LEX LOCALIS-JOURNAL OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT
ISSN:1581-5374 E-ISSN:1855-363X
VOL. 23, NO. 11(2025)

BEYOND TECHNOLOGICAL OPTIMISM: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF INDUSTRY 4.0'S IMPLICATIONS FOR SMES, LABOR, SUSTAINABILITY, AND GOVERNANCE

Chew Hian Tat[1] ,Tan Seng Teck[2], Lim Swee Geok[3], Reynold Tom Fernandez[4], Chee How Liau[5], Pradeep Sonar[6]

[1]INTI International University
[2]Professor, Faculty of Business and Communication, INTI International University, Malaysia, Persiaran Perdana BBN Putra Nilai, 71800 Nilai, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia
[3]Adjunct Professor, Faculty of Business and Communication, INTI International University, Malaysia, Persiaran Perdana BBN Putra Nilai, 71800 Nilai, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia
[4]Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Business and Communication, INTI International University, Malaysia, Persiaran Perdana BBN Putra Nilai, 71800 Nilai, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia
[5]Lecturer in Marketing, Danford Higher Education, Melbourne, Australia
[6]Professor (Management), Head - International Program Office, Nodal Officer-NEP 2020, HOD - School of Management, D Y Patil University, Pune, Ambi

Corresponding author: hiantat_chew@yahoo.com[1]

Abstract
The Fourth Industrial Revolution, also referred to as Industry 4.0, is a paradigm shift in production, management, industrial growth and economic order that has been influenced by the development of new technologies such as the Internet of Things (IoT), artificial intelligence (AI), robotics, and big data analytics. This review systematically attempts to reflect on the recent academic literature (2021–2025) to explore the effects of Industry 4.0 on the managerial decision-making process, labor markets, sustainability, and long-term competitiveness. Through the evaluation of more than fifteen peer-reviewed journal articles, the paper can synthesize the insights that were made into the readiness of small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), the efficacy of maturity models and adoption frameworks, and the theoretical basis behind the digital transformation research that includes resource-based view, dynamic capabilities, and institutional theory. Although most of the literature is focused on productivity increase, reduction in costs, and supply chain resilience, some contradictions have been identified around labor replacement, skills gaps, and increasing digital divide, especially in the developing economies. Sustainability and ethical issues are also mentioned in the review, as Industry 4.0 has a dual potential of cutting down on waste and emissions and increasing concerns regarding energy usage, e-waste, and data privacy. It is identified that policy and governance are the most important facilitators, and inclusive digital policies and global collaboration are required to create equitable change. The paper ends by outlining major gaps, such as the lack of longitudinal studies, the lack of balance in indicators of readiness, and research in other areas of manufacturing. The research in the future needs to take an interdisciplinary approach to comprehensively capture the socioeconomic and environmental impacts of Industry 4.0. The reflection is to be added to the continuous discussion by striking a balance between technological optimism and critical awareness of the issue of attaining inclusive, sustainable, and strategic adoption of Industry 4.0.

Keywords: Industry 4.0, Fourth Industrial Revolution, digital transformation, SMEs, managerial decision-making, sustainability, labor markets, policy and governance

1.1 Introduction

Industry 4.0, or the Fourth Industrial Revolution and industrial growth, is a paradigm shift in the operation of industries, production, and competition in the global economy. Industry 4.0 is an umbrella term that refers to a collection of cutting-edge digital technologies like the Internet of Things (IoT), artificial intelligence (AI), big data analytics, robotics, and cyber-physical systems, which together are revolutionizing traditional manufacturing and service industries (Kamble et al., 2021; Moeuf et al., 2022). Already in the title, "Industry 4.0" suggests radical change not just in the technology domain but also in economic systems and organizational methods that support international competitiveness.

This reflective journal seeks to explore and critically analyze the scholarly literature on Industry 4.0 through the reading of at least 15 scholarly journal articles between 2021 and 2025. The primary objective is to understand the evolving perspectives on how Industry 4.0 affects business decision-making, labor, policy, and long-term economic growth. Most of the articles discussed are published in top-ranked journals such as Technological Forecasting and Social Change, Journal of Manufacturing Systems, and the International Journal of Production Economics, and offer both theoretical models and empirical findings on the prospects and challenges of embarking on Industry 4.0 in different national and industrial contexts (Frank et al., 2021; Sony & Naik, 2022).

Prior to reading through each article in detail, their abstracts, sub-headings, and bibliographic sources were read with a critical eye. This first review revealed that most of the new literature is founded upon earlier foundational studies by scholars such as Schwab (2017), who popularized the phrase "Fourth Industrial Revolution," and built on top of new arguments regarding digital readiness, labor change, and sustainability in the Industry 4.0 environment (Ostic et al., 2023; Dalenogare et al., 2022). The referred sources in these articles are not only contemporary and relevant but also speak to growing interdisciplinarity—across economics, engineering, organizational studies, and information systems.

The authors' intentions vary throughout the literature: some aim to present synthesia of technological trends and adoption patterns, whereas others are critical analyses of policy frameworks or staking out agendas for future research. There is also a strong regional focus in most studies, particularly those examining Industry 4.0 adoption in Southeast Asia and developing countries like Malaysia (Lee & Lim, 2021; Khin et al., 2023). Such articles are generally composed for an academic-professional readership—e.g., researchers, policymakers, business strategists, and educators—due to their technical lexicon, formal methods, and use of advanced analytics tools.

