.1108/IJOPM-12-2024-1023](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-12-2024-1023).
- Kleindorfer, P.R., Singhal, K. and Van Wassenhove, L.N. (2005), "Sustainable operations management", *Production and Operations Management*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 482-492, doi: [10.1111/j.1937-5956.2005.tb00235.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-5956.2005.tb00235.x).
- Lashitew, A.A., Narayan, S., Rosca, E. and Bals, L. (2022), "Creating social value for the 'base of the pyramid': an integrative review and research agenda", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 178 No. 2, pp. 445-466, doi: [10.1007/s10551-020-04710-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04710-2).

- Longoni, A. and Cagliano, R. (2015), "Cross-functional executive involvement and worker involvement in lean manufacturing and sustainability alignment", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 35 No. 9, pp. 1332-1358, doi: [10.1108/IJOPM-02-2015-0113](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-02-2015-0113).
- Matos, S.V., Schleper, M.C., Hall, J.K., Baum, C.M., Low, S. and Sovacool, B.K. (2024), "Beyond the new normal for sustainability: transformative operations and supply chain management for negative emissions", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 44 No. 13, pp. 263-295, doi: [10.1108/IJOPM-06-2024-0487](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-06-2024-0487).
- Mithas, S., Chen, Z.L., Saldanha, T.J. and De Oliveira Silveira, A. (2022), "How will artificial intelligence and Industry 4.0 emerging technologies transform operations management?", *Production and Operations Management*, Vol. 31 No. 12, pp. 4475-4487, doi: [10.1111/poms.13864](https://doi.org/10.1111/poms.13864).
- Mueller, C., Seber, S., Shulman, J. and Stover, K. (2020), *Operations-Driven Sustainability*, McKinsey & Company.
- Pan, X., Chakkol, M. and Johnson, M. (2026), "Examining innovation in digital platforms: unveiling the strategy of Zhongtai", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 611-641, doi: [10.1108/IJOPM-12-2024-1025](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-12-2024-1025).
- Pirson, M.A. and Lawrence, P.R. (2010), "Humanism in business – toward a paradigm shift?", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 93 No. 4, pp. 553-565, doi: [10.1007/s10551-009-0239-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0239-1).
- Prajogo, D., Cooper, B., Donohue, R. and Nair, A. (2026), "The influence of interpersonal relationships on interorganizational relationships in supply chains: the role of loyalty and conflict", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 642-662, doi: [10.1108/IJOPM-12-2024-1043](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-12-2024-1043).
- Razak, G., Hendry, L. and Stevenson, M. (2026), "African socio-cultural characteristics: enabling or hindering sustainability?", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 663-695, doi: [10.1108/IJOPM-12-2024-1050](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-12-2024-1050).
- Ribbink, D., D'Lima, R. and Pun, H. (2026), "Impact of supply chain transparency on the consumption of remanufactured consumer goods", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 696-718, doi: [10.1108/IJOPM-05-2024-0395](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-05-2024-0395).
- Schilling, L., Gleim, I.-M., Khalid, R.U., Wagner, R. and Seuring, S. (2026), "Informal digital transactions: a path to value creation in base-of-the-pyramid supply chains", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 719-740, doi: [10.1108/IJOPM-11-2024-1011](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-11-2024-1011).
- Shu, W. and Di, F. (2026), "Fostering workplace safety with a gender-diverse workforce", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 741-770, doi: [10.1108/IJOPM-04-2024-0313](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-04-2024-0313).
- Storsjö, I., Seepma, A., Dube, N., Alonso Calderón, J., Martí, I. and Pullman, M. (2026), "Impact pathways: on the grand challenge of forced displacement and how to address European refugee crises", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 771-792, doi: [10.1108/IJOPM-11-2024-1019](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-11-2024-1019).
- van Dun, D.H., Weritz, P. and Kumar, M. (2026), "How leadership enhances absorptive capacity for industry 4.0 technology adoption through social integration mechanisms", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 793-817, doi: [10.1108/IJOPM-11-2024-1016](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-11-2024-1016).
- Wilhelm, M.M., Blome, C., Bhakoo, V. and Paulraj, A. (2016), "Sustainability in multi-tier supply chains: understanding the double agency role of the first-tier supplier", *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 42-60, doi: [10.1016/j.jom.2015.11.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2015.11.001).
- World Economic Forum (2024), *Global Risks Report 2024*, World Economic Forum, Geneva, available at: <https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-risks-report-2024> (accessed 1 January 2026).

Further reading

- World Economic Forum (2025), *Global Risks Report 2025*, World Economic Forum, Geneva, available at: <https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-risks-report-2025> (accessed 1 January 2026).