

[Click here to view linked References](#)Submitted version (not for citation). Final version of the paper here: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43546-021-00096-z>

Examining the development of a digital ecosystem in an Industry 4.0 context: A sociotechnical perspective

Authors:

Emanuele Gabriel Margherita, University of Tuscia, Department of Economics Engineering Society and Organization – DEIM, Via del Paradiso, 47, 01100, Viterbo, Italy - emargherita@unitus.it
(corresponding author)

Alessio Maria Braccini, University of Tuscia, Department of Economics Engineering Society and Organization – DEIM, Via del Paradiso, 47, 01100, Viterbo, Italy – abbraccini@unitus.it

Corresponding Author:

Emanuele Gabriel Margherita, emargherita@unitus.it

Abstract: To respond to increased competition, manufacturing organisations have started developing digital ecosystems within a supply chain by adopting Industry 4.0 technologies. That approach promises to improve organisational efficiency by automating operations and decision-making activities. The development of the digital ecosystem passes through vertical and horizontal integrations of technologies. Vertical integration represents the integration of various organisational units, and it is a milestone in the process of reaching horizontal integration where different organisations integrate their production processes in a supply chain. The extant literature reveals that the vertical integration of an organisation is challenging to achieve, as the adoption process of Industry 4.0 employs a technocentric perspective without considering the way that technology users can cause strong workforce resistance against Industry 4.0 adoption. The sociotechnical perspective addresses this issue by considering both technology and users during the adoption process. Therefore, this paper illustrates the applicability of the sociotechnical approach to an in-depth single case study of an Italian manufacturing group which successfully adopted Industry 4.0 technologies. We show the adoption process of Industry 4.0 technologies, highlighting the outcome of the adoption and proposing sociotechnical enabling factors that assist in achieving vertical integration.

Keywords: Industry 4.0, sociotechnical theory, single case study, Industry 4.0 vertical integration, Industry 4.0 ecosystems

Introduction

1
2 Manufacturing organisations face fierce competition from competitors in developing countries,
3 which undermine their market share through competitive prices and quality products (Margherita
4 and Braccini 2020b). Governments worldwide address this challenge by promoting Industry 4.0
5 (henceforth I40) industrial plans to support the competitiveness of a country's manufacturing sector
6 (Evans and Annunziata 2012; Kagermann, Wolfgang, and Helbig 2013). These plans encourage
7 organisations to adopt technologies – including Big Data, the Internet of Things and Robotics - to
8 optimise and automate the production process through programmable cyber-physical systems (CPS)
9 that automatically control machinery in assembly lines. The way organisations use I40 technologies
10 allows them addressing problems along the assembly line without human interaction, and through
11 autonomous machines (Lee, Bagheri, and Kao 2015).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Moreover, organisations integrate these technologies to develop a digital ecosystem of
22 manufacturing organisations in a supply chain (Kagermann et al. 2013; Julian Marius Müller,
23 Buliga, and Voigt 2018). The development of this digital ecosystem passes through two phases. In
24 the first phase, called vertical integration, each organisation internally integrates several units. In the
25 second phase, called horizontal integration, organisations in the supply chain share the information,
26 integrating the production process and facilitating collaboration among partners (Kagermann et al.
27 2013; Julian Marius Müller et al. 2018). Adopting I40 technologies, which enable vertical
28 integration, is necessary to undertake horizontal integration and reach a digital ecosystem.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The exploration of the digital ecosystem of I40 technologies is at an early stage. Most of the studies
37 focus on the vertical integration of the internal organisational units by implementing I40
38 technologies. That is a challenging process for organisations because they experience various issues
39 during the adoption process. These difficulties rely on the lack of proper organisational actions to
40 implement I40 technologies (Sony and Naik 2019a, 2019b). I40 adoption is a complex process that
41 consists of end-to-end digital integration of technologies and requires a well-prepared workforce to
42 manage those technologies (Kagermann et al. 2013). The integration of I40 technologies is
43 problematic as there is no best practice to follow, and there is a scarcity of experts to lead I40
44 projects (Sony and Naik 2019b).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 To date, most of the studies exploring I40 adoption have followed a “technocentric perspective”.
54 This perspective privileges the integration of the technologies within the production plant without
55 considering the workforce who are the users of these technologies. However, some studies have
56 argued that this perspective is not appropriate for I40 adoption because workers are not prepared to
57 manage these technologies due to a lack of proper competences and skills, which can cause strong
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 workforce resistance against I40 adoption (de Sousa Jabbour, Jabbour, Foropon, and Filho 2018;
2 Liao, Deschamps, Loures, and Ramos 2017). Workers require specific training and vocational
3 courses along the adoption process to accept and to use I40 technologies (Prause, Atari, Prause, and
4 Atari 2017; Sayar and Er 2018; Margherita and Bua 2021).

5
6
7 Therefore, these studies call for workers' involvement during the adoption process of I40
8 technologies and a sociotechnical perspective for I40 adoption (Kagermann et al. 2013; Sarker,
9 Chatterjee, Xiao, and Elbanna 2019). The sociotechnical perspective conceives of the organisation
10 as a work system composed of social and technological systems that are “jointly optimised” to
11 operate effectively (Bostrom and Heinen 1977; Lyytinen and Newman 2008). This perspective
12 allows us to study the changes within the work systems, the interrelations among the two systems,
13 the consequent sociotechnical equilibrium, and the improvements delivered by the novel I40 work
14 system (Bostrom and Heinen 1977; Sony and Naik 2020).

15
16
17 Within this framework, the main goal of this study is twofold. Firstly, the paper illustrates an I40
18 adoption employing a sociotechnical perspective. To this end, we conducted an in-depth case study
19 of an Italian manufacturing organisation producing bathroom ceramics that successfully adopted
20 I40 technologies. Secondly, we propose sociotechnical enabling factors for effective vertical
21 integration of I40 technologies. The study answers the following question: “*What are the*
22 *sociotechnical enabling factors for an effective Industry 4.0 adoption?*”

23
24
25 The paper is structured as follows. Section 1 is devoted to the relevant literature on I40 initiatives
26 and the sociotechnical approach. The article continues in section 2 with the research method. We
27 outline the case study in section 3, pointing out the traditional work systems, the I40 adoption
28 process and the I40 work systems. Section 4 shows the improvements of both systems and the
29 enabling factors for I40 adoption. The paper ends in section 5 with conclusions and implications for
30 researchers and practitioners.

31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 **1 Related Literature**

48
49
50 This section presents the I40 initiative, the works that have investigated I40 adoption, and the
51 sociotechnical perspective.

52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 **1.1 Industry 4.0**

Inspired by the German government, I40 is an industrial initiative that aims to innovate production processes by adopting leading-edge technologies, including Big Data, the Internet of Things, and

1 Robotics. I40 allows for deploying the generic concept of cyber-physical systems (Kagermann et al.
2 2013) that automatically control machinery and address mechanical issues on the assembly line
3 without human interaction (Lee et al. 2015). I40 adoption promises to deliver value in organisations
4 by establishing a more efficient production process, reducing natural resource usage, and providing
5 safer workplaces (Braccini & Margherita 2019; Margherita and Braccini 2020c).
6
7

8
9 To this end, the I40 initiative claims to develop a digital ecosystem of organisations within a supply
10 chain to exploit these technologies fully. The development of a digital ecosystem passes through
11 vertical and horizontal integration (Blunck and Werthmann 2017; Kagermann et al. 2013).
12
13

14
15 Vertical integration is internal to the organisation and represents the integration of several
16 organisational units, including marketing and sales or technology development, by end-to-end
17 digitally integrated technologies across different levels (Kagermann et al. 2013). The vertical
18 integration also allows for a flexible and reconfigurable production infrastructure adapted to each
19 specific customer order or even changing market requirements. Vertical integration is a requirement
20 to start the process of achieving horizontal integration.
21
22

23
24 Horizontal integration represents the digital information sharing that facilitates collaboration among
25 partners within a value chain, including the customer (Julian Marius Müller et al. 2018). This
26 integration addresses specific areas of an organisation (e.g. purchasing, production, logistics) that
27 are connected with all the value chain's external partners.
28
29

30
31 Horizontal integration characterises inter- and intra-organisation smart networking of cross-
32 company and internal-company measures that digitalise the information flow of internal
33 programmable logic controllers of value chain actors (Stock and Seliger 2016). The integration of
34 the horizontal value chain optimises the information flow and flow of goods from the customer to
35 the organisation and vice versa (Blunck and Werthmann 2017). In horizontal and vertical
36 integration, we see an I40 technology ecosystem.
37
38

