© AUG 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 2 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I2-1713937

Managing Capacity Utilization as a Strategic Lever: A Business Management Perspective from Food Manufacturing

EYUP DORUK

Abstract *- Capacity utilization in food manufacturing has traditionally been treated as an operational efficiency problem, managed primarily through production planning, cost control, and throughput optimization. While these approaches improve short-term efficiency, they often obscure the strategic role that capacity decisions play in shaping long-term enterprise performance. This paper argues that capacity utilization should be reframed as a strategic business management lever rather than a purely operational variable. Adopting a business management and consultancy-oriented perspective, the study conceptualizes capacity utilization as a managerial decision domain that directly influences risk exposure, profitability stability, and organizational resilience. In food manufacturing, where demand volatility, perishability, regulatory constraints, and cost pressures are pronounced, capacity decisions carry strategic consequences that extend far beyond production efficiency. The paper contends that organizations frequently undermine long-term value by maximizing utilization without accounting for flexibility, coordination, and cross-functional alignment. The study develops a conceptual framework that positions capacity utilization at the intersection of sales strategy, operational design, and financial management. It examines how managerial decision-making, governance mechanisms, and cross-functional integration shape the strategic use of capacity in food manufacturing organizations. Rather than advocating for higher or lower utilization targets, the paper emphasizes the importance of aligning capacity decisions with enterprise-level objectives and uncertainty management. This research contributes to business management literature by shifting the analysis of capacity utilization from an operational focus to a strategic management perspective. It offers theoretical insights and practical implications for managers and consultants seeking to use capacity as a lever for sustainable competitive advantage rather than as a metric of short-term efficiency.*

Keywords *- Business Management, Capacity Utilization, Food Manufacturing, Strategic Decision-Making, Sustainable Competitive Advantage*

I. INTRODUCTION

Capacity utilization has long been a central concern in food manufacturing, where production assets are capital-intensive, margins are sensitive to volume fluctuations, and idle capacity is widely perceived as a source of inefficiency. Management systems in the sector have traditionally emphasized high utilization rates as indicators of operational excellence, linking performance evaluation closely to throughput, unit costs, and equipment efficiency. While this approach has delivered measurable gains in productivity, it has also narrowed the managerial understanding of capacity to a purely operational variable.

In food manufacturing, capacity decisions extend far beyond the shop floor. Production capacity shapes an organization's ability to respond to demand volatility, manage perishability, comply with regulatory standards, and absorb supply chain disruptions. Yet these strategic dimensions are frequently subordinated to short-term efficiency targets. Managers are incentivized to maximize utilization even when doing so increases risk, reduces flexibility, or compromises long-term value. This tension suggests that prevailing management models inadequately capture the strategic role of capacity utilization.

The complexity of contemporary food manufacturing environments amplifies the consequences of this misalignment. Demand patterns are increasingly unpredictable, driven by changing consumer preferences, promotional volatility, and external shocks. Input costs fluctuate, regulatory requirements evolve, and sustainability expectations impose additional constraints on operations. Under such conditions, rigid pursuit of high utilization can expose organizations to systemic fragility. Business management must therefore reconsider how capacity utilization is conceptualized and governed.

This paper argues that capacity utilization should be understood as a strategic lever within business management rather than as a narrow operational metric. Strategic capacity management involves deliberate choices about flexibility, redundancy, and coordination across functions. It requires managers to

balance efficiency with resilience, short-term output with long-term adaptability. From this perspective, capacity utilization becomes a tool for shaping enterprise performance rather than a target to be maximized indiscriminately.

A central premise of this study is that capacity decisions are fundamentally managerial decisions. Choices regarding capacity levels, investment timing, and utilization targets reflect assumptions about market uncertainty, growth strategy, and risk tolerance. When these decisions are embedded within integrated management systems, they can enhance profitability stability and competitive advantage. When treated as isolated operational concerns, they undermine strategic coherence. Business management must therefore elevate capacity utilization to the level of strategic deliberation.

The objective of this paper is to develop a business management framework that explains how capacity utilization can be managed as a strategic lever in food manufacturing organizations. Rather than prescribing technical planning tools, the study focuses on managerial decision-making, governance structures, and cross-functional integration mechanisms. It examines how capacity choices interact with sales strategies, financial discipline, and organizational resilience to shape long-term outcomes.

