



UNIVERSITY OF CANBERRA, AUSTRALIA

Hannes Reinhardt

PhD UC Student ID: u3109899

Title of the Research Project:

SUPPLY CHAIN RISK MANAGEMENT

**Supply Chain Risk Management Practices in Singapore
Manufacturing, Transport & Logistics Companies**

Faculty of Business, Government & Law

Primary Advisor: Adjunct Professor Yunus Kathawala

Secondary Advisor: Dr Craig Applegate

The thesis is submitted in fulfillment of the requirement of the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

May 2019

Acknowledgment

Studying my PhD was a journey of endurance, strength and self-determination. It required an enormous amount of energy, willpower, patience, openness, time, support and wisdom to finish it. The completion of this thesis could not have been accomplished without the support and encouragement from many individuals. Their contributions are sincerely appreciated and must be recognized. I am apologizing here in advance if I have omitted some contributors. I personally feel indebted and grateful to all who provided me with their feedback, constructive criticism and suggestions for further improvement.

Firstly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisors, Professor Yunus Kathawala and Dr Craig Applegate. Their wisdom, guidance, efficiency and continuous support of my work motivated me to complete and finalize this quality study.

Many others have contributed, and the list here is not all-encompassing. Specifically, I would like to extend my thanks to Dr Wilson Loh, Frank Boey and Traugott Wierer. Their professional guidance in learning statistical analysis and structural equation modelling helped me tremendously to enhance my analytical skills. They always answered my questions in a timely manner and in great detail. They provided me with support far beyond the analytical and technical issues associated with statistical analysis.

Special thanks are extended as well to Doris Wee, Franziska Stieger, Franz Fritz and Mareike Betz, who supported me on many occasions with administration, organization, Word and PowerPoint processing, and other valuable inputs. Reviews from subject matter experts helped to enhance this study, and my thanks go to Dr Eric Kuan Choon Hook, President of Management Development Institute of Singapore (MDIS); Dr Marcel Thom, Partner and Managing Director at Boston Consulting Group (BCG); Dr Markus Lade, General Manager at Siemens Industry Asia, Singapore; Mr Neo Sing Hwee, Partner and Head of Risk Management at Ernst and Young (EY) Financial Services and Advisory Company, Singapore; Mr Oliver Hale, Managing Director at Crimson and Co., Global Supply Chain Consulting Company, Singapore; and Ms. Jacqueline Zhang, Risk Manager at Allianz Insurance Company, Singapore.

Lastly, I want to particularly thank my wife, Yoke Fong, and my three children, Nicole Maria, Natalie Maria and Lukas, who have tirelessly given me the greatest support during these years

of my PhD journey. Without their continued support, encouragement, strength, relinquishment on countless occasions and love, it would have been impossible to attain the persistence to overcome every obstacle and finally complete this journey.

Table of Contents

Authenticity and Originality statement	i
Acknowledgment	iii
Table of Contents	v
List of Figures	xi
List of Tables	xv
List of Abbreviations	xix
List of Appendices	xxiii
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Motivation for Research.....	1
1.2. Positioning of the Research Study	3
1.3. Background	5
1.3.1. Key Attributes of Supply Chain Risk Factors.....	7
1.3.2. Globalization and Specialization	7
1.3.3. Institutional and Regulatory Changes.....	8
1.3.4. New Technologies and Manufacturing Systems.....	8
1.3.5. Natural and Man-Made Catastrophes	9
1.3.6. Operational Problems.....	9
1.3.7. Summary	9
1.4. List of Keywords	10
1.5. Research Purpose and Objectives	10
1.6. Target Groups.....	13
1.7. Study Overview.....	14
1.8. Chapter Summary.....	16
2. Literature Review	17
2.1. Behavioural Science Theories	17
2.2. Supply Chain Risk Definitions.....	19
2.3. Supply Chain Risk Sources	21
2.3.1. Macro-environment Risks (Natural Disasters)	24
2.3.2. Further Expansion on Risk Sources	26
2.4. Risk Groupings.....	28
2.5. Risk Strategies.....	30
2.6. Risk Standards, Frameworks and Guides.....	32
2.6.1. ISO 31000:2009 Risk Management Standard, International	35
2.6.2. AS/NZS 4360:2004 Risk Management Standard, Australia/New Zealand	37
2.6.3. BS 31100:2008 Risk Management Standard, UK	38
2.6.4. JIS Q 2001:2001 Risk Management Standard, Japan	38

