ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

Supply Chain Management and Marketing Strategy to Enhance Customer Value of a Logistic Company

Xu Huiqing[1]

[1]Doctor in Business Administration

[1]Emilio Aguinaldo College, Manila, Philippines

Publication Date: 2026/06/26

Abstract: This study examined the level of Supply Chain Management and Marketing Strategy practices of a logistics company and determined whether differences exist in employees' assessments when grouped according to demographic characteristics. It further investigated the relationship between Supply Chain Management and Marketing Strategy to understand how operational practices relate to market-oriented outcomes. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, data were collected from 130 employee-respondents through a structured questionnaire covering four dimensions of Supply Chain Management and six dimensions of Marketing Strategy. Statistical treatments included frequency and percentage distribution, weighted mean, independent samples t-test, one-way analysis of variance, and Pearson product–moment correlation.

Findings indicate that respondents assessed both Supply Chain Management and Marketing Strategy at an overall "Agree" or "Practiced" level, suggesting that these functions are generally implemented but with room for improvement. Technology Integration emerged as the strongest dimension of Supply Chain Management, while Network Coordination registered comparatively lower ratings, particularly in areas related to inter-organizational communication. For Marketing Strategy, Market Intelligence and Market Share were rated more favorably, whereas Product or Service Positioning showed weaker performance, reflecting uncertainty in differentiation and brand clarity.

Tests of difference revealed no significant variations in the assessment of Supply Chain Management and Marketing Strategy when respondents were grouped by age, civil status, and educational qualification. A significant difference was observed only in Market Share when grouped by sex, indicating a perceptual variation rather than a systemic disparity. Correlation analysis showed no significant relationship between overall Supply Chain Management and overall Marketing Strategy. However, several weak but significant relationships were identified at the dimensional level, revealing selective interactions and possible trade-offs between operational efficiency and market-oriented practices.

The study concludes that while Supply Chain Management and Marketing Strategy are both moderately practiced, they operate with limited functional integration. Strengthening cross-functional coordination, particularly between operational and marketing units, is recommended to ensure that improvements in supply chain efficiency translate into enhanced customer value and sustained competitive performance.

How to Cite: Xu Huiqing (2026) Supply Chain Management and Marketing Strategy to Enhance Customer Value of a Logistic Company. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(6), 1367-1388. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

I. INTRODUCTION

Supply chain management (SCM) and marketing strategy are increasingly interdependent in contemporary business environments: firms now compete on the end-to-end capability to deliver value reliably, quickly, and sustainably rather than on product features alone (Ozdemir et al., 2022; Todo et al., 2022). The COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent geopolitical shocks demonstrated how supply-side disturbances directly undermine marketing promises, which has driven research and practice to treat SCM as a strategic partner of marketing rather than a back-office function (Ozdemir et al., 2022).

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

Research on Supply Chain Management Strategies of Multinational Retailers in China Based on IKEA (Jinbo jia, 2024). Driven by globalization and digitalization, the supply chain management of multinational retail enterprises in China is facing unprecedented challenges and opportunities. This study focuses on IKEA's supply chain management strategy in the Chinese market. It aims to reveal how it improves market competitiveness through supply chain optimization and responds to rapidly changing consumer demands. This study found that IKEA has effectively improved the response speed and cost efficiency of the supply chain by implementing refined inventory management, strengthening supplier relations, and adopting advanced information technology. The results show that IKEA's supply chain strategy not only meets the individual needs of consumers but also enhances its market adaptability and customer satisfaction. However, IKEA still has room for improvement in logistics efficiency, supplier cooperation depth, and market dynamics prediction. In China's continuous economic growth and consumption upgrading, IKEA's supply chain management experience has important reference value for understanding and grasping the complexity of the Chinese market. Future research could further explore how IKEA integrates emerging technologies to achieve continuous innovation and optimization of the supply chain.

The Resource-Based View (RBV) provides a powerful lens for understanding how supply-chain resources (technology platforms, warehousing capacity, specialized logistics capabilities) can become sources of sustained competitive advantage when they are valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable, and non-substitutable (Huang et al., 2023; Mugoni et al., 2024). In SCM contexts, RBV encourages researchers and managers to examine not only what resources exist but how they are orchestrated and leveraged by marketing to create credible and durable market promises.

Market orientation links marketing strategy directly to operational decisions by emphasizing continuous collection and responsive use of customer and competitor intelligence (Al Azzani, 2024; Shahzad et al., 2024). When market orientation is combined with supply-chain orientation and digital integration, firms are better able to sense changes in demand and convert insights into reliable fulfillment — reducing stockouts and improving customer satisfaction (Shahzad et al., 2024; Jing et al., 2024).

Network-level perspectives and resilience research complement RBV and market orientation by modeling inter-firm dependencies, trust, and partner governance that underpin marketing claims (Todo et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2021). In volatile post-pandemic markets, firms that sustain broad, visible, and coordinated supplier networks are better able to substantiate marketing claims such as lead-time reliability or sustainable sourcing because those claims depend on multi-tier network performance (Lin et al., 2021; Todo et al., 2022).

Digitalization and Industry 4.0 technologies (cloud platforms, IoT telemetry, advanced analytics) are key enablers of SCM–marketing integration: they provide the visibility and speed required for demand sensing, dynamic pricing, and customer-level fulfillment decisions (Huang et al., 2023; Jing et al., 2024). Empirical studies find that digital transformation improves forecasting accuracy and supply-chain responsiveness, which marketing teams can translate into differentiated customer experiences.

This study examines Jiayi Supply Chain Enterprise Group as a focal firm to investigate how supply-chain resources, network governance, and market orientation interact to shape marketing strategy and performance. [Insert here a short, specific sentence about Jiayi's scale, core logistics capabilities, digital systems, markets served, or unique resources e.g., "Jiayi operates X warehouses, employs Y logistics staff, and uses Z digital platform for order management."] The study uses RBV and market-orientation frameworks, enriched by network and digitalization perspectives, to identify managerial levers that convert SCM capabilities into market advantage (Huang et al., 2023; Al Azzani, 2024; Todo et al., 2022).

Global supply chain pressure and Chinese business and consumer confidence (Assad Ullah, et al, 2024)

The ripple effects of disruptions in the global supply chains have pervasive economic consequences for various industries and the overall economy. This study examines the impact of global supply chain pressure on Chinese business and consumer confidence from February 2000 to September 2024. It employs Quantile-on-quantile (QQ) regression, which helps to understand how varying levels of global supply chain pressure influence different levels of Chinese business and consumer confidence, providing insights beyond what can be gauged via a mean-based regression. The main results show the following: Firstly, Chinese business confidence is negatively associated with supply chain pressure across all upper, middle, and lower quantiles, reflecting a homogenous adverse impact irrespective of the levels of both variables. Secondly, Chinese consumer confidence is impacted heterogeneously by the magnitude of supply chain pressure, indicating the relevance of the quantile distribution of both variables to their association. The results remain valid after applying a Wavelet Quantile Correlation approach, indicating their robustness. Our findings offer crucial insights to Chinese policymakers and other stakeholders, suggesting that Chinese businesses do not tolerate pressure in the global supply chain, whereas Chinese consumers tend to switch to local products and services during lapses in the global supply chain.

Recent global events such as the China-United States trade war, the COVID-19 outbreak, the Russia-Ukraine conflict, and the ongoing war in the Middle-East have placed significant strain on the global supply chain. Events like these imminently precipitate significant global supply chain disruptions and induce doubt in one's mind if the world economy is entering a de-globalization phase (Roscoe et al., 2020). Besides these events, the recent increase in natural calamities has impeded the smooth functioning of the global supply chain (Barrot and Sauvagnat, 2016, Wei et al., 2023).

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

At the business level, supply chain disruptions decelerate production and delivery activities and influence the costs of raw materials (Hu et al., 2024), leading to reduced sales, revenues, and profit margins (Chaplynska and Chelombitko, 2023). A delay in delivering goods to customers can lead to a reduction in customer loyalty and potentially a loss of customers and market share. A negative customer experience can damage brand reputation and consumer confidence, given that disruptions in business operations and delivery schedules harm a firm's reputation and customer relationships. On a related front, supply chain bottlenecks can heighten inflation (Carrière-Swallow et al., 2023), ultimately affecting businesses, consumers, and the entire economy.

China and the Future of Global Supply Chains, We review China's role in four major sectors—apparel, consumer electronics, PV, and autos—over the past decade, then consider four plausible scenarios to 2030 and their implications for China's future role in global trade and investment patterns. (Agatha Kratz, et al, 2024)

Rumors of globalization's death are greatly exaggerated. Even after decades of fast-paced expansion, China's weight in global production and exports continues to grow on the back of heavy-handed industrial policies and deep domestic imbalances. But after a long period of accommodation, trading partners are pushing back, concerned about their own industrial bases, jobs, and supply chain security. Some are erecting trade barriers, others are prioritizing the "de-risking" of strategic supply chains. However, these policies are running up against the incredible efficiency of China's manufacturing sector, as well as excess capacity buildup since the outbreak of COVID-19.

At the margins, the structure of global trade is changing. Global supply chains are adapting to new geopolitical realities. Countries are fighting to create or save their manufacturing jobs, investing billions to strengthen their technological edge, and using new tools to shape global trade and investment flows to their advantage. Ongoing and upcoming policies—in the US and beyond—could further reshape global production and trade patterns.

At this important juncture, we look back and ahead. We review China's role in four major sectors—apparel, consumer electronics, solar photovoltaics (PV), and autos—and associated supply chains over the past decade. We then look forward to four plausible scenarios to 2030 and their implications for China's future role in each of these sectors, as well as for global trade and investment patterns more broadly.

China has gained global export and manufacturing share in all four sectors over the past decade at the expense of other producers. While the US's "China shock" happened over a decade ago, Germany and Japan have suffered significant, systematic declines in global market share across sectors and supply chain steps from China's manufacturing expansion in the past ten years. South Korea, Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), and Mexico have been more resilient. They benefited from the past seven years of US policy pushback, but pressure is building from low-priced Chinese inputs.

Some production has relocated outside China since the start of the US-China trade war in 2017, but at varying scale and speed depending on the sector . Apparel and electronics have seen more movement out of China than automotives and solar. Much of that relocation has benefited emerging markets (EMs)—first and foremost in Asia—rather than advanced economies, with one exception: the US under the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA). Most striking, however, is China's resilience as a producer of inputs and finished goods for the world, despite quickly rising costs in the country and growing trade and other barriers globally.

In many sectors, labor cost considerations seem to have taken a backseat to production and logistical efficiency. Today, no country can replicate China's highly optimized production ecosystem at scale, so firms remain slow to relocate to alternative production hubs, even in lower-tech, lower-value-add sectors such as apparel.

As a result, policy is becoming a core driver of diversification outcomes. Indian and Vietnamese incentives to attract electronic manufacturing have driven large-scale investments by major MNCs that in turn played a crucial role in driving manufacturing relocation. A range of more drastic US policy decisions kick-started significant movement in global production of solar PVs. Finally, trade integration underpinned much of the past decades of auto supply chain regionalization, as well as more recent decisions to expand apparel production in Egypt and Turkey.