39
40 The literature exploring digital ecosystems by I40 technologies is at an infant stage. Most of the
41 studies are focused on exploring how organisations achieve the vertical integration that is a
42 challenging process due to difficulties in adopting I40 technologies (Prause et al. 2017; Sayar and
43 Er 2018). A lack of best practices and experts hamper I40 adoption (Sony and Naik 2019a).
44
45

46
47 Some studies employ a technocentric perspective which considers technologies as the main driver
48 of the benefits because these technologies increase the automation of operations and decision-
49 making activities (Kang et al. 2016). Thus, during the adoption process, organisations may privilege
50 technology implementation and integration without considering the workforce (Prause et al. 2017).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 However, Sayar and Er (2018) showed that the technocentric perspective is inadequate for I40
2 adoption because workers require specific training to be effective in the use of I40 technologies.
3 They showed that even if an organisation implements I40 technologies, workers might not accept
4 those technologies or use them, which can result in economic losses.
5
6

7 Prause et al. (2017) further describe the failure to adopt I40 technologies. They explain the
8 technocentric perspective is not sufficient for effective vertical integration of I40 technologies
9 because workers do not manage them properly. Also, these considerations are due to a lack of
10 involvement of users at the adoption stage. In line with this, some studies claim that the workforce
11 should take part in the adoption process because they are not currently prepared to use these
12 technologies due to a lack of proper competences and skills (Margherita and Braccini 2021), which
13 causes strong workforce resistance against I40 adoption (Bonekamp and Sure 2015; de Sousa
14 Jabbour et al. 2018; Kamble, Gunasekaran, and Sharma 2018; Margherita and Braccini 2020a;
15 Julian M. Müller 2019).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **1.2 The Sociotechnical Perspective**

27
28 The term “sociotechnical” was coined in the 1950s by Trist and Emery. They studied the
29 implementation of the “Longwall Method” in a coal mine and documented worker responses.
30 Workers migrated from a traditional method of extracting coal to a new semi-mechanised
31 “Longwall Method” for gathering coal (Trist and Bamforth 1951). The researchers showed that
32 productivity decreased unexpectedly, albeit the new method supposedly facilitated workers’ tasks.
33 This outcome occurred because managers did not consider the social system (people, relationships,
34 organisational structure) during the adoption phase. The former method allowed workers to perform
35 a variety of tasks using different tools, or better, workers had a high degree of element of job
36 enrichment (Leonardi 2012). Conversely, the new method “destroyed” these social patterns,
37 generating worker dissatisfaction that turned into resistance to the technology which eventually
38 resulted in a decrease in productivity.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48


49 To solve this issue, the technology adoption should be considered with a sociotechnical perspective
50 (henceforth STP) that considered both the social issues and the technical issues (Sarker et al. 2019).
51 The STP posits that the conjoint optimisation of both systems leads to effective technology
52 adoption within the organisation.
53
54
55
56

57 The STP employs the work system theory, which provides a perspective for understanding systems
58 in organisations (Alter 2013; Von Bertalanffy 1972). The STP describes the organisation as
59 composed of social and technical systems. The former includes the workers, their roles, and the
60
61
62
63
64
65

organisational rules. The latter includes the technologies for accomplishing organisational tasks (Trist 1981).

Bostrom's sociotechnical model (Figure 1) synthesises the findings around the STP (Bostrom and Heinen 1977). The model depicts the main elements which are impacted by new technologies within the organisation. The model views organisational systems as multivariate systems of four interacting components – task, structure, actor, and technology. Still, during technology adoption, sociotechnical systems are open systems. They have to be continuously adapted to the environment to maintain the state of equilibrium. The equilibrium or joint optimisation of both systems involves stable relationships between the system components and their environment. This joint optimisation leads to improvements in both systems. In technical systems, the improvements concern better performance and achieved economic objectives, whereas the improvements in the social system concern enhanced job satisfaction and a higher quality of work-life balance (Land 2000; Sarker, Chetterjee, and Xiao 2013).

Fig. 1 The Sociotechnical Model (Bostrom and Heinen 1977; Leavitt 1964)



2 Research Method

This study targets the STP of a case of I40 adoption, showing the social and technical improvements and the enabling factors of I40 adoption. The study illustrates a single case study of an Italian manufacturing organisation in the ceramic industry which adopted various I40 technologies. We selected the organisation as a revelatory case since it was the first mover in adopting I40 in its domain (Yin 2002).

As primary data, we collected four face-to-face, semi-structured interviews with four key informants (Kumar, Stern, Anderson, Stern, and Anderson 1993), including members of the steering committee of the I40 adoption - the chief executive officer (CEO) and the chief production officer (CPO) – and two workers operating in the traditional and novel production processes. We decided to interview these two groups because their voices often diverged on themes related to how work conditions changed after the technology adoption (Sawyer and Jarrahi 2014).

We conducted semi-structured interviews in December 2018 during an organisational visit that lasted 3 hours. The average length of each interview was 30 minutes. We also collected observations of the production line, observing the operations of smart machines, control systems, and activities performed by workers on the line. We followed the track indicated in Table 1. We slightly adapted the interview track according to the roles of each interviewee.

We conducted observations of the I40 production line and compiled field notes. We further gathered secondary data. We included official balance sheets and articles from distinguished national newspapers regarding the traditional production process, the I40 adoption process, the I40 production process and its improvements.

Table 1 Track Interview

Interviewee:	Questions:
Management (CEO and CPO)	Organisational facts: worker number, turnover level
	Features of I40 technologies
	Needs triggering the I40 adoption
	The management I40 adoption process
	Worker participation in the I40 adoption process
	Changes in work practice triggering I40 adoption
	Technical systems improvements from the I40 adoption
	Social Systems improvements from the I40 adoption
	Type and nature of the work performed
	Experience in the production process before I40 adoption
Workers	Social systems for the workers from the I40 adoption
	Changes in working conditions before and after the I40 adoption
	Personal awareness of the benefits of I40 adoption

We gathered the organisation's official balance sheets by using the database AIDA¹ and additional articles from distinguished national newspapers from their official websites. Moreover, we employed the data obtained from a previous analysis of the same case unit (Ruggieri, Braccini, Poponi, and Mosconi 2016).

We triangulated all the data to enhance the validity and reliability of the study and reduce subjectivity in empirical evidence (Denzin 2006; Walsham 2006).

After that, the research team collected all the data sources in a data corpus and integrated them into a single research database which we coded following the guidelines for the validity and reliability of qualitative inquiry (Corbin and Strauss 2015; Locke 2001). The sociotechnical model (Figure 1) has been used as a sensitising device to identify critical events in the work context and assess their

¹ AIDA is an online database, owned by Bureau van Dijk, containing financial information of more than 500.000 Italian companies. AIDA has official balance reports of Italian companies of the last 10 years.

1 impact. In Table 2, we summarise the most relevant interview and newspaper excerpts for the
 2 aspects discussed in the case description. Finally, we propose a full narrative of events and their
 3 interactions in a visual form (Langley 1999). This visual expression narrates the implementation
 4 process from the beginning to end as a sequence of incidents that affect the work system.
 5
 6