2.6.5.	ONR 49000 Risk Management Standard, Austria	39
2.6.6.	CAN/CSA Q850-97:1997 Risk Management Standard, Canada	40
2.6.7.	COSO:2004 Risk Management Standard, USA	40
2.6.8.	<i>Project Risk Analysis & Management (PRAM) Guide</i> , UK	43
2.6.9.	Guide to Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK®), USA	44
2.6.10.	Summary	44
2.7.	Risk Management Regulations.....	44
2.7.1.	Singapore: Listing Rules and Code of Corporate Governance	45
2.7.2.	USA: Sarbanes–Oxley Act	46
2.7.3.	Germany: KonTraG Corporate Control and Transparency Act.....	47
2.7.4.	Switzerland: Article 663b of the Swiss Code of Obligations	47
2.8.	Chapter Summary.....	47
3.	Research Questions.....	51
4.	Research Methodology and Research Design	53
4.1.	Research Methodology and Design Method	53
4.2.	Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA).....	55
4.3.	Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB)	57
4.4.	Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)	59
4.4.1.	Criticism of the Theoretical TAM	61
4.5.	Proposed Conceptual Research Model.....	62
4.6.	Construct Details of the Conceptual Research Model	63
4.6.1.	Definitions of Constructs	65
4.6.2.	Level of Understanding of SCRM (LOU)	66
4.6.3.	Management Support for SCRM (MS).....	66
4.6.4.	Perceived Risk of Catastrophic Events for SCRM (PRCE).....	68
4.6.5.	Perceived Ease of Use of SCRM (PEOU)	70
4.6.6.	Construct Perceived Usefulness of SCRM (PU)	71
4.6.7.	Attitude Towards Using SCRM (A)	71
4.6.8.	Intention to Use SCRM (IU).....	72
4.6.9.	Actual Use of SCRM (AU).....	72
4.7.	Hypotheses	74
4.8.	Research Design	76
4.8.1.	Theoretical Foundation	78
4.8.2.	Research Instrument.....	79
4.9.	Pilot Study.....	80

4.10.	Ethical Considerations.....	81
4.10.1.	Obtaining Voluntary Participation and Consent	82
4.10.2.	Benefits of Taking Part in the Survey	82
4.11.	Chapter Summary.....	83
5.	Research Questionnaire and Data Collection	85
5.1.	Research Questionnaire.....	85
5.1.1.	Design	86
5.1.2.	Order of Questions	87
5.1.3.	Layout	87
5.1.4.	Grouping of Questions	88
5.1.5.	Choosing the First Question.....	89
5.1.6.	Use of Contrast	89
5.1.7.	Response Rate.....	90
5.1.8.	Survey Errors and Pre-testing	90
5.2.	Scale Item Variables.....	92
5.3.	Selection of Survey Participants	95
5.4.	Proportionate Stratified Sampling.....	97
5.5.	Chapter Summary.....	98
6.	Data Analysis.....	99
6.1.	Methodological Problems Associated with Quantitative Measures.....	100
6.1.1.	Common Method Variance.....	100
6.1.2.	Nonresponse Bias.....	102
6.1.3.	Sampling Error.....	104
6.1.4.	Return of Questionnaires	107
6.2.	Statistical Procedures Observed	107
6.2.1.	Data Screening	107
6.2.2.	Detecting Outliers	108
6.2.3.	Reliability.....	108
6.2.4.	Validity	109
6.2.5.	Factor Analysis	109
6.2.6.	Collinearity and Normality of Data	110
6.2.7.	Goodness of Fit.....	110
6.3.	Chapter Summary.....	114
7.	Pilot Study	115
7.1.	Pilot Study Details.....	115