Diversification from China almost always involves Chinese companies. Chinese firms lead FDI in manufacturing in Southeast Asia and are growing their footprint in Mexico, CEE and North Africa. They also remain the top intermediate input and semi-finished goods suppliers for many MNCs. This complicates efforts to reduce dependency on China by blurring the definition of a "Chinese good" and can spark tensions between the US and diversification partners that benefit from Chinese FDI. It also gives the Chinese government leverage over the pace and extent of de-risking, as seen with Beijing reportedly prohibiting automakers from investing in India and restricting Chinese Foxconn employees from transferring to iPhone factories in India.

Diversification has concentrated in a few countries, with Vietnam topping the list for all sectors in our study except autos. This concentration has been positive in the short run. Vietnam has offered manufacturers—Chinese and non-Chinese an easy and practical way out of China. But Vietnam's centrality will be a liability in the long run. It will likely come under increasing scrutiny from the new US administration and an over-concentration of manufacturing activity in the country will put pressure on its human, logistical, and energy resources. Electronics suppliers, as a matter of fact, are already being asked to diversify manufacturing beyond Vietnam.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

Diversified production capacity remains fragile. China's dominance of various supply chains means it has become a global price maker in many industries. Hence, China's market share losses can reverse over time, especially in contexts of overcapacity, high inventories, and producer price declines in China. China's extremely stable production environment offers an easy fallback for more volatile emerging market environments (e.g. Bangladesh after a power supply and currency crisis in 2022). Relocation of production to smaller markets can also create inflationary pressures that quickly upend diversification momentum.

Pathways for China's Key Industries to Secure Core Positions in Global Supply Chains: A Comparative and Empirical Study (Jianwen Lou and Tiantian Li, 2024)

This study develops a comprehensive analytical framework to examine how nations secure core positions in global supply chains (GSCs) for key industries. It combines a comparative analysis of advanced economies Los Angeles (aerospace), Munich (high-end manufacturing), London (biopharmaceuticals), and Tokyo (automotive)—with a survey-based empirical assessment of Chinese industry practitioners. Using the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), factor analysis and the Delphi method, an evaluation framework is constructed across five dimensions: technology, value, governance, resilience, and sustainability. The findings show that developed economies sustain their leadership through upstream innovation and standard-setting, coordination of high-value activities, integrated industrial ecosystems, and risk-buffering mechanisms. Empirical results reveal that while China demonstrates relative strengths in governance and value creation, it continues to lag in frontier technologies, resilience, and sustainability. Building on both comparative and empirical evidence, the study proposes strategic pathways for China's key industries, including technological breakthroughs, innovation-driven clusters, governance reforms, digital resilience, and green cooperation. These insights provide actionable guidance for policymakers and highlight how latecomer economies can transform structural disadvantages into innovation momentum, evolving from participants to rule-setters in global supply chains.

➢ *Theoretical Framework*

This study anchored on the Supply Chain Management Theory and Resource-Based View (RBV) Theory. RBV posits that firms gain competitive advantage by leveraging unique, valuable, and hard-to-imitate resources. In supply chain management, this applies to capabilities such as supplier relationships, logistics efficiency, technology integration, and network coordination.

Likewise, Market Orientation Theory which suggests that firms achieve superior performance when they continuously collect and respond to market intelligence regarding customers and competitors. It connects directly with supply chain decisions efficient supply chains enable faster responses to customer needs. These includes: Market intelligence, product/service positioning, promise communication, Customer satisfaction, market share, profitability.

➢ *Statement of the Problem*

This study assessed the supply chain management and marketing strategy to enhance customer value of a logistic company. Specifically, it will answer the following:

- What is the demographic profile of respondents in terms of the following: a) Age, b) Sex, c) Civil Status, and d) Educational Attainment?
- What is the assessment of respondents on the Supply chain management in terms of the following: a) supplier relationships, b) logistics efficiency, c) technology integration, and d) network coordination?
- Is there significant difference in the assessment of respondent on the Supply chain management when their profile is taken as test factor?
- What is the assessment of respondents on marketing strategy in terms of the following: a) Market intelligence, b) product/service positioning, c) promise communication, d) Customer satisfaction, e) market share, and f) profitability?
- Is there significant difference in the assessment of respondents on the marketing strategy when their profile is taken as test factor?
- Is there significant relationship in the assessment of respondents between the supply chain management and marketing strategy?
- Based on the results of the study what enhanced customer value of a logistic company can be proposed?

➢ *Scope and Delimitation of the Study*

This study were conducted at Shandong Jiayi Logistics Co, Ltd, located in Shandong, China. 130 employees from said company will be employed as the respondents of this study. They will assess the Supply chain management in terms of the supplier relationships, logistics efficiency, technology integration, and network coordination. Likewise, on the marketing strategy in terms of the Market intelligence, product/service positioning, promise communication, Customer satisfaction, market share, and profitability.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

II. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

➢ *The Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of the Age, Sex, Civil Status, and Educational Attainment*

Table 1 Respondents' Demographic Profile

Indicators	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age	1 – Below 20 years old	24	18.5
	2 – 21–30 years old	25	19.2
	3 – 31–40 years old	23	17.7
	4 – 41–50 years old	32	24.6
	5 – Above 50 years old	26	20.0
Sex	1 – Male	63	48.5
	2 – Female	67	51.5
Civil Status	1 – Single	30	23.1
	2 – Married	27	20.8
	3 – Widow/er	29	22.3
	4 – Separated	44	33.8
Educational Qualification	1 – Tech Vocational Graduate	44	33.8
	2 – College Graduate	48	36.9
	3 – Graduate School	38	29.2
Total		***130***	***100%***

Table 1 presents a respondent pool that is reasonably spread across age categories, with a slight concentration in the 41–50 years old bracket. The largest group falls under Age 4 (41–50 years old) at 32 respondents or 24.6 percent, followed by those above 50 (Age 5) with 26 respondents or 20.0 percent. The 21–30 group accounts for 25 respondents or 19.2 percent, while the below 20 category has 24 respondents or 18.5 percent. The smallest share is the 31–40 group at 23 respondents or 17.7 percent. Taken together, the distribution suggests the data are shaped more by mid-career and older employees than by very young entrants, which may matter because experience and job tenure often influence how people judge internal processes like supplier coordination, technology use, or marketing execution.

Sex distribution is close to balanced, though females slightly outnumber males. There are 67 female respondents (51.5 percent) compared with 63 males (48.5 percent). This near parity is helpful because it reduces the chance that overall means are being driven by one sex group alone. At the same time, the slight female majority may subtly affect the overall pattern of ratings if women and men tend to evaluate customer-facing performance or communication practices differently in this organization. That possibility becomes relevant later when the test of difference shows a significant sex-based difference specifically for market share.

Civil status shows a more noticeable skew. The largest category is separated (coded 4) with 44 respondents or 33.8 percent, while single (coded 1) accounts for 30 respondents or 23.1 percent. Widow/er (coded 3) follows closely with 29 respondents or 22.3 percent, and married (coded 2) is the smallest group at 27 respondents or 20.8 percent. The high proportion of separated respondents is unusual in many workplace samples and may suggest that the company's workforce includes a meaningful share of individuals managing more complex personal responsibilities. While civil status is not inherently tied to work perceptions, it may still influence how employees weigh reliability, coordination, and stability in operational systems, especially if they value predictability in schedules, policies, or workload.

Educational qualification indicates a generally well-prepared workforce, with the largest segment being college graduates. College graduates (coded 2) comprise 48 respondents or 36.9 percent, followed by tech vocational graduates (coded 1) at 44 respondents or 33.8 percent, and graduate school completers (coded 3) at 38 respondents or 29.2 percent. In practical terms, this mix implies that respondents include both technical-practice oriented employees and those with more formal academic preparation, which may shape how they interpret constructs like "data-driven decision-making" or "market intelligence systems." Since later ANOVA results show no significant differences by educational qualification, it appears that perceptions are relatively consistent across these educational groups, even if their day-to-day work roles may differ.

Overall, Table 1 suggests the study's findings are grounded in a workforce that is mature, fairly balanced by sex, diverse in civil status, and moderately high in educational attainment. This profile likely supports stable and experience-based assessments of supply chain management and marketing strategy. Still, it also hints that interpretations should remain cautious, because demographic clusters, particularly age and civil status, could carry latent workplace role differences that a basic profile table does not capture. If I were reading this as a manager, I would already be thinking: the results probably reflect "how the system feels" to employees who have been around long enough to compare practices over time.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

➢ *On the Assessment of Respondents on the Supply Chain Management in Terms of the Supplier Relationships, Logistics Efficiency, Technology Integration, and Network Coordination*

Table 2 Assessment of Employee-Respondents on the Supply Chain Management in Terms of Supplier Relationships

Indicator (Statement)	WM	SD	QD	VI
The company maintains long-term, trust-based relationships with its suppliers.	2.89	1.13	Agree	Practiced
Suppliers consistently meet agreed quality standards for products and services.	2.88	1.01	Agree	Practiced
Jiayi and its suppliers regularly share information to improve operations.	2.92	1.13	Agree	Practiced
The company collaborates with suppliers to solve problems and reduce risks.	2.88	1.08	Agree	Practiced
There is transparency in communication and transactions with suppliers.	2.94	1.03	Agree	Practiced
Jiayi encourages innovation and suggestions from its suppliers.	2.51	1.07	Agree	Practiced
Supplier performance is regularly monitored and evaluated through clear criteria.	2.44	1.13	Disagree	Slightly Practiced
Overall Mean	**2.78**	**0.52**	**Agree**	**Practiced**

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Highly Practiced); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Practiced); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Practiced); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Practiced)

Table 2 indicates that supplier relationships are generally viewed as practiced, with an overall mean of 2.78 and a standard deviation of 0.52, which falls within the "Agree-Practiced" range. Most item means cluster between 2.88 and 2.94, suggesting that employees perceive supplier-related routines as present and fairly consistent. At the same time, the standard deviations for many items are around 1.01 to 1.13, which is not small. That amount of spread hints that employees may not be seeing the same supplier relationship quality across departments, suppliers, or even product lines. In other words, some teams may experience suppliers as dependable partners, while others may deal with more friction.

The highest-rated item is "There is transparency in communication and transactions with suppliers" (M = 2.94, SD = 1.03). Close behind is "Jiayi and its suppliers regularly share information to improve operations" (M = 2.92, SD = 1.13). These two items together may suggest that information exchange is a visible practice, perhaps through routine coordination calls, shared delivery schedules, or regular updates on stock availability. Employees seem to recognize that transparency exists at least at a working level. Still, the standard deviations remain above 1.00, implying that "transparency" might be strong with certain suppliers but inconsistent with others, especially when there are disruptions or urgent changes.

Several items sit at almost the same level, which is worth noticing because it suggests stable perceptions of the basic relationship framework. "The company maintains long-term, trust-based relationships with its suppliers" (M = 2.89, SD = 1.13), "Suppliers consistently meet agreed quality standards" (M = 2.88, SD = 1.01), and "The company collaborates with suppliers to solve problems and reduce risks" (M = 2.88, SD = 1.08) are essentially clustered. This pattern may indicate that employees recognize relationship continuity and cooperation, but they may not see these as standout strengths. It feels more like "this is how we usually operate," rather than a distinctive capability that clearly sets the company apart.

