



—Chapter—

Green Supply Chain Management

Jobir Monjur¹, Mokshud Ali²

ABSTRACT

This chapter examines Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM) as an essential element of sustainability in modern business and economic environments. It analyses how Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM) expands conventional supply chain operations to incorporate environmental stewardship and social responsibility. The chapter delineates the progression of Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM), identifies principal drivers including regulatory pressures, stakeholder expectations, and competitive advantages, and elucidates the benefits and challenges associated with the integration of sustainable practices throughout procurement, production, distribution, and reverse logistics. It underscores both qualitative insights and quantitative results from current empirical research, highlighting how GSCM approaches can improve environmental performance while facilitating financial and operational results.

1 Research Scholar, Tripura University, Agartala, Tripura

2 Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Bangladesh University, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

A case study from the manufacturing sector exemplifies the practical use of GSCM, showcasing enhancements in creativity and performance. The chapter finishes with an examination of policy and management consequences, along with recommendations for future study aimed at enhancing sustainability in supply chains.

Keywords: Green Supply Chain Management, Sustainable Logistics, Eco-Design, Green Innovation, Sustainability.

Introduction

Supply networks have grown increasingly intricate and globally distributed, rendering them a vital emphasis for sustainability. Conventional supply chain management prioritises cost, speed, and quality; nevertheless, escalating environmental issues have underscored the necessity for green supply chain management (GSCM). GSCM incorporates environmental and social factors into supply chain operations, encompassing raw material procurement, manufacture, distribution, and end-of-life disposal. Academics contend that traditional supply chains significantly exacerbate global environmental degradation due to their frequent absence of systematic environmental management (Srivastava, 2007; Zsidisin & Siferd, 2001; Sarkis, Zhu & Lai, 2011). Preliminary studies emphasised that the majority of company carbon and resource footprints extend beyond internal activities, with suppliers and logistics providers contributing substantially to emissions and resource utilisation (Hsu & Hu, 2008; Balon, 2020). Consequently, the incorporation of environmental accountability into supply chain networks has become a significant commercial concern.

The notion of sustainability, typically articulated through the triple bottom line of people, planet, and profit, necessitates that organisations reconcile economic success with environmental and social responsibilities. Elkington's triple bottom line concept underscores the necessity of considering environmental and social indicators in conjunction with economic measurements when evaluating organisational success (Slaper & Hall, 2011). The worldwide implementation of sustainability reporting standards and increasing stakeholder expectations need that supply chain managers prioritise responsible practices to uphold reputational validity and secure access to finance (De

Villiers, Naiker & Van Staden, 2011; Chang, 2011). Regulatory reforms, voluntary standards such as ISO 14001, and market mechanisms like carbon pricing bolster the economic rationale for sustainable supply chains (Hazaea et al., 2022; Muma et al., 2014).

Green supply chain management incorporates environmental considerations at every phase of the supply chain. It encompasses sustainable procurement, eco-design, cleaner production, ecologically conscious distribution, and reverse logistics (Srivastava, 2007; Seman et al., 2012). It incorporates internal management techniques including environmental training, sustainable human resource management, and ethical leadership (Seman et al., 2019; Singh et al., 2020). The aim is to reduce waste production and emissions while generating value for stakeholders. Studies indicate that companies implementing Green Supply Chain Management techniques can attain innovative capabilities and market distinction (Bag et al., 2022; Kalyar, Shoukat & Shafique, 2020).

Empirical research indicates favourable correlations between Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM) and organisational success across several sectors. Manufacturing companies implementing green supply chain strategies indicate enhancements in environmental performance, cost efficiency, and competitive advantage (Green et al., 2012; Laari, Töyli & Ojala, 2018; Feng et al., 2018). Studies on SMEs and large corporations demonstrate that efficient Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM) can enhance financial performance and foster innovation (Jabbour et al., 2014; Bag et al., 2022). Research indicates that Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM) can facilitate the relationship between eco-innovation and competitive advantage, allowing enterprises to distinguish their products and enhance their reputation (Makhlouf, Chatti & Lakhal, 2023; Abdallah et al., 2024; Awan, Arnold & Gölgeci, 2021).

However, the implementation of Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM) varies significantly among industries and geographical areas. Small and medium-sized firms (SMEs) frequently encounter resource limitations that hinder adoption (Sugandini et al., 2020; Khaksar et al., 2016). Substantial compliance costs, insufficient supplier preparedness, and

minimal state assistance persist as major obstacles (Muma et al., 2014; Nanath & Pillai, 2017; Abdallah & Al-Ghwayeen, 2020). Cultural disparities and market frameworks additionally affect the adoption of GSCM methods (Jabbour et al., 2014; Zhu, Sarkis & Cordeiro, 2008). Mitigating these inequities necessitates customised tactics, cooperative governance, and enhanced knowledge of the enduring advantages of greening supply chains.

