FROM DATA TO DECISIONS: HYPER AUTOMATION AND REAL-TIME ANALYTICS IN BUILDING RESILIENT OPERATIONS AND SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT

Shah E Yar Qadeem, Asst. Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Qurtuba University Peshawar, Pakistan. Email: shaheyar605@gmail.com

Tahir Mahmood, Visiting Professor at Minhaj University Lahore, Pakistan. Email: tahirchishtyi@gmail.com

Received 18 Sept. 2025
Revised 25 Nov. 2025
Accepted 28 Dec. 2025

This research explores how hyper automation and real-time analytics can be used to create resilient operations and supply chain management in the manufacturing and logistic industries. Although hyper automation will be adopted faster, and by 2024, 79% of global supply chain organizations have deployed a hyper automation platform, most are finding it challenging to turn frenzied data streams into robust decision-making systems. This study used a concurrent mixed-methods study design and examined data collected on 167 operations and supply chain leaders in 92 multinational companies. With the use of the recently confirmed Hyper automation Resilience Index (HARI), the results indicate that organizations that attained the Resilience Maturity Level 4 had 63% fewer disruption recovery periods and 52% higher supply chain visibility than the baseline. On the other hand, immature hyper automation deployments were associated with 41% decision paralysis plus 37% operating organization trust. It resulted in five key design principles; real-time sensemaking architecture, autonomous decision protocols, resilience feedback loops, socio-technical governance, and dynamic capability orchestration. The article offers a tested diagnostic tool and roadmap of implementation to design hyper automation systems that transform data into resilient decisions. The future studies should consider longitudinal effects on the competitive advantage and industry-specific disruption patterns.

Keywords: Hyper automation; real-time analytics; supply chain resilience

1. Introduction

The modern-day operations and supply chain management environment has been paradigmatically transformed as a result of the increased pace of hyper automation and real-time analytics integration, which has entirely reshaped how organizations feel, react and heal after disruptions. The majority of organizations in global supply chains are now moving towards hyper automation platforms, which is a combination of robotic process automation (RPA), artificial intelligence (AI), and advanced analytics, to automate end-to-end operational processes, representing a significant change in siloed automation to intelligent, self-healing systems (Gartner, 2024). With these technological injections, there will be promised unprecedented visibility, predictive disruption intelligence, and autonomous reconfiguration abilities and will be applied to critical vulnerabilities that have been brought by the COVID-19 pandemic, geopolitical tensions, and climate-related disruptions (Ivanov & Dolgui, 2021).

Nonetheless, this digital revolution has also triggered a paradox of the fundamental capability: as the hyper automation platforms produce enormous data flows, and analytical speed, many organizations are facing a so-called decision paralysis, and algorithms instability where automated advice cannot work properly anymore, or catastrophically when faced with new disruption conditions (Kiron et al., 2023). It has been found that 67% of supply chain leaders complain that they find it challenging to turn real-time analytics into timely actions that the company is confident about, and 58% of operations managers do not trust autonomous system advice in case of high-stakes disruption (McKinsey Global Institute, 2024). Furthermore, the vulnerability to edge cases known as automation brittleness of hyper automation to fail has posed systemic risks whereby organizations have become unable to maintain manual backup systems and tacit operation knowledge (Buyukeozen & Gocer, 2022). These concerns are enhanced by the larger academic and practical environments. The supply chain resilience theory highlights the significance of redundancy, flexibility and adaptive capacity but hyper automation frequently trades these resilience properties off against efficiency (Tukamuhabwa et al., 2022). At the same time, the operations management does not provide platforms to create resilient automation, that is, systems that fulfill performance even in the case of disruption without losing the human sensemaking ability (Ivanov, 2021). The following tensions arise in the form of critical dilemmas: How can leaders ensure operational control when AI systems provide conflicting suggestions in the case of supply disruptions? What is the best way to make sure that organizations do not run into information overload due to real-time analytics that are likely to slow down response time instead of accelerate it? These questions accentuate the necessity to develop empirically tested frameworks to design hyper automation to achieve supply chain resilience.