The lowest-rated item is "Supplier performance is regularly monitored and evaluated through clear criteria" (M = 2.44, SD = 1.13), which falls into "Disagree-Slightly Practiced." This is a meaningful weak point because long-term relationships without consistent performance evaluation can become complacent relationships. Employees might be experiencing supplier management as informal, dependent on personal rapport, or reactive rather than metric-based. The second lowest is "Jiayi encourages innovation and suggestions from its suppliers" (M = 2.51, SD = 1.07), which barely stays in "Agree." That result may suggest that suppliers are treated as providers, not co-designers. In practical terms, there may be limited structured channels for supplier-led improvement ideas, such as joint Kaizen sessions or supplier innovation workshops.

In summary, Table 2 portrays supplier relationships as generally functional and cooperative, with transparency and information sharing being the most visible strengths. However, the relatively low score on formal supplier performance monitoring signals a gap in governance, which could quietly weaken quality, cost control, and risk management over time. If the organization wants supplier relationships to translate into stronger logistics performance and market competitiveness, it may need to tighten evaluation systems, not just maintain "good working relationships."

Table 3 Assessment of Employee-Respondents on the Supply Chain Management in Terms of Logistics Efficiency

Indicator (Statement)	WM	SD	QD	VI
The company ensures timely delivery of goods and services to customers.	2.62	1.06	Agree	Practiced
Transportation resources are effectively utilized to reduce costs.	2.93	1.03	Agree	Practiced
Warehouse management systems support smooth inventory flow.	2.85	1.04	Agree	Practiced
Logistics operations adapt quickly to unexpected disruptions or changes.	2.81	0.98	Agree	Practiced
Delivery errors and delays are minimal in the company's operations.	2.66	1.12	Agree	Practiced
Logistics processes are standardized and consistently followed.	2.43	1.15	Disagree	Slightly Practiced

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

Jiayi continuously implements measures to improve logistics performance.	2.56	1.11	Agree	Practiced
Overall Mean	**2.70**	**0.45**	**Agree**	**Practiced**

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Highly Practiced); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Practiced); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Practiced); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Practiced)

Table 3 shows that logistics efficiency is rated as practiced overall, with an overall mean of 2.70 and a standard deviation of 0.45. This falls within the "Agree-Practiced" band, suggesting employees generally believe that logistics operations work adequately. Yet, the spread of item means from 2.43 to 2.93 suggests that some parts of logistics are stronger than others. This kind of unevenness often shows up in real operations: transport may be working fine, while process discipline or standardization lags behind.

The strongest item is "Transportation resources are effectively utilized to reduce costs" (M = 2.93, SD = 1.03). Employees likely observe tangible evidence of this, such as route planning, load consolidation, scheduling discipline, or vendor cost controls. The next strongest is "Warehouse management systems support smooth inventory flow" (M = 2.85, SD = 1.04), followed closely by "Logistics operations adapt quickly to unexpected disruptions" (M = 2.81, SD = 0.98). These ratings may suggest that the organization has working systems and some flexibility when disruptions happen, such as sudden order changes or delivery delays. The standard deviations being around 1.00 still imply variation, but the pattern leans toward a generally positive operational picture.

Several items land in the midrange, implying "good enough" performance rather than exceptional efficiency. "Delivery errors and delays are minimal" (M = 2.66, SD = 1.12) and "The company ensures timely delivery of goods and services to customers" (M = 2.62, SD = 1.06) are both positive but not strong. The interesting part is that employees agree with timeliness, yet the mean is not particularly high. This could mean deliveries are often timely, but when delays occur, they are noticeable or costly. In logistics, a few late deliveries can shape perception disproportionately, especially when customers complain or when internal teams scramble to fix issues.

The lowest item is "Logistics processes are standardized and consistently followed" (M = 2.43, SD = 1.15), interpreted as "Disagree-Slightly Practiced." This stands out as a structural weakness. If processes are not standardized, the system may rely too much on individual experience and informal workarounds. When that happens, performance may look acceptable during normal operations but becomes fragile under pressure, staff turnover, or peak demand. The relatively high SD also suggests that some units may have strong process discipline while others operate with more improvisation.

Overall, Table 3 paints logistics efficiency as generally practiced, with transportation cost control as a visible strength. However, the weak score on standardization may signal why employees do not rate timeliness and error reduction as strongly as expected. If process consistency improves, it is likely that delivery reliability, responsiveness, and customer satisfaction metrics will follow, because logistics outcomes often hinge on disciplined routines more than heroic problem-solving.

Table 4 Assessment of Employee-Respondents on the Supply Chain Management in Terms of Technology Integration

Indicator (Statement)	WM	SD	QD	VI
The company uses digital systems (e.g., ERP, CRM) to support supply chain operations.	2.73	1.00	Agree	Practiced
Technology improves the accuracy of inventory management.	2.93	1.01	Agree	Practiced
Employees are trained to effectively use new technologies in logistics.	3.16	0.97	Agree	Practiced
Jiayi invests in advanced technologies to remain competitive.	3.06	0.96	Agree	Practiced
Technology is integrated across departments to ensure smooth workflow.	2.86	0.92	Agree	Practiced
Data-driven decision-making is supported by the company's digital tools.	2.81	1.01	Agree	Practiced
Automation and digital systems have reduced errors in supply chain operations.	2.65	0.90	Agree	Practiced
Overall Mean	**2.89**	**0.42**	**Agree**	**Practiced**

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Highly Practiced); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Practiced); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Practiced); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Practiced)

Table 4 indicates that technology integration is one of the stronger areas of supply chain management, with an overall mean of 2.89 and a standard deviation of 0.42, interpreted as "Agree-Practiced." Compared with Tables 2 and 3, this construct shows a relatively tighter spread, which may suggest that technology practices are more consistently perceived across the organization. Still, the item standard deviations hover around 0.90 to 1.01, meaning employee experiences with technology may still differ depending on role, department, or level of exposure to digital tools.

The highest-rated indicator is "Employees are trained to effectively use new technologies in logistics" (M = 3.16, SD = 0.97). This is notable because training is often the first thing companies neglect when implementing systems. Employees appear to acknowledge that training occurs and is visible enough to shape their assessment. The next strongest item is "Jiayi invests in advanced technologies to remain competitive" (M = 3.06, SD = 0.96), followed by "Technology improves the accuracy of inventory management" (M = 2.93, SD = 1.01). Together, these items may suggest a deliberate investment pattern: tools are being

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

adopted, employees are being oriented, and there is perceived operational value, especially in inventory accuracy.

Mid-level items include "Technology is integrated across departments to ensure smooth workflow" (M = 2.86, SD = 0.92) and "Data-driven decision-making is supported by the company's digital tools" (M = 2.81, SD = 1.01). These are positive, but they may hint that integration is still somewhat uneven. Many organizations buy software but struggle with cross-department adoption, shared dashboards, or consistent data input. A mean below 3.00 may suggest that employees see the tools, yet do not always experience seamless system-to-system handoffs, especially between warehousing, transport, and customer-facing units.

The lowest item is "Automation and digital systems have reduced errors in supply chain operations" (M = 2.65, SD = 0.90), though it remains in the "Agree" range. This is an interesting gap because technology adoption does not automatically reduce errors if processes are weak or if staff still rely on manual overrides. Given that Table 3 flagged low standardization, it is plausible that technology benefits are being limited by inconsistent process execution. In practical terms, the system might be in place, but the human routines around it still introduce avoidable mistakes.

In summary, Table 4 suggests the organization is doing fairly well in technology integration, especially in training and visible investment. However, error reduction through automation is not yet strongly felt, which may point to the need for tighter process discipline, better data governance, or clearer accountability for system use. Technology seems present, but its payoff looks like it could still improve with better operational alignment.

Table 5 Assessment of Employee-Respondents on the Supply Chain Management in Terms of Network Coordination

Indicator (Statement)	WM	SD	QD	VI
The company maintains effective communication with all supply chain partners.	2.45	1.14	Disagree	Slightly Practiced
Jiayi aligns its goals with those of its supply chain network.	2.73	1.13	Agree	Practiced
Information is shared in real time with distributors and stakeholders.	2.75	1.08	Agree	Practiced
Collaborative planning is conducted with partners to meet customer demand.	2.75	1.04	Agree	Practiced
There is a high level of trust among network members.	2.72	1.05	Agree	Practiced
Jiayi works closely with partners to manage risks and uncertainties.	2.68	1.12	Agree	Practiced
The company coordinates activities across the network to avoid duplication and inefficiencies.	2.64	1.13	Agree	Practiced
Overall Mean	**2.67**	**0.45**	**Agree**	**Practiced**

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Highly Practiced); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Practiced); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Practiced); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Practiced)

Table 5 presents network coordination as practiced overall, but with a few noticeable weak spots that deserve attention. The overall mean is 2.67 with a standard deviation of 0.45, which places the construct under "Agree-Practiced." Most indicators fall in the 2.64 to 2.75 range, suggesting that coordination mechanisms exist and are visible. Still, one item falls below the "Agree" threshold, implying that the quality of coordination may vary depending on which partner or part of the network is involved.

The strongest indicators relate to information exchange and collaborative planning. "Information is shared in real time with distributors and stakeholders" (M = 2.75, SD = 1.08) and "Collaborative planning is conducted with partners to meet customer demand" (M = 2.75, SD = 1.04) rank at the top. These items likely reflect operational routines like shared schedules, demand forecasting discussions, or regular check-ins with distributors. However, the SD values remain above 1.00, suggesting that "real time" may be true for some partners, while others receive updates late or inconsistently.

The lowest-rated item is "The company maintains effective communication with all supply chain partners" (M = 2.45, SD = 1.14), interpreted as "Disagree-Slightly Practiced." This is a critical contradiction that is worth unpacking. Employees agree that information is shared in real time, yet they do not agree that communication is effective with all partners. One possible explanation is that communication exists, but it may be fragmented, reactive, or uneven. For example, the company might communicate very well with key distributors but struggle with smaller suppliers, third-party carriers, or occasional subcontractors. Another possibility is that communication channels exist, but expectations, escalation protocols, or feedback loops are unclear.

Other midrange results such as "There is a high level of trust among network members" (M = 2.72, SD = 1.05) and "Jiayi aligns its goals with those of its supply chain network" (M = 2.73, SD = 1.13) suggest that employees do not see the network as hostile or chaotic. Yet, the means are not high enough to indicate strong strategic alignment. The coordination items "avoid duplication and inefficiencies" (M = 2.64, SD = 1.13) and "manage risks and uncertainties" (M = 2.68, SD = 1.12) also hint at an ongoing effort rather than a fully mature coordination system.

Overall, Table 5 implies that network coordination is present but not uniformly reliable. The organization appears to be doing reasonably well in planning and information sharing, but the weak rating for "effective communication with all partners" suggests a practical gap that could surface during disruptions, urgent customer requests, or multi-party delivery issues. Strengthening common communication

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

standards, clearer partner segmentation, and more consistent coordination routines may be the difference between "generally practiced" and "consistently dependable" coordination.

- *On the Significant Difference in the Assessment of Respondent on the Supply Chain Management when their Profile is Taken as Test Factor*

Table 6 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Supply Chain Management in Terms of Age

Indicator	Age Groups (1–5) Mean Range	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Supplier Relationships	2.58 – 2.87	1.31	0.27	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Logistics Efficiency	2.63 – 2.79	0.57	0.69	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Technology Integration	2.80 – 2.97	0.81	0.52	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Network Coordination	2.58 – 2.88	1.65	0.17	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Overall Supply Chain Management	**2.67 – 2.80**	**1.25**	**0.29**	**Fail to Reject Ho**	**No significant difference**

Table 6 demonstrates that age does not significantly differentiate employee assessments of supply chain management dimensions. For supplier relationships, the F value is 1.31 with p = 0.27, indicating no significant difference across the five age groups. Although mean ratings range from 2.58 to 2.87, the variation is not statistically persuasive. This suggests that younger and older employees largely share similar perceptions of supplier trust, transparency, and information sharing. If differences exist in real experience, they may be tied more to job role or department than to age category itself.