7.1.1.	Sample Size.....	115
7.1.2.	Participants.....	117
7.2.	Pilot Study Results	118
7.2.1.	Response rate	118
7.2.2.	Descriptive Statistics.....	119
7.2.3.	Overview of Constructs	123
7.2.4.	Exploratory Factor Analysis	124
7.3.	Changes and Modifications	129
7.4.	Chapter Summary.....	132
8.	Main Study	133
8.1.	Representativeness of the Sample	133
8.1.1.	Response Rate	134
8.1.2.	Sample Size.....	136
8.1.3.	Determining Non-Response Bias.....	136
8.2.	Descriptive Statistics	141
8.2.1.	Company Information (Section B).....	142
8.2.2.	Demographic Data of Respondents (Section C)	145
8.2.3.	Descriptive Statistics of Measurement Items (Section A)	147
8.3.	Data Analysis	148
8.3.1.	Assessment of Normality	148
8.3.2.	Assessment of Outliers	149
8.3.3.	Bootstrapping	150
8.3.4.	Collinearity	152
8.3.5.	Construct Validity	155
8.4.	Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)	159
8.4.1.	Assessment of Measurement Model	161
8.4.2.	Assessment of Model Fit	161
8.4.3.	Re-specifying the Measurement Model	167
8.4.4.	Assessment of Structural Model	171
8.4.5.	Re-specifying the Structural Model	174
8.5.	Hypothesis Testing	185
8.6.	Chapter Summary.....	186
9.	Discussion.....	189
9.1.	Business Context.....	189
9.2.	Discussion About Descriptive Statistics (Sections B and C of Questionnaire)	190

9.2.1.	Business Sectors.....	191
9.2.2.	Main Reason for Doing Risk Management in Your Organization	191
9.2.3.	Activities to Increase the Resilience of Your Supply Chain.....	192
9.2.4.	Discussion About the Respondents.....	193
9.3.	Respondents Perception of Key Study Constructs	199
9.4.	Significant and Non-significant Relationship Paths.....	206
9.4.1.	Stated Original Hypotheses: Construct Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU).....	206
9.4.2.	Stated Original Hypothesis: Construct Level of Understanding (LOU).....	208
9.4.3.	Stated Original Hypothesis: Construct Management Support (MS)	209
9.4.4.	Stated Original Hypothesis: Construct Perceive Risk of Catastrophic Events (PRCE)	211
9.4.5.	Stated Original Hypothesis: Construct PU	213
9.4.6.	Stated Original Hypothesis: Construct A.....	214
9.4.7.	Stated Original Hypothesis: Construct Intention to Use (IU).....	215
9.5.	Additional New Relationship Paths	217
9.5.1.	New Hypothesis: Construct Management Support (MS)	217
9.5.2.	New Hypothesis: Construct Perceived Risk of Catastrophic Events (PRCE) .	219
9.6.	Chapter Summary.....	221
10.	Conclusion	223
10.1.	Introduction	223
10.2.	Revisiting the Study Objectives	224
10.2.1.	Research Question 1: What Are Supply Chain Risk Management (SCRM) Practices in Singapore Companies?.....	224
10.2.2.	Research Question 2: How Did Level of Understanding (LOU) and Management Support (MS) Influence Supply Chain Risk Management (SCRM) Practices in Singapore Companies?	225
10.2.3.	Research Question 3: How Did Perceived Risk of Catastrophic Events (PRCE) Impact Supply Chain Risk Management (SCRM) Practices in Singapore Companies? .	225
10.2.4.	Research Question 4: What Newly Identified and Tested Relationship Paths Exist?	226
10.3.	Significance of Study Findings	226
10.3.1.	Generalization of the Study Findings	228
10.3.2.	Theoretical Contributions	230
10.3.3.	Managerial Implications	233

10.4. Limitations and Directions for Future Research	234
10.5. Concluding Remarks	235
Appendices.....	239
Appendix A Pilot Study Questionnaire	241
Appendix B Changes and Modifications from Pilot Study.....	249
Appendix C Main Study Questionnaire	253
Appendix D Additional Nonresponse Bias Computations.....	259
Appendix E Additional Graphs for Survey Sections B + C	267
Appendix F Table for Assessment of Normality	273
Appendix G Table for Assessment of Outliers	275
Appendix H Summary of Values for Goodness of Fit Indexes.....	279
References.....	281