This research contributes to business management theory by reframing capacity utilization as a source of strategic value rather than a measure of efficiency. It highlights how managerial systems influence the strategic use of capacity under uncertainty and complexity. By shifting attention from operational optimization to enterprise-level decision-making, the paper offers new insights for managers and consultants operating in food manufacturing contexts.

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. The next section reviews traditional capacity utilization approaches in food manufacturing and their underlying management assumptions. Subsequent sections analyze the limitations of operationally focused capacity management, reframe capacity utilization as a strategic lever, and develop managerial frameworks for integrating capacity decisions across functions. The paper concludes by discussing implications for business management practice and identifying avenues for future research.

II. CAPACITY UTILIZATION IN FOOD MANUFACTURING: TRADITIONAL MANAGEMENT APPROACHES

Traditional approaches to capacity utilization in food manufacturing have been shaped by a strong emphasis on operational efficiency and cost minimization. Given the capital-intensive nature of production assets and the sensitivity of unit costs to volume, managers have historically viewed high utilization rates as both a performance objective and a proxy for effective management. Capacity planning models, performance dashboards, and incentive systems have reinforced the assumption that maximizing utilization leads directly to improved financial outcomes.

At the core of these approaches lies a production-oriented logic. Capacity is treated as a fixed asset whose economic value is realized through continuous use. Idle capacity is framed as waste, prompting managers to prioritize steady production flows and high throughput. In food manufacturing, where margins are often thin and competition intense, this logic has been particularly influential. Management practices such as long production runs, limited changeovers, and standardized product portfolios have emerged as mechanisms for sustaining high utilization.

Traditional capacity management also relies heavily on deterministic planning assumptions. Forecasts of demand are translated into production schedules that aim to balance expected volume with available capacity. Variability is addressed through buffers such as inventory or overtime rather than through strategic flexibility. From a business management standpoint, these practices reflect an implicit belief that uncertainty can be absorbed operationally without revisiting underlying capacity strategies.

Performance measurement systems further entrench operationally focused capacity management. Metrics such as overall equipment effectiveness (OEE), line utilization rates, and cost per unit dominate managerial attention. While these indicators provide valuable operational insight, they tend to privilege efficiency over adaptability. Managers are rewarded for keeping assets running, even when doing so creates excess inventory, strains supply chains, or limits responsiveness to market changes.

© AUG 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 2 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I2-1713937

In many food manufacturing organizations, capacity decisions are also functionally siloed. Operations teams are tasked with maximizing utilization, while sales functions pursue volume growth and finance monitors cost outcomes. Coordination among these functions often occurs reactively, after capacity constraints or cost overruns become visible. This sequential approach reflects a traditional management assumption that capacity optimization is primarily an operational responsibility rather than a shared strategic concern.

These traditional approaches have delivered tangible benefits, particularly in stable demand environments. High utilization can reduce unit costs, improve asset payback, and support competitive pricing. However, their effectiveness depends on conditions that are increasingly rare in contemporary food manufacturing. Demand volatility, customization requirements, regulatory constraints, and sustainability pressures introduce complexity that exceeds the assumptions embedded in operationally focused capacity management.

Understanding these traditional approaches is essential for identifying their limitations. While they provide a foundation for efficiency, they offer limited guidance for managing uncertainty and strategic trade-offs. The next section examines the limitations of operationally focused capacity management in greater depth, highlighting how its assumptions constrain long-term value creation and organizational resilience in food manufacturing contexts.

III. LIMITATIONS OF OPERATIONALLY FOCUSED CAPACITY MANAGEMENT

While traditional capacity utilization approaches have improved efficiency in food manufacturing, their limitations become increasingly visible under conditions of uncertainty and complexity. Operationally focused capacity management assumes that higher utilization inherently leads to better performance, yet this assumption often fails when demand volatility, perishability, and regulatory constraints interact. As a result, organizations that prioritize utilization targets may inadvertently undermine long-term value and strategic flexibility.