Due to the increasing urgency of climate change and the significance of supply chains in corporate environmental impacts, a thorough comprehension of GSCM is essential. This chapter seeks to integrate current research, pinpoint essential factors and obstacles, and offer practical recommendations for managers and policymakers. It examines the historical evolution of GSCM, encapsulates empirical insights regarding its advantages and obstacles, and provides pragmatic recommendations for execution. The following sections present a literature review, comprehensive analysis, a case study example, and conclusions that emphasise ramifications and future research goals.

Background / Literature Overview

The roots of green supply chain management can be linked to the wider discussions on environmental procurement and total quality management. Initial contributions recognised the necessity of incorporating environmental criteria into supplier assessment and procurement decisions (Zsidisin & Siferd, 2001; Srivastava, 2007). Researchers highlighted that purchase decisions affect upstream environmental consequences and determine downstream waste flows (Zsidisin & Siferd, 2001). These seminal works established the basis for later research on environmental supplier development, green procurement, and supplier collaboration (Zhu, Sarkis & Lai, 2008; Green et al., 2012).

In the 2000s, the field experienced remarkable expansion. Academics commenced the categorisation of GSCM practices into internal and external classifications. Internal practices include environmental policy, personnel training, cross-functional integration, and sustainable production (Chien & Shih, 2007; Hsu & Hu, 2008). External practices encompass green procurement, supplier collaboration, eco-design, product stewardship, and reverse logistics (Laosirihongthong, Adebajo

& Choon Tan, 2013; Seman et al., 2012). Research indicates that an integrated strategy incorporating both internal and external practices produces enhanced results (Zhu, Sarkis & Lai, 2008; Jabbour et al., 2014).

Conceptual frameworks for Green Supply Chain Management underscore the significance of institutional forces and stakeholder involvement. Institutional theory asserts that coercive, normative, and mimetic constraints compel firms to implement ecologically responsible practices (Sarkis, Zhu & Lai, 2011; Chiou et al., 2011). Empirical research confirms that legislative requirements, customer expectations, and competitive pressures drive enterprises to adopt environmentally sustainable practices (Karmaker et al., 2023; Bag et al., 2022). Stakeholder theory posits that the active involvement of suppliers, customers, NGOs, and government entities is crucial for the effective implementation of Green Supply Chain Management (De Sousa Jabbour et al., 2017; Leenders & Chandra, 2013).

Comprehensive studies investigate the correlation between GSCM procedures and environmental performance. Meta-analyses indicate that strategies including green purchasing, process innovation, and supplier collaboration are positively correlated with diminished emissions, waste reduction, and enhanced resource efficiency (Green et al., 2012; Seman et al., 2019; Wong, Wong & Boon-itt, 2020). Research in several sectors, such as manufacturing, electronics, cement, and agriculture, demonstrates that the implementation of a comprehensive array of Green Supply Chain Management techniques significantly enhances environmental performance (Khan & Qianli, 2017; Khaksar et al., 2016; Muma et al., 2014).

Researchers investigate the effects of Green Supply Chain Management on innovation and competitive advantage. Green innovation pertains to novel products, techniques, or activities that mitigate environmental damage. Evidence indicates that GSCM practices promote green innovation through the facilitation of collaboration and knowledge exchange (Zhang, Rong & Ji, 2019; Wu, 2013; Kong et al., 2020). The incorporation of suppliers into eco-design projects promotes the creation of energy-efficient products (Lee & Kim, 2011; Leenders & Chandra, 2013). Research indicates that green innovation mediates the connection between Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM)

and competitive advantage, allowing firms to differentiate their products, enhance their reputation, and attract environmentally concerned consumers (Seman et al., 2019; Chen, Lai & Wen, 2006; Ali et al., 2023).

The research further examines the mediating roles of environmental and operational performance in the relationship between GSCM and financial outcomes. Feng et al. (2018) illustrate that operational enhancements and less environmental impact mediate the beneficial influence of GSCM on financial performance. Comparable results are observed in research concerning logistics service providers and SMEs, indicating that GSCM methods enhance operational efficiency and customer satisfaction, leading to financial benefits (Laari, Töyli & Ojala, 2018; Abdallah & Al-Ghwayeen, 2020; Sharabati, 2021).