List of Figures

Figure 1: Schematic representation of key elements of introduction chapter.....	1
Figure 2: Positioning of the research study.....	4
Figure 3: Roadmap of study chapters	15
Figure 4: Schematic representation of key elements of literature review chapter.....	17
Figure 5: Deloitte’s supply chain risks sources model	23
Figure 6: Trends in occurrence and victims of reported disasters	24
Figure 7: Number of catastrophic events 1970–2016.....	25
Figure 8: Risk diagram.....	29
Figure 9: 2013, COSO Internal Control – Integrated Framework Principles Matrix/Cube.....	43
Figure 10: Schematic overview of key elements of methodology and design chapter.....	53
Figure 11: Theory of reasoned action (TRA)	56
Figure 12: Theory of planned behaviour (TPB)	58
Figure 13: TAM original technology acceptance model	60
Figure 14: Refined TAM without attitude variable	61
Figure 15: Proposed conceptual research model for this study	63
Figure 16: Conceptual research framework.....	78
Figure 17: Schematic overview of key elements of research questionnaire and data collection chapter	85
Figure 18: Schematic overview of key elements of data analysis chapter	99
Figure 19: Schematic overview of key elements of pilot study chapter	115
Figure 20: Schematic overview of key elements of main study chapter	133
Figure 21: Formula for CR calculation.....	156
Figure 22: Formula for AVE calculation	156
Figure 23: Hypothesized measurement model.....	165
Figure 24: Adjusted measurement model	170
Figure 25: Structural model A	173
Figure 26: Structural model B.....	177
Figure 27: Structural model C.....	181
Figure 28: Schematic overview of key elements of discussion study chapter.....	189
Figure 29: Years of experience in relation to position as percentage within position in the company.....	194
Figure 30: Years of experience in relation to age as percentage within age groups.....	195

Figure 31: Years of experience in relation to gender as a percentage within gender groups	196
Figure 32: Years of experience in relation to highest education level as a percentage within education groups.....	197
Figure 33: Relationship between age and gender as a percentage within gender groups.....	198
Figure 34: Relationship between age and position in the company as a percentage within position groups	198
Figure 35: Relationship between age and highest education level as a percentage within education groups.....	199
Figure 36: Mean scored level of understanding within age groups	200
Figure 37: Mean scored level of understanding (LOU) within gender groups.....	201
Figure 38: Mean scored level of understanding (LOU) within position groups.....	202
Figure 39: Mean scored level of understanding within education groups	203
Figure 40: Mean scored management support (MS) within age groups	204
Figure 41: Mean scored management support (MS) within gender groups.....	204
Figure 42: Mean scored management support (MS) within position groups.....	205
Figure 43: Mean scored management support (MS) within education groups.....	206
Figure 44: Schematic overview of conclusion study chapter	223
Figure 45: Graphical display for business sector early/late response	260
Figure 46: Graphical display for position in the company early/late response.....	261
Figure 47: Graphical display for gender early/late response	262
Figure 48: Graphical display for highest education level early/late response	263
Figure 49: Graphical display for company size by number of employees early/late response	264
Figure 50: Graphical display for years of experience in supply chain risk management early/late response	265
Figure 51: Graphical display for age early/late response.....	266
Figure 52: Graphical display of business sector	267
Figure 53: Graphical display of company size by number of employees.....	268
Figure 54: Graphical Display for Main reasons doing risk management within your organization	268
Figure 55: Graphical display for activities you will undertake to increase the resilience of your supply chain.....	269
Figure 56: Graphical display for position in the company	269
Figure 57: Graphical display for years of experience in supply chain risk management	270

Figure 58: Graphical display for gender	270
Figure 59: Graphical display for age	271
Figure 60: Graphical display for highest education level	271