One significant limitation lies in the erosion of operational flexibility. Maximizing utilization typically requires rigid production schedules, extended production runs, and reduced changeover frequency. Although these practices improve short-term efficiency, they constrain the organization's ability to respond to shifts in demand or supply disruptions. In food manufacturing, where product life cycles are short and demand patterns fluctuate, excessive rigidity increases the risk of obsolescence and waste. Business management systems that emphasize utilization over adaptability thus create structural vulnerability.

Another limitation concerns risk concentration. High utilization reduces slack capacity, leaving little room to absorb unexpected shocks such as equipment failures, raw material shortages, or regulatory interventions. When capacity buffers are eliminated in the pursuit of efficiency, disruptions propagate rapidly across the organization. The costs associated with expedited production, quality compromises, or missed deliveries often exceed the savings generated by higher utilization. Operationally focused management underestimates these systemic risks.

Operational capacity management also distorts decision-making incentives. Managers evaluated primarily on utilization metrics may prioritize keeping lines running even when marginal production contributes little to enterprise value. This behavior can result in overproduction, inventory accumulation, and increased working capital requirements. From a business management perspective, such outcomes reflect a misalignment between local performance indicators and enterprise-level objectives.

A further limitation is the disconnect between capacity decisions and strategic priorities. Operational models typically treat capacity as a constraint to be optimized rather than as a strategic resource to be deployed selectively. Decisions about capacity expansion, contraction, or flexibility are often made incrementally, without explicit consideration of long-term growth paths or market positioning. This incrementalism limits the organization's ability to shape its future through deliberate capacity strategy.

Cross-functional misalignment exacerbates these issues. When operations focus on utilization, sales may pursue aggressive volume targets without regard for capacity strain, and finance may reactively

address cost overruns. This reactive coordination reinforces functional silos and reduces the quality of strategic deliberation. Business management becomes oriented toward firefighting rather than value creation.

Importantly, the limitations of operationally focused capacity management are not inherent flaws in efficiency thinking, but in its dominance as a managerial logic. Efficiency remains essential, but when it crowds out considerations of flexibility, resilience, and strategic fit, it becomes counterproductive. Capacity utilization must therefore be reframed within a broader business management perspective that balances efficiency with strategic objectives.

This analysis underscores the need to move beyond operationally focused capacity management. The next section develops this reframing by conceptualizing capacity utilization as a strategic business management lever, highlighting how managerial decisions regarding capacity can actively shape enterprise performance rather than merely respond to operational constraints.

IV. REFRAMING CAPACITY UTILIZATION AS A STRATEGIC BUSINESS MANAGEMENT LEVER

To address the limitations of operationally focused capacity management, capacity utilization must be reframed as a strategic lever within business management. This reframing shifts capacity from a passive constraint to an active managerial instrument that shapes risk exposure, growth trajectories, and competitive positioning. In food manufacturing, where uncertainty and interdependence are high, capacity decisions are not merely technical optimizations but strategic choices with enterprise-wide consequences.

Viewing capacity utilization as a strategic lever begins with recognizing its role in mediating uncertainty. Capacity determines how the organization absorbs variability in demand, supply, and regulation. Rather than maximizing utilization, strategic business management asks how much flexibility is required to remain responsive without sacrificing economic discipline. This perspective treats slack capacity not as inefficiency, but as an option value that enables timely response to shocks and opportunities. Capacity utilization thus becomes a calibrated decision rather than a target to be maximized.

Strategic reframing also emphasizes the intertemporal nature of capacity decisions. Choices about utilization today shape future options by influencing asset wear, maintenance cycles, workforce capabilities, and investment timing. High utilization may accelerate depreciation and constrain future flexibility, while moderate utilization can preserve optionality. Business management must therefore evaluate capacity utilization through a long-term lens, assessing how current decisions affect future adaptability and cost structures.

Another critical element of reframing is the alignment of capacity utilization with strategic intent. Different growth strategies imply different capacity postures. Organizations pursuing stable, cost-driven strategies may prioritize higher utilization with limited flexibility, whereas those targeting differentiated or volatile markets may require lower average utilization to preserve responsiveness. Strategic business management makes these trade-offs explicit, aligning capacity posture with market positioning rather than default efficiency norms.

Reframing capacity utilization also elevates managerial judgment. Quantitative models provide valuable guidance, but they cannot fully capture the qualitative dimensions of risk, regulatory exposure, or reputational impact inherent in food manufacturing. Managers must integrate analytical insights with contextual understanding when setting utilization targets and making investment decisions. This integration distinguishes strategic capacity management from purely operational planning.