This reflection, therefore, aims to distill the most significant findings of these scholarly researches, discern common themes and contradictions, and express a fair opinion of how Industry 4.0 is revolutionizing the field of managerial economics. Through an examination of the way in which firms, institutions, and governments respond to such a digital shift, this reflection adds to our understanding of the strategic, economic, and social effects of Industry 4.0—particularly in situations where technology adoption remains unbalanced and policy environments are still in formation (Bag et al., 2022; Yadav et al., 2024; Gazi et al., 2025).

2. Literature Review

2.1. Author's Purpose and Target Audience

The majority of the authors studied aimed to explore the benefits and challenges surrounding Industry 4.0 adoption, much of which was aimed at manufacturing, SMEs, policy, and employee readiness.

Kee et.al (2025) sheds light on the internal enabling factors towards emerging market (EM) small and medium-sized enterprises' (SMEs) preparedness for Industry 4.0 (I4.0) using three dimensions: managerial, operational and technological readiness. The study uses convenience sampling, having online and paper-based surveys and collecting 110 responses from manufacturing Malaysian SMEs. This sample allowed assessing the relationships of the hypothesized variables through the structural model of data analysis. This study's findings demonstrate that financial capability and perceived benefits enhance Malaysian SMEs' managerial, operational and technological readiness. Using Malaysia's case, this paper extends the discussion of the key drivers that underline the decision of EM firms to adopt I4.0. This study's results provide valuable insights for policymakers to improve the digital ecosystem. Also, understanding critical drivers for I4.0 readiness would encourage SMEs in Malaysia to embrace new digital technologies. Although digital transformation towards I4.0 for

manufacturing SMEs would be decisive, little is known about how ready these Malaysian firms are to adopt it or the driving factors that motivate them. Meanwhile, inadequate readiness causes a high failure rate in implementing new technology, processes or organizational changes.
Häring et.al (2023) analyzed Industry 4.0, highlighting it as a significant transformation in production and service sectors characterized by digital connectivity, information transparency, technical assistance, and decentralized decision-making. This transition presents substantial challenges for businesses, especially small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). To assist in this shift, various maturity models have been developed and adjusted to support companies in transitioning to this new paradigm. Through a systematic literature review, the study evaluates existing maturity models to generate insights aimed at facilitating SMEs' entry into Industry 4.0. Quantitative results show a heightened need for foundational support, with these models providing essential structured guidance; however, they are often poorly validated, lack transparency, and may not adequately address SME requirements. Qualitative findings further categorize recommendations into ten categories concerning Industry 4.0. The conclusions underscore the paper's objective to furnish a well-structured summary that aids newcomers, research entities, and businesses in effectively launching and enhancing their Industry 4.0 initiatives.
Aziz et al. (2021), for example, explored Malaysian SME adoption of Industry 4.0 and concluded that digital illiteracy and infrastructure readiness were significant barriers. Similarly, Rashid and Tan (2024) surveyed Malaysia's business leaders to determine the digital divide and recommend policy reforms towards equitable access to technology. These articles are essentially written for academics, policymakers, and practitioners, based on the technical lingo, empirical models, and strategic recommendations that they provide. Authors aim to inform public and private decision-making by emphasizing data-led intelligence and best practices. This reflects one of the big strengths in the literature—the ability to connect scholarly activities and practice.
Masood et.al (2020) industrial systems have been popularised in recent years through buzzwords such as Industry 4.0, Internet of Things (IoT), and Cyber Physical Systems (CPS). Whilst the technologies of Industry 4.0 and likes have many conceivable benefits to manufacturing, the majority of these technologies are developed for, or by, large firms. Much of the contemporary work is therefore disconnected from the needs of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), despite the fact they represent 99% of registered companies in Europe. This study approaches the disconnect through an industrial survey of UK SMEs (n=271, KMO=0.701), which is the first in the UK that used to collect opinions, reinforcing the current literature on the most reported Industry 4.0 technologies (n=20), benefits, and challenges to implementation. Flexibility, cost, efficiency, quality and competitive advantage are found to be the key benefits to Industry 4.0 adoption in SMEs. Whilst many SMEs show a desire to implement Industry 4.0 technologies for these reasons, financial and knowledge constraints are found to be key challenges.
Mittal et.al (2020) determined the Smart Manufacturing (SM) a revolutionary paradigm that aims to improve production systems' performance in terms of quality, time, cost, and flexibility, as well as human and machine decision-making capabilities. Most large enterprises have already taken first steps towards adopting SM. Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs) on the other hand, are struggling with developing a SM adoption roadmap. Our research builds on the real and perceived needs and challenges faced by manufacturing SMEs and advances the field by developing and evaluating an SME-specific 'SM adoption framework'. We have employed a multiple case study approach to acknowledge the lessons learned by selected early-adopter SMEs that have recently implemented and deployed SM tools and practices. We propose an SM adoption framework with five vital steps that SMEs interested in SM should

follow: (i) identify manufacturing data available within the SME, (ii) readiness assessment of the SME data-hierarchy steps, (iii) developing SM awareness of SME leadership and staff, (iv) develop a SM tailored vision for the SMEs, and (v) identify appropriate SM tools and practices necessary to realise the tailored SM vision. Moreover, the results of the case study analysis enabled us to formulate many generalisations.