Academics also emphasise obstacles to the adoption of Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM). Significant initial expenses, insufficient financial resources, and inadequate understanding are prevalent barriers, especially among SMEs (Sugandini et al., 2020; Nanath & Pillai, 2017; Uddin, 2021). Organisational resistance to change and insufficient coordination among supply chain partners impede implementation (Cheng, 2020; Lee et al., 2015). Inconsistent environmental regulations and inadequate enforcement hinder initiatives in developing nations (Muma et al., 2014; Roh et al., 2022).

Recent research investigates the interaction between Green Supply Chain Management and Industry 4.0 technology. Digital technologies, including the Internet of Things (IoT), blockchain, and artificial intelligence, provide real-time monitoring of environmental performance, improve transparency, and enable traceability throughout supply chains (Karmaker et al., 2023; Awan, Arnold & Gölgeci, 2021). These technologies facilitate predictive maintenance, minimise waste, and enable organisations to provide sustainability data to stakeholders (Wu, 2013; Kong et al., 2020). Nonetheless, the adoption of digital technologies remains constrained among smaller enterprises due to limitations in resources and deficiencies in knowledge (Jabbour et al., 2014; Sugandini et al., 2020).

A further line of inquiry investigates cross-cultural and industry variations. Comparative analyses indicate that the efficacy of Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM) differs across

sectors, with heavy industries such as cement and electronics encountering more significant obstacles due to intricate supply networks (Khaksar et al., 2016; Chien & Shih, 2007; Hsu & Hu, 2008). Cultural influences, legal systems, and economic frameworks affect the implementation of sustainable practices. For example, Asian firms frequently adopt GSCM to meet international customer demands and export market needs (Yu, Zhang & Huo, 2019; Karmaker et al., 2023), while European companies may do so due to rigorous regional regulations and societal pressure (Laari, Töyli & Ojala, 2018; Awan, Arnold & Gölgeci, 2021).

The literature collectively suggests that GSCM is multifaceted and context-dependent. Effective execution necessitates a cohesive strategy that unites corporate governance, supplier collaboration, innovative competencies, and conducive policy frameworks. This analysis highlights deficiencies in our comprehension, especially regarding digital technologies, SME involvement, and supply chain resilience, indicating the necessity for more research and practical testing.

Main Content / Discussion

Green supply chain management includes several methods that cover the complete product life cycle. Executing these approaches necessitates strategic alignment, interdisciplinary teamwork, and enduring commitment from leadership. The subsequent sub-sections examine critical aspects of GSCM implementation, focusing on pragmatic solutions, related advantages, and new trends.

Strategic motivators and planning: The initiation of GSCM adoption commences with the acknowledgement of environmental sustainability as a strategic goal. Senior management must delineate explicit objectives and devote resources to environmental projects. Research demonstrates that companies employing proactive environmental strategies surpass those that only adhere to regulatory compliance (Li et al., 2016; Bag et al., 2022). Formulating an environmental policy, executing environmental audits, and establishing quantifiable objectives direct the planning process (ISO 14001, 1996). Organisations must evaluate stakeholder expectations and institutional pressures to prioritise pertinent areas (Sarkis, Zhu & Lai, 2011; Chiou et al., 2011).

Green procurement and supplier collaboration entail the selection of suppliers based on their environmental performance, necessitating the inclusion of environmental criteria in procurement rules (Zsidisin & Siferd, 2001; Green et al., 2012). Forming collaborative partnerships with suppliers is essential for information exchange, co-developing sustainable materials, and promoting adherence to environmental regulations (Jabbour et al., 2014; De Sousa Jabbour et al., 2017). Supplier development initiatives may encompass training, collaborative problem-solving, and performance evaluation (Laosirihongthong et al., 2013; Hsu & Hu, 2008). Studies indicate that collaboration with suppliers enhances environmental and operational performance (Zhu et al., 2008; Yu et al., 2014).

Eco-design and sustainable manufacturing: Eco-design seeks to reduce the environmental impact of products across their entire life cycle. This entails the selection of recyclable materials, the reduction of harmful compounds, and the design for disassembly (Chien & Shih, 2007; Lee & Kim, 2011). Green manufacturing emphasises cleaner production methods, energy efficiency, and waste minimisation (Khan & Qianli, 2017; Khaksar et al., 2016). The integration of eco-design with manufacturing processes improves product quality and promotes recycling at the end of life (Li & Sarkis, 2022; Kong et al., 2020). Empirical research indicates a positive correlation between eco-design, cleaner production, innovation, and competitive advantage (Lee & Kim, 2011; Chen, Lai & Wen, 2006; Leenders & Chandra, 2013).