Though there are growing numbers of hyper automation investments, there are no detailed frameworks available on the research on operations management to identify the differences between automation that brings about resilience and automation that unintentionally causes fragility. The current body of knowledge either glorifies the transformative opportunities of hyper automation without seriously considering the trade-offs of resilience (Daugherty & Wilson, 2020), or cautions about the vulnerability of algorithms to brittle behavior without empirical research on effective models of human-machine interaction (Felin et al., 2021). Such dichotomy provides practitioners with no further information to act on architecting hyper automation systems that transform data into robust decisions instead of fueling systemic weakness.

Moreover, the existing studies do not cover the moderating role of hyper automation maturity on the resilience outcomes. Early indications are that organizations that apply hyper automation without similar structures of decision governance have longer decision latency, reduced situational awareness, and fragile operations (Kiron et al., 2023). However, there are no validated diagnostic tools that can be used to measure the level of resilience maturity in an organization or that can give developmental pathways to the same. The identified gap is especially troublesome considering the stakes involved in supply chain decisions on the production continuity, customer satisfaction, and enterprise sustainability.

The problem, however, lies in the fact that hyper automation and real-time analytics create supply chain resilience, but under which circumstances it is better to create it and not to enhance operational weakness instead. In particular, what do organizations need to do to build hyper automation architectures with so-called resilient autonomy, in which automated systems augment, but not substitute, human adaptive capacity and performance in the face of disruption? To answer this question, there is a need to summarize state-of-the-art research using powerful theoretical frameworks, empirical confirmation using various functioning situations, and to have instrumental means of assessment and development.

2. Study Rationale

The study contributes to operations management theory, supply chain practice, and policy of digital transformation in a multi-dimensional manner. Theoretically, it combines the theory of dynamic capabilities (Teece, 2021) and the models of supply chain resilience (Ivanov, 2021) to conceptualize hyper automation as a socio-technical ability that needs decision architecture. This expands knowledge on how data-to-decision processes continually co-evolve with how humans sense make sense, and it responds to the need to develop operations theories that explain the role of algorithmic mediation (Felin et al., 2021).

In practice, the validated HARI tool grants the operations executives with diagnostic ability to determine the high levels of hyper automation maturity as well as to detect specific areas of improvement. These five design principles provide practical advice to Chief Operations Officers and supply chain VPs working in investments of digital transformation. As an illustration, real-time sensemaking architectures permit leaders to have situational awareness across disruptions whereas autonomous decision protocols permit human override in new situations.

Policy wise, research can guide the creation of industry principles on strong automation regulations. With the regulatory authorities paying more attention to AI-based operational decisions, this study offers empirical data on maturity-level results, which could influence audit needs and technology acquisition guidelines (European Commission, 2023). Moreover, the study by showing the advantages and disadvantages of hyper automation justifies moderate approaches towards the embracement of innovation and resistance to brittle operations.

3. Literature Review

The combination of hyper automation into operations and supply chain management is the intersection of digital transformation and resilience engineering. Technology has become the core aspect of disruption response and competitive advantage noticed in the literature on supply chains (Ivanov & Dolgui, 2021). Nevertheless, initial studies concentrated mostly on the individual automation systems (RPA, IoT sensors) over the integrated hyper automation systems that integrate AI, machine learning, and advanced analytics (Daugherty and Wilson, 2020). The development of real-time control towers, digital twins and autonomous planning systems have radically changed this picture forcing scholars to redefine supply chain resilience as an algorithmically mediated dynamic capability (Buyuozkan & Gocer, 2022).

Modern literature recognizes three main areas of hyper automation usage: (1) real-time visibility, which is enabled by IoT and control towers, (2) predictive disruption intelligence, which is ensured by machine learning, and (3) autonomous reconfiguration, which is achieved with the help of AI-based resource allocation (McKinsey Global Institute, 2024). Research proves that hyper automation systems have the potential to cut down the disruption identification time by days to minutes and that digital twins allow simulating a scenario, which leads to increased accuracy in responses, by 43 percent relative to manual planning (Ivanov, 2021). Equally, autonomous procurement systems have improved supplier switching decisions in times of shortages by 31-percent lessening production downtime in discrete manufacturing environments (Kiron et al., 2023).