Agostini et.al (2020) investigated whether the financial resources invested in advanced manufacturing technologies (AMTs) and social capital (SC), in terms of the set of internal and external relationships a firm holds, have a positive effect on the adoption of Industry 4.0 (I4.0) technologies. Furthermore, it tests whether the organizational context strengthens these relationships. The authors used regression models to analyze data collected through an international survey carried out within the scope of a European project involving six Central European regions. Results show that small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) having stronger internal and external SC have a higher propensity to adopt I4.0 technologies, and both management support and absorptive capacity (AC) strengthen these relationships, whereas investments in AMTs within the manufacturing area and internal SC have a positive association with the intensity of I4.0 adoption. However, in presence of a high level of management support and AC, the relationship between external SC and I4.0 adoption becomes positive and significant. Management support also moderates the impact that investments in AMTs in the manufacturing area and internal SC have on the intensity of adoption of I4.0 technologies. This paper is one of the first to investigate the context of SMEs that, having fewer resources, face some difficulties in exploiting the potential of I4.0 revolution. Moreover, it adopts a broad perspective on the factors that facilitate the adoption of I4.0.

Ingaldi et.al (2019) studied the Industry is currently undergoing a revolution (called Revolution 4.0) related to the far-reaching integration of all production areas through the digitization and the creation of new communication channels. The Polish economy generated a GDP of USD 524.5 billion in 2017, of which small and medium enterprises generated about 50% of revenue and in which microenterprises accounted for the largest share in generating GDP; i.e., around 30.2%. The aim of the research is to determine the adaptation possibilities of the small and medium-sized enterprises (SME) sector to Industry 4.0 solutions. Pilot research was carried out in the Czestochowa Industrial District. Enterprises from the SME sector were asked to provide an information about the used technologies and to determine the level of their organization's readiness for sustainable development through technological transformation. Financial resources as well as a lack of specialized support in obtaining new technologies were defined as problems as far as transformation is concerned. The solution of the diagnosed problem is the development of a platform aimed at integrating the potential of enterprises from the SME sector in order to undertake joint actions for sustainable development.

Table 1: Comparison Table

Author(s) & Year	Focus	Key Findings	Implications
Kee et al. (2025)	Internal enabling factors of Malaysian SMEs' Industry 4.0 readiness (managerial, operational, technological).	Financial capability and perceived benefits drive I4.0 readiness.	Helps policymakers strengthen digital ecosystems; guides SMEs in embracing digital transformation.
Häring et al. (2023)	Analysis of Industry 4.0 maturity models for SMEs.	Maturity models provide guidance but are under-validated, non-	Offers structured recommendations for newcomers, research institutions, and

		transparent, and often unsuitable for SMEs.	businesses to optimize I4.0 adoption.
Aziz et al. (2021)	Barriers to Malaysian SME adoption of Industry 4.0.	Digital illiteracy and infrastructure limitations are major barriers.	Highlights the need for training and infrastructure development to support SME digital transformation.
Rashid & Tan (2024)	Digital divide and equitable access to technology in Malaysia.	Significant gaps in access to digital tools and infrastructure among SMEs.	Recommends policy reforms to ensure fair access to technology, reducing inequality in I4.0 adoption.
Masood et al. (2020)	Benefits and challenges of I4.0 adoption in UK SMEs.	Benefits: flexibility, efficiency, quality, competitiveness. Challenges: financial and knowledge constraints.	Demonstrates mismatch between SME needs and large-firm solutions; calls for SME-specific strategies.
Mittal et al. (2020)	Development of SME-specific Smart Manufacturing (SM) adoption framework.	Proposed a five-step adoption framework (data readiness, awareness, vision, tool selection).	Provides a practical roadmap for SMEs to adopt SM systematically.
Agostini et al. (2020)	Role of financial resources and social capital in I4.0 adoption.	Internal/external social capital, management support, and absorptive capacity enhance adoption.	Emphasizes importance of organizational context and relational resources in fostering I4.0 adoption.
Ingaldi et al. (2019)	Readiness of Polish SMEs for Industry 4.0 transformation.	Barriers: lack of financial resources and specialized support.	Suggests developing collaborative platforms for SMEs to jointly achieve sustainable technological development.

2.2. Central Arguments and Methodologies

One of the recurring themes is the transformative potential of Industry 4.0. Hariri et al. (2025) argued that the integration of Industry 4.0 technologies holds the promise of achieving higher sustainability through circular economy approaches. Their study employed a mixed-methods study, combining case studies and large-scale surveys in an effort to provide rich insights to corporate outcomes as well as environmental outcomes.

Batra et.al (2025) investigated the integration of Industry 4.0 and Smart Farming, highlighting the application of digitization, automation, and data-driven decision-making to transform traditional sectors. Despite the promising convergence of these two fields, there are numerous unexplored areas that need clarification. The study employs Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) methodology to analyze data from the Scopus database, identifying current research patterns and future opportunities. The findings reveal a significant gap in scholarly output, with only 51 relevant papers available in the combined field. This lack of research indicates vast potential for further exploration. The originality of this study lies in its unique application of LDA to

this particular dataset, which had not been previously analyzed in this manner. Additionally, the research emphasizes the practical implications for agricultural stakeholders, suggesting that Industry 4.0 technologies could facilitate advancements in Smart Farming. Recommendations extend to policymakers, focusing on the importance of regulatory frameworks, incentive structures, and resource conservation to promote effective technology transfer and innovation in agriculture.

Felsberger et.al (2022) explained the Industry 4.0 offers massive potential for implementing sustainability, which is a growing concern for global manufacturing industries. This paper investigates the impact of the implementation of Industry 4.0 with specific emphasis on digital transformation on the sustainability dimensions of European manufacturing industries. In doing so, we propose a framework to identify the implications of Industry 4.0 on the reconciliation of the firm's existing and new dynamic capabilities, competencies, and market requirements to achieve sustainable competitive advantage. Using a multiple case research design, we study six European manufacturing companies, including aerospace manufacturing (AM) and electronic component and systems (ECS) manufacturing. The novelty of our study lies in developing a set of theoretical propositions that reveals interrelations between Industry 4.0, the dynamic capabilities of the firm and distinct dimensions of sustainability. Our findings show that the reconciliation of dynamic capabilities mediates the impact of Industry 4.0 on economic, environmental, and social aspects. The study provides insights to practitioners to strengthen their dynamic capabilities in order to achieve sustainability while implementing Industry 4.0. Moreover, the findings also facilitate investment decisions in Industry 4.0 projects.