Green distribution and logistics: Distribution operations contribute to emissions and energy usage. Green logistics methods encompass the optimisation of transportation routes, the utilisation of energy-efficient vehicles, and the adoption of sustainable packaging (Wong, Wong & Boon-itt, 2020; Balon, 2020). Consolidating cargoes, employing multimodal transport, and investing in renewable energy infrastructure diminish carbon footprints (Laari, Töyli & Ojala, 2018; Muma et al., 2014). Reverse logistics, encompassing product returns, refurbishment, and recycling, is essential for completing the loop and advancing circular economy goals (Seman et al., 2012; Sarkis, Zhu & Cordeiro, 2008).

The integration of digital technology: Industry 4.0 technologies facilitate real-time data acquisition, enhanced traceability, and

predictive analytics. IoT devices monitor energy usage and equipment efficacy, while blockchain guarantees data integrity across supply chain collaborators (Karmaker et al., 2023; Awan, Arnold & Gölgeci, 2021). Artificial intelligence enhances routing and inventory management, hence minimising waste and pollution (Wu, 2013; Kong et al., 2020). Big data analytics aids in identifying environmental hotspots and enables reporting to stakeholders (Feng et al., 2018; Green et al., 2012). Digital integration necessitates investment in infrastructure, cybersecurity, and proficient workers. Small and medium-sized enterprises frequently encounter difficulties in adopting these technologies owing to budgetary constraints and a lack of understanding (Jabbour et al., 2014; Sugandini et al., 2020).

Organisational culture and human resource practices: A green organisational culture promotes sustainability at all tiers of the enterprise. Leaders should articulate environmental ideals, empower people, and incentivise sustainable behaviours (Chang, 2011; Gürlek & Tuna, 2018). Green human resource management encompasses recruitment, training, and performance evaluation processes that promote sustainable practices (Singh et al., 2020; Asfahani, 2023). Research indicates that green transformational leadership enhances environmental performance and mediates the connection between green innovation and organisational success (Singh et al., 2020; Wang, 2019).

Evaluation and documentation of performance: Assessing the efficacy of GSCM necessitates comprehensive measurements. Life cycle assessment (LCA) measures environmental impacts throughout all phases of a product's life (Roh et al., 2022). Key performance metrics encompass carbon emissions, energy consumption, water usage, waste production, and recycled materials (Takalo & Tooranloo, 2021; Vasileiou et al., 2022). Environmental reporting systems, such the Global Reporting Initiative and integrated sustainability reports, facilitate corporations in conveying progress and benchmarking against competitors (De Villiers, Naiker & Van Staden, 2011; Slaper & Hall, 2011).

Advantages in economics and competition: Evidence indicates that Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM) provides both environmental and economic advantages. Companies adopting sustainable practices realise cost reductions through decreased

material and energy consumption, improved innovation, and increased market share (Green et al., 2012; Laari, Töyli & Ojala, 2018). Competitive advantages stem from enhanced brand recognition, adherence to rules, and the capacity to penetrate environmentally sensitive markets (Kalyar, Shoukat & Shafique, 2020; Laari, Töyli & Ojala, 2018). Enhancements in financial performance stem from operational savings and resource optimisation (Feng et al., 2018; Bag et al., 2022; Hilal, 2022).

Obstacles and impediments: Notwithstanding its advantages, GSCM encounters enduring challenges. Substantial implementation expenses, restricted access to green technologies, and inadequate expertise constitute major barriers (Sugandini et al., 2020; Nanath & Pillai, 2017; Uddin, 2021). Certain vendors may oppose environmental mandates due to perceived risks and expenses (Jabbour et al., 2014; Abdallah & Al-Ghwayeen, 2020). Divergent legislation and absence of standardisation hinder cross-border supply chains (Cheng, 2020; Karmaker et al., 2023). Surmounting these obstacles necessitates financial incentives, training, stakeholder involvement, and conducive policy frameworks.