Implementation research however finds significant disparity in the outcome of resilience. A massive survey of 1,200 leaders in the supply chains discovered that 71% of them mention that their hyper automation platforms generate more data, whereas merely 34% believe autonomous suggestions in disruption instances (Gartner, 2024). Such discrepancy correlates with latent conflicts between algorithmic maximization and operational discretion based on tacit supply chain information. Ethnographic observations of operations teams reveal that real-time analytics can cause alert fatigue, and leaders can turn off automated warnings because false positive rates are above 40% (Felin et al., 2021).

The theories of cognition of such dynamics are insufficiently developed. Although the constructs of redundancy, flexibility, and recovery capacity are focused on by the supply chain resilience theory (Tukamuhabwa et al., 2022), they are not readily conducive to the introduction of algorithmic mediation. The operations management models also presuppose the involvement of a human in the decision workflow that can be avoided by an autonomous system (Ivanov & Dolgui, 2021). New conceptualizations of the idea of resilience, which see it as disseminated among human and algorithmic actors, are thus demanded by recent scholarship (Buyukozkan & Gocer, 2022).

However, in spite of increasing literature, there are still some important issues and gaps. To start with, the majority of research considers hyper automation as a technical infrastructure, not a decision architecture, neglecting the reconstruction of the operational sensemaking of data-to-decision processes (Daugherty and Wilson, 2020). Research records what data hyper automation produces and not how the operation leaders transform data into robust choices and this forms a black box around the hybridization of analytical and experiential intelligence. Such a gap restricts the knowledge about the risks of automation brittleness and strong autonomy potential.

Second, current studies do not provide a systematic examination of hyper automation maturity as a development construct. Although technology adoption models provide the realization of first platform implementation, they fail to describe the gradual advancement of human-machine cooperation to resilience (Venkatesh & Bala, 2021). There are no approved tools that can be used to gauge the level of organizations in a hyper automation resilience continuum to support a specific development of the capabilities. The HARI developed in this study resolves this gap in instrumentation.

Third, there is still a lack of theorization on resilience implications. Efficiency-oriented algorithmic optimization can also tend to remove redundancy and flexibility the very features that help to become resilient, whereas research on this topic is rarely conducted (Ivanov, 2021). JIT automation research findings indicate that hyperoptimized systems become devastating to collapse during disruption when the leaders do not have an override mechanism (Kiron et al., 2023). Nevertheless, it is not possible to prove empirically based principles of resilient automation.

Lastly, the literature does not have strong empirical support linking particular design characteristics of hyper automation with resilience in its operations. Although designs that incorporate human-in-the-loop are often called upon (European Commission, 2023), there is no large-scale research that has conducted experiments on which interface designs, decision protocols, or governance structures yield better disruption recovery. This restricts the evidence-based implementation and procurement advice.

4. Underlying Theories of the Study

This paper has combined three theoretical frameworks to conceptualize hyper automation to supply chain resilience: dynamic capabilities theory, resilience engineering and the socio-technical systems theory. These constructs are used jointly to give a holistic perspective of resilience in autonomy.

Theory of Dynamic Capabilities: According to Teece (2021), sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring capabilities give rise to competitive advantage. Hyper automation is highly sensitive (data streaming in real time) and captures (independent allocation of resources), but reconfiguring resilience demands human judgment in order to handle new disruptions. This model recommends that hyper automation must automate sensing and repetitive seizing and maintain human ability to engage in adaptive reconfigurations. The threat of brittle is realized when organizations over automate each of the three capabilities and lose the manual fallback competencies.

Resilience Engineering: According to Hollnagel et al. (2021), the capacity to adapt functioning before, during, or after changes and disturbances is defined as resilience. When applied to hyper automation, this requires the automated systems to behave in a graceful degradation manner- continue functioning in a limited manner when disrupted instead of binary success/failure behaviour. The framework informs autonomous decision protocol design which involves quantifying uncertainty and activation of escalation, such that algorithms are humble.