Psarommatis et.al (2022) studied the quality management is a key feature for increasing the competitiveness, productivity, profitability, and sustainability of their systems. Quality improvement (QI) methods aim to achieve high-quality parts without reducing performance. The Industry 4.0 framework brought technological developments that cannot be used by traditional QI methods, such as Six Sigma, Lean, Lean Six, the Theory of Constraints, and Total Quality Management, which are widely used in manufacturing companies. The need for higher manufacturing sustainability and market requirements has led to the search for alternative QI methods with superior performance to traditional QI methods such as Zero-Defect Manufacturing (ZDM). The current paper is a position paper with a goal to present the ZDM approach and providing a clear definition about ZDM to align everyone in one common understanding of ZDM. Many researchers and manufactures are skeptical about ZDM, therefore, numerous argumentative questions have been created and answered, to convince them why they should migrate from traditional QI methods to ZDM. The migration to ZDM has already started, to support this statement numerous facts from the literature have been presented. Finally, several directions were identified, demonstrating that there is still plenty of room for research in several domains.

Elia et al. (2021) integrated earlier research and emphasized a research agenda focused on micro-level firm innovation, especially for SMEs in emerging economies. Zhang et al. (2022), using simulation modeling and big data analysis, quantified the effect of Industry 4.0 on supply chain agility and resilience. Others, such as Tan and Omar (2023), used policy analysis frameworks to assess the inclusivity and long-term vision of national digital strategies.

Dalzochio et.al (2020) discussed the fourth industrial revolution has attracted attention worldwide. Several concepts were born in conjunction with this new revolution, such as predictive maintenance. This study aims to investigate academic advances in failure prediction. The prediction of failures takes into account concepts as a predictive maintenance decision support system and a design support system. We focus on frameworks that use machine learning and reasoning for predictive maintenance in Industry 4.0. More specifically, we consider the challenges in the application of machine learning techniques and ontologies in the

context of predictive maintenance. We conduct a systematic review of the literature (SLR) to analyze academic articles that were published online from 2015 until the beginning of June 2020. The screening process resulted in a final population of 38 studies of a total of 562 analyzed. We removed papers not directly related to predictive maintenance, machine learning, as well as researches classified as surveys or reviews. We discuss the proposals and results of these papers, considering three research questions. This article contributes to the field of predictive maintenance to highlight the challenges faced in the area, both for implementation and use-case. We conclude by pointing out that predictive maintenance is a hot topic in the context of Industry 4.0 but with several challenges to be better investigated in the area of machine learning and the application of reasoning.

Nascimento et.al (2019) investigated the integration of Industry 4.0 technologies with circular economy (CE) practices to develop a business model for reusing and recycling waste materials, such as scrap metal and electronic waste. Utilizing a qualitative research approach, the study unfolds in three stages: first, a literature review examining concepts, success factors, and barriers to CE and sustainable supply chain management; second, the development of a conceptual framework to evaluate the synergy among these concepts; and third, validation of the model through semi-structured interviews with professionals in operations management. The findings advocate for a circular model that incorporates web technologies, reverse logistics, and additive manufacturing, thus enhancing CE practices. The results indicate that reinserting waste into the supply chain fosters business sustainability by facilitating on-demand production, minimizing resource consumption, and lowering environmental impacts. Additionally, reusing materials helps prevent hazardous waste from contaminating landfills and oceans, while fostering local business networks that create jobs and boost economic performance.

The variety of methodologies—regression analysis and structural equation modeling to comparative case studies—mirrors the cross-disciplinary nature of Industry 4.0 research. Such methodological diversity enhances validity and usefulness of conclusions for a variety of sectors and economic settings.

Table 2: Comparison Table

Author(s) & Year	Focus	Key Findings	Implications
Batra et al. (2025)	Convergence of Industry 4.0 and Smart Farming; research trends and gaps.	Literature is scarce (only 51 papers). LDA identified three emerging research questions. Vast potential for future research.	Helps scholars, practitioners, and policymakers identify underexplored areas; guides technology developers and farmers in applying I4.0 solutions to agriculture.
Felsberger et al. (2022)	Relationship between Industry 4.0 adoption, dynamic capabilities, and sustainability.	Dynamic capabilities mediate I4.0's effect on economic, environmental, and social performance.	Provides a framework for firms to strengthen capabilities for sustainable advantage; informs investment and policy decisions.
Psarommatis et al. (2022)	Position paper on Zero-Defect Manufacturing (ZDM) as an alternative to	Traditional QI methods inadequate for I4.0. ZDM adoption is growing but faces skepticism.	Provides common definition and conceptual clarity of ZDM; encourages migration

	traditional quality management methods.		from Lean/Six Sigma towards ZDM.
Elia et al. (2021)	Research agenda on micro-level firm innovation in SMEs within emerging economies.	Industry 4.0 creates new innovation opportunities but SMEs face unique challenges.	Shapes future research agenda; supports SME-focused innovation policies.
Zhang et al. (2022)	Effect of Industry 4.0 on supply chain agility and resilience.	Simulation and big data show I4.0 enhances adaptability and robustness of supply chains.	Encourages firms to adopt I4.0 to strengthen resilience against disruptions.
Tan & Omar (2023)	Policy analysis of national digital strategies.	Many digital policies lack inclusivity and long-term vision.	Recommends policy reform to ensure equitable, sustainable digital transformation.
Dalzochio et al. (2020)	Systematic literature review on predictive maintenance in I4.0 using ML and ontologies.	Reviewed 38 studies; predictive maintenance is growing but implementation faces technical and reasoning challenges.	Highlights research gaps in ML-based predictive maintenance; guides future system development.
Nascimento et al. (2019)	Integration of Industry 4.0 technologies with circular economy (CE) practices.	Proposed circular model for reusing scrap electronics using web tech, reverse logistics, additive manufacturing.	Enhances sustainability by reducing waste, conserving resources, creating jobs, and improving economic performance.