7
 8 **Table 2** Interview and newspaper excerpts
 9

10 Topic	11 Source	12 Interview excerpts
13 Detail of I40 14 adoption	15 CEO	16 We were lucky to have enough space, our partner set up the 17 implementation of each technology thoroughly while we previously 18 communicated to workers these changes.
19 Technical System of 20 the Traditional 21 Work System	22 CPO	23 The traditional production process is here. These are the moulds to 24 create the product, which are then dried. We switch on the oven for 25 twelve hours to bake the products at the end of the day. Workers 26 moved the products to the logistics unit.
27 Social System of the 28 Traditional Work 29 System	30 CPO	31 One operator manages one machine. Everything is manual. These 32 operators are in charge of producing the goods with the help of 33 moulds. Then, we have operators that move the goods by forklifts that 34 drive.
35 I40 Social systems 36 improvement	37 CPO	38 Employees thanked us. Heavy manual labour was the critical issue of 39 the factory. Now their tasks have changed favourably.
40 Worker role in the 41 Traditional Work 42 System	43 CPO	44 During the production, the worker establishes a relation with each 45 product. A worker moves the semi-finished good, shaping it and 46 obtains visual and sensorial feedback regarding the product quality.
47 I40 technical system 48 improvement	49 CEO	50 This I40 application is the first in the ceramic industry. We risked a 51 lot, but our production increased by 30%, and we reduced defects and 52 damaged products during the transports from 30% down to 9%.
53 I40 technical system 54 improvement	55 Article	56 The company is environmentally friendly. They reduced the usage of 57 natural resources, increasing the efficiency of the production line. 58 The company improves workforce conditions through I40. We 59 requalified the worker, and now, they are technology experts.
60 I40 social system 61 improvement	62 Article	63 Currently, technologies move product in automation and workers 64 control the system through a computer. The company also provides 65 several vocational courses for workers.
66 Worker role in I40 67 work systems	68 Worker 69 1	70 I am supervising these four machines which produce washbasins. The 71 work I do now is less manual and more mental. I can activate and stop 72 the machine, and I help set up the device better by providing feedback 73 to technology experts.
74 Worker role in I40 75 work systems	76 CPO	77 Now, the worker is close to the mechanical arm. He knows how to 78 craft the product. In case of mistakes of the mechanical arm, he can 79 detect them and stop production.
80 Job enlargement for 81 workers	82 CEO	83 Only the workers know how to improve the processes because they 84 operate with these pieces of machinery. We welcome their feedback.
85 Worker role in I40 86 work systems	87 Worker 88 2	89 We feel safer than before. We cannot enter in the robot area when 90 robots are producing, while we supervise the process. And the forklift 91 drivers are in safety.
92 Training Program 93 for apprentices	94 CPO	95 We hired this young worker. Now he is working in the traditional 96 factory to get craft skills. Then, after a preparation course, we will 97 move him to the I40 factory as a supervisor.

1	Low-work quality	CPO	Once, we proposed to production line employees to work on Sunday with well-paid overtime. They refused to work since the works are so physically hard to perform.
2			
3			
4	Low product quality level	CEO	Our organisation based the competitive advantage on the higher quality over the market. The traditional product process does not allow it anymore.
5			
6			
7			
8	Risk of I40 adoption	CEO	We were the first manufacturing organisation in adopting these technologies. The risk relies on the lack of best practices to follow during these phases.
9			
10			
11	Joint Optimisation of I40 work system	CPO	Workers complained regarding the machinery speed, as they cannot follow the production tasks properly. Therefore, we reduced that speed since we do think that quality comes chiefly from human work.
12			
13			
14			
15	The adoption process of I40 technologies	CPO	“We hired two technology experts to automate the process and teach workers how to use the novel machines. We also help workers to understand the machine proving vocational courses outside the firm” (CPO).
16			
17			
18			
19			
20	The adoption process of I40 technologies	CPO	In the beginning, workers were contrary to these technologies because these pieces of machinery automate the production. After some months, they thanked us because these technologies helped them to operate in a better way and with better conditions.
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26	The motivation of the I40 adoption	CEO	We do not want to import ceramics because we know how to produce it in a better way. Our strategy is to increase the quality of our products. If we import ceramics and we produce 5000 products fewer, We have to fire 50 people. For us, Industry 4.0 was the way to maintain stable employment and optimise production.
27			
28			
29			
30			


3 Case Description

This section illustrates the STP application in a single case study of an Italian manufacturing organisation. It describes the traditional work systems, the causes and adoption process of I40, and the I40 work system.

3.1 The Traditional Work System

The unit of analysis is a medium-sized Italian manufacturing organisation of the sanitary ceramic industry employing around 200 workers located in the Lazio region. The organisation produces bathroom ceramics with a creative design and enduring materials, and it is attentive towards environmental sustainability and innovation in the product and process. The traditional work system includes all the activities accomplished during the traditional production process from the production of the goods to the logistic unit. Figure 2 summarises the main components of the traditional work system.

Fig. 2 The Traditional Work System



The traditional production process consists of three phases: primary, secondary, and support. The primary phase encompasses all the activities needed to prototype and produce the goods. In the first step, workers are in charge of production tasks. They realise a series of chalk moulds in the shape of the sanitary ceramics. These chalk moulds dry in the desiccation room for 15 days. Afterwards, workers pour the ceramics' main elements, vitreous china and fireclay, into these chalk moulds and leave them there for some days.

After that, these moulds are opened to extract the raw and humid sanitaryware. The products created in the following phase are entirely handmade. Expert artisans place these articles over lathes and the complete manual refining of the sanitaryware's shape.

After that, the products are dried through continuous ventilation over a drying belt and thoroughly inspected. Those products which pass the inspection are enamelled by highly specialised workers in cabins and then baked in a high-temperature oven. At the end of this process, the finished goods undergo a quality control check, and those in compliance are packed and stored in the warehouse by workers using a forklift.

Goods which do not pass the quality inspection are destroyed and recycled. Such articles are reprocessed in the secondary phase in order to address production mistakes. Finally, in the support phase, workers prepare the product for shipment and ensure disposal of the waste produced in the process.

The major concerns regarding the traditional production process are as follows:

- **Inefficient technical system.** Although workers were experts in production tasks, the technical systems employed in the production process were inefficient, which resulted in a high rate of semi-finished products that had to be reprocessed or recycled.
- **Lack of apprentices.** The human resource department struggles to find young apprentices to hire along the production line to replace old workers. This issue is due to the awareness

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

that the ceramic production operations are demanding and pose several work hazards (Dantas de Sena Junior et al. 2016).

- **Issues during the handling of products.** During the transport via forklifts driven by workers, mishaps occur because of incorrect placement of the goods or use of brakes.
- **Low quality level of product.** The organisation bases the competitive advantage on higher product quality. However, competitors have reached the same quality level through their production processes. The traditional work systems cannot support this strategy anymore.
- **Low quality of work.** The traditional work system involves demanding tasks, which is demotivational and stressful for workers.

3.2 The adoption process of Industry 4.0

The management of the organisation decided to adopt I40 technologies to innovate the traditional production line. They chose an organisation leader to develop manufacturing pieces of machinery and also guide the adoption phase. The CEO emphasised the risks regarding the adoption phase of I40 technologies. The organisation was the first mover in adopting these novel technologies. The I40 pieces of machinery required a reengineering of the production process and a physical factory layout redesign due to several large-sized pieces of machinery.

The management decided to adopt autonomous machines—like self-driving forklifts, robotised arms, and fully automatic conveyors—to produce products and move them from one phase of production to another to address the traditional work system issues. The technology developer manages the end-to-end integration of I40 technologies by interconnecting their control systems with the CPS that govern the technologies. The management planned the innovation and discussed the plan with all workers.

The management motivated the adoption of these technologies because they are necessary to guarantee the company's long-term survival in a market dominated by low-cost producers in developing countries with low labour costs. The adoption phase lasted five years.

This innovation significantly changed workforce operations and required workers with digital competencies. The company offered workers the opportunity to retire or leave the position if they were unwilling to learn new skills. All those who accepted the offer to stay were able to attend vocational training courses provided by the technology developers. The reaction of workers was initially adverse because they expected these technologies to kill their jobs through automation. Soon, their response became favourable because workers comprehended that these technologies only automate their demanding muscular activities and improve their work conditions.


1 A team composed of technicians and managers led the I40 adoption. The technicians acted as
 2 facilitators between the production line workers and the management to reach both systems' joint
 3 optimisation (Mumford 2003). The management stated that the main issue was the speed of I40
 4 technologies, which hampered workers in the management of their operations. Accordingly,
 5 technology experts adjusted the speed of I40 technologies. Thus, workers can manage the
 6 machinery and I40 technologies to maximise production.
 7
 8
 9

10
 11 Lastly, the organisation maintained the traditional work systems to produce goods with a demand
 12 level which does not justify the high fixed costs of the I40 work systems.
 13
 14
 15

16 3.3 The Industry 4.0 Work System

17
 18 The I40 work system includes all the activities during the novel production and logistics units.
 19 Different kinds of robots take on hard muscular work previously performed by workers. By
 20 applying the sociotechnical lens, Figure 3 summarises the main components of the I40 work
 21 system.
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26

27 **Fig. 3** The Industry 4.0 Work System



28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44 Along the process, workers act as supervisors. They check whether the pieces of machinery are in
 45 compliance with guidelines and they evaluate the quality of the product at each production phase.
 46 The products are then placed on shelves and moved by autonomous fork trucks along the assembly
 47 line and eventually stored in the warehouse. Whether the workers mark the part as defective or
 48 damaged, the trucks deliver it to a secondary phase. Furthermore, technologies digitally trace the
 49 complete production process. The traceability of data concerns the lead time, the machines that
 50 processed the product, and the workers controlling or operating them.
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56

57
 58 Also, production line workers are in charge of providing feedback to technology experts to improve
 59 technology operations and avoid issues that occurred along the line.
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

4 Findings and discussion

This section presents the improvement of I40 work systems and their enabling factors and thus answers the research question.