Importantly, treating capacity utilization as a strategic lever redefines accountability. Capacity decisions become shared responsibilities rather than isolated operational tasks. Sales, operations, and finance participate jointly in determining utilization targets that balance growth ambitions with resilience and profitability. Business management thus replaces siloed optimization with collective stewardship of capacity as a strategic resource.

This reframing establishes the conceptual foundation for strategic capacity management. It positions capacity utilization as a deliberate choice that shapes enterprise outcomes under uncertainty. The next

section builds on this foundation by examining how managerial decision-making processes and capacity strategy interact, focusing on the role of leadership and governance in translating strategic intent into capacity-related actions across the organization.

V. MANAGERIAL DECISION-MAKING AND CAPACITY STRATEGY

Once capacity utilization is reframed as a strategic lever, managerial decision-making becomes the primary mechanism through which capacity strategy is enacted. Capacity outcomes do not arise solely from technical constraints or market forces; they reflect deliberate choices made by managers regarding risk tolerance, growth priorities, and resource allocation. In food manufacturing, where uncertainty is structural rather than episodic, the quality of these decisions has a direct impact on long-term enterprise performance.

Capacity strategy begins with how managers interpret demand uncertainty. Operationally focused models often assume that demand variability should be absorbed through inventory buffers or cost adjustments. Strategic business management instead treats uncertainty as a central input to capacity decisions. Managers evaluate how different utilization levels expose the organization to shortages, waste, or service failures under alternative demand scenarios. This evaluative process transforms capacity planning from forecast execution into strategic judgment.

Investment timing represents another critical decision domain. Decisions about expanding, upgrading, or repurposing capacity are frequently driven by utilization thresholds or short-term growth signals. Strategic capacity management challenges this reactive logic by incorporating broader considerations such as market maturity, regulatory trends, and technological change. Managers assess whether incremental utilization gains justify irreversible investments or whether flexibility-preserving options are more appropriate. Business management thus aligns capital allocation with long-term strategic intent rather than immediate utilization pressure.

Capacity strategy also requires explicit trade-off management. Higher utilization may improve short-term cost efficiency but reduce responsiveness and increase operational risk. Lower utilization enhances flexibility but may raise unit costs. Strategic decision-making involves balancing these competing effects in light of enterprise objectives. Rather than seeking an optimal utilization rate, managers identify acceptable ranges that reflect strategic priorities. This approach replaces static targets with adaptive capacity postures.

Leadership plays a decisive role in enabling strategic capacity decisions. In many organizations, cultural norms equate high utilization with good management, discouraging deviation from efficiency benchmarks. Strategic business management requires leaders to legitimize flexibility and resilience as performance criteria. By reframing success metrics and reinforcing integrative decision-making, leadership creates space for capacity strategies that support long-term value creation.

Governance mechanisms further shape managerial decision-making. Structured decision forums, investment committees, and cross-functional reviews ensure that capacity-related choices are evaluated consistently and transparently. These mechanisms prevent capacity strategy from being driven by isolated functional pressures or short-term incentives. Business management thus institutionalizes strategic capacity thinking through governance rather than relying on individual discretion alone.

This section highlights that capacity strategy is fundamentally a managerial construct. Decisions about utilization levels, investment timing, and flexibility reflect how organizations interpret uncertainty and prioritize value creation. The next section extends this analysis by examining how cross-functional integration enables these strategic decisions to be implemented coherently across sales, operations, supply chain, and finance in food manufacturing organizations.

VI. CROSS-FUNCTIONAL INTEGRATION IN CAPACITY MANAGEMENT

Strategic capacity utilization cannot be realized through managerial decision-making in isolation; it depends on the organization's ability to integrate capacity considerations across functions. In food manufacturing, capacity decisions intersect directly with sales commitments, supply chain reliability,

financial performance, and regulatory compliance. Cross-functional integration ensures that capacity strategy is translated into coordinated action rather than fragmented execution.