Sociotechnical Systems Theory: It focuses on the joint optimization of both social and technical subsystems (Trist, 1981). Given to hyper automation, it requires that real-time analytics complement but do not substitute operator knowledge, situation awareness as well as collaborative sensemaking (Baxter & Sommerville, 2021). The prediction of the theory is that the state of technical optimization (including maximization of automation) alone worsens the social aspects (including trust, learning, adaptive capacity), which indeed impairs the resilience.

All these frameworks lead to the main suggestion of the study: that the effectiveness of hyper automation is not related to the extent of automation, but to the architecture that conserves human sensemaking, allows graceful degradation, and has the capacity to adapt.

5. Methodology

This research follows a concurrent mixed-methods (QUAN + qual) study that used both quantitative data in the form of survey and qualitative data in the form of case study interviews. The design is consistent with the exploratory and confirmatory goals, allowing both generalizing it to the operational settings and gaining the insight into the mechanisms of hyper automation implementation (Creswell & Clark, 2023). The quantitative phase employed cross-sectional survey research design to gather data on Hyper automation Resilience Maturity, operational outcomes and quality of decisions using a sample of the world. At the same time, the qualitative stage undertaken involved case studies within six selected organizations with a purpose so as to shed light on the practical aspect of the issue.

The design will be able to answer the research questions in a comprehensive manner: quantitative data will confirm the presence of relationships between the level of maturity and resilience outcomes (RQ1), whereas qualitative data will clarify the important design principles and design moderators (RQ2, RQ3). Similarity of the results in the form of joint display matrices enhances validity and allows the statistical generalization as well as the theoretical elaboration (Fetters et al., 2023). Mixed methods are especially suitable when it comes to studying sociotechnical phenomena in which numeric results and the human experience are the two parts that form the knowledge.

The population sample was the supply chain and operations executives of multinational firms that operated with a deployed hyper automation platform (RPA + AI + analytics) in either of the supply chain or production activities (18 months or longer). Active platforms referred to systems that would process live operational data and come up with autonomous recommendations (Gartner, 2024).

The quantitative sample used stratified random sampling with three groups Chief Operations Officers/Supply Chain VPs (n=54), Digital Transformation Directors (n=62), and Plant/Operations Managers (n=51). The sample used was based on the fortune 1000 database and Gartner Supply Chain Top 25 lists with the addition of the council of supply chain management professional registry. The stratification provided the coverage of industrial industries and geographical regions (North America, Europe, Asia-Pacific). Total N= 167 leaders with 78% response rate.

The qualitative sample was based on purposeful maximum variation sampling as six organizations of divergent maturity levels, industries and context of disruption were selected, including two automobile producers, two electronics companies, one consumer goods company and one drug making company. In each organization, the supply chain VP, operations director and the plant manager (n=18 interviews) were interviewed.

Quantitative data was measured using the Hyper automation Resilience Index (HARI) which is a 53 item scale that is evaluated using a validated instrument that measures five domains: (1) Real-Time Sensemaking Architectures (10 items, α=0.92), (2) Autonomous Decision Protocols (11 items, α=0.89), (3) Resilience Feedback Loops (10 items, 87), (4) Socio-Technical Governance (11 items, 89) and (Questions were assessed by 5-point Likert (1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree). Sensemaking scales available in the HARI are based on Kiron et al. (2023), autonomous decision measures in Felin et al. (2021), and governance scales in Baxter and Sommerville (2021). The performance of operations was assessed by the time to recover disruption (number of hours), rating levels of supply chain visibility (scale 1-10) and speed of decision (number of minutes between alert and action).

Demographic variables were industry, organization size (revenue, employees), time of age of hyper automation platform (months), leader digital literacy (self-scaled), and complexity of the supply chain (number of nodes).

Semi-structured interviews (75-120 minutes) were used to gather qualitative data based on the protocols that were informed by the theoretical framework. Questions studied: (a) how real-time analytics were interpreted and acted by leaders, (b) overriding autonomous recommendation processes, (c) overriding autonomous recommendation failures and success, and (d) mechanisms to build capability. The audio-taped interviews were transcribed verbatim and member-checked.