List of Tables

Table 1: Selected risk definitions and risk views.....	20
Table 2: Selected samples of further risk sources and their descriptions	27
Table 3: Selected risk strategies.....	31
Table 4: Constructs and definitions of the TRA model	56
Table 5: Measurement items for this study.....	94
Table 6: Determining minimum returned sample size.....	106
Table 7: Pilot study participants by distribution of business sector categories	119
Table 8: Pilot study participants by company size.....	120
Table 9: Pilot study participants by position in the company	120
Table 10: Pilot study participants by years of experience	120
Table 11: Pilot study participants by gender.....	120
Table 12: Pilot study participants by age	120
Table 13: Pilot study participants by highest education level.....	121
Table 14: Pilot study participants' activities to increase SCRM resilience	122
Table 15: Main reasons for doing risk management.....	123
Table 16: Overview of constructs	124
Table 17: Pilot study EFA by constructs	128
Table 18: Measurement items for this study.....	130
Table 19: EFA simulation based on 24 items by constructs	132
Table 20: Mean comparison between early and late respondents.....	140
Table 21: Independent t-test and Levene's test for equality of variances between early and late respondents	141
Table 22: Distribution of business sector categories	142
Table 23: Company size by number of employees	142
Table 24: Statistics for top 2 reasons for doing risk management within your organization	143
Table 25: Statistics for activities you will undertake or currently working on to improve SCRM resilience	144
Table 26: Statistics for activities you will undertake to increase the resilience of your supply chain.....	145
Table 27: Statistics for position in the company.....	146
Table 28: Statistics for years of experience in supply chain risk management	146
Table 29: Statistics for gender	146

Table 30: Statistics for age.....	147
Table 31: Statistics for highest education level	147
Table 32: Bootstrap estimate	152
Table 33: Collinearity statistics for dependent variable intention to use (IU).....	154
Table 34: Collinearity statistics for dependent variable actual use (AU)	154
Table 35: Validity measures for the measurement model (construct level)	158
Table 36: Fit indices and their acceptable thresholds	163
Table 37: Correlations of Q21 with factors of actual use (AU).....	164
Table 38: Summary of computed values for structural model A.....	174
Table 39: Summary of implausible correlation values for perceived ease of use (PEOU) ...	176
Table 40: Summary of not significant standardized regression weights	176
Table 41: Summary of computed values for structural model B.....	178
Table 42: Summary of missing modification indices	178
Table 43: Summary of not significant standardized regression weights	179
Table 44: Summary of computed values for structural model C.....	182
Table 45: Summary of goodness of fit statistics for measurement and structural models ...	184
Table 46: Summary of goodness of fit statistics simplified view	185
Table 47: Summary of hypothesis testing.....	186
Table 47: Level of understanding (LOU)	249
Table 48: Management support (MS)	249
Table 49: Perceived risk of catastrophic event (PRCE).....	249
Table 50: Perceived ease of use (PEOU) of SCRM	249
Table 51: Perceived usefulness (PU) of SCRM.....	250
Table 52: Attitude (A) towards using SCRM	250
Table 53: Intention to use (IU) SCRM	250
Table 54: Actual use (AU) of SCRM	251
Table 55: Within-block factor analysis for level of understanding (LOU)	252
Table 56: Within-block factor analysis for management support (MS)	252
Table 57: Within-block factor analysis for perceived risk of catastrophic events (PRCE) ...	252
Table 58: Within-block factor analysis for perceived ease of use (PEOU).....	252
Table 59: Within-block factor analysis for perceived usefulness (PU)	252
Table 60: Within-block factor analysis for attitude (A) towards using	252
Table 61: Within-block factor analysis for intention to use (IU).....	252
Table 62: Within-block factor analysis for actual use (AU).....	252

Table 63: Computation for business sector early/late response cross-tabulation	259
Table 64: Computation for position in the company early/late response cross-tabulation....	260
Table 65: Computation for gender early/late response cross-tabulation	261
Table 66: Computation for highest education level early/late response cross-tabulation	262
Table 67: Computation for company size by number of employees early/late response cross-tabulation	263
Table 68: Computation for years of experience in supply chain risk management early/late response cross-tabulation.....	264
Table 69: Computation for age early/late response cross-tabulation.....	265
Table 70: Mardia’s multivariate assessment of normality	273
Table 71: Mahalanobis outliers test	275
Table 72: Summary of values for goodness of fit indexes for this study	279