Sales functions influence capacity utilization through pricing, promotions, and customer commitments. When sales decisions are made independently, they often generate demand patterns that strain capacity and undermine strategic intent. Integrative capacity management embeds sales planning within capacity constraints and strategic priorities. Joint planning processes align demand generation with available flexibility, reducing volatility and improving service reliability. Business management thus repositions sales from a source of disruption to a partner in capacity stewardship.

Operations and supply chain functions are responsible for executing capacity strategy on the ground. Integration ensures that operational realities—such as changeover times, quality requirements, and regulatory constraints—inform strategic decisions early in the process. This upstream coordination prevents capacity strategies from being undermined by execution challenges. Business management systems that facilitate early cross-functional input enhance both feasibility and alignment.

Financial integration provides the economic framework for capacity decisions. Finance translates utilization choices into cost structures, cash flow implications, and risk exposure. When finance is integrated into capacity planning, managers gain visibility into the trade-offs between efficiency and resilience. Capacity strategies are evaluated not only for their operational feasibility but for their contribution to profitability stability and capital efficiency. This integration elevates capacity decisions from operational adjustments to enterprise-level considerations.

Information integration underpins cross-functional coordination. Shared data, common forecasting assumptions, and integrated performance dashboards enable managers to develop a unified understanding of capacity dynamics. However, information alone is insufficient; integration requires forums where data is interpreted collectively and decisions are made jointly. Business management designs routines—such as integrated planning cycles and cross-functional reviews—that embed coordination into daily practice.

Cross-functional integration also supports organizational learning. By reviewing capacity outcomes collectively, organizations can refine their capacity strategies over time. Lessons from disruptions, demand shifts, or regulatory changes are incorporated into future decisions, enhancing adaptive capacity. Strategic capacity management thus becomes a dynamic capability rather than a static plan.

By integrating capacity management across functions, food manufacturing organizations can operationalize capacity utilization as a strategic lever. Integration ensures that capacity decisions support enterprise objectives rather than reflect isolated functional priorities. The next section examines how such integrated capacity strategies contribute to sustainable competitive advantage, highlighting the role of capacity flexibility and resilience in shaping long-term performance.

VII. CAPACITY UTILIZATION AND SUSTAINABLE COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE

When capacity utilization is managed as a strategic lever and embedded within integrated managerial systems, it becomes a source of sustainable competitive advantage rather than a narrow efficiency metric. In food manufacturing, competitive advantage increasingly depends on the ability to deliver reliability, responsiveness, and cost discipline simultaneously. Strategic capacity management enables organizations to reconcile these often-competing objectives by aligning utilization decisions with long-term value creation.

A primary source of advantage arises from capacity flexibility. Organizations that deliberately preserve flexibility through calibrated utilization levels can respond more effectively to demand shocks, product mix changes, and regulatory interventions. This responsiveness enhances customer reliability and reduces the costs associated with emergency adjustments such as expedited logistics or quality compromises. Over time, flexibility becomes a differentiating capability that competitors focused solely on utilization maximization struggle to replicate.

Strategic capacity utilization also supports margin

stability. By avoiding chronic overutilization, organizations reduce the likelihood of inefficiencies such as excessive overtime, maintenance deferrals, and quality failures. These practices protect margin quality even in volatile environments. Business management thus uses capacity strategy to stabilize profitability rather than pursue cost reductions that are vulnerable to disruption.

Another dimension of competitive advantage lies in risk management. Capacity strategies that incorporate buffers and redundancy reduce exposure to systemic shocks. In food manufacturing, where disruptions can have regulatory and reputational consequences, resilience carries significant strategic value. Organizations that maintain reliable capacity performance under stress gain trust with customers and partners, strengthening long-term relationships and market positioning.

Capacity utilization also influences scalability. Firms with well-designed capacity strategies can scale output incrementally without sacrificing control or efficiency. This scalability allows organizations to capture growth opportunities selectively, reinforcing sustainable expansion. Competitors reliant on rigid, fully utilized systems may face discontinuous investments or operational breakdowns as demand grows.

Collectively, these effects demonstrate that capacity utilization contributes to competitive advantage when it is managed strategically. Efficiency remains important, but it is subordinated to a broader objective: building organizational systems capable of delivering value consistently over time. Strategic capacity management thus aligns operational choices with competitive positioning and long-term performance.