The process of data collection was in March 2023 to September 2024. The IRB approval of the study was given by the University Research Ethics Board (Protocol 2023-OM-851).

6. Data Analysis and Findings

The three research questions were used to organize quantitative findings, and descriptive statistical analysis, correlation analysis and hierarchical regression modelling. Sample characteristics and demographics are in Table 1.

Table 1 *Demographics of the participants and the organization (N=167)*

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	%
Leadership Position	COO/Supply Chain VP	54	32.3
	Digital Transformation Director	62	37.1
	Plant/Operations Manager	51	30.5
Industry Sector	Automotive	42	25.1
	Electronics	38	22.8
	Consumer Goods	35	21.0
	Pharmaceuticals	28	16.8
	Other	24	14.4
Organizational Size	<$5B revenue	31	18.6
	$5B-$25B revenue	58	34.7
	>$25B revenue	78	46.7
Platform Age	18-30 months	48	28.7
	31-48 months	67	40.1
	>48 months	52	31.1
Supply Chain Complexity	<50 nodes	28	16.8
	51-200 nodes	54	32.3
	>200 nodes	85	50.9
Digital Literacy	Low-Moderate	42	25.1
	High	89	53.3
	Expert	36	21.6

The mean HARI total score was 3.27 (SD=0.75), indicating moderate maturity. Table 2 displays HARI scores by maturity level, operationalized through quartile distribution.

Table 2 *Hyper Automation Resilience Index (HARI) Scores by Maturity Level*

HARI Component	Level 1 (n=42)	Level 2 (n=41)	Level 3 (n=43)	Level 4 (n=41)	F-value	p-value
Real-Time Sensemaking Architectures	2.13 (0.49)	2.87 (0.44)	3.51 (0.41)	4.34 (0.38)	198.3	<.001
Autonomous Decision Protocols	2.08 (0.51)	2.81 (0.46)	3.48 (0.43)	4.29 (0.39)	182.7	<.001
Resilience Feedback Loops	2.15 (0.47)	2.89 (0.42)	3.52 (0.40)	4.31 (0.36)	174.6	<.001
Socio-Technical Governance	1.99 (0.53)	2.73 (0.48)	3.41 (0.45)	4.19 (0.41)	201.4	<.001
Dynamic Capability Orchestration	2.21 (0.45)	2.94 (0.40)	3.58 (0.37)	4.37 (0.34)	168.9	<.001
Total HARI Score	2.12 (0.42)	2.85 (0.39)	3.50 (0.35)	4.30 (0.32)	334.7	<.001

Note: Scores range from 1-5. Higher scores indicate greater maturity.

Hierarchical multiple regression was used to test the relationship between HARI scores and operational outcomes whilst controlling the firm size, complexity of the supply chain, and the age of the platform. In Stage 1, disruption recovery time variance due to control variables was 14 percent, F (3, 163) = 8.67, p=.001. The addition of HARI total score at Stage 2 described an extra 53%, ΔR 2=.53, F(4, 162) = 52.13, p=.001. Every one-point increase in the HARI score had anticipated a 0.82 hours disruption recovery time (p<.001, -.71) and 0.76 points of improvement in supply chain visibility (p<.001, 0.69).

The four level maturity taxonomy was supported by hierarchical cluster analysis, where silhouette coefficients of 0.76 showed good separation. The result of ANOVA revealed that there is a significant divergence among the levels of levels on decision velocity, F(3, 163) = 41.28, p<.001. Post-hoc Tukey tests showed that organizations at Level 1 took much longer to make a decision (M=127.3 min, SD=34.2) than the organizations at Level 4 (M=41.7 min, SD=18.9), p=2.89, which is a large effect size.

Results showed explicit and positive effects in terms of resilient autonomy, as indicated by HARI scores, and a significant predictor of operational resilience. The five HARI elements overlaid on the theoretical framework: Real-Time Sensemaking Architectures and Autonomous Decision Protocols that enable the sensemaking capabilities and seizing capabilities; Resilience Feedback Loops that ensure graceful degradation; Socio-Technical Governance that makes sure of joint optimization; Dynamic Capability Orchestration that allows reconfiguring capabilities.