Logistics efficiency also shows no significant differences by age, with F = 0.57 and p = 0.69. The mean range (2.63–2.79) is relatively narrow, which reinforces the idea that logistics routines are experienced similarly regardless of age. Technology integration follows the same pattern. Even though means range from 2.80 to 2.97, the ANOVA result (F = 0.81, p = 0.52) indicates that these differences could easily be due to normal sampling variation. This is somewhat encouraging because technology adoption and comfort sometimes vary by age, yet this sample does not show strong age-based differences in technology integration perceptions.

Network coordination comes closest to showing age-based variation, but it still does not reach significance. The F value is 1.65 with p = 0.17, and mean ratings range from 2.58 to 2.88. This pattern may suggest that the youngest or oldest groups experience coordination differently, perhaps because they interact with partners in different capacities. Still, the lack of statistical significance means the evidence is not strong enough to claim a real age effect in this dataset.

The overall SCM composite confirms the same conclusion. With F = 1.25 and p = 0.29, overall supply chain management assessments do not significantly differ across age categories. This is consistent with the idea that supply chain practices are embedded in organizational routines that employees observe similarly across age groups. Where differences exist, they may be small and operationally subtle.

In summary, Table 6 suggests that age is not a determining factor in how employees perceive supply chain management in Jiayi. The organization's supply chain practices appear to be experienced in a broadly consistent way across younger and older employees. For management, this can be read as a sign of standardized exposure to supply chain systems. At the same time, it also suggests that if improvements are needed, they likely apply across the workforce rather than being targeted only at a specific age cohort.

Table 7 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Supply Chain Management in Terms of Sex

Indicator	Sex (Mean)	t	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Supplier Relationships	Male 2.81 / Female 2.75	0.60	0.55	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Logistics Efficiency	Male 2.68 / Female 2.71	-0.38	0.71	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Technology Integration	Male 2.84 / Female 2.93	-1.22	0.23	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Network Coordination	Male 2.59 / Female 2.75	-1.96	0.05	Fail to Reject Ho	Not statistically significant
Overall Supply Chain Management	**Male 2.73 / Female 2.79**	**-1.28**	**0.20**	**Fail to Reject Ho**	**No significant difference**

Table 7 shows that sex does not meaningfully differentiate how employees assess supply chain management dimensions. Supplier relationships show a small mean difference between males (M = 2.81) and females (M = 2.75), but the t-test result (t = 0.60, p = 0.55) indicates this difference is not statistically significant. The same pattern appears in logistics efficiency where males rated 2.68 and females rated 2.71 (t = -0.38, p = 0.71). In practical terms, it appears that day-to-day experiences of logistics processes and supplier engagement are fairly similar for both groups, at least as captured by this instrument.

Technology integration also shows no significant sex-based difference. Male respondents reported a mean of 2.84, while females reported 2.93, with t = -1.22 and p = 0.23. That gap is modest and statistically nonsignificant. This may

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

suggest that technology exposure and training are relatively accessible regardless of sex, or at least not perceived differently across groups. Given that Table 4 showed training as a high-rated item, this non-difference is consistent with the idea that training opportunities are distributed broadly.

Network coordination is the one area that comes close to significance but still does not meet the usual threshold. Males rated network coordination at 2.59 compared with 2.75 for females, and the test result ($t = -1.96$, $p = 0.05$) is right at the margin. Because it is presented here as "Fail to Reject Ho," it is being treated as not statistically significant, which is reasonable if the institution requires p to be strictly less than 0.05. Still, the pattern is interesting: females appear to rate coordination more positively. This may hint that women are more likely to occupy roles where coordination and communication are more visible, such as customer service or coordination-focused positions, though that would need role data to confirm.

Looking at the composite, overall supply chain management is also not significantly different across sex groups. Males recorded an overall SCM mean of 2.73, females 2.79, with $t = -1.28$ and $p = 0.20$. The mean difference is small and statistically negligible, which supports the conclusion that supply chain management perceptions are broadly consistent for male and female respondents. This consistency can be interpreted positively: supply chain practices are experienced as relatively uniform across groups.

In summary, Table 7 suggests that sex is not a meaningful factor in shaping perceptions of supply chain management among respondents. Where slight differences appear, they are not strong enough to be statistically persuasive. The results may point to organizational processes that are applied similarly across employees, rather than being experienced differently by sex, which is often a desirable organizational condition.

Table 8 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Supply Chain Management in Terms of Civil Status

Indicator	Civil Status Groups (1–4) Mean Range	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Supplier Relationships	2.74 – 2.84	0.18	0.91	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Logistics Efficiency	2.54 – 2.81	1.99	0.12	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Technology Integration	2.80 – 2.98	1.43	0.24	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Network Coordination	2.62 – 2.76	0.75	0.53	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Overall Supply Chain Management	**2.68 – 2.79**	**1.32**	**0.27**	**Fail to Reject Ho**	**No significant difference**

Table 8 shows that civil status does not significantly influence employee assessments of supply chain management. Supplier relationships show an F value of 0.18 with $p = 0.91$, indicating that perceptions across single, married, widow/er, and separated groups are essentially the same in statistical terms. This is supported by the narrow mean range (2.74–2.84), suggesting that relationship practices with suppliers are experienced similarly regardless of civil status. In operational settings, this result makes sense because supplier relationship practices are generally shaped by role responsibilities rather than personal demographic status.

Logistics efficiency displays $F = 1.99$ with $p = 0.12$, which is not significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. Still, the mean range here is somewhat wider (2.54–2.81), hinting at possible differences in perception that do not reach statistical reliability. It may be that certain civil status groups are clustered in particular job roles or work schedules, which could affect how they experience logistics disruptions or workload. However, the evidence provided by ANOVA suggests those differences are not consistent enough to claim a real group effect.

Technology integration shows $F = 1.43$ with $p = 0.24$, while network coordination shows $F = 0.75$ with $p = 0.53$, both indicating no significant civil status-based differences. The overall SCM composite is also nonsignificant with $F = 1.32$ and $p = 0.27$. These findings imply that the organization's supply chain systems, coordination routines, and technology use are perceived in a broadly uniform way across civil status categories.

A more cautious interpretation is that civil status may influence work-life conditions, but those conditions may not translate into different views about supply chain management effectiveness. Employees may have different personal circumstances, yet they still operate within the same supply chain processes and observe similar outcomes. If role and department were included, it might reveal stronger differentiators than civil status alone.

In summary, Table 8 supports the conclusion that civil status does not significantly affect employee perceptions of supply chain management. The company's supply chain practices appear to be experienced similarly across personal demographic categories, which suggests that improvement planning can focus on operational issues identified in the descriptive tables rather than demographic segmentation by civil status.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

Table 9 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Supply Chain Management in Terms of Educational Qualification

Indicator	Educational Groups (1–3) Mean Range	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Supplier Relationships	2.69 – 2.87	1.30	0.28	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Logistics Efficiency	2.62 – 2.80	1.83	0.16	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Technology Integration	2.81 – 2.95	1.11	0.33	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Network Coordination	2.63 – 2.71	0.29	0.75	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Overall Supply Chain Management	**2.72 – 2.81**	**1.50**	**0.23**	**Fail to Reject Ho**	**No significant difference**

Table 9 indicates that educational qualification does not produce statistically significant differences in how employees assess supply chain management. Across all four SCM dimensions, the Sig. values remain above 0.05, and the mean ranges are relatively narrow. Supplier Relationships, for example, ranges from 2.69 to 2.87 (F = 1.30, p = 0.28). This suggests that respondents, regardless of being tech-voc graduates, college graduates, or graduate school completers, tend to see supplier-related practices in largely similar terms.

A closer look shows that Logistics Efficiency has one of the wider mean ranges (2.62 to 2.80) and also a comparatively higher F value (F = 1.83), yet it still remains statistically non-significant (p = 0.16). That pattern may suggest that educational background could shape how employees notice process details, such as warehousing flow or transport utilization, but the data does not support a clear separation among groups. In real settings, it is plausible that an employee with more formal training may be slightly more critical of standardization gaps, while others may focus on whether deliveries "generally work," but those differences appear muted here.

Technology Integration ranges from 2.81 to 2.95 (F = 1.11, p = 0.33), again indicating limited variation. This is worth noting because technology adoption often creates sharper divides between groups with different training exposure. Here, the scores suggest that technology tools and systems are perceived as accessible and visible to all employee groups, not only to the more educated segment. That may imply that the company's operational technologies are embedded enough in daily routines that educational background does not strongly shape perceived effectiveness.

Network Coordination is the most stable dimension in the table, with mean range 2.63 to 2.71 (F = 0.29, p = 0.75). This may suggest that coordination practices, such as communication with partners and alignment across the network, are experienced at a similar level regardless of educational attainment. In many firms, coordination depends more on formal protocols and reporting lines than on individual educational exposure, which could explain the near-uniform evaluations.

Overall Supply Chain Management ranges from 2.72 to 2.81 (F = 1.50, p = 0.23), reinforcing the conclusion that educational qualification does not significantly differentiate perceptions of SCM. In summary, Table 9 shows a fairly uniform picture: employees across educational groups appear to agree, at roughly comparable levels, on how SCM is practiced in the company. If a subtle takeaway exists, it is that the slightly higher means among graduate school respondents in some dimensions may reflect higher awareness or more confidence in evaluating processes, but the statistical evidence does not justify treating that as a meaningful difference.

- *On the Assessment of Respondents on Marketing Strategy in Terms of the Market Intelligence, Product/Service Positioning, Promise Communication, Customer Satisfaction, Market Share, and Profitability*

Table 10 Assessment of Employee Respondents on the Marketing Strategy in Terms of Market Intelligence

Indicator (Statement)	WM	SD	QD	VI
The company regularly collects information about customer needs and preferences.	2.61	1.08	Agree	Practiced
Jiayi closely monitors competitors' activities to adjust its strategies.	2.77	1.07	Agree	Practiced
Market research findings are used to guide strategic decisions.	2.59	1.11	Agree	Practiced
The company anticipates market trends and prepares accordingly.	2.68	1.04	Agree	Practiced
Employees are encouraged to share insights about market opportunities.	2.63	1.08	Agree	Practiced
Jiayi adapts its services based on changing industry demands.	2.78	0.96	Agree	Practiced
The company invests in tools and systems for market data analysis.	2.86	1.01	Agree	Practiced
Overall Mean	**2.70**	**0.46**	**Agree**	**Practiced**

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Highly Practiced); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Practiced); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Practiced); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Practiced)

Table 10 shows that market intelligence is assessed as practiced, with an overall mean of 2.70 and a standard deviation of 0.46. This suggests that employees generally agree that the company gathers and uses market information, though the means do not indicate exceptionally strong performance. Item scores range from 2.59 to 2.86, which implies most practices are present but may still be developing. In many service firms, market intelligence can easily become a routine "data collection activity" without consistently

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

feeding into decisions, so the midrange scores here feel plausible.