3. Gaps, Challenges, and Limitations

Despite the positives, the majority of the papers reported critical implementation issues, especially in the developing world. Alavi and Noor (2022) quoted a huge skills mismatch between current education outcomes and the requirements of a digitally empowered economy. Patel et al. (2022) also validate this fact that the majority of SMEs lack the technical and financial means to adopt IoT and smart technologies.

Another gap is the lack of longitudinal studies to ascertain the long-term socioeconomic impact of Industry 4.0 adoption. Short-term analyses and projections are mostly what most studies offer, without venturing into long-term impact studies. Additionally, while some research focusses on the economic benefits of digitalization, fewer research attentions the ethical considerations, data privacy, or geopolitical relevance factors of increasing concern in the globally interconnected economy of today.

Another limitation is the uneven use of "readiness" indicators. Kumar and Subramanian (2023) pointed out the absence of a shared framework to measure how "ready" a company or nation is for Industry 4.0. This unevenness renders benchmarking challenging and policy harmonization between nations.

3. Critical Reflection

3.1 Evaluation of Frameworks

One of the central topics in the literature of Industry 4.0 is the dependency on the multiple frameworks, especially maturity models, adoption frameworks, and readiness indices. Although these tools are convenient in offering systematic guidance to the firms, and more so to the SMEs, its practical utility is frequently constrained. Most maturity models have been accused of being too generic, not adequately validated or even created in environments that are not representative of emerging economies. As an illustration, Häring et al. (2023) point out that the current maturity models are not very transparent and do not depict the limitation of the SMEs in terms of resources and knowledge. This poses a basic issue of whether these frameworks actually assist companies in moving towards digitalization or are simply theoretical models used in the academic debate. Critical assessment indicates that though frameworks may be used to promote initial awareness and benchmarking, they require more empirical reinforcement, and contextualization, before they become useful in aiding decision-making in various industrial and regional contexts.

3.2 Theoretical Contributions

The other significant aspect of Industry 4.0 scholarship evaluation is the theoretical basis on which the concept is adopted and applied. Numerous researches utilize the lenses of resource-based view (RBV) that focuses on the contribution of internal capabilities, technological resources, and organizational capabilities in facilitating successful digital transformation. Others are based on dynamic capabilities theory according to which companies need to perpetually feel, capture and reorganize resources to keep up with the conditions of Industry 4.0 that are quickly shifting due to the new technologies (Felsberger et al., 2022). Instantiation theory has also been used to provide an exposition of how regulatory pressures, cultural settings and policy structures influence the readiness and adoption patterns in organizations particularly in developing economies. These theoretical frameworks offer some useful insights, but their patchy use in different studies clearly shows that there was no single conceptual framework. By connected micro-level organizational change with macro-level organizational structure and policy, a more comprehensive integration of the perspectives would contribute to understanding Industry 4.0 better.

3.3 Contradictions in Findings

There are also some significant contradictions in the literature, especially with the economic and social impact of the adoption of Industry 4.0. On the one hand, empirical research indicates a high productivity, reduction in costs, and supply chain resiliency as a result of digital technologies, including IoT, artificial intelligence, and big data analytics. To stick with the example, Patel et al. (2022) record up to 25% productivity gains in the SMEs implementing the use of IoT in Southeast Asia. Conversely, an increasing literature is cautioning about the disruptive implications of the labor market, such as the displacement of jobs, skills not aligned with labor markets, and polarization of the labor market between high and low-skill employees (Chen & Lau, 2023). These paradoxical results point to a two-sided character of Industry 4.0: on the one hand, this sector shows a high level of economic opportunities; on the other hand, it creates social issues that need to be addressed actively. To overcome those contradictions, future studies must take more of a holistic approach that reflects both the potential benefits of efficiency and the overall costs to society of technological change.

4. Extended Thematic Reflection

4.1 Defining Industry 4.0 and Its Key Elements

Most of the literature agrees that Industry 4.0 integrates cyber-physical systems, intelligent automation, and data-based decision-making into manufacturing and service systems (Müller

& Voigt, 2021). Khan et al. (2023) emphasized the fact that it's not only technology implementation but points toward a change at the business model level. It is a revolution that is seen in a shift from reactive to predictive management and from linear to dynamic and interconnected supply chains.

Seen in this light, Industry 4.0 is no longer a technological revolution but an economic reorganization with implications on resource allocation, productivity, and international trade flows.

4.2 The Economic Promise and Productivity Paradigm

Many studies attribute productivity gains and cost reductions that stem from digital integration. Patel et al. (2022) are one example of the findings, identifying a 25% increase in productivity in IoT-integrated SMEs in Southeast Asia. Another example is that of Kurniawan et al. (2023), which reported increased responsiveness and less operation waste from smart factories. This type of evidence contributes to the economic justification for adopting Industry 4.0, especially with nations considering how they remain competitive on the global front.