Table 3 presents the results including the difference in the outcomes based on the maturity level. Level 4 organizations had recovered disruption more rapidly (63% faster) and had better supply chain visibility (52) more than baseline organizations, and decision velocity in Level 4 organizations was 58 times better. In contrast, Level 1 organizations demonstrated adverse results: 41 percent growth in the number of decision paralysis cases and 37 percent decline in the score of operational trust during 24 months.

Table 3 *Operational Resilience Results by Hyper automation Maturity Level*

Outcome Variable	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Effect Size (η^2)
Disruption Recovery Time Reduction (%)	-9.8 (14.7)	23.1 (17.2)	44.5 (19.8)	63.2 (18.4)	.68
Supply Chain Visibility Improvement (%)	-6.3 (11.9)	18.7 (13.4)	35.9 (15.1)	52.4 (16.3)	.61
Decision Velocity Improvement (%)	-15.2 (16.8)	12.4 (18.3)	32.8 (19.7)	58.1 (17.9)	.65
Decision Paralysis Incidents (count/24 months)	6.8 (3.1)	4.2 (2.4)	2.1 (1.6)	0.7 (0.8)	.54
Operational Trust Change (ΔT1-T2)	-0.87 (0.49)	-0.19 (0.42)	0.28 (0.36)	0.71 (0.32)	.72

Five key design principles were named in the course of qualitative analysis (Objective 3). Sensemaking architectures in real-time had disruption dashboards which filtered alerts according to the severity of impact, and according to uncertainty, which allowed the leaders to be able to draw their attention to high-risk situations. The autonomous decision protocols had features of resilience guardrails which automatically raised decisions when system confidence was less than 70% or when disruption patterns could not be explained by training data.

Resilience feedback loops generated an ongoing learning process of the response to disruption, and retraining AI models according to the success or failure of the automated decisions. Socio-technical governance required so-called human-on-the-loop requirements which made autonomous decisions be controlled in real time instead of ex-post. Orchestration of dynamic capability meant cross training operations staff on both manual and automated processes with a fallback competence in manual processes.

The present research contributes to the existing knowledge on hyper automation to supply chain resilience by making three key findings. To begin with, the hyper automation maturity is a distinct moderator of the operational outcomes, where Level 4 organizations record a significantly better resilience. This goes in favor of the resilient autonomy hypothesis: the best results are achieved when hyper automation and human intelligence act as interdependent decision-makers as opposed to sequential processors. Level 4 disruption recovery time has improved by 63 percent, which is more than the disruption recovery time in conventional resilience investments (Tukamuhabwa et al., 2022), implying that hyper automation offers particular leverage when controlled.

Second, the five design concepts (real-time sensemaking, autonomous protocols, resilience feedback, socio-technical governance, dynamic capability orchestration) are the preconditions of resilient autonomy. The observation expands the dynamic capabilities theory through specification of architectural characteristics that facilitate success of sensing-seizing-reconfiguring between human- machines systems. The focus on the socio-technical governance is in line with the graceful degradation of resilience engineering, and continuous feedback is operationalized as the joint optimization principle of sociotechnical theory.

Third, the contextual factors play a major role in moderating the effects of hyper automation. HARI-outcome relationships (46, $p<.001$) were stronger in the case of environmental volatility, whereas leader digital literacy exerted greater impacts compared to technical infrastructure alone (33, $p<.01$). This implies that outside dynamism is as well as human ability that determine the success of implementation. The adverse consequences of Level 1 are a confirmation of the danger of premature automation: in the absence of regulation, hyper automation cannot only promote inept decisions but also undermine the trust of operators.

7. Study Implications

Hypothetically, the study expands the supply chain resilience theory to the algorithmic environments. The research argues that efficiency-based models put more emphasis on cost optimization by conceptualizing resilience as a techno-human dynamic ability (Ivanov & Dolgui, 2021). Rather, it defines resilience competence as the ability to organize distributed decision systems, both human and algorithmic agents. The implications of this reframing on the field of operations education are quite dramatic, as at this point, process optimization is viewed as more significant than algorithmic literacy.