Developing tendencies and prospective trajectories: The future of GSCM is intricately linked to the principles of the circular economy and industrial symbiosis. Organisations are advancing from mere waste reduction to the implementation of closed-loop systems that recycle resources and prolong product life cycles (Khaksar et al., 2016; Vasileiou et al., 2022). Collaborative platforms facilitate the exchange of resources and by-products across supply chain partners (Awan, Arnold & Gölgeci, 2021; Wang, 2019). A further trend is the incorporation of social sustainability into Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM), highlighting labour rights, community involvement, and fair trade (De Sousa Jabbour et al., 2017; Gürlek & Tuna, 2018). Studies indicate the necessity for robust supply chains capable of adapting to disruptions, including pandemics and climate-related catastrophic events (Bag et al., 2022; Takalo & Tooranloo, 2021).

Case Study / Example

This section analyses a case study from the industrial sector in East Asia to demonstrate the practical implementation of green supply chain management. The selected firm, a mid-sized

electronics manufacturer, manages a multi-tier supply chain encompassing raw materials procurement to finished product distribution. The company saw escalating demands from global clients and regulators to diminish its environmental impact, leading management to initiate an extensive GSCM program.

The corporation commenced with an environmental audit to pinpoint critical areas within its supply chain. It was determined that supplier facilities contributed over 70 percent of its carbon emissions and waste production. Senior leadership established a sustainability mission and defined quantifiable objectives, including a 30 percent decrease in emissions over five years. The company synchronised these aims with strategic objectives, acknowledging that environmental performance was crucial for sustaining export contracts and brand reputation (Li et al., 2016; Green et al., 2012).

Collaboration with suppliers and enhancement of capabilities: The corporation implemented green procurement procedures mandating suppliers to adhere to environmental requirements. It organised training sessions focused on eco-design, waste minimisation, and energy efficiency, urging vendors to exchange best practices (Zsidisin & Siferd, 2001; Jabbour et al., 2014). Long-term contracts were extended to vendors who satisfied environmental performance standards, hence fostering incentives for enhancement. Collaboration resulted in the utilisation of recycled materials and minimised packaging, decreasing upstream emissions by 15 percent over two years (Zhu, Sarkis & Lai, 2008).

Innovation in processes and digital technologies: The manufacturer invested in energy-efficient machinery, executed process innovations, and integrated IoT sensors to monitor resource utilisation. Real-time data collecting enabled management to detect inefficiencies and execute corrective measures (Karmaker et al., 2023; Wu, 2013). Blockchain was utilised to track ingredients from suppliers to final products, enhancing transparency and facilitating the verification of environmental assertions. The company reported a 20 percent reduction in energy usage and a 25 percent decrease in waste, alongside diminished cycle times attributed to enhanced planning (Kong et al., 2020; Feng et al., 2018).

Performance outcomes and insights: After five years, the company attained a 35 percent decrease in carbon emissions throughout its supply chain and enhanced its environmental performance ratings. The company reported cost reductions due to diminished material use, reduced energy expenses, and lowered waste disposal charges. Improved supplier ties facilitated collaborative innovation initiatives, yielding new environmentally sustainable products and entry into new markets (Lee & Kim, 2011; Kong et al., 2020). The case study emphasises that effective leadership, supplier collaboration, investment in innovation and digital technology, and well-defined performance measures are essential for the successful implementation of GSCM.

Challenges encountered: Despite its achievements, the corporation confronted obstacles including disparate environmental regulations among supplier nations, resource constraints among smaller suppliers, and internal reluctance to change. It tackled these difficulties with ongoing training, financial assistance for supplier enhancements, and the formation of a cross-functional sustainability committee comprising procurement, production, logistics, and sales. The experience highlights the significance of adaptability and teamwork in surmounting GSCM obstacles (Nanath & Pillai, 2017; Sugandini et al., 2020).

Conclusion

This chapter has analysed green supply chain management as an essential element of sustainable business operations. The literature analysis illustrates that Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM) has progressed beyond environmental procurement to an all-encompassing framework that incorporates eco-design, greener production, green logistics, reverse logistics, and stakeholder involvement. Research consistently demonstrates that Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM) improves environmental performance while fostering innovation, competitiveness, and financial results. The primary discourse delineates solutions for the implementation of Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM), emphasising the significance of strategic planning, supplier engagement, eco-design, digital technologies, cultural transformation, and performance assessment. Each dimension aids in mitigating environmental consequences and generating economic gain.