The highest-rated item is "The company invests in tools and systems for market data analysis" (M = 2.86, SD = 1.01). Employees likely notice visible tools, such as CRM reports, customer feedback systems, or dashboards tracking delivery performance and client retention. The second highest is "Jiayi adapts its services based on changing industry demands" (M = 2.78, SD = 0.96), followed very closely by "Jiayi closely monitors competitors' activities to adjust its strategies" (M = 2.77, SD = 1.07). These findings may suggest a company that pays attention to external signals and tries to adjust accordingly, perhaps by modifying service packages, route offerings, or customer service commitments when competitors shift.

The lowest item is "Market research findings are used to guide strategic decisions" (M = 2.59, SD = 1.11). Even though it is still within "Agree," it is the weakest in the set. This gap is common in organizations where data are gathered but decision rights remain informal or top-down. Employees may be seeing market studies being produced, but not seeing them clearly translated into policies, budgets, or operational changes. Similarly, "The company regularly collects information about customer needs and preferences" (M = 2.61, SD = 1.08) and "Employees are encouraged to share insights about market opportunities" (M = 2.63, SD = 1.08) sit on the lower side, hinting that customer listening and internal idea-sharing may be somewhat uneven or dependent on individual managers.

The midrange pattern is also interesting because the items are close to one another, implying a fairly consistent but moderate level of market intelligence activity. "The company anticipates market trends and prepares accordingly" (M = 2.68, SD = 1.04) suggests some planning, yet not at a level employees would describe as strong foresight. If I were advising the firm, I would ask whether market intelligence is centralized in a small group or distributed among customer-facing units. If it is too centralized, employees might not feel it shaping their day-to-day work.

In summary, Table 10 portrays market intelligence as practiced, with visible investments in analytics tools and some capacity to adapt to industry demands. However, the relatively lower score for using research findings in strategic decisions may suggest a "last-mile" problem where insights do not consistently become decisions. Improving the linkage between market information and concrete strategic actions could help employees perceive market intelligence as more than just reporting.

Table 11 Assessment of Employee-Respondents on the Marketing Strategy in Terms of Product/Service Positioning

Indicator (Statement)	WM	SD	QD	VI
Jiayi clearly differentiates its services from competitors.	2.38	1.18	Disagree	Slightly Practiced
The company highlights unique features that create value for customers.	2.52	1.18	Agree	Practiced
Service quality is consistently aligned with the company's brand promise.	2.52	1.12	Agree	Practiced
Customers perceive Jiayi as a reliable logistics service provider.	2.42	1.13	Disagree	Slightly Practiced
The company effectively communicates its strengths in the market.	2.50	1.15	Agree	Practiced
Jiayi adjusts its positioning strategy to remain competitive.	2.45	1.16	Disagree	Slightly Practiced
Employees understand and support the company's positioning efforts.	2.51	1.12	Agree	Practiced
Overall Mean	**2.47**	**0.41**	**Disagree**	**Slightly Practiced**

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Highly Practiced); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Practiced); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Practiced); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Practiced)

Table 11 stands out because it is the only marketing construct rated overall as "Disagree-Slightly Practiced," with an overall mean of 2.47 and a standard deviation of 0.41. This suggests that employees do not consistently perceive the company's positioning as clear or strongly executed. The means range from 2.38 to 2.52, clustering close to the threshold between "Disagree" and "Agree." That narrow spread may indicate a shared perception: positioning exists in some form, but it is not sharp or compelling in daily practice.

The lowest-rated item is "Jiayi clearly differentiates its services from competitors" (M = 2.38, SD = 1.18). This is a practical issue because in logistics and service industries, differentiation often comes from reliability, speed, specialized handling, or customer support standards. A low score here may mean employees feel the company offers similar services to competitors and has not clearly articulated what makes it distinct. Another weak item is "Customers perceive Jiayi as a reliable logistics service provider" (M = 2.42, SD = 1.13), which is concerning because reliability is typically a core positioning pillar in logistics. This may not mean the company is unreliable, but it may suggest that employees are uncertain whether customers truly recognize reliability as a defining brand attribute.

The strongest items, though still modest, include "The company highlights unique features that create value for customers" (M = 2.52, SD = 1.18) and "Service quality is consistently aligned with the company's brand promise" (M = 2.52, SD = 1.12). These results may indicate that some effort exists to present value propositions and align service delivery with promises. "Employees understand and support the company's positioning efforts" (M = 2.51, SD = 1.12) also suggests internal buy-in is not absent. Yet, the overall low mean implies that understanding alone has not translated into consistent external messaging or clear market perception.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

Several items sit in the "Disagree" range, including "Jiayi adjusts its positioning strategy to remain competitive" (M = 2.45, SD = 1.16) and "The company effectively communicates its strengths in the market" (M = 2.50, SD = 1.15), which is borderline. The standard deviations above 1.10 across items indicate mixed experiences: some employees may see strong positioning efforts in certain customer segments, while others see unclear messaging or inconsistent brand signals. This kind of inconsistency can happen if marketing materials say one thing while operational realities vary by location or service type.

Overall, Table 11 suggests product and service positioning is an area that needs more deliberate refinement. Employees do not strongly see differentiation, and they are not fully confident that customers perceive the company as reliably positioned. This does not automatically imply weak performance; it may instead reflect unclear branding, inconsistent messaging, or lack of internal alignment between what is promised and what is consistently delivered. Strengthening positioning would likely require clearer value propositions tied to measurable service attributes that employees can confidently stand behind.

Table 12 Assessment of Employee-Respondents on the Marketing Strategy in Terms of Promise Communication

Indicator (Statement)	WM	SD	QD	VI
The company clearly communicates service expectations to customers.	2.46	1.11	Disagree	Slightly Practiced
Commitments made to customers are consistently fulfilled.	2.56	1.11	Agree	Practiced
Jiayi provides accurate information about delivery timelines.	2.48	1.09	Disagree	Slightly Practiced
Marketing messages are consistent with actual service performance.	2.55	1.14	Agree	Practiced
Customers trust the company's service commitments.	2.45	1.12	Disagree	Slightly Practiced
Jiayi promptly informs customers of any changes or issues.	2.62	1.12	Agree	Practiced
Employees play an active role in ensuring promises are kept.	2.59	1.08	Agree	Practiced
Overall Mean	**2.53**	**0.46**	**Agree**	**Practiced**

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Highly Practiced); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Practiced); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Practiced); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Practiced)

Table 12 indicates that promise communication is generally practiced, with an overall mean of 2.53 and a standard deviation of 0.46, interpreted as "Agree-Practiced." Still, the pattern is mixed, with several items falling into "Disagree-Slightly Practiced." This suggests that while the company does communicate promises, the clarity and credibility of those promises may not be consistently experienced by employees. In service organizations, this matters because promise communication is not only about marketing messages but also about operational follow-through and timely customer updates.

The highest-rated item is "Jiayi promptly informs customers of any changes or issues" (M = 2.62, SD = 1.12), followed by "Employees play an active role in ensuring promises are kept" (M = 2.59, SD = 1.08). These two items suggest that employees perceive a real effort to manage expectations when situations change, such as delays, route disruptions, or last-minute customer adjustments. It also implies that frontline staff may be compensating for gaps by actively communicating with clients. In practice, this might look like customer service staff calling clients to explain a delay or operations staff coordinating new schedules.

However, several items fall below the "Agree" threshold, including "The company clearly communicates service expectations to customers" (M = 2.46, SD = 1.11), "Jiayi provides accurate information about delivery timelines" (M = 2.48, SD = 1.09), and "Customers trust the company's service commitments" (M = 2.45, SD = 1.12). This is an interesting tension: employees say the company informs customers of changes, yet they do not strongly agree that expectations and timelines are clearly communicated from the start. It may suggest the company is better at reactive communication than proactive communication. When promises are unclear initially, staff may end up spending time "fixing" expectations after issues emerge.

Items related to consistency are modestly positive. "Commitments made to customers are consistently fulfilled" (M = 2.56, SD = 1.11) and "Marketing messages are consistent with actual service performance" (M = 2.55, SD = 1.14) suggest some alignment between what is said and what is delivered, but not at a level employees see as strong. Again, the standard deviations above 1.10 imply unevenness. Some teams may be very consistent, while others experience breakdowns that affect customer trust.

Overall, Table 12 suggests promise communication is present but somewhat uneven, leaning toward "we do our best to update customers when problems happen." That is valuable, but it is not the same as having clear, reliable promises that customers trust upfront. Strengthening proactive communication, especially around timelines and service expectations, may reduce the need for constant damage control and could support stronger customer satisfaction and market share outcomes.

Table 13 Assessment of Employee-Respondents on the Marketing Strategy in Terms of Customer Satisfaction

Indicator (Statement)	WM	SD	QD	VI
Customers are satisfied with the overall quality of Jiayi's services.	2.72	1.12	Agree	Practiced
The company receives positive feedback from its customers.	2.52	1.15	Agree	Practiced
Jiayi addresses customer complaints quickly and effectively.	2.43	1.13	Disagree	Slightly Practiced

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

Customers are likely to recommend Jiayi's services to others.	2.65	1.13	Agree	Practiced
The company maintains strong long-term relationships with its clients.	2.38	1.13	Disagree	Slightly Practiced
Jiayi regularly measures and tracks customer satisfaction.	2.59	1.10	Agree	Practiced
Service improvements are based on customer feedback.	2.48	1.08	Disagree	Slightly Practiced
Overall Mean	**2.54**	**0.49**	**Agree**	**Practiced**

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Highly Practiced); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Practiced); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Practiced); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Practiced)

Table 13 shows that customer satisfaction practices are generally assessed as practiced, with an overall mean of 2.54 and a standard deviation of 0.49. The item means range from 2.38 to 2.72, which suggests that employees perceive customers as moderately satisfied, but not uniformly so across all areas. This middle-range pattern feels typical in service firms where customers may be pleased with core service delivery but less impressed with complaint handling or relationship maintenance.

The highest-rated indicator is "Customers are satisfied with the overall quality of Jiayi's services" (M = 2.72, SD = 1.12), followed by "Customers are likely to recommend Jiayi's services to others" (M = 2.65, SD = 1.13). These scores suggest employees observe customers returning and speaking positively, which may reflect a decent baseline service quality. "Jiayi regularly measures and tracks customer satisfaction" (M = 2.59, SD = 1.10) also indicates that some measurement system exists. That could involve customer feedback forms, complaint logs, or periodic service evaluations.

The lowest-rated item is "The company maintains strong long-term relationships with its clients" (M = 2.38, SD = 1.13), which is interpreted as "Disagree-Slightly Practiced." This is important because client relationship strength often translates into repeat business, referrals, and resilience during market shifts. A low score here may suggest that relationships are transactional or that account management practices are not consistent. Another weak area is responsiveness to concerns. "Jiayi addresses customer complaints quickly and effectively" (M = 2.43, SD = 1.13) falls under "Disagree," implying that complaint resolution may be slow or uneven, perhaps due to unclear escalation routes or limited authority at the frontline.

Some indicators sit near the midpoint and offer a more nuanced picture. "The company receives positive feedback from its customers" (M = 2.52, SD = 1.15) is positive, yet "Service improvements are based on customer feedback" (M = 2.48, SD = 1.08) is slightly practiced. This could mean feedback is collected but not always acted upon in ways employees can see. That kind of gap can weaken trust internally because employees may feel they are gathering feedback without seeing tangible changes.