List of Abbreviations

6σ	six sigma
A	attitude towards using SCRM
AAA	American Accounting Association
ACRA	Accounting and Corporate Regulatory Authority
ADF	asymptotically distribution – free estimation
AGFI	adjusted goodness of fit index
AICPA	American Institute of Certified Public Accountants
AIRMIC	Association of Insurance and Risk Managers
ALARM	National Forum for Risk Management in the Public Sector
APM	Association for Project Management
AS	Australian Standards
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AU	actual use of SCRM
AVE	average variance extracted
BCM	business continuity management
BSI	British Standards Institution
CFI	comparative fit index
CMV	common method variance
COSO	Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission
CR	composite reliability
CRED	Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters
D	Mahalanobis distance
D ²	squared Mahalanobis distance
df	degree of freedom
DOS	Singapore Department of Statistics
ERM	enterprise risk management
ETA	event tree analysis
FEI	Financial Executives International
FERMA	Federation of European Risk Management Associations
FTAs	free trade agreements
GDP	gross domestic product
GFI	goodness of fit index

GLS	generalized least squares
HACCP	hazard analysis and critical control points
HAZOP	hazard and operability study
IEC	International Electrotechnical Commission
IFI	incremental fit index
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IFRSs	International Financial Reporting Standards
IIA	Institute of Internal Auditors
IMA	Institute of Management Accountants
IRM	Institute of Risk Management
IRSS	Institute of Health and Society, Université Catholique de Louvain
IS	information systems
ISIC	International Standard Industrial Classification
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
IU	intention to use SCRM
JSA	Japanese Standards Association
LOU	level of understanding of SCRM
LPI	logistics performance index
ML	maximum likelihood
MNC	multinational corporation
MS	management support for SCRM
MSV	maximum shared variance
MTI	Ministry of Trade and Investment
MTMM	multitrait–multimethod matrix
N	total population size
n	total sample size
NFI	normed fit index
N_h	population size for stratum h
n_h	sample size for stratum h
NNFI	non-normed fit index
NZS	New Zealand Standards
NZS	Standards of New Zealand
OLS	ordinary (unweighted) least squares
ON	Österreichische Normungsinstitut

PBC	perceived behavioural control
PDCA Cycle	plan – do – check – act cycle, or Deming’s cycle
PEOU	perceived ease of use of SCRM
PGFI	parsimonious goodness of fit index
PMBok	project management body of knowledge
PNFI	parsimonious normed fit index
PRAM	project risk analysis and management
PRCE	perceived risk of catastrophic events
PU	perceived usefulness of SCRM
RMR	root mean residual
RMSEA	root mean squared error of approximation
RMSR	root mean squared residual
SBF	Singapore Business Federation
SCRLC	Supply Chain Risk Leadership Council
SCRM	supply chain risk management
SEM	structural equation modelling
SGX	Singapore Exchange Ltd.
SMEs	small and medium-sized enterprises
SOX	Sarbanes–Oxley Acts
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Science
SRMR	Standardized Root Mean Residual
SSIC	Singapore Standard Industrial Classification
TAM	technology acceptance model
TLI	Tucker-Lewis index
TPB	theory of planned behaviour
TQM	total quality management
TRA	theory of reasoned action
US\$	United States Dollar
USA	United States of America
US-GAAP	US Generally Accepted Accounting Standards
VIF	variance inflation factor
WLS	weighted least squares
χ^2	chi-square
χ^2/df	chi-square/degree of freedom

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Pilot Study Questionnaire.....	241
Appendix B	Changes and Modifications from Pilot Study	249
Appendix C	Main Study Questionnaire.....	253
Appendix D	Additional Nonresponse Bias Computations	259
Appendix E	Additional Graphs for Survey Sections B + C	267
Appendix F	Table for Assessment of Normality	273
Appendix G	Table for Assessment of Outliers	275
Appendix H	Summary of Values for Goodness of Fit Indexes	279