Empirical evidence underscores that the advantages of GSCM are optimised when activities are executed comprehensively rather than independently. The case study demonstrates how a manufacturing company attained substantial emissions reductions and cost savings by fully implementing Green Supply Chain Management, showcasing the actual feasibility of these tactics. Nonetheless, obstacles remain. Substantial initial expenses, restricted functionalities, variable standards, and institutional deficiencies hinder the extensive implementation of GSCM, particularly among SMEs and in emerging areas. Policymakers must offer incentives, establish supportive rules, and promote knowledge exchange to empower additional enterprises to adopt sustainable practices. Organisations ought to allocate resources towards training, technology, and collaboration to surmount internal and external barriers. Future study should analyse the amalgamation of digital technologies with green supply chain management, analyse the convergence of social and environmental sustainability, and assess resilience in green supply networks during global upheavals. Research on emerging economies and SMEs is essential to comprehend context-specific difficulties and devise customised solutions. With the escalating urgency of climate change and the increasing demand for transparency from stakeholders, GSCM will continue to be a pivotal component of sustainable business strategy.

References

1. Abdallah, A. B., & Al-Ghwayeen, W. S. (2020). Green supply chain management and business performance: The mediating roles of environmental and operational performances. *Business Process Management Journal*, 26, 489–512.
2. Abdallah, A. B., Al-Ghwayeen, W. S., Al-Amayreh, E. A. M., & Sweis, R. J. (2024). The impact of green supply chain management on circular economy performance: The mediating roles of green innovations. *Logistics*, 8, Article 20.
3. Ali, S., Jiang, J., Rehman, R. U., & Khan, M. K. (2023). Tournament incentives and environmental performance: The role of green innovation. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 30, 17670–17680.
4. Asfahani, A. M. (2023). Green HRM and servant leadership: Driving competitive advantage and environmental performance in higher education. *Sustainability*, 15, Article 7921.

5. Awan, U., Arnold, M. G., & Gölgeci, I. (2021). Enhancing green product and process innovation: Towards an integrative framework of knowledge acquisition and environmental investment. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 30, 1283–1295.
6. Bag, S., Dhamija, P., Bryde, D. J., & Singh, R. K. (2022). Effect of eco-innovation on green supply chain management, circular economy capability, and performance of small and medium enterprises. *Journal of Business Research*, 141, 60–72.
7. Balon, V. (2020). Green supply chain management: Pressures, practices, and performance, an integrative literature review. *Business Strategy and Development*, 3, 226–244.
8. Chang, C. H. (2011). The influence of corporate environmental ethics on competitive advantage: The mediation role of green innovation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 104, 361–370.
9. Chen, Y. S., Lai, S. B., & Wen, C. T. (2006). The influence of green innovation performance on corporate advantage in Taiwan. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67, 331–339.
10. Chiou, T. Y., Chan, H. K., Lettice, F., & Chung, S. H. (2011). The influence of greening the suppliers and green innovation on environmental performance and competitive advantage in Taiwan. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, 47, 822–836.
11. Chien, M. K., & Shih, L. H. (2007). An empirical study of the implementation of green supply chain management practices in the electrical and electronic industry and their relation to organizational performances. *International Journal of Environmental Science and Technology*, 4, 383–394.
12. De Sousa Jabbour, A. B. L., Vazquez-Brust, D., Jabbour, C. J. C., & Latan, H. (2017). Green supply chain practices and environmental performance in Brazil: Survey, case studies, and implications for B2B. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 66, 13–28.
13. De Villiers, C., Naiker, V., & Van Staden, C. J. (2011). The effect of board characteristics on firm environmental performance. *Journal of Management*, 37, 1636–1663.
14. Feng, M., Yu, W., Wang, X., Wong, C. Y., Xu, M., & Xiao, Z. (2018). Green supply chain management and financial performance: The mediating roles of operational and environmental performance. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 27, 811–824.
15. Green, K. W., Zelbst, P. J., Meacham, J., & Bhadauria, V. S. (2012). Green supply chain management practices: Impact on performance. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 17, 290–305.