In summary, Table 13 suggests employees perceive a generally acceptable level of customer satisfaction, anchored by overall service quality and some likelihood of recommendation. However, the weaker scores in long-term relationship building and complaint handling point to areas that may quietly erode customer loyalty over time. Strengthening relationship management and complaint resolution processes could help convert "moderate satisfaction" into more consistent loyalty, which would likely feed into stronger market share outcomes.

Table 14 Assessment of Employee-Respondents on the Marketing Strategy in Terms of Market Share

Indicator (Statement)	WM	SD	QD	VI
Jiayi's market presence has grown steadily in recent years.	2.65	1.11	Agree	Practiced
The company has a strong competitive position in the logistics industry.	2.73	1.08	Agree	Practiced
Jiayi attracts new customers consistently.	2.95	1.10	Agree	Practiced
Existing customers prefer Jiayi over competitors.	2.78	1.10	Agree	Practiced
The company expands its service offerings to increase market reach.	2.55	1.11	Agree	Practiced
Jiayi is recognized as a leading player in its sector.	2.57	1.07	Agree	Practiced
Employees believe the company has the capacity to expand its market share.	2.55	1.14	Agree	Practiced
Overall Mean	**2.68**	**0.39**	**Agree**	**Practiced**

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Highly Practiced); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Practiced); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Practiced); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Practiced)

Table 14 indicates that market share-related practices are assessed as practiced, with an overall mean of 2.68 and a standard deviation of 0.39. Compared with other marketing constructs, this is relatively strong and also shows a tighter dispersion, suggesting employees share a somewhat consistent view of the company's market presence. The item means range from 2.55 to 2.95, with all items falling in the "Agree" range. This implies employees generally perceive the company as competitive and capable of attracting and retaining customers.

The highest-rated item is "Jiayi attracts new customers consistently" (M = 2.95, SD = 1.10). This may reflect visible growth activities such as new contracts, expanded routes, or increased customer inquiries. Next is "Existing customers prefer Jiayi over competitors" (M = 2.78, SD = 1.10), followed by "The company has a strong competitive position in the logistics industry" (M = 2.73, SD = 1.08). These results suggest employees perceive a stable customer base and a reasonable competitive stance, which could be tied to service coverage, pricing, or operational capability.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

The lowest-rated items are "The company expands its service offerings to increase market reach" (M = 2.55, SD = 1.11) and "Employees believe the company has the capacity to expand its market share" (M = 2.55, SD = 1.14). These are still within "Agree," but they may hint at cautious optimism rather than confidence. Employees might see customer acquisition happening, but they may be less certain about the company's ability to scale, perhaps due to resource constraints, staffing capacity, or operational bottlenecks. "Jiayi is recognized as a leading player in its sector" (M = 2.57, SD = 1.07) also sits relatively low, which could mean the company is competitive but not necessarily perceived as a top-of-mind industry leader.

An interesting angle here is that the market share construct is rated higher overall than product and service positioning in Table 14. That combination may suggest growth is being driven more by operational capability, networks, or pricing rather than by a sharply differentiated brand message. In some industries, companies grow through service coverage and reliability rather than brand positioning. Still, if positioning remains weak, sustaining long-term market share growth can become harder when competitors catch up.

Overall, Table 14 suggests employees view the company as capable of maintaining and even growing its market presence, with customer acquisition being the most visible strength. However, the slightly lower ratings on capacity to expand and sector leadership imply that growth may be occurring within limits. Strengthening the foundations, such as positioning clarity and scalable operations, may help the company convert current market presence into a more durable competitive advantage.

Table 15 Assessment of Employee-Respondents on the Marketing Strategy in Terms of Profitability

Indicator (Statement)	WM	SD	QD	VI
Jiayi generates consistent financial growth.	2.78	1.05	Agree	Practiced
The company's revenues cover costs and contribute to profit.	2.75	1.14	Agree	Practiced
Jiayi invests profits into service and operational improvements.	3.22	0.96	Agree	Practiced
Profitability is supported by efficient cost management.	2.96	0.97	Agree	Practiced
The company's pricing strategy contributes to financial success.	2.95	1.14	Agree	Practiced
Jiayi's financial performance is stronger compared to industry averages.	2.38	1.05	Disagree	Slightly Practiced
Employees are aware of the importance of profitability to long-term success.	2.42	1.06	Disagree	Slightly Practiced
Overall Mean	**2.78**	**0.43**	**Agree**	**Practiced**

Legend: 3.51 – 4.00 (Strongly Agree-Highly Highly Practiced); 2.51 – 3.50 (Agree- Practiced); 1.51 – 2.50 (Disagree-Slightly Practiced); 1.0-1.50 (Strongly Disagree-Not Practiced)

Table 15 shows that profitability-related practices are generally assessed as practiced, with an overall mean of 2.78 and a standard deviation of 0.43. This indicates employees agree that the company demonstrates financial performance and uses profitability to support operations. Item means range from 2.38 to 3.22, suggesting that some aspects of profitability are perceived strongly while others are viewed more skeptically. The variability is worth noting because employees often have uneven exposure to financial information; frontline staff may only see profitability indirectly through budget availability, staffing levels, or operational investments.

The strongest item is "Jiayi invests profits into service and operational improvements" (M = 3.22, SD = 0.96). This suggests employees see tangible reinvestment, perhaps through upgraded equipment, system improvements, training, or process initiatives. "Profitability is supported by efficient cost management" (M = 2.96, SD = 0.97) and "The company's pricing strategy contributes to financial success" (M = 2.95, SD = 1.14) also rank high, indicating employees perceive cost control and pricing discipline as key profitability drivers. In practical terms, this may reflect careful fuel management, route optimization, staffing controls, or pricing structures that align with service costs.

Midrange items include "Jiayi generates consistent financial growth" (M = 2.78, SD = 1.05) and "The company's revenues cover costs and contribute to profit" (M = 2.75, SD = 1.14). These are positive, but they are not strong endorsements. Employees might see profitability as generally present but perhaps influenced by market conditions, seasonal fluctuations, or cost pressures. The high SD values suggest mixed views. Some employees may perceive growth as steady, while others see financial performance as unpredictable or uneven across business segments.

The weakest items are "Jiayi's financial performance is stronger compared to industry averages" (M = 2.38, SD = 1.05) and "Employees are aware of the importance of profitability to long-term success" (M = 2.42, SD = 1.06), both falling into "Disagree-Slightly Practiced." These results may suggest limited benchmarking and limited internal financial communication. Employees may not feel confident comparing performance to competitors, likely because they do not have access to comparative data. At the same time, the low score on employee awareness hints that profitability may not be actively communicated as a shared organizational priority, which can weaken cost-conscious behavior at operational levels.

Overall, Table 15 suggests employees generally believe the company is profitable and reinvests gains into operations, which is a positive sign for sustainability. However, limited benchmarking awareness and weak employee-level financial understanding may constrain profitability improvements over time. If the company wants to strengthen long-term financial success, it may need clearer internal communication about

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

financial goals and how day-to-day operational behaviors link to profit outcomes.

- *On the Significant Difference in the Assessment of Respondents on the Marketing Strategy when their Profile is Taken as Test Factor?*

Table 16 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Marketing Strategy in Terms of Sex

Indicator	Sex (Mean)	t	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Market Intelligence	Male 2.70 / Female 2.71	-0.17	0.86	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Product/Service Positioning	Male 2.46 / Female 2.48	-0.27	0.79	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Promise Communication	Male 2.53 / Female 2.53	-0.03	0.98	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Customer Satisfaction	Male 2.54 / Female 2.53	0.13	0.90	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Market Share	**Male 2.61 / Female 2.75**	**-2.10**	**0.04**	**Reject Ho**	**Significant difference exists**
Profitability	Male 2.82 / Female 2.74	1.01	0.32	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Overall Marketing Strategy	**Male 2.61 / Female 2.62**	**-0.50**	**0.62**	**Fail to Reject Ho**	**No significant difference**

Table 16 indicates that sex does not significantly differentiate perceptions across most marketing strategy dimensions, with one important exception. Market intelligence is virtually identical for males (M = 2.70) and females (M = 2.71), and the test result (t = -0.17, p = 0.86) confirms no significant difference. Similarly, product and service positioning shows no meaningful separation between males (M = 2.46) and females (M = 2.48), with t = -0.27 and p = 0.79. These results suggest that both groups share the same general view that market intelligence is practiced and positioning is relatively weaker.

Promise communication is also perceived similarly, with males at 2.53 and females at 2.53, producing an almost zero mean difference (t = -0.03, p = 0.98). Customer satisfaction shows the same trend, with males at 2.54 and females at 2.53 (t = 0.13, p = 0.90). These values are close enough that any practical difference is minimal. If anything, the similarity may suggest that marketing-related execution is visible in shared organizational spaces, such as customer feedback handling, service commitment practices, and internal communication.

The one statistically significant result is market share. Males rated market share at 2.61, while females rated it higher at 2.75, and this difference is statistically significant (t = -2.10, p = 0.04). This suggests that female respondents perceive the company's market share position and growth more positively than male respondents. The reason is not directly revealed by the table, but a plausible explanation is that females may have stronger exposure to customer acquisition signals, customer retention conversations, or positive feedback loops in roles that deal more directly with clients. Another possibility is that men and women interpret "market share growth" differently based on what they see in their daily work, such as workload changes, new accounts, or service expansion.

Profitability does not show a significant difference. Males reported 2.82 while females reported 2.74, with t = 1.01 and p = 0.32. So even if females rate market share higher, that does not translate into a significantly different profitability perception. This is not necessarily contradictory. Employees can perceive market presence as improving while still feeling uncertain about how that translates into stronger profit performance, especially if costs also rise or operations become more complex.

Overall marketing strategy is not significantly different by sex, with males at 2.61 and females at 2.62 (t = -0.50, p = 0.62). This indicates that the significant difference for market share is a specific localized difference rather than a broad divergence in marketing perceptions. In summary, Table 16 suggests marketing strategy perceptions are broadly shared across sex groups, but females appear to view market share more favorably, which may be a useful insight for management when interpreting internal perceptions of competitive position.

Table 17 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Marketing Strategy in Terms of Age

Indicator	Age Groups (1–5) Mean Range	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Market Intelligence	2.63 – 2.83	0.99	0.41	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Product/Service Positioning	2.42 – 2.59	0.76	0.55	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Promise Communication	2.45 – 2.75	1.85	0.12	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Customer Satisfaction	2.45 – 2.63	0.79	0.53	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Market Share	2.58 – 2.74	0.64	0.63	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Profitability	2.72 – 2.84	0.42	0.79	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Overall Marketing Strategy	**2.58 – 2.64**	**0.47**	**0.76**	**Fail to Reject Ho**	**No significant difference**

Table 17 indicates no statistically significant differences in marketing strategy assessments across age groups. Market intelligence shows F = 0.99 and p = 0.41, suggesting that employees of different ages do not significantly differ in how they view market data gathering, competitor monitoring, and the use of market information. Even though the mean range spans 2.63 to 2.83, the variation is not strong enough to conclude that age shapes market intelligence perceptions.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

Product and service positioning also shows no significant difference, with F = 0.76 and p = 0.55. This result aligns with Table 7's overall finding that positioning is relatively weak, and it appears that this weakness is felt similarly across ages. Promise communication comes closer to significance with F = 1.85 and p = 0.12, but still remains nonsignificant. This pattern may hint that certain age groups, perhaps those with longer experience, interpret communication reliability differently. Still, without significance, it remains more of a possible signal than a conclusion.