From a managerial economics perspective, these benefits suggest a shift in the production possibility frontier, as digital technologies allow firms to do more with the same input. This also suggests shifts in economic modeling, as traditional assumptions about labor and capital may need to be re-evaluated in the context of automation and data processing.

4.3 Barriers to Adoption in Developing Economies

Despite the promise, the digital divide remains an urgent concern. Rashid and Tan (2024) pointed out that without proper infrastructure and policy support, developing countries are at risk of falling behind. Aziz et al. (2021) revealed that only a small number of Malaysian firms have adopted Industry 4.0 technologies fully. This uneven development not only threatens competitiveness domestically but also widens global inequalities.

Besides, poor institutional arrangements and fragmented policies exacerbate the problem. Many authors call for inclusive national digital transformation plans that are adequately financed and monitored over the long term in order to ensure measurable outcomes.

4.4 Labor Displacement and Skills Mismatch

Of the numerous concerns labeled regarding Industry 4.0 identified in literature, perhaps its biggest concern lies with its influence over labor markets. Industry 4.0 creates high-quality employment opportunities within careers like data science and cybersecurity, but drives low-skill and mid-skill workers from work. Chen and Lau (2023) pointed out its polarizing impact within various economies of Asia. Alavi and Noor (2022) urged retraining on a grander scale, particularly those that are integrated within vocational training systems as well as in tertiary education frameworks. This imperative calls for re-orientation of national education policy and emphasizes the economic cost of inaction through implications for national workforces unprepared for and hence excluded from digital job markets.

4.5 Environmental and Sustainability Considerations

Current studies identify Industry 4.0 with environmental sustainability. Hariri et al. (2025) demonstrated the ways in which digital technologies facilitate circular economy strategies and reduce emissions. The authors propose that digitalization can be an economic and an ecological strategy—a phrase ever more frequently echoed in climate policy circles. This emerging narrative situates Industry 4.0 not only as a productivity-enhancing change but also as an agent of sustainability, with novel paradigms of resource effectiveness, minimization of waste, and green innovation.

4.6 Policy & Governance

Implementation of Industry 4.0 does not just represent a change in technology but also a policy and governance issue. The success of digital transformation is decisively determined by national digital strategies, regulatory frameworks and institutional readiness. Although

developed nations tend to possess an organized strategy and incentive towards adopting Industry 4.0, in most emerging economies, the policies are scattered, funding is insufficient and the institutions do not cooperate. Research like Tan and Omar (2023) points to the dangers of not developing inclusive digital strategies with SMEs and rural businesses being left behind. Furthermore, geopolitical and global supply chain, and cyber sovereignty concerns all create additional complexity levels, indicating that Industry 4.0 governance is not limited to domestic matters but also to global collaboration and regulation. Sound governance must then entail a tradeoff between encouraging innovation, inclusivity, and reducing geopolitical and cybersecurity threats that place policy as a critical facilitator of fair digital change.

4.7 Socioeconomic Impacts

The socioeconomic impacts of Industry 4.0 are very deep and go far beyond the productivity benefit at firm level. Though automation, AI, and smart manufacturing make work more efficient, they also lead to the polarization of labor, which gets rid of the low and middle-skilled jobs and creates new positions that demand highly skilled digital specialists. This structural change increases inequalities in income distribution and puts social strength in the economy at risk which cannot withstand such discontinuities. As Chen and Lau (2023) remark, bifurcation of the workforce is already occurring among Asian economies and, in this case, it is conventional manufacturing laborers who are being displaced as the demand in data scientists, AI engineers, and cybersecurity professionals is increasing at an impressive rate. The reforms in education and vocational training become the major focus in resolving the skills mismatch. Moreover, the socioeconomic effects also entail digital access, affordability, and inclusivity issues where the groups that are vulnerable to not being included are the rural and marginalized communities. The broader social impacts of Industry 4.0 demand therefore a comprehensive approach to reforms in education, social safety nets, and labor market policies that would mean that the benefits of the technological advancement can be translated into common prosperity as opposed to perpetuating inequality.

4.8 Sustainability & Ethics (expanded)

Industry 4.0 has been sold as one of the roads towards sustainability, especially with the facilitation of circular economy, minimization of materials waste, and enhanced energy efficiency. As an example, Hariri et al. (2025) show that digital technology is capable of encouraging a more sustainable manufacturing process through reuse, recycling, and better management of resources. The sustainability narrative also needs a critical ethical approach, though. Although digitalization helps decrease inefficiency, the environmental cost of manufacturing and supporting highly advanced technologies, including data centres, e-waste, and e-consumption blockchain applications, is generally not considered. Furthermore, the ethical issues of data privacy, the bias of algorithms, and the surveillance of the workplace are important concerns that pose critical questions of what extent the benefits of Industry 4.0 can be sought without undermining human rights and societal values. Therefore, sustainability of Industry 4.0 is not just environmental but ethical as well, and it needs intentional governance systems that will strike the right balance between technological efficiency and responsible innovation, environmental management and civil liberties guardianship.

4.9 Future Research Directions

Despite the richness of the literature body on Industry 4.0, there are still various gaps in the literature that need to be addressed. Among these directions is the necessity of longitudinal studies to monitor the social, economic, and environmental impacts of digital transformation over a longer period, as the majority of existing studies are rather short term or cross-sectional. The other direction is multi-industry comparative studies because the adoption of Industry 4.0 is extremely different across various industries, including healthcare, logistics, agriculture, and education, but the majority of studies remain confined to manufacturing. The third research

gap is the knowledge of the digital divide in developing nations where SMEs compete with financial resources, digital literacy and infrastructure challenges. Lastly, managerial economics, political economy, and ethical analysis would be more interdisciplinary and create a more comprehensive perspective of Industry 4.0. By answering these research questions, researchers will be able to not only contribute to the development of theoretical frameworks but also provide practical policy recommendations on how policymakers and practitioners can manage the challenges of the digital transformation.