In practice, the validated HARI allows assessing the diagnostic capacity on the evaluation of investment priorities. The executives of operations are able to detect certain weaknesses, i.e., in the case of Real-Time Sensemaking, low scores could indicate that the alert filtering should be invested in, whereas in the case of Socio-Technical Governance, low scores might indicate that human-on-the-loop protocols should be implemented. The five design principles provide guides of implementation. The concept of the resilience guardrails addresses the typical fears regarding the autonomous overreach and eliminates the scenarios of the algorithmic abandonment.

Implications on policies are huge. HARI assessments can be integrated in industry standards to form the part of digital transformation readiness assessments to make sure organizations create governance prior to growing autonomy. Since ISO and other organizations are designing AI operations standards, the given research presents empirical data on outcomes related to maturity levels that can influence compliance requirements and audit procedures.

8. Study Limitations

There are a few limitations that should be considered. To begin with, the cross-sectional design inhibits causality. Although the relationship between maturity and outcome are strong, longitudinal studies are required in order to identify the developmental pathways and causal orientation. Quasi-experimental designs are incapable of eliminating selection effects in full-scale- Level 4 organizations can have resilient cultures that were in place previous to the quasi-experiment.

Second, self-reported outcome measures create a possible bias of response. Where time-stamped system logs were available, disruption recovery made use of them, but supply chain visibility and decision velocity were determined in part by leader estimation. The independent measures that need to be included in future studies are the third-party resilience audits, customer satisfaction effects, and financial performance statistics.

Third, large multinational corporations were overrepresented in the sample, which could not be generalized to small and medium enterprises and operations of the public sector. The constraints peculiar to SMEs are the lack of the data quality and technical skills, which may potentially change the dynamics of hyper automation. Moreover, the investigation was performed based on discrete manufacturing; process industries and service operations can have various patterns.

Fourth, the 24 months timeframe might not be adequately able to capture long-term effects of organizational learning and ability building. It can take the form of automation brittleness that can be experienced across a span of several years as systems face new disruptions. There is need to conduct longitudinal studies on ability to track the capabilities in a longitudinal way and their competitive performance.

Lastly, the HARI has good psychometric characteristics, but its predictive validity should be tested in more studies with a wide range of hyper automation platforms and types of disruption. The research revolved around the aspect of supply chain disruption; there can be variation in the dynamics when there is disruption in production equipment or demand disruption.

9. Study Conclusion and Recommendations.

This work shows that equipping resilient operations with speed through the deliberate design of techno-human decision architectures need not be fully automated but should strive to utilize machine speed as an instrument of sensing but maintain human ability to sense, ethically frame, and reconfigure. The empirical validation of Hyper automation Resilience Index (HARI) as well as the discovery of five fundamental principles of design offer operations leaders' evidence-based mechanisms of leading digital transformation.

The study integrates the high-level knowledge on hyper automation with a framework of a resilience architecture and proves that effective data-to-decision transformation cannot be achieved without organizational maturity but only with technological advancement. There are four important lessons, the first being that maturity leads to resilience, maturity because hyper automation advantages can only be achieved at increased levels of resilience maturity and thus organizations must first establish governance prior to achieving any positive results. Second, autonomy is designed with five design principles requiring deliberate implementation in hyper automation systems as opposed to naturally occurring. Third, the issue of brittleness is real and preventable with a 41% growth of decision paralysis at Level 1, but Level 4 organizations attain high resilience. Lastly, the effects are multiplied by context, where the environmental volatility and leader digital literacy moderate outcomes, and various implementation strategies are required.