Customer satisfaction shows F = 0.79 and p = 0.53, and market share shows F = 0.64 and p = 0.63, both indicating no significant difference across age groups. Profitability is also nonsignificant, with F = 0.42 and p = 0.79. The overall marketing strategy composite confirms the same trend with F = 0.47 and p = 0.76. Taken together, these values suggest that marketing strategy, as perceived internally, is not divided along age lines.

One practical reading is that marketing-related information and performance signals are shared across the organization rather than concentrated in a specific age group. For example, if growth signals and customer feedback are discussed openly, employees of different ages may form similar judgments. Another possibility is that age differences exist, but the measurement approach, sample sizes per group, or within-group variability masks them. The standard deviations in earlier descriptive tables suggest sizable individual-level variation, which can reduce the ability of ANOVA to detect group differences.

Overall, Table 17 suggests that age does not significantly influence how employees assess marketing strategy. This implies that marketing strengths and weaknesses, such as relatively strong market share perceptions and weaker positioning, are broadly shared views rather than age-specific impressions. For decision-making, this can be useful because improvement plans do not need to be tailored by age group; instead, attention can focus on the substantive marketing dimensions that scored lowest.

Table 18 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Marketing Strategy in Terms of Civil Status

Indicator	Civil Status Groups (1–4) Mean Range	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Market Intelligence	2.68 – 2.75	0.18	0.91	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Product/Service Positioning	2.38 – 2.53	0.94	0.42	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Promise Communication	2.44 – 2.57	0.56	0.64	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Customer Satisfaction	2.50 – 2.56	0.10	0.96	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Market Share	2.60 – 2.80	1.37	0.26	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Profitability	2.71 – 2.85	0.53	0.66	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Overall Marketing Strategy	**2.59 – 2.64**	**0.57**	**0.64**	**Fail to Reject Ho**	**No significant difference**

Table 18 suggests that respondents' assessments of marketing strategy are broadly consistent across civil status groups. The mean ranges are fairly tight for all dimensions, with Market Intelligence ranging only from 2.68 to 2.75 (F = 0.18, p = 0.91) and Customer Satisfaction from 2.50 to 2.56 (F = 0.10, p = 0.96). In practical terms, these are small movements around the same central tendency, which fits the overall pattern of "no significant difference." It looks like employees, whether single, married, widowed, or separated, tend to evaluate the firm's marketing-related practices in a similar way.

When the individual dimensions are compared, Product/Service Positioning shows the widest spread in the table, but even here the range remains modest at 2.38 to 2.53 (F = 0.94, p = 0.42). That may suggest that positioning perceptions can vary slightly depending on personal circumstances, but the variation is not strong enough to be statistically meaningful. Promise Communication also follows this same shape, with means between 2.44 and 2.57 (F = 0.56, p = 0.64), which hints at minor differences in how respondents interpret "promises" and messaging consistency, yet still not enough to claim a real group-based gap.

An interesting point in Table 18 is that Market Share and Profitability show relatively wider mean ranges than Market Intelligence, but the evidence still does not support a civil-status-based difference. Market Share ranges from 2.60 to 2.80 (F = 1.37, p = 0.26), while Profitability ranges from 2.71 to 2.85 (F = 0.53, p = 0.66). Those spreads may look noticeable at a glance, especially since market share often feels like a "headline" performance marker in logistics firms, but the p-values imply that any apparent separation is likely due to normal variation within groups rather than a consistent pattern between groups.

Looking at the overall score, Overall Marketing Strategy falls within a narrow band of 2.59 to 2.64 (F = 0.57, p = 0.64). This is the kind of result I usually interpret as a signal that civil status is not a meaningful differentiator in workplace perceptions of organizational marketing strategy. From a practical standpoint, this may imply that the strategies and communication channels used by the company are experienced similarly across employees, regardless of personal family situation.

In summary, Table 18 provides a stable finding: civil status does not significantly influence how employees assess marketing strategy across Market Intelligence, Product/Service Positioning, Promise Communication, Customer Satisfaction, Market Share, Profitability, and the overall composite.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

If there is a critique to add, it is that civil status might simply be too distant from day-to-day marketing and customer-facing operations to create detectable differences. What may matter more, though not tested here, are factors like job role, department assignment, tenure, or exposure to customer feedback systems.

Table 19 Test of Difference in the Assessment of Marketing Strategy in terms of Educational Qualification

Indicator	Educational Groups (1–3) Mean Range	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Market Intelligence	2.69 – 2.71	0.02	0.98	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Product/Service Positioning	2.43 – 2.54	0.76	0.47	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Promise Communication	2.44 – 2.64	2.13	0.12	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Customer Satisfaction	2.51 – 2.57	0.23	0.80	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Market Share	2.62 – 2.79	2.74	0.07	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Profitability	2.73 – 2.85	0.97	0.38	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant difference
Overall Marketing Strategy	**2.59 – 2.63**	**0.66**	**0.52**	**Fail to Reject Ho**	**No significant difference**

Table 19 shows that respondents' assessments of marketing strategy do not significantly differ when grouped according to educational qualification. The Sig. values are all above 0.05, and several mean ranges are quite narrow. Market Intelligence is especially consistent, ranging only from 2.69 to 2.71 (F = 0.02, p = 0.98), which strongly suggests that market sensing practices, data gathering, and trend monitoring are perceived similarly across educational groups.

Product/Service Positioning also remains statistically non-significant (F = 0.76, p = 0.47), with means between 2.43 and 2.54. This is interesting because positioning involves interpretation of brand value and differentiation, which might be expected to vary by educational exposure. The results imply that employees, regardless of educational background, share comparable impressions of how the company positions itself and communicates distinctiveness to customers.

Promise Communication is the closest dimension to showing group separation, with the widest mean range (2.44 to 2.64) and the highest F value in Table 19 (F = 2.13), yet it still remains non-significant (p = 0.12). This is one of those results that may deserve a cautious note: there could be a developing difference that might become clearer with a larger sample or with grouping variables more directly tied to customer-facing work. For instance, employees with more training might pay closer attention to whether promised timelines match actual performance, while others may judge based on general customer interactions.

Customer Satisfaction shows minimal variation (2.51 to 2.57; F = 0.23, p = 0.80), suggesting shared perceptions about feedback, complaint handling, and service experience. Market Share also approaches, but does not reach, significance (F = 2.74, p = 0.07), with means between 2.62 and 2.79. This near-threshold result may indicate that employees with different educational backgrounds view market expansion and competitive strength slightly differently. Still, the p-value means we should not overstate it.

Profitability remains non-significant (F = 0.97, p = 0.38), with a mean range of 2.73 to 2.85, and Overall Marketing Strategy is likewise stable (2.59 to 2.63; F = 0.66, p = 0.52). Overall, Table 19 suggests that educational qualification does not materially shape how employees evaluate marketing strategy in this company. If anything stands out, it is the "almost significant" pattern in Market Share and the wider spread in Promise Communication, which might hint at areas where perceptions are less uniform and may depend on who has access to performance metrics or customer feedback systems.

- *On the Significant Relationship in the Assessment of Respondents Between the Supply Chain Management and Marketing Strategy*

Table 20 Correlation Between the Assessment of Supply Chain Management and Marketing Strategy

Supply Chain Management	Marketing Strategy	Computed r	Sig.	Decision	Interpretation
Supplier Relationships	Market Intelligence	-0.279	0.001	Reject Ho	Significant weak negative correlation
	Product/Service Positioning	0.020	0.824	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Promise Communication	-0.014	0.870	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Customer Satisfaction	0.083	0.350	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Market Share	0.100	0.256	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Profitability	0.244	0.005	Reject Ho	Significant weak positive correlation
Logistics Efficiency	Market Intelligence	-0.254	0.004	Reject Ho	Significant weak negative correlation

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

	Product/Service Positioning	0.154	0.081	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Promise Communication	-0.178	0.043	Reject Ho	Significant weak negative correlation
	Customer Satisfaction	0.098	0.266	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Market Share	-0.025	0.777	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Profitability	0.171	0.052	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
Technology Integration	Market Intelligence	-0.089	0.315	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Product/Service Positioning	-0.065	0.460	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Promise Communication	0.017	0.847	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Customer Satisfaction	-0.012	0.889	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Market Share	-0.117	0.185	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Profitability	0.162	0.065	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
Network Coordination	Market Intelligence	0.246	0.005	Reject Ho	Significant weak positive correlation
	Product/Service Positioning	0.019	0.828	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Promise Communication	0.056	0.529	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Customer Satisfaction	-0.058	0.513	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Market Share	0.046	0.606	Fail to Reject Ho	No significant relationship
	Profitability	-0.175	0.046	Reject Ho	Significant weak negative correlation
Overall Supply Chain Management	**Overall Marketing Strategy**	**0.031**	**0.729**	**Fail to Reject Ho**	**No significant relationship**

Table 20 provides a mixed and somewhat nuanced correlation pattern between Supply Chain Management (SCM) dimensions and Marketing Strategy dimensions. At the overall level, Overall Supply Chain Management is not significantly related to Overall Marketing Strategy ($r = 0.031$, $p = 0.729$). This is an important finding because it suggests that, in this dataset, stronger SCM perceptions do not automatically translate into stronger marketing strategy perceptions, at least not in a simple linear way. In practice, that may mean employees mentally separate "operations performance" from "market-facing performance," treating them as related in theory but not necessarily linked in daily observation.

Looking at significant relationships, Supplier Relationships shows a statistically significant weak negative correlation with Market Intelligence ($r = -0.279$, $p = 0.001$). This is a bit counterintuitive at first glance because one might expect firms with strong supplier relationships to also have strong market intelligence practices. One possible explanation is that when employees view supplier ties as stable and dependable, they may feel less urgency to monitor market signals closely, especially in an industry where supplier reliability can dominate day-to-day concerns. On the other hand, Supplier Relationships is significantly and weakly positively related to Profitability ($r = 0.244$, $p = 0.005$), which is easier to interpret, since dependable suppliers often support cost control, fewer disruptions, and smoother service delivery, all of which can support financial outcomes.

Logistics Efficiency also has significant weak negative relationships with Market Intelligence ($r = -0.254$, $p = 0.004$) and Promise Communication ($r = -0.178$, $p = 0.043$). This pattern may suggest a tension employees perceive between operational execution and outward-facing messaging. In a logistics setting, teams focused on "getting shipments moving" sometimes operate with a practical mindset that does not always align with how promises are framed or marketed. It may also reflect that when efficiency problems are visible, employees become more skeptical of the company's market messaging or of the reliability of market data used for planning.

Network Coordination presents two statistically significant correlations that are worth noting. First, it has a weak positive correlation with Market Intelligence ($r = 0.246$, $p = 0.005$), implying that tighter coordination across partners may go hand-in-hand with better information sharing and market sensing. That makes intuitive sense: coordinated networks often require shared forecasts, real-time updates, and demand tracking. At the same time, Network Coordination has a weak negative correlation with Profitability ($r = -0.175$, $p = 0.046$). This result is a little uncomfortable but plausible. Coordination, especially when it involves extra meetings, shared systems, compliance processes, or partner concessions, can increase overhead costs or slow decision-making, which may pressure profitability if not managed carefully.