4.1 Improvements in Industry 4.0 Work systems

I40 adoption led to improvement in the technical and social work systems. Table 3 summarises the improvements for both systems.

Regarding the technical systems, the organisation increased output quantity by 30% and the gamut of products offered to customers from 11 to 16. I40 adoption also reduced the lead time. I40 adoption increased the quality level of the products. In the traditional production process, the organisation only used traditional ceramics mixture. In contrast, in the I40 production system, the traditional ceramics mixture can be mixed with different minerals (such as gold and silver). According to the CEO, these technologies allowed the organisation to govern their production processes, creating more practical and enduring products with a refined design, leading to a higher quality product.

Table 3 Industry 4.0 Work Systems Improvement

Improvements in Industry 4.0 Work Systems	
Technical Systems	Social Systems
- Output quantity increased by 30%	- Safer work environment
- Higher product quality	- Reduction of work incidents
- Increased gamut of products	- Higher job satisfaction
- Reduction of defects from 30% to 9%.	- Less intense work
	- Workers as supervisors
	- Better training program

Moreover, the shift of operations from workers to autonomous robots that took over all the physical work also contributed to reducing defects and damaged products during the transport, which decreased from 30% down to 9%. Still, thanks to the CPS, these technologies improved product tracking, reducing measures of order inaccuracy. CPS also continuously analyses information concerning the processes and provides comprehensive reports on the machinery status and predictions regarding future production trends.

Regarding the social systems, I40 adoption contributes to a safer and healthier work environment. The I40 technical system alleviated several issues, such as using dangerous materials that increase powder in the plant and pollution in the air. Furthermore, demanding muscular tasks are now performed by machinery, reducing the likelihood of workers coming to suffer from occupational

1 diseases. At the same time, the automation of such operations reduced the number of work
2 incidents, particularly in the handling phase of products, and increased the satisfaction and life
3 quality of workers. Also, workers enriched their tasks because they supervised technologies and
4 provided feedback to technology experts to improve I40 technology operations and avoid issues that
5 occurred along the line.
6
7

8
9 Finally, the management proposed a better and articulated training program to encourage young
10 workers to become apprentices. Contrary to the traditional production process training that involved
11 only a short period of training on the job on the machines, the apprentice for I40 line initially
12 learned the artisanal mastery of crafting ceramics into the traditional work systems. They are then
13 moved into the I40 work systems when they have acquired enough knowledge of ceramic
14 production. Apprentices are also enrolled in vocational training to develop digital competencies to
15 manage these technologies. Thus, they contribute to maintaining a stable I40 production process.
16 Accordingly, this program allows developing proper competencies to work in the ceramic industry
17 and makes for more engaging work. Similarly, the management also enrolled experienced workers
18 in training courses to develop and enrich their digital skills.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **4.2 Enabling factors for Industry 4.0 adoption**

30 Applying the STP lens, this investigation pinpointed three sociotechnical enabling factors for an
31 effective I40 adoption: *a worker-centric work system, unchanged organisational value system and*
32 *status quo of workers, CPS for improving the production process, and an approach of not*
33 *controlling workers.*
34
35
36
37
38
39

- 40 • *Worker-centric I40 work system.* The traditional work systems rely mainly on artisanal
41 competences of workers for producing the goods. Human craft, as the CPO said, made
42 quality products. I40 technologies innovated work practices, reducing demanding and
43 mechanical movements that correspond to the absence of task significant elements and allow
44 for job enlargement. Indeed, the worker's role is increasingly fundamental during the
45 production process and through continuous feedback systems. Workers act as supervisors to
46 check control quality. Also, they provide feedback to technology experts to improve the
47 production process.
48
- 49 • *Unchanged organisational value system and status quo of workers.* Within the traditional
50 work system, the more competent workers have more experience and competences in
51 crafting ceramics. Instead, the I40 work system requires, beyond these qualifications, digital
52 competencies to deal with I40 technologies. These could cause issues on the organisational
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 value system and worker status quo within the organisation. For instance, a newly recruited
2 worker possessing higher digital competencies can be considered suitable by the
3 management to work on the I40 assembly line while more experienced workers who do not
4 have those competencies may not. The organisation carried out two actions to address this
5 issue: vocational courses and a training programme in the traditional assembly line for
6 newly recruited workers. Through the vocational courses, experienced workers filled the
7 gaps in their understanding of digital competence. In contrast, the training programme
8 maintained an unaltered organisational value system privileging the ownership of artisanal
9 competence over digital competences.

- 10 • *CPS for improving the production process, not to control workers.* I40 technologies are
11 often related to control issues because of increasing control and supervision over workers at
12 the operative level that employ these technologies to complete their tasks (Evans and
13 Annunziata 2012; Kagermann et al. 2013; Kang et al. 2016). In our case, CPS acquire data
14 along the entire production process, providing accurate real-time information to the
15 management in terms of production quantity and time for accomplishing tasks. The
16 organisation exploits this information to monitor the process rather than to control the
17 employees. Also, workers contribute to improving the production process by providing
18 feedback to technology experts, which implies that the workers take a proactive role.

32 33 34 **5 Conclusions, study limitation and implications**

35
36
37 The study's main contribution is to apply the STP to I40 adoption to illustrate the system
38 improvements and the sociotechnical enabling factors. We used the sociotechnical lens, proposing a
39 full narrative of all the events starting from the organisations' traditional work system, the I40
40 adoption process and the new I40 work systems.

41
42
43 The study has implications for researchers and practitioners. Regarding the implications for
44 practitioners, we investigated the I40 adoption process, which can be used as a guideline for similar
45 organisations implementing these technologies. Managers should also consider the users of
46 technologies during the I40 adoption. We highlighted how the management handles the workforce
47 to accept I40 technologies and the importance of training courses to build digital competencies. The
48 shakedown of I40 technologies occurs when workers perceive and comprehend that these
49 technologies increase organisational productivity, work practices and workforce conditions.

50
51
52 The study is useful for policymakers interested in developing incentives for I40 initiatives.
53 Incentives should be designed both for the purchase of these technologies and for training courses.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
Regarding the implications for researchers, the study provides further evidence that there is a need to treat I40 adoption as a larger sociotechnical matter rather than exclusively one of technical system delivery. To advance the topic of I40 adoption, we suggest investigating the barriers and workaround practices that impede successful adoption (Alter 2014). We also call for further studies to detect future digital competences to handle these technologies and investigate the appropriation process, employing the adaptive structuration theory or task-technology fit (DeSanctis and Poole 1994; Goodhue and Thompson 1995).

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
The study focuses on the vertical integration of I40 technologies. A further step to study the digital ecosystem in the I40 realm is the horizontal integration of technologies among organisations. The STP reveals that the integration of novel technologies impacts the organisation's social system, which implements the technology and the organisation of the supply chain (Sony and Naik 2020). Since this discourse is underdeveloped, we encourage scholars to conduct qualitative research, particularly action research, ethnography, and exploration of a single case study to explore the sociotechnical consequences of horizontal integration of I40 technologies.

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
Moreover, we also encourage scholars to investigate the topic of the end-to-end integration of I40 technologies. In our case, this phase was successful because the technology developer designed all I40 technologies and their integrable control systems. Therefore, a promising research avenue is to consider the opposite situation by investigating the end-to-end integration of various I40 technologies of different technology developers. What are the sociotechnical consequences for the organisation?

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
Our study has some limitations. It is exploratory in nature and based on an organisation located in Italy. Our study results are mostly generalisable to organisations operating in the European context that share similar characteristics – industry type, firm size, and level of governmental support for the adoption of these technologies – to the Italian context. Nevertheless, we encourage researchers to investigate the vertical integration of I40 technologies in other contexts and countries, such as developing countries, Asian countries and North and South American countries.