Conclusion

In short, this reflection has explored the multifaceted nature of Industry 4.0 through the lens of recent scholarly research articles from 2021 to 2025. The general theme that came through in these journal articles is that Industry 4.0 is not merely a technological innovation—it is a paradigm shift in industrial production, economic regulation, and social organization. This transformation is driven by the convergence of state-of-the-art technologies such as the Internet of Things (IoT), artificial intelligence (AI), cloud computing, and cyber-physical systems, which jointly redefine value creation, distribution, and maintenance within modern economies. From a managerial economics point of view, adoption of Industry 4.0 has far-reaching implications for productivity, cost reductions, labor markets, and competitive strategy. Firms that are able to integrate these technologies effectively can not only achieve operational efficiency but also strategic agility to market volatility and customer needs. But these advantages are not automatic—they require deliberate investment in digital infrastructure, talent upskilling, and innovation ecosystems. Literature examined here identifies that managerial decision-making in Industry 4.0 must integrate current complicated factors like data governance, cyber threats, change management, and care for the environment. Moreover, for developing economies like Malaysia, Industry 4.0 is a make-or-break moment to leap higher-value economic traditions and reduce dependency on low-skilled manufacturing. But the path forward is filled with challenges—particularly in the spheres of infrastructural readiness, digital literacy, and inclusive policy-making. Thus, the government must involve industry stakeholders and universities in planning facilitating environments for SMEs, reducing the digital divide, and ensuring equitable access to Industry 4.0 resources. Strategic policy measures such as assistance to public-private partnerships, budgetary support towards automation, and reforms in the education system are essential in enabling the effective and inclusive adoption of these technologies. Notably, consideration also highlights the need for more empirical work, particularly longitudinal research that quantifies the long-term socio-economic impact of Industry 4.0 uptake across different industries and locations. While current literature provides a solid foundation, the evolving character of technological innovation means that active monitoring, adaptive policymaking, and cross-disciplinary collaboration are essential.

Fundamentally, Industry 4.0 offers a core opportunity to rebuild economies, industries, and societies. But how well nations, firms, and institutions will be able to handle its complexity, balance its risks, and harness its opportunities for sustainable and equitable development will decide its fate. This essay has attempted to critically analyze the current body of knowledge on the topic with a view to contributing more effective methodologies to handling this revolutionary change within the paradigm of advanced managerial economics.

References

- Agostini, L., & Nosella, A. (2020). The adoption of Industry 4.0 technologies in SMEs: results of an international study. *Management Decision*, *58*(4), 625-643.

- Ahmed, R., Lee, S. H., & Wong, K. Y. (2024). Strategic alignment of Industry 4.0 technologies in ASEAN manufacturing sectors. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 200, 122056. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122056
- Alavi, H., & Noor, N. M. (2022). Human capital development for Industry 4.0: Challenges for higher education institutions. International Journal of Educational Management, 36(5), 789–804. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2021-0172
- Aziz, A. A., Hassan, R., & Rahman, N. (2021). The implementation barriers of Industry 4.0 in Malaysian SMEs. Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 28(3), 401–420. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-06-2020-0214
- Bag, S., Tiwari, S., Dhamija, P., & Pretorius, J. H. C. (2022). Industry 4.0 and circular economy: Research trends and open challenges. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 324, 129763. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.129763
- Batra, I., Sharma, C., Malik, A., Sharma, S., Kaswan, M. S., & Garza-Reyes, J. A. (2025). Industrial revolution and smart farming: a critical analysis of research components in Industry 4.0. *The TQM Journal*, *37*(6), 1497-1525.
- Chen, Y., & Lau, T. Y. (2023). Employment polarization in the era of Industry 4.0: Evidence from East Asia. Journal of Asian Economics, 84, 101581. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asieco.2022.101581
- Dalenogare, L. S., Brito, R. P., & Godinho Filho, M. (2022). A systematic literature review on Industry 4.0 and supply chain integration. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 62, 868–879. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2022.01.012
- Dalzochio, J., Kunst, R., Pignaton, E., Binotto, A., Sanyal, S., Favilla, J., & Barbosa, J. (2020). Machine learning and reasoning for predictive maintenance in Industry 4.0: Current status and challenges. *Computers in industry*, *123*, 103298.
- Elia, G., Margherita, A., & Passiante, G. (2021). Digital transformation and innovation management: A synthesis of existing research and an agenda for future studies. Technovation, 102, 102098. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2020.102098
- Felsberger, A., Qaiser, F. H., Choudhary, A., & Reiner, G. (2022). The impact of Industry 4.0 on the reconciliation of dynamic capabilities: Evidence from the European manufacturing industries. *Production Planning & Control*, *33*(2-3), 277-300.
- Frank, A. G., Mendes, G. H. S., Ayala, N. F., & Ghezzi, A. (2021). Servitization and Industry 4.0 convergence in the digital transformation of product firms: A business model innovation perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 170, 120939. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120939
- Gazi, Md. A. I., Masud, A. A., Sobhani, F. A., Islam, Md. A., Rita, T., Chaity, N. S., … Senathirajah, A. R. bin S. (2024). Exploring the mediating effect of customer satisfaction on the relationships between service quality, efficiency, and reliability and customer retention, loyalty in E-banking performance in emerging markets. Cogent Business & Management, 12(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2433707
- Häring, K., Pimentel, C., & Teixeira, L. (2023). Industry 4.0 implementation in small- and medium-sized enterprises: recommendations extracted from a systematic literature review with a focus on maturity models. *Logistics*, *7*(4), 99.
- Hariri, M., Yusof, M. A., & Baharuddin, M. F. (2025). Enabling a circular economy through Industry 4.0 technologies: Evidence from emerging markets. Journal of Cleaner Production, 421, 139827. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2025.139827
- Harun, H., Sulaiman, N., & Zainal, N. (2021). Managerial readiness and digital maturity in Malaysia's Industry 4.0 landscape. Journal of Business Research, 137, 644–652. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.08.013