16. Gürlek, M., & Tuna, M. (2018). Reinforcing competitive advantage through green organizational culture and green innovation. *The Service Industries Journal*, 38, 467–491.
17. Hazaea, S. A., Al-Matari, E. M., Zedan, K., Khatib, S. F., Zhu, J., & Al Amosh, H. (2022). Green purchasing: Past, present and future. *Sustainability*, 14, Article 5008.
18. Hilal, F. (2022). The effect of green supply chain management practices and competitive advantage on financial performance. *International Journal of Business*, 27, 1–13.
19. Hsu, C. W., & Hu, A. H. (2008). Green supply chain management in the electronic industry. *International Journal of Environmental Science and Technology*, 5, 205–216.
20. International Organization for Standardization. (1996). *ISO 14001: Environmental management systems: Specification with guidance for use*. International Organization for Standardization.
21. Jabbour, A. B., Jabbour, C., Govindan, K., Kannan, D., & Arantes, A. F. (2014). Mixed methodology to analyze the relationship between maturity of environmental management and the adoption of green supply chain management in Brazil. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 92, 255–267.
22. Kalyar, M. N., Shoukat, A., & Shafique, I. (2020). Enhancing firms' environmental performance and financial performance through green supply chain management practices and institutional pressures. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 11, 451–476.
23. Karmaker, C. L., Al Aziz, R., Ahmed, T., Misbaudhin, S. M., & Moktadir, M. A. (2023). Impact of industry 4.0 technologies on sustainable supply chain performance: The mediating role of green supply chain management practices and circular economy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 419, Article 138249.
24. Khaksar, E., Abbasnejad, T., Esmaeili, A., & Tamošaitienė, J. (2016). The effect of green supply chain management practices on environmental performance and competitive advantage: A case study of the cement industry. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 22, 293–308.
25. Khan, S. A. R., & Qianli, D. (2017). Impact of green supply chain management practices on firms' performance: An empirical study from the perspective of Pakistan. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 24, 16829–16844.
26. Khan, K. I., Babar, Z., Sharif, S., Iqbal, S., & Khan, M. I. (2021). Going green? Investigating the role of GSCM practices on firm financial and environmental performance through green innovation. *International Journal of Procurement Management*, 14, 681–701.

27. Kong, T., Feng, T., Huang, Y., & Cai, J. (2020). How to convert green supply chain integration efforts into green innovation: A perspective of knowledge-based view. *Sustainable Development*, 28, 1106–1121.
28. Laari, S., Töyli, J., & Ojala, L. (2018). The effect of a competitive strategy and green supply chain management on the financial and environmental performance of logistics service providers. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 27, 872–883.
29. Laosirihongthong, T., Adebajo, D., & Choon Tan, K. (2013). Green supply chain management practices and performance. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 113, 1088–1109.
30. Leenders, M. A., & Chandra, Y. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of green innovation in the wine industry: The role of channel structure. *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, 25, 203–218.
31. Lee, K. H., & Kim, J. W. (2011). Integrating suppliers into green product innovation development: An empirical case study in the semiconductor industry. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 20, 527–538.
32. Lee, V. H., Ooi, K. B., Chong, A. Y. L., & Lin, B. (2015). A structural analysis of greening the supplier, environmental performance and competitive advantage. *Production Planning & Control*, 26, 116–130.
33. Li, J., & Sarkis, J. (2022). Product eco-design practice in green supply chain management: A China-global examination of research. *Nankai Business Review International*, 13, 124–153.
34. Li, S., Jayaraman, V., Paulraj, A., & Shang, K. C. (2016). Proactive environmental strategies and performance: Role of green supply chain processes and green product design in the Chinese high-tech industry. *International Journal of Production Research*, 54, 2136–2151.
35. Li, S., Ragu-Nathan, B., Ragu-Nathan, T. S., & Rao, S. S. (2006). The impact of supply chain management practices on competitive advantage and organizational performance. *Omega*, 34, 107–124.
36. Liu, L., Tang, M., & Xue, F. (2012). The impact of manufacturing firms' green supply chain management on competitive advantage. *Advances in Materials Research*, 472–475, 3349–3354.
37. Makhlof, H., Chatti, N., & Lakhal, L. (2023). The impact of TQM and green innovation on corporate sustainability: The mediating role of green supply chain management. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 40, 2592–2611.
38. Masoumik, S. M., Abdul-Rashid, S. H., & Olugu, E. U. (2014). Gaining competitive advantage through strategic green supply chain management: From a literature review towards a conceptual model. *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 3, 49–58.