53 54 55 **Conflict of interest**

56
57
58
On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

59 60 61 62 **Data availability**

1 The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author on
2 request
3
4
5

6 **References**

- 7
8
9 Alter, S. (2013) Work system theory: Overview of Core Concepts, Extensions, and Challenges for
10 the Future. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 14(2): 72–121
11
12 Alter, S. (2014) Theory of workarounds. *Communications of the Association for Information*
13 *Systems*, 34(1)
14
15
16
17 Blunck, E., & Werthmann, H. (2017) Industry 4.0 – an opportunity to realize sustainable
18 manufacturing and its potential for a circular economy. *DIEM: Dubrovnik International*
19 *Economic Meeting*, 3(1): 644–666
20
21
22
23 Bonekamp, L., & Sure, M. (2015) Consequences of Industry 4.0 on human labour and work
24 organisation. *Journal of Business and Media Psychology*, 6(1): 33–40
25
26
27
28 Bostrom, R. P., & Heinen, S. J. (1977) MIS Problems and Failures: A Socio-Technical Perspective.
29 Part I: The Causes. *MIS Quarterly*, 1(3)
30
31
32 Braccini, A. M., & Margherita, E. (2019) Exploring Organizational Sustainability of Industry 4.0
33 under the Triple Bottom Line: The Case of a Manufacturing Company. *Sustainability*, 11(1),
34 36. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11010036>
35
36
37
38 Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. L. (2015) Basics of Qualitative Research. In: S. P. Inc (ed) *Techniques*
39 *and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*
40
41
42
43 Dantas de Sena Junior, L. C., Alves da Silva, R. E., Mendonça Torres, L., Gomes de Sousa, Y., de
44 Medeiros, S. M., & Bittencourt Leite de Carvalho, J. (2016) Knowledge workers on
45 occupational hazards in the industry of ceramics. *International Archives of Medicine*, 9
46
47
48
49 de Sousa Jabbour, A. B. L., Jabbour, C. J. C., Foropon, C., & Filho, M. G. (2018) When titans meet
50 – Can industry 4.0 revolutionise the environmentally-sustainable manufacturing wave? The
51 role of critical success factors. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 132:18–25.
52 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.01.017>
53
54
55
56
57 Denzin, N. (2006) *Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook*. (A. Transaction, ed) (5th Ed.). Aldine
58 *Transaction*
59
60
61 DeSanctis, G., & Poole, M. S. (1994) *Capturing the Complexity in Advanced Technology Use:*
62
63
64
65

Adaptive Structuration Theory. *Organization Science*, 5(2): 121–147

1
2 Evans, P. C., & Annunziata, M. (2012) Industrial Internet: Pushing the Boundaries of Minds and
3 Machines

4
5
6 Goodhue, D. L., & Thompson, R. L. (1995) Task-Technology Fit and individual performance. *MIS*
7 Quarterly, 19(2): 213–236

8
9
10 Kagermann, H., Wolfgang, W., & Helbig, J. (2013) Recommendations for implementing the
11 strategic initiative INDUSTRIE 4.0. Working Group. Acatech, Frankfurt Am Main, Germany.,
12 82. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.1205.8966>

13
14
15 Kamble, S. S., Gunasekaran, A., & Sharma, R. (2018). Analysis of the driving and dependence
16 power of barriers to adopt industry 4.0 in Indian manufacturing industry. *Computers in*
17 *Industry*, 101: 107–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2018.06.004>

18
19
20 Kang, H. S., Lee, J. Y., Choi, S., Kim, H., Park, J. H., Son, J. Y., ... Noh, S. Do. (2016) Smart
21 manufacturing: Past research, present findings, and future directions. *International Journal of*
22 *Precision Engineering and Manufacturing - Green Technology*, 3(1): 111–128.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40684-016-0015-5>

24
25
26 Kumar, N., Stern, L. W., Anderson, J. C., Stern, L. W., & Anderson, J. C. (1993) Conducting
27 interorganizational research using key informants. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(6):
28 1633–1651

29
30
31 Land, F. (2000) Evaluation in a Socio-Technical Context. In Basskerville, R., Stage, J., and
32 DeGross, J.I., *Organizational and Social Perspectives on Information Technology*. Boston,
33 Kluwer Academic Publishers

34
35
36 Langley, A. (1999) Strategies for Theorizing from Process Data. *Academy of Management*, 24(4)

37
38
39 Leavitt, H. J. (1964) Applied organization change in industry: Structural, technical and human
40 approaches. In *New perspectives in organisational research* (Wiley)

41
42
43 Lee, J., Bagheri, B., & Kao, H. A. (2015) A Cyber-Physical Systems architecture for Industry 4.0-
44 based manufacturing systems. *Manufacturing Letters*, 3

45
46
47 Leonardi, P. M. (2012) Materiality, sociomateriality, and socio-technical systems: What do these
48 terms mean? How are they different? Do we need them? In: P. M. Leonardi, B. A. Nardi (ed),
49 *Materiality and Organizing: Social Interaction in a Technological World*. Oxford

50
51
52 Liao, Y., Deschamps, F., Loures, E. de F. R., & Ramos, L. F. P. (2017) Past, present and future of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Industry 4.0 - a systematic literature review and research agenda proposal. *International*
2 *Journal of Production Research*, 55(12), 3609–3629

3
4 Locke, K. D. (2001) *Grounded theory in management research*. London: SAGE Publications

5
6 Lyytinen, K., & Newman, M. (2008) Explaining information systems change: A punctuated socio-
7 technical change model. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 17(6)

8
9
10 Margherita, E. G., & Braccini, A. M. (2020a) Exploring the socio-technical interplay of Industry
11 4.0: a single case study of an Italian manufacturing organisation. In *Proceedings of the 6th*
12 *International Workshop on Socio-Technical Perspective in IS Development (STPIS 2020)*,
13 June 8-9, 2020. CEUR Workshop Proceedings (CEUR-WS.org)

14
15
16 Margherita, E. G., & Braccini, A. M. (2020b) Industry 4.0 Technologies in Flexible Manufacturing
17 for Sustainable Organizational Value: Reflections from a Multiple Case Study of Italian
18 Manufacturers. *Information Systems Frontiers*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-020-10047-y>

19
20
21 Margherita, E. G., & Braccini, A. M. (2020c) Organizational Impacts on Sustainability of Industry
22 4.0: A Systematic Literature Review from Empirical Case Studies. In: R. Agrifoglio, R.
23 Lamboglia, D. Mancini, & F. Ricciardi (eds.) *Digital Business Transformation Organizing,*
24 *Managing and Controlling in the Information Age* (pp. 173–186). Springer.
25 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47355-6_12

26
27
28 Margherita, E. G., & Braccini, A. M. (2021) Managing the Fourth Industrial Revolution: A
29 Competence Framework for Smart Factory. In: Hamdan A., Hassanien A.E., Razzaque A.,
30 A.B. (ed.) *The Fourth Industrial Revolution: Implementation of Artificial Intelligence for*
31 *Growing Business Success*. *Studies in Computational Intelligence*. Springer.
32 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-62796-6_23

33
34
35 Margherita, E. G., & Bua, I. (2021) The role of Human Resource Practices for the development of
36 Operator 4.0 in Industry 4.0 organisations: A literature review and a Research Agenda.
37 *Businesses*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/businesses1010002>

38
39
40 Müller, Julian M. (2019) Assessing the barriers to Industry 4.0 implementation from a workers'
41 perspective. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 52(13): 2189–2194.
42 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2019.11.530>

43
44
45 Müller, Julian Marius, Buliga, O., & Voigt, K. I. (2018) Fortune favors the prepared: How SMEs
46 approach business model innovations in Industry 4.0. *Technological Forecasting and Social*
47 *Change*, 132: 2–17