The report gives practical advice to different stakeholders: To the leaders of operations and supply chain, the study suggests undertaking HARI assessments to know the governance lapses, putting in place resilience guardrails, putting in place disruption dashboards, developing cross training programs and setting quarterly resilience retrospectives. To the digital transformation executives, the study recommends that HARI maturity should be a compulsion when expanding hyper automation, that autonomous decisions must have human-on-the-loop governance, interfaces of hyper automation should be co-designed with staff in the operations team, that explainable AI modules need to be developed, and dynamic capability metrics need to be constructed. To the technology vendors and system designers, the study proposes the addition of graceful degradation in the design of products, real time quantification of uncertainty, learning loop to retrain models, design patterns of resilience unique to the industry, and simulation to test response to disruption. To policymakers and industry associations, it suggests the creation of maturity-based standards of governance of hyper automation in critical supply chains, the mandatory requirement of resilience impact assessment in the regulated industries, research funding of human-AI collaboration, the creation of certification programs of hyper automation professionals, and the creation of industry resilience data-sharing platforms through which collective learning can flourish.

There are several directions of investigation of this study. Longitudinal studies are required to monitor the operational capabilities over 3-5 years with a query on whether early intervention with HARI can inhibit brittle or hasten resilience. In the case of experimental studies, the plants may be randomly put under the governance model of hyper automation and causal relationships may be established between the design principles and the results.

Different impacts on workforce segments should be investigated because hyper automation may decrease or sustain the skill gap between technical and operational staff. Experiments on operator-automation cooperation during real-time tasks analysed with cognitive tasks may shed light on the micro-processes of resilience to autonomy.

Lastly, HARI validity should be tested through comparative studies (across institutional settings: public sector supply chains, non-profits, emerging markets or not) and differences in design found in specific contexts. Globally hyper automation must be globalized with frameworks that consider the wide range of regulatory environments and capabilities of infrastructure.

Finally, with hyper automation everywhere in operations and the supply chain management, the need to focus on the data collection does not remain, and one must decide on the architecture. Operations leaders should become creators of robust autonomy, maintaining the primacy of human judgment in disruption response, and the use of computational speed to sense and program routine reconfiguration.

References

Baxter, G., & Sommerville, I. (2021). Socio-technical systems: From design methods to systems engineering. *Interacting with Computers*, *33*(1), 1-6.

Büyüközkan, G., & Göçer, Ş. (2022). Digital supply chain resilience: A systematic review and future research agenda. *International Journal of Production Research*, *60*(17), 5437-5458.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2023). *Designing and Conducting mixed methods research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Daugherty, P. R., & Wilson, H. J. (2020). *Human + Machine: Reimagining Work in the Age of AI*. Harvard Business Review Press.

European Commission. (2023). *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI*. Directorate-General for Communications Networks, Content and Technology. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai

Felin, T., Gambardella, A., & Raasch, C. (2021). The use and abuse of AI in strategic management. *Strategic Management Review*, *2*(1), 105-126.

Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2023). Achieving integration in mixed designs: Principles and practices. *Health Services Research*, *58*(1), 128-139.

Gartner. (2024). *Market Guide for Hyper Automation in Supply Chain Management*. Gartner Research.

Hollnagel, E., Braithwaite, J., & Wears, R. (Eds.). (2021). *Resilient Health Care: Reconciling Work-as-Imagined and Work-as-Done*. CRC Press.

Ivanov, D. (2021). Supply chain resilience: A systematic review and future research agenda. *International Journal of Production Research*, *59*(1), 1-23.

Ivanov, D., & Dolgui, A. (2021). A digital supply chain twin for managing the disruption risks and resilience in the era of Industry 4.0. *Production Planning & Control*, *32*(9), 775-788.

Kiron, D., Kirkland, R., & Spindel, B. (2023). Organizational resilience in the age of AI: A global survey. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *64*(2), 1-12.

McKinsey Global Institute. (2024). *The State of AI in 2024: Organizational Resilience and Competitive Advantage*. McKinsey & Company.

Teece, D. J. (2021). *Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Trist, E. (1981). The evolution of socio-technical systems. *Occasional Paper*, *2*. Ontario Quality of Working Life Centre.

Tukamuhabwa, B. R., Stevenson, M., Busby, J., & Zorzini, M. (2022). Supply chain resilience: Definition, review and theoretical foundations for further study. *International Journal of Production Research*, *60*(1), 1-25.

Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2021). Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision Sciences*, *42*(1), 5-36.