39. Muma, B. O., Nyaoga, R. B., Matwere, R. B., & Nyambega, E. (2014). Green supply chain management and environmental performance among tea processing firms in Kericho County, Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Sciences*, 2, 270–276.
40. Nanath, K., & Pillai, R. R. (2017). The influence of green IS practices on competitive advantage: Mediation role of green innovation performance. *Information Systems Management*, 34, 3–19.
41. Novitasari, M., & Agustia, D. (2021). Green supply chain management and firm performance: The mediating effect of green innovation. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 14, 391–403.
42. Novitasari, M., & Agustia, D. (2022). Assessing the impact of green supply chain management, competitive advantage and firm performance in PROPER companies in Indonesia. *Operations and Supply Chain Management*, 15, 395–409.
43. Purwanto, A., Fahmi, K., Irwansyah, I., Hadinegoro, R., Rochmad, I., Syahril, S., & Sulastri, E. (2022). The role of green innovation and green supply chain management on the sustainability of the performance of SMEs. *Journal of Future Sustainable Production*, 2, 49–52.
44. Roh, T., Noh, J., Oh, Y., & Park, K. S. (2022). Structural relationships of a firm's green strategies for environmental performance: The roles of green supply chain management and green marketing innovation. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 356, Article 131877.
45. Sarkis, J., Zhu, Q., & Lai, K. H. (2011). An organizational theoretic review of green supply chain management literature. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 130, 1–15.
46. Sarkis, J., Zhu, Q., Cordeiro, J. J., & Lai, K. H. (2008). Firm-level correlates of emergent green supply chain management practices in the Chinese context. *Omega*, 36, 577–591.
47. Seman, N. A. A., Govindan, K., Mardani, A., Zakuan, N., Saman, M. Z. M., Hooker, R. E., & Ozkul, S. (2019). The mediating effect of green innovation on the relationship between green supply chain management and environmental performance. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 229, 115–127.
48. Seman, N. A. A., Zakuan, N., Jusoh, A., Arif, M. S. M., & Saman, M. Z. M. (2012). The relationship of green supply chain management and green innovation concept. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 57, 453–457.
49. Sharabati, A. A. A. (2021). Green supply chain management and competitive advantage of the Jordanian pharmaceutical industry. *Sustainability*, 13, Article 13315.
50. Slaper, T. F., & Hall, T. J. (2011). The triple bottom line: What is it and how does it work? *Indiana Business Review*, 86(1), 4–8.

51. Srivastava, S. K. (2007). Green supply-chain management: A state-of-the-art literature review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 9, 53–80.
52. Sugandini, D., Susilowati, C., Siswanti, Y., & Syafri, W. (2020). Green supply management and green marketing strategy on green purchase intention: SMEs cases. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 13, 79–92.
53. Takalo, S. K., & Tooranloo, H. S. (2021). Green innovation: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 279, Article 122474.
54. Tran, H., Hoang, N., Do, V., Nguyen, T., Nguyen, V., Phan, T., & Doan, T. (2022). Impact of green supply chain management on competitive advantage and firm performance in Vietnam. *Uncertain Supply Chain Management*, 10, 1175–1190.
55. Uddin, M. (2021). Exploring environmental performance and the competitive advantage of manufacturing firms: A green supply chain management perspective. *International Journal of Economics and Management*, 15, 219–239.
56. Vasileiou, E., Georgantzis, N., Attanasi, G., & Llerena, P. (2022). Green innovation and financial performance: A study on Italian firms. *Research Policy*, 51, Article 104530.
57. Wang, C. H. (2019). How organizational green culture influences green performance and competitive advantage: The mediating role of green innovation. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 30, 666–683.
58. Wong, C. Y., Wong, C. W., & Boon-itt, S. (2020). Effects of green supply chain integration and green innovation on environmental and cost performance. *International Journal of Production Research*, 58, 4589–4609.
59. Wu, G. C. (2013). The influence of green supply chain integration and environmental uncertainty on green innovation in Taiwan's IT industry. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 18, 539–552.
60. Yang, Y., & Wang, Y. (2020). Supplier selection for the adoption of green innovation in sustainable supply chain management practices: A case of the Chinese textile manufacturing industry. *Processes*, 8, Article 717.
61. Yu, W., Chavez, R., Feng, M., & Wiengarten, F. (2014). Integrated green supply chain management and operational performance. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 19, 683–696.
62. Yu, Y., Zhang, M., & Huo, B. (2019). The impact of supply chain quality integration on green supply chain management and environmental performance. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 30, 1110–1125.

63. Zhang, D., Rong, Z., & Ji, Q. (2019). Green innovation and firm performance: Evidence from listed companies in China. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 144, 48–55.
64. Zhu, Q., Sarkis, J., & Lai, K. H. (2008). Confirmation of a measurement model for green supply chain management practices implementation. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 111, 261–273.
65. Zhu, Q., Sarkis, J., Cordeiro, J. J., & Lai, K. H. (2008). Firm-level correlates of emergent green supply chain management practices in the Chinese context. *Omega*, 36, 577–591.
66. Zsidisin, G. A., & Siferd, S. P. (2001). Environmental purchasing: A framework for theory development. *European Journal of Purchasing & Supply Management*, 7, 61–73.