Finally, Technology Integration shows no statistically significant relationships with any marketing strategy dimension in Table 23 (all p-values > 0.05). That may suggest that technology is being treated more as an operational necessity than as a marketing enabler in this context. For

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

example, having ERP or CRM systems may support internal tracking, but employees may not see these tools as directly influencing market positioning, customer satisfaction, or market share. In summary, Table 23 indicates that links between SCM and marketing strategy are selective rather than broad. The significant relationships are mostly weak, and several move in negative directions, which suggests that the organization may benefit from better alignment between operational priorities and market-facing strategy so that improvements in one area do not unintentionally undermine perceptions in another.

III. DISCUSSIONS

➢ *Summary of Findings*

- Profile of the Respondents. The respondents represent a relatively balanced and diverse workforce in terms of age, sex, civil status, and educational qualification. While the largest age group falls within 41–50 years old, younger and older groups are also well represented, suggesting perspectives drawn from both early-career and more experienced employees. The distribution by sex is nearly even, which reduces the likelihood of gender bias in overall perceptions. Civil status shows greater concentration among separated and single respondents, while educational qualification reflects a workforce composed largely of college graduates, followed by tech vocational and graduate school completers. Taken together, this profile suggests that the assessments reflect views shaped by varied life stages and educational exposures rather than a narrowly defined respondent group.
- Assessment of Supply Chain Management. Overall, Supply Chain Management is assessed at an "Agree" and "Practiced" level across all four dimensions, indicating generally favorable but not exceptional perceptions. Technology Integration emerges as the strongest area, with respondents particularly acknowledging employee training and investment in advanced systems, which may suggest visible and consistent use of digital tools in daily operations. Supplier Relationships and Logistics Efficiency also receive positive evaluations, though specific practices such as supplier performance monitoring and standardized logistics processes fall closer to the "Slightly Practiced" range. Network Coordination records the lowest overall mean among SCM dimensions, primarily due to weaker ratings on communication across partners, suggesting that inter-organizational alignment remains an area where practice may lag behind intention.
- Differences in Supply Chain Management. Across sex, age, civil status, and educational qualification, no statistically significant differences are found in the assessment of Supply Chain Management. This consistency suggests that SCM practices are experienced similarly by employees regardless of demographic or educational background. While minor variations in mean scores appear across groups, these differences do not reach statistical significance, implying that perceptions of SCM are shaped more by shared organizational processes than by personal characteristics. From an interpretive standpoint, this may indicate that SCM systems and routines are sufficiently standardized to produce a relatively uniform employee experience.
- Assessment of Marketing Strategy. Marketing Strategy is likewise assessed at an overall "Agree" and "Practiced" level, although the pattern across dimensions is less even than in SCM. Market Intelligence and Market Share receive comparatively higher ratings, suggesting that respondents recognize efforts related to competitor monitoring, market adaptation, and customer acquisition. In contrast, Product/Service Positioning is rated lowest overall and falls within the "Disagree" or "Slightly Practiced" range, indicating uncertainty about differentiation and brand clarity. Promise Communication and Customer Satisfaction sit between these extremes, reflecting partial confidence in how commitments are communicated and fulfilled, but also pointing to gaps in complaint handling, trust-building, and long-term relationship management.
- Differences in Marketing Strategy. Most dimensions of Marketing Strategy do not significantly differ when respondents are grouped by sex, age, civil status, or educational qualification. The lone exception appears in Market Share when grouped by sex, where a statistically significant difference is observed, suggesting that male and female respondents may perceive the company's competitive position and growth capacity differently. Aside from this, the absence of significant differences implies that marketing-related practices and outcomes are perceived in broadly similar ways across employee groups. This uniformity may reflect centralized marketing policies, but it may also mask subtle role-based differences that are not captured by demographic variables alone.
- Relationship Between Supply Chain Management and Marketing Strategy. The correlation analysis reveals a selective and nuanced relationship between Supply Chain Management and Marketing Strategy rather than a strong, overarching linkage. Overall Supply Chain Management is not significantly correlated with Overall Marketing Strategy, suggesting that employees do not automatically associate operational strength with marketing effectiveness. However, several weak but significant relationships emerge at the dimensional level, including negative associations between Supplier Relationships and Market Intelligence, and between Logistics Efficiency and Promise Communication. At the same time, Supplier Relationships show a weak positive relationship with Profitability, and Network Coordination is positively related to Market Intelligence but negatively related to Profitability. These mixed directions may suggest underlying trade-offs, where operational focus and coordination sometimes support financial outcomes but may also dilute attention to market sensing or messaging if alignment is weak. Collectively, the findings imply that stronger integration between SCM and marketing functions may be needed to ensure that improvements in one domain reinforce, rather than counteract, the other.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

IV. CONCLUSION

- Profile of the Respondents. The diversity observed in the respondents' demographic profile supports the credibility of the study's findings, as perspectives were drawn from employees across different age groups, civil statuses, and educational backgrounds. The near balance between male and female respondents further strengthens the representativeness of the data. Taken as a whole, the profile suggests that the conclusions of the study are not narrowly shaped by a single subgroup but instead reflect a broad organizational viewpoint informed by varied professional and life experiences.
- Supply Chain Management Practices. The study concludes that Supply Chain Management practices are generally established and functioning at a satisfactory level within the organization. Employees perceive Technology Integration as the most consistently practiced dimension, indicating that digital systems, training, and automation are already embedded in operational routines. At the same time, weaker areas such as supplier performance monitoring, standardized logistics procedures, and network-level communication point to gaps between operational capability and coordination depth. This pattern suggests that while internal systems are relatively mature, external alignment across the supply chain remains uneven.
- Uniformity of Supply Chain Management Perceptions. The absence of significant differences in Supply Chain Management assessments across sex, age, civil status, and educational qualification indicates a high degree of uniformity in how SCM practices are experienced. This finding implies that SCM policies and procedures are implemented consistently across the organization, regardless of employee background. However, such uniformity may also indicate limited flexibility or differentiation in SCM approaches, which could restrict responsiveness to the specific needs of distinct operational roles or partner relationships.
- Marketing Strategy Effectiveness. Marketing Strategy is likewise concluded to be practiced at an acceptable but moderate level, with clearer strengths in Market Intelligence and Market Share development. These results suggest that the organization is attentive to external market conditions and growth opportunities. Nevertheless, persistent weaknesses in Product or Service Positioning highlight unresolved issues related to differentiation, brand clarity, and value communication. The mixed performance of Promise Communication and Customer Satisfaction further suggests that marketing intent does not always translate smoothly into customer experience.
- Stability of Marketing Strategy Across Groups. Marketing Strategy assessments remain largely consistent across demographic and educational groups, reinforcing the conclusion that marketing practices are centralized and broadly standardized. The single significant difference observed in Market Share by sex suggests perceptual variation rather than structural disparity, possibly reflecting differences in role exposure or market-facing responsibilities. Overall, the findings indicate that employees share a common understanding of marketing performance, though this shared view may overlook nuanced differences in frontline versus back-office perspectives.
- Limited but Meaningful Link Between Supply Chain Management and Marketing Strategy. The study concludes that Supply Chain Management and Marketing Strategy are not strongly aligned at an overall level, as evidenced by the lack of a significant correlation between their composite measures. However, the presence of several weak but significant relationships at the dimensional level suggests selective points of interaction rather than systemic integration. In particular, the mixed positive and negative correlations imply that improvements in certain SCM areas may support profitability or market intelligence, while simultaneously constraining communication or market responsiveness. This pattern points to the need for deliberate cross-functional coordination, as operational efficiency alone does not automatically translate into marketing effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Adopting more inclusive consultation mechanisms when refining operational and marketing initiatives. While perceptions are generally consistent across groups, periodic focus group discussions or cross-level feedback sessions could surface subtle concerns that are not captured through quantitative surveys alone.
- Ensure that strategic decisions remain responsive to the lived experiences of employees across different roles and career stages.
- The organization is encouraged to move beyond internal system optimization toward stronger external integration. In particular, clearer supplier performance metrics, more consistent logistics standardization, and formalized evaluation mechanisms may help address areas currently rated as only slightly practiced.
- Network Coordination to reinforce communication and alignment among supply chain partners. Management may consider establishing regular coordination meetings, shared performance dashboards, or joint planning protocols with key partners. Such mechanisms could help translate internal operational strengths into more cohesive network-wide performance, particularly during periods of disruption or rapid demand shifts.
- Management is advised to revisit branding, differentiation, and messaging strategies to ensure consistency between what is promised and what is delivered.
- Strengthening internal communication about brand positioning may also help employees better support marketing efforts in their respective roles.
- Management may consider targeted briefings or internal knowledge-sharing sessions to align understanding of market performance across departments. Doing so could promote a more coherent internal narrative regarding competitive position and growth direction.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun249

- Stronger cross-functional alignment. Rather than treating operations and marketing as parallel domains, the organization may benefit from joint planning initiatives, shared performance indicators, and integrated review processes.
- Aligning operational capabilities with market-facing goals could help ensure that improvements in efficiency, coordination, or supplier relationships reinforce marketing effectiveness instead of inadvertently constraining it.

REFERENCES

[1]. Al Azzani, H. A. (2024). Market and supply chain orientation; dynamic capabilities leading to innovation and operational capabilities. SAGE
[2]. Assad Ullah, et al (2024) Global supply chain pressure and Chinese business and consumer confidence
[3]. Borgatti, S. P., & Li, X. (2009). On social network analysis in a supply chain context. Journal of Supply Chain Management, 45(2), 5–22.
[4]. Deloitte Insights. (2024, May 23). Global supply-chain resilience amid disruptions. Deloitte. https://www2.deloitte.com
[5]. Huang, K., [and coauthors]. (2023). The impact of Industry 4.0 on supply chain capability and performance: A resource-based perspective. International Journal of Production Economics, 280, Article 108525.
[6]. Jianwen Lou and Tiantian Li, (2024) Pathways for China's Key Industries to Secure Core Positions in Global Supply Chains: A Comparative and Empirical Study
[7]. Jinbo jia, (2024) Research on Supply Chain Management Strategies of Multinational Retailers in China Based on IKEA).
[8]. Jing, H., [and coauthors]. (2024). Digital transformation, supply chain integration, and supply chain performance. SAGE Open, 14. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241281616
[9]. Lin, Y., & [coauthors]. (2021). The effects of supply chain diversification during the COVID-19 pandemic. Resources, Conservation & Recycling, 168, Article 105337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.105337
[10]. Mugoni, E., [and coauthors]. (2024). Sustainable supply chain management practices and performance: Resource-based and natural-resource-based perspectives. Journal of Cleaner Production, 420, Article 137643. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.137643
[11]. Ozdemir, D., [and coauthors]. (2022). Supply chain resilience during the COVID-19 pandemic. Logistics Journal / International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications, 25, 1–22. (Available at PubMed Central) https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8771080/
[12]. Shahzad, M. K., Ahmed, S., & Anwar, F. (2024). Market orientation, supply chain integration, and firm performance: Knowledge-based dynamic capabilities perspective. Pakistan Business Review, 26(1), 45–67. (PDF available online)
[13]. Todo, Y., [and coauthors]. (2022). Robustness and resilience of supply chains during the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of International Business Studies, 53(10), 1802–1820. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-022-00508-7