- 1 Mumford, E. (2003) Redesigning Human Systems. IGI Global
- 2 Prause, G., Atari, S., Prause, G., & Atari, S. (2017) On sustainable production networks for Industry
3 4.0. Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues, Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Center,
4 4(4): 421–431
5
6
7
- 8 Ruggieri, A., Braccini, A. M., Poponi, S., & Mosconi, E. M. (2016) A Meta-Model of Inter-
9 Organisational Cooperation for the Transition to a Circular Economy. Sustainability, 8(11):
10 1153. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su8111153>
11
12
13
- 14 Sarker, S., Chatterjee, S., Xiao, X., & Elbanna, A. (2019) The Sociotechnical Axis of Cohesion for
15 IS discipline: its historical legacy and its continued relevance. MIS Quarterly 43(3): 695–719
16
17
18
- 19 Sarker, S., Chatterjee, S., & Xiao, X. (2013) How “Sociotechnical” Is Our IS Research? An
20 Assessment and Possible Ways Forward. In: R. Baskerville, & M. Chau (eds), Proceedings of
21 the 34th International Conference on Information Systems. ICIS 2013, 1–24
22
23
24
- 25 Sawyer, S., & Jarrahi, M. H. (2014) Sociotechnical Approaches to the Study of Information
26 Systems. In Computing Handbook, 3rd ed. In: A. Tucker, & H. Topi (eds), Computing
27 Handbook: Information systems and information technology, 3rd Edition. Boca Raton, FL:
28 Taylor & Francis.
29
30
31
32
- 33 Sayar, D., & Er, Ö. (2018) The Antecedents of Successful IoT Service and System Design: Cases
34 from the Manufacturing Industry. International Journal of Design, 12(1): 67–78
35
36
37
- 38 Sony, M., & Naik, S. (2019a) Critical factors for the successful implementation of Industry 4.0: a
39 review and future research direction. Production Planning and Control: 1–17.
40 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2019.1691278>
41
42
43
- 44 Sony, M., & Naik, S. (2019b) Key ingredients for evaluating Industry 4.0 readiness for
45 organizations: a literature review. Benchmarking. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-09-2018-0284>
46
47
- 48 Sony, M., & Naik, S. (2020) Industry 4.0 integration with socio-technical systems theory: A
49 systematic review and proposed theoretical model. Technology in Society, 61: 101248.
50 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101248>
51
52
53
- 54 Stock, T., & Seliger, G. (2016) Opportunities of Sustainable Manufacturing in Industry 4.0.
55 Procedia CIRP, 40: 536–541. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2016.01.129>
56
57
- 58 Trist, E. (1981). The sociotechnical perspective: The evolution of sociotechnical systems as a
59 conceptual framework and as an action research program. Perspectives on Organizational
60
61
62
63
64
65

Design and Behavior. John Wiley and Sons, New York

Von Bertalanffy, L. (1972) The History and Status of General Systems Theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 15(4)

Walsham, G. (2006) Doing interpretive research. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 15(3), 320–330. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ejis.3000589>

Yin, R. K. (2002) *Case study research: Design and methods*. (SAGE Publications, Ed.) (Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks, CA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Examining the development of a digital ecosystem in an Industry 4.0 context: A sociotechnical perspective

Authors:

Emanuele Gabriel Margherita, University of Tuscia, Department of Economics Engineering Society and Organization – DEIM, Via del Paradiso, 47, 01100, Viterbo, Italy - emargherita@unitus.it
(corresponding author)

Alessio Maria Braccini, University of Tuscia, Department of Economics Engineering Society and Organization – DEIM, Via del Paradiso, 47, 01100, Viterbo, Italy – abbraccini@unitus.it

Corresponding Author:

Emanuele Gabriel Margherita, emargherita@unitus.it

Abstract: To respond to increased competition, manufacturing organisations have started developing digital ecosystems within a supply chain by adopting Industry 4.0 technologies. That approach promises to improve organisational efficiency by automating operations and decision-making activities. The development of the digital ecosystem passes through vertical and horizontal integrations of technologies. Vertical integration represents the integration of various organisational units, and it is a milestone in the process of reaching horizontal integration where different organisations integrate their production processes in a supply chain. The extant literature reveals that the vertical integration of an organisation is challenging to achieve, as the adoption process of Industry 4.0 employs a technocentric perspective without considering the way that technology users can cause strong workforce resistance against Industry 4.0 adoption. The sociotechnical perspective addresses this issue by considering both technology and users during the adoption process. Therefore, this paper illustrates the applicability of the sociotechnical approach to an in-depth single case study of an Italian manufacturing group which successfully adopted Industry 4.0 technologies. We show the adoption process of Industry 4.0 technologies, highlighting the outcome of the adoption and proposing sociotechnical enabling factors that assist in achieving vertical integration.

Keywords: Industry 4.0, sociotechnical theory, single case study, Industry 4.0 vertical integration, Industry 4.0 ecosystems

Introduction

1
2 Manufacturing organisations face fierce competition from competitors in developing countries,
3 which undermine their market share through competitive prices and quality products (Margherita
4 and Braccini 2020b). Governments worldwide address this challenge by promoting Industry 4.0
5 (henceforth I40) industrial plans to support the competitiveness of a country's manufacturing sector
6 (Evans and Annunziata 2012; Kagermann, Wolfgang, and Helbig 2013). These plans encourage
7 organisations to adopt technologies – including Big Data, the Internet of Things and Robotics - to
8 optimise and automate the production process through programmable cyber-physical systems (CPS)
9 that automatically control machinery in assembly lines. The way organisations use I40 technologies
10 allows them addressing problems along the assembly line without human interaction, and through
11 autonomous machines (Lee, Bagheri, and Kao 2015).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Moreover, organisations integrate these technologies to develop a digital ecosystem of
22 manufacturing organisations in a supply chain (Kagermann et al. 2013; Julian Marius Müller,
23 Buliga, and Voigt 2018). The development of this digital ecosystem passes through two phases. In
24 the first phase, called vertical integration, each organisation internally integrates several units. In the
25 second phase, called horizontal integration, organisations in the supply chain share the information,
26 integrating the production process and facilitating collaboration among partners (Kagermann et al.
27 2013; Julian Marius Müller et al. 2018). Adopting I40 technologies, which enable vertical
28 integration, is necessary to undertake horizontal integration and reach a digital ecosystem.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The exploration of the digital ecosystem of I40 technologies is at an early stage. Most of the studies
37 focus on the vertical integration of the internal organisational units by implementing I40
38 technologies. That is a challenging process for organisations because they experience various issues
39 during the adoption process. These difficulties rely on the lack of proper organisational actions to
40 implement I40 technologies (Sony and Naik 2019a, 2019b). I40 adoption is a complex process that
41 consists of end-to-end digital integration of technologies and requires a well-prepared workforce to
42 manage those technologies (Kagermann et al. 2013). The integration of I40 technologies is
43 problematic as there is no best practice to follow, and there is a scarcity of experts to lead I40
44 projects (Sony and Naik 2019b).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 To date, most of the studies exploring I40 adoption have followed a “technocentric perspective”.
54 This perspective privileges the integration of the technologies within the production plant without
55 considering the workforce who are the users of these technologies. However, some studies have
56 argued that this perspective is not appropriate for I40 adoption because workers are not prepared to
57 manage these technologies due to a lack of proper competences and skills, which can cause strong
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 workforce resistance against I40 adoption (de Sousa Jabbour, Jabbour, Foropon, and Filho 2018;
2 Liao, Deschamps, Loures, and Ramos 2017). Workers require specific training and vocational
3 courses along the adoption process to accept and to use I40 technologies (Prause, Atari, Prause, and
4 Atari 2017; Sayar and Er 2018; Margherita and Bua 2021).

5
6
7 Therefore, these studies call for workers' involvement during the adoption process of I40
8 technologies and a sociotechnical perspective for I40 adoption (Kagermann et al. 2013; Sarker,
9 Chatterjee, Xiao, and Elbanna 2019). The sociotechnical perspective conceives of the organisation
10 as a work system composed of social and technological systems that are “jointly optimised” to
11 operate effectively (Bostrom and Heinen 1977; Lyytinen and Newman 2008). This perspective
12 allows us to study the changes within the work systems, the interrelations among the two systems,
13 the consequent sociotechnical equilibrium, and the improvements delivered by the novel I40 work
14 system (Bostrom and Heinen 1977; Sony and Naik 2020).

15
16
17 Within this framework, the main goal of this study is twofold. Firstly, the paper illustrates an I40
18 adoption employing a sociotechnical perspective. To this end, we conducted an in-depth case study
19 of an Italian manufacturing organisation producing bathroom ceramics that successfully adopted
20 I40 technologies. Secondly, we propose sociotechnical enabling factors for effective vertical
21 integration of I40 technologies. The study answers the following question: “*What are the*
22 *sociotechnical enabling factors for an effective Industry 4.0 adoption?*”

23
24
25 The paper is structured as follows. Section 1 is devoted to the relevant literature on I40 initiatives
26 and the sociotechnical approach. The article continues in section 2 with the research method. We
27 outline the case study in section 3, pointing out the traditional work systems, the I40 adoption
28 process and the I40 work systems. Section 4 shows the improvements of both systems and the
29 enabling factors for I40 adoption. The paper ends in section 5 with conclusions and implications for
30 researchers and practitioners.

31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 **1 Related Literature**

48
49
50 This section presents the I40 initiative, the works that have investigated I40 adoption, and the
51 sociotechnical perspective.