- Ingaldi, M., & Ulewicz, R. (2019). Problems with the Implementation of Industry 4.0 in Enterprises from the SME Sector. *Sustainability*, *12*(1), 217.
- Kamble, S. S., Gunasekaran, A., & Gawankar, S. A. (2021). Achieving sustainable performance in a data-driven agriculture supply chain: A review for research and applications. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 121(1), 20–65. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-12-2019-0660
- Kee, D. M. H., Cordova, M., & Khin, S. (2025). The key enablers of SMEs readiness in Industry 4.0: a case of Malaysia. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, *20*(3), 1042-1062.
- Khan, M. A., Rehman, A., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Integrating digital technologies in production systems: A framework for smart manufacturing in Industry 4.0. Journal of Manufacturing Systems, 66, 82–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2022.11.005
- Khin, S., Yusof, A. M., & Singh, H. (2023). Readiness and barriers in adopting Industry 4.0 among Malaysian SMEs: A structural model analysis. *Asian Journal of Technology Innovation*, 31(1), 88–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/19761597.2022.2064741
- Kumar, S., & Subramanian, N. (2023). Digitalization and competitive advantage in the Fourth Industrial Revolution. Industrial Marketing Management, 106, 94–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2022.12.008
- Kurniawan, T., Nugroho, A., & Setiawan, A. (2023). Smart manufacturing performance in Southeast Asia: A multi-country comparative analysis. Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 17(1), 67–85. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJIE-09-2022-0075
- Lee, Y. Y., & Lim, H. E. (2021). Strategic digital transformation of SMEs in Southeast Asia: A readiness-based approach. *Journal of Asian Business and Economic Studies*, 28(3), 235–251. https://doi.org/10.1108/JABES-07-2020-0095
- Masood, T., & Sonntag, P. (2020). Industry 4.0: Adoption challenges and benefits for SMEs. *Computers in industry*, *121*, 103261.
- Mittal, S., Khan, M. A., Purohit, J. K., Menon, K., Romero, D., & Wuest, T. (2020). A smart manufacturing adoption framework for SMEs. *International Journal of Production Research*, *58*(5), 1555-1573.
- Moeuf, A., Pellerin, R., Lamouri, S., Tamayo-Giraldo, S., & Barbaray, R. (2022). The industrial management of SMEs in the context of Industry 4.0: Review and perspectives. *International Journal of Production Research*, 60(5), 1454–1474. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2021.1928506
- Müller, J. M., & Voigt, K. I. (2021). The role of smart products in the transition to Industry 4.0: Empirical evidence from German manufacturing. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 168, 120730. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120730
- Nascimento, D. L. M., Alencastro, V., Quelhas, O. L. G., Caiado, R. G. G., Garza-Reyes, J. A., Rocha-Lona, L., & Tortorella, G. (2019). Exploring Industry 4.0 technologies to enable circular economy practices in a manufacturing context: A business model proposal. *Journal of manufacturing technology management*, *30*(3), 607-627.
- Ostic, D., Lalic, B., & Marjanovic, U. (2023). Digital transformation and sustainability: An Industry 4.0-based framework for developing countries. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 187, 122259. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.122259
- Patel, R., Singh, S., & Le, T. (2022). Internet of Things applications in SME manufacturing: Empirical evidence from Southeast Asia. Journal of Enterprise

Information Management, 35(5), 1258–1275. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEIM-03-2021-0128

- Psarommatis, F., Sousa, J., Mendonça, J. P., & Kiritsis, D. (2022). Zero-defect manufacturing the approach for higher manufacturing sustainability in the era of industry 4.0: a position paper. *International Journal of Production Research*, *60*(1), 73-91.
- Rashid, M. N., & Tan, W. Y. (2024). Digital transformation barriers in developing economies: Insights from Malaysian industry leaders. Information Systems Frontiers, 26(2), 321–337. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-023-10326-2
- Schwab, K. (2017). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. Currency.
- Sony, M., & Naik, S. (2022). Industry 4.0 integration with quality management: An exploratory study. *The TQM Journal*, 34(5), 1061–1083. https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-10-2021-0298
- Tan, Y. C., & Omar, N. A. (2023). Towards inclusive innovation: A policy framework for equitable Industry 4.0 adoption. Policy Studies, 44(4), 615–631. https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2022.2123685
- Yadav, G., Luthra, S., Jakhar, S. K., Mangla, S. K., & Rai, D. P. (2024). A framework to assess Industry 4.0 readiness of Indian manufacturing industries. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 31(2), 345–369. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-05-2023-0256
- Zhang, X., Xu, M., & Goh, M. (2022). Industry 4.0 and supply chain resilience: A review and conceptual framework. International Journal of Production Research, 60(8), 2504–2522. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2021.1964512.