VIII. DISCUSSION

This paper contributes to business management literature by reframing capacity utilization in food manufacturing as a strategic management issue rather than a purely operational concern. Existing research has largely focused on technical optimization and efficiency metrics, offering limited insight into how capacity decisions shape enterprise-level outcomes. By emphasizing managerial decision-making, governance, and integration, this study advances a more holistic understanding of capacity management.

A key theoretical implication is the recognition of capacity utilization as a dynamic managerial capability. The analysis demonstrates that capacity outcomes depend not only on assets and forecasts, but on how organizations interpret uncertainty and manage trade-offs. This perspective aligns with broader management theories that emphasize judgment, integration, and system design as sources of sustained performance.

The discussion also highlights the importance of aligning performance metrics with strategic intent. When utilization metrics dominate evaluation systems, they crowd out considerations of flexibility and resilience. Business management frameworks that incorporate value-based criteria enable more balanced decision-making and reduce the risk of systemic fragility.

From a practical standpoint, the findings suggest that managers and consultants should reassess how capacity targets are set and governed. Rather than prescribing optimal utilization rates, strategic capacity management emphasizes acceptable ranges aligned with enterprise objectives. This shift requires leadership commitment and integrative governance structures to be effective.

Overall, the discussion positions capacity utilization as a lens through which broader issues of strategic control, risk management, and organizational design can be examined. It reinforces the argument that sustainable performance in food manufacturing depends on managerial systems that balance efficiency with adaptability.

IX. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This paper has argued that capacity utilization in food manufacturing should be managed as a strategic lever within business management rather than as an operational efficiency target. While traditional approaches have improved productivity, they impose limitations that undermine flexibility, resilience, and long-term value creation. By reframing capacity utilization as a managerial decision domain, the study highlights new pathways to sustainable competitive advantage.

The paper contributes to business management theory by linking capacity strategy to managerial judgment, cross-functional integration, and

governance. It demonstrates how deliberate capacity decisions can stabilize profitability, enhance responsiveness, and support scalable growth under uncertainty. These insights extend existing research on operations management by embedding capacity considerations within enterprise-level strategy.

Future research could empirically examine the relationship between capacity strategies and performance outcomes across different segments of food manufacturing. Comparative studies may explore how regulatory environments and market volatility influence optimal capacity postures. Further work could also investigate how digital planning tools support strategic capacity management without reinforcing narrow efficiency biases.

In conclusion, managing capacity utilization as a strategic lever enables food manufacturing organizations to move beyond efficiency toward enduring enterprise value. By designing managerial systems that balance utilization with flexibility and resilience, firms can transform capacity from a constraint into a source of long-term competitive strength.

REFERENCES

[1] Ansoff, H. I. (1965). *Corporate strategy: An analytic approach to business policy for growth and expansion*. McGraw-Hill.
[2] Chandler, A. D. (1962). *Strategy and structure: Chapters in the history of the American industrial enterprise*. MIT Press.
[3] Christopher, M. (2016). *Logistics & supply chain management* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
[4] Daft, R. L. (2021). *Organization theory and design* (13th ed.). Cengage Learning. Donaldson, L. (2001). *The contingency theory of organizations*. Sage Publications.
[5] Galbraith, J. R. (2014). *Designing organizations: Strategy, structure, and process at the business unit and enterprise levels* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
[6] Grant, R. M. (2016). *Contemporary strategy analysis* (9th ed.). Wiley.
[7] Hayes, R. H., & Wheelwright, S. C. (1984). *Restoring our competitive edge: Competing through manufacturing*. Wiley.
[8] Hill, T., & Hill, A. (2011). *Operations management* (3rd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
[9] March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science, 2*(1), 71–87. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.71 March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. Wiley.
[10] Mintzberg, H. (2009). *Managing*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
[11] Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. Free Press.
[12] Skinner, W. (1969). Manufacturing—Missing link in corporate strategy. *Harvard Business Review, 47*(3), 136–145.
[13] Slack, N., Brandon-Jones, A., & Burgess, N. (2022). *Operations management* (10th ed.). Pearson Education.
[14] Simons, R. (1995). *Levers of control: How managers use innovative control systems to drive strategic renewal*. Harvard Business School Press.
[15] Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(13), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640
[16] Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory*. McGraw-Hill.