52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 **1.1 Industry 4.0**

Inspired by the German government, I40 is an industrial initiative that aims to innovate production processes by adopting leading-edge technologies, including Big Data, the Internet of Things, and

1 Robotics. I40 allows for deploying the generic concept of cyber-physical systems (Kagermann et al.
2 2013) that automatically control machinery and address mechanical issues on the assembly line
3 without human interaction (Lee et al. 2015). I40 adoption promises to deliver value in organisations
4 by establishing a more efficient production process, reducing natural resource usage, and providing
5 safer workplaces (Braccini & Margherita 2019; Margherita and Braccini 2020c).
6
7

8
9 To this end, the I40 initiative claims to develop a digital ecosystem of organisations within a supply
10 chain to exploit these technologies fully. The development of a digital ecosystem passes through
11 vertical and horizontal integration (Blunck and Werthmann 2017; Kagermann et al. 2013).
12
13

14
15 Vertical integration is internal to the organisation and represents the integration of several
16 organisational units, including marketing and sales or technology development, by end-to-end
17 digitally integrated technologies across different levels (Kagermann et al. 2013). The vertical
18 integration also allows for a flexible and reconfigurable production infrastructure adapted to each
19 specific customer order or even changing market requirements. Vertical integration is a requirement
20 to start the process of achieving horizontal integration.
21
22

23
24 Horizontal integration represents the digital information sharing that facilitates collaboration among
25 partners within a value chain, including the customer (Julian Marius Müller et al. 2018). This
26 integration addresses specific areas of an organisation (e.g. purchasing, production, logistics) that
27 are connected with all the value chain's external partners.
28
29

30
31 Horizontal integration characterises inter- and intra-organisation smart networking of cross-
32 company and internal-company measures that digitalise the information flow of internal
33 programmable logic controllers of value chain actors (Stock and Seliger 2016). The integration of
34 the horizontal value chain optimises the information flow and flow of goods from the customer to
35 the organisation and vice versa (Blunck and Werthmann 2017). In horizontal and vertical
36 integration, we see an I40 technology ecosystem.
37
38

39
40 The literature exploring digital ecosystems by I40 technologies is at an infant stage. Most of the
41 studies are focused on exploring how organisations achieve the vertical integration that is a
42 challenging process due to difficulties in adopting I40 technologies (Prause et al. 2017; Sayar and
43 Er 2018). A lack of best practices and experts hamper I40 adoption (Sony and Naik 2019a).
44
45

46
47 Some studies employ a technocentric perspective which considers technologies as the main driver
48 of the benefits because these technologies increase the automation of operations and decision-
49 making activities (Kang et al. 2016). Thus, during the adoption process, organisations may privilege
50 technology implementation and integration without considering the workforce (Prause et al. 2017).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 However, Sayar and Er (2018) showed that the technocentric perspective is inadequate for I40
2 adoption because workers require specific training to be effective in the use of I40 technologies.
3 They showed that even if an organisation implements I40 technologies, workers might not accept
4 those technologies or use them, which can result in economic losses.
5
6

7 Prause et al. (2017) further describe the failure to adopt I40 technologies. They explain the
8 technocentric perspective is not sufficient for effective vertical integration of I40 technologies
9 because workers do not manage them properly. Also, these considerations are due to a lack of
10 involvement of users at the adoption stage. In line with this, some studies claim that the workforce
11 should take part in the adoption process because they are not currently prepared to use these
12 technologies due to a lack of proper competences and skills (Margherita and Braccini 2021), which
13 causes strong workforce resistance against I40 adoption (Bonekamp and Sure 2015; de Sousa
14 Jabbour et al. 2018; Kamble, Gunasekaran, and Sharma 2018; Margherita and Braccini 2020a;
15 Julian M. Müller 2019).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **1.2 The Sociotechnical Perspective**

27
28 The term “sociotechnical” was coined in the 1950s by Trist and Emery. They studied the
29 implementation of the “Longwall Method” in a coal mine and documented worker responses.
30 Workers migrated from a traditional method of extracting coal to a new semi-mechanised
31 “Longwall Method” for gathering coal (Trist and Bamforth 1951). The researchers showed that
32 productivity decreased unexpectedly, albeit the new method supposedly facilitated workers’ tasks.
33 This outcome occurred because managers did not consider the social system (people, relationships,
34 organisational structure) during the adoption phase. The former method allowed workers to perform
35 a variety of tasks using different tools, or better, workers had a high degree of element of job
36 enrichment (Leonardi 2012). Conversely, the new method “destroyed” these social patterns,
37 generating worker dissatisfaction that turned into resistance to the technology which eventually
38 resulted in a decrease in productivity.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48


49 To solve this issue, the technology adoption should be considered with a sociotechnical perspective
50 (henceforth STP) that considered both the social issues and the technical issues (Sarker et al. 2019).
51 The STP posits that the conjoint optimisation of both systems leads to effective technology
52 adoption within the organisation.
53
54
55
56

57 The STP employs the work system theory, which provides a perspective for understanding systems
58 in organisations (Alter 2013; Von Bertalanffy 1972). The STP describes the organisation as
59 composed of social and technical systems. The former includes the workers, their roles, and the
60
61
62
63
64
65

organisational rules. The latter includes the technologies for accomplishing organisational tasks (Trist 1981).

Bostrom's sociotechnical model (Figure 1) synthesises the findings around the STP (Bostrom and Heinen 1977). The model depicts the main elements which are impacted by new technologies within the organisation. The model views organisational systems as multivariate systems of four interacting components – task, structure, actor, and technology. Still, during technology adoption, sociotechnical systems are open systems. They have to be continuously adapted to the environment to maintain the state of equilibrium. The equilibrium or joint optimisation of both systems involves stable relationships between the system components and their environment. This joint optimisation leads to improvements in both systems. In technical systems, the improvements concern better performance and achieved economic objectives, whereas the improvements in the social system concern enhanced job satisfaction and a higher quality of work-life balance (Land 2000; Sarker, Chetterjee, and Xiao 2013).

Fig. 1 The Sociotechnical Model (Bostrom and Heinen 1977; Leavitt 1964)



2 Research Method

This study targets the STP of a case of I40 adoption, showing the social and technical improvements and the enabling factors of I40 adoption. The study illustrates a single case study of an Italian manufacturing organisation in the ceramic industry which adopted various I40 technologies. We selected the organisation as a revelatory case since it was the first mover in adopting I40 in its domain (Yin 2002).

As primary data, we collected four face-to-face, semi-structured interviews with four key informants (Kumar, Stern, Anderson, Stern, and Anderson 1993), including members of the steering committee of the I40 adoption - the chief executive officer (CEO) and the chief production officer (CPO) – and two workers operating in the traditional and novel production processes. We decided to interview these two groups because their voices often diverged on themes related to how work conditions changed after the technology adoption (Sawyer and Jarrahi 2014).

We conducted semi-structured interviews in December 2018 during an organisational visit that lasted 3 hours. The average length of each interview was 30 minutes. We also collected observations of the production line, observing the operations of smart machines, control systems, and activities performed by workers on the line. We followed the track indicated in Table 1. We slightly adapted the interview track according to the roles of each interviewee.

We conducted observations of the I40 production line and compiled field notes. We further gathered secondary data. We included official balance sheets and articles from distinguished national newspapers regarding the traditional production process, the I40 adoption process, the I40 production process and its improvements.

Table 1 Track Interview

Interviewee:	Questions:
Management (CEO and CPO)	Organisational facts: worker number, turnover level
	Features of I40 technologies
	Needs triggering the I40 adoption
	The management I40 adoption process
	Worker participation in the I40 adoption process
	Changes in work practice triggering I40 adoption
	Technical systems improvements from the I40 adoption
	Social Systems improvements from the I40 adoption
	Type and nature of the work performed
	Experience in the production process before I40 adoption
Workers	Social systems for the workers from the I40 adoption
	Changes in working conditions before and after the I40 adoption
	Personal awareness of the benefits of I40 adoption

We gathered the organisation's official balance sheets by using the database AIDA¹ and additional articles from distinguished national newspapers from their official websites. Moreover, we employed the data obtained from a previous analysis of the same case unit (Ruggieri, Braccini, Poponi, and Mosconi 2016).

We triangulated all the data to enhance the validity and reliability of the study and reduce subjectivity in empirical evidence (Denzin 2006; Walsham 2006).

After that, the research team collected all the data sources in a data corpus and integrated them into a single research database which we coded following the guidelines for the validity and reliability of qualitative inquiry (Corbin and Strauss 2015; Locke 2001). The sociotechnical model (Figure 1) has been used as a sensitising device to identify critical events in the work context and assess their

¹ AIDA is an online database, owned by Bureau van Dijk, containing financial information of more than 500.000 Italian companies. AIDA has official balance reports of Italian companies of the last 10 years.

1 impact. In Table 2, we summarise the most relevant interview and newspaper excerpts for the
 2 aspects discussed in the case description. Finally, we propose a full narrative of events and their
 3 interactions in a visual form (Langley 1999). This visual expression narrates the implementation
 4 process from the beginning to end as a sequence of incidents that affect the work system.
 5
 6

7
 8 **Table 2** Interview and newspaper excerpts
 9

10 Topic	11 Source	12 Interview excerpts
13 Detail of I40 14 adoption	15 CEO	16 We were lucky to have enough space, our partner set up the 17 implementation of each technology thoroughly while we previously 18 communicated to workers these changes.
19 Technical System of 20 the Traditional 21 Work System	22 CPO	23 The traditional production process is here. These are the moulds to 24 create the product, which are then dried. We switch on the oven for 25 twelve hours to bake the products at the end of the day. Workers 26 moved the products to the logistics unit.
27 Social System of the 28 Traditional Work 29 System	30 CPO	31 One operator manages one machine. Everything is manual. These 32 operators are in charge of producing the goods with the help of 33 moulds. Then, we have operators that move the goods by forklifts that 34 drive.
35 I40 Social systems 36 improvement	37 CPO	38 Employees thanked us. Heavy manual labour was the critical issue of 39 the factory. Now their tasks have changed favourably.
40 Worker role in the 41 Traditional Work 42 System	43 CPO	44 During the production, the worker establishes a relation with each 45 product. A worker moves the semi-finished good, shaping it and 46 obtains visual and sensorial feedback regarding the product quality.
47 I40 technical system 48 improvement	49 CEO	50 This I40 application is the first in the ceramic industry. We risked a 51 lot, but our production increased by 30%, and we reduced defects and 52 damaged products during the transports from 30% down to 9%.
53 I40 technical system 54 improvement	55 Article	56 The company is environmentally friendly. They reduced the usage of 57 natural resources, increasing the efficiency of the production line. 58 The company improves workforce conditions through I40. We 59 requalified the worker, and now, they are technology experts.
60 I40 social system 61 improvement	62 Article	63 Currently, technologies move product in automation and workers 64 control the system through a computer. The company also provides 65 several vocational courses for workers.
66 Worker role in I40 67 work systems	68 Worker 69 1	70 I am supervising these four machines which produce washbasins. The 71 work I do now is less manual and more mental. I can activate and stop 72 the machine, and I help set up the device better by providing feedback 73 to technology experts.
74 Worker role in I40 75 work systems	76 CPO	77 Now, the worker is close to the mechanical arm. He knows how to 78 craft the product. In case of mistakes of the mechanical arm, he can 79 detect them and stop production.
80 Job enlargement for 81 workers	82 CEO	83 Only the workers know how to improve the processes because they 84 operate with these pieces of machinery. We welcome their feedback.
85 Worker role in I40 86 work systems	87 Worker 88 2	89 We feel safer than before. We cannot enter in the robot area when 90 robots are producing, while we supervise the process. And the forklift 91 drivers are in safety.
92 Training Program 93 for apprentices	94 CPO	95 We hired this young worker. Now he is working in the traditional 96 factory to get craft skills. Then, after a preparation course, we will 97 move him to the I40 factory as a supervisor.

1	Low-work quality	CPO	Once, we proposed to production line employees to work on Sunday with well-paid overtime. They refused to work since the works are so physically hard to perform.
2			
3			
4	Low product quality level	CEO	Our organisation based the competitive advantage on the higher quality over the market. The traditional product process does not allow it anymore.
5			
6			
7			
8	Risk of I40 adoption	CEO	We were the first manufacturing organisation in adopting these technologies. The risk relies on the lack of best practices to follow during these phases.
9			
10			
11	Joint Optimisation of I40 work system	CPO	Workers complained regarding the machinery speed, as they cannot follow the production tasks properly. Therefore, we reduced that speed since we do think that quality comes chiefly from human work.
12			
13			
14			
15	The adoption process of I40 technologies	CPO	“We hired two technology experts to automate the process and teach workers how to use the novel machines. We also help workers to understand the machine proving vocational courses outside the firm” (CPO).
16			
17			
18			
19			
20	The adoption process of I40 technologies	CPO	In the beginning, workers were contrary to these technologies because these pieces of machinery automate the production. After some months, they thanked us because these technologies helped them to operate in a better way and with better conditions.
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26	The motivation of the I40 adoption	CEO	We do not want to import ceramics because we know how to produce it in a better way. Our strategy is to increase the quality of our products. If we import ceramics and we produce 5000 products fewer, We have to fire 50 people. For us, Industry 4.0 was the way to maintain stable employment and optimise production.
27			
28			
29			
30			


3 Case Description

This section illustrates the STP application in a single case study of an Italian manufacturing organisation. It describes the traditional work systems, the causes and adoption process of I40, and the I40 work system.

3.1 The Traditional Work System

The unit of analysis is a medium-sized Italian manufacturing organisation of the sanitary ceramic industry employing around 200 workers located in the Lazio region. The organisation produces bathroom ceramics with a creative design and enduring materials, and it is attentive towards environmental sustainability and innovation in the product and process. The traditional work system includes all the activities accomplished during the traditional production process from the production of the goods to the logistic unit. Figure 2 summarises the main components of the traditional work system.

Fig. 2 The Traditional Work System



The traditional production process consists of three phases: primary, secondary, and support. The primary phase encompasses all the activities needed to prototype and produce the goods. In the first step, workers are in charge of production tasks. They realise a series of chalk moulds in the shape of the sanitary ceramics. These chalk moulds dry in the desiccation room for 15 days. Afterwards, workers pour the ceramics' main elements, vitreous china and fireclay, into these chalk moulds and leave them there for some days.

After that, these moulds are opened to extract the raw and humid sanitaryware. The products created in the following phase are entirely handmade. Expert artisans place these articles over lathes and the complete manual refining of the sanitaryware's shape.

After that, the products are dried through continuous ventilation over a drying belt and thoroughly inspected. Those products which pass the inspection are enamelled by highly specialised workers in cabins and then baked in a high-temperature oven. At the end of this process, the finished goods undergo a quality control check, and those in compliance are packed and stored in the warehouse by workers using a forklift.

Goods which do not pass the quality inspection are destroyed and recycled. Such articles are reprocessed in the secondary phase in order to address production mistakes. Finally, in the support phase, workers prepare the product for shipment and ensure disposal of the waste produced in the process.

The major concerns regarding the traditional production process are as follows:

- **Inefficient technical system.** Although workers were experts in production tasks, the technical systems employed in the production process were inefficient, which resulted in a high rate of semi-finished products that had to be reprocessed or recycled.
- **Lack of apprentices.** The human resource department struggles to find young apprentices to hire along the production line to replace old workers. This issue is due to the awareness

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

that the ceramic production operations are demanding and pose several work hazards (Dantas de Sena Junior et al. 2016).

- **Issues during the handling of products.** During the transport via forklifts driven by workers, mishaps occur because of incorrect placement of the goods or use of brakes.
- **Low quality level of product.** The organisation bases the competitive advantage on higher product quality. However, competitors have reached the same quality level through their production processes. The traditional work systems cannot support this strategy anymore.
- **Low quality of work.** The traditional work system involves demanding tasks, which is demotivational and stressful for workers.

3.2 The adoption process of Industry 4.0

The management of the organisation decided to adopt I40 technologies to innovate the traditional production line. They chose an organisation leader to develop manufacturing pieces of machinery and also guide the adoption phase. The CEO emphasised the risks regarding the adoption phase of I40 technologies. The organisation was the first mover in adopting these novel technologies. The I40 pieces of machinery required a reengineering of the production process and a physical factory layout redesign due to several large-sized pieces of machinery.

The management decided to adopt autonomous machines—like self-driving forklifts, robotised arms, and fully automatic conveyors—to produce products and move them from one phase of production to another to address the traditional work system issues. The technology developer manages the end-to-end integration of I40 technologies by interconnecting their control systems with the CPS that govern the technologies. The management planned the innovation and discussed the plan with all workers.

The management motivated the adoption of these technologies because they are necessary to guarantee the company's long-term survival in a market dominated by low-cost producers in developing countries with low labour costs. The adoption phase lasted five years.

This innovation significantly changed workforce operations and required workers with digital competencies. The company offered workers the opportunity to retire or leave the position if they were unwilling to learn new skills. All those who accepted the offer to stay were able to attend vocational training courses provided by the technology developers. The reaction of workers was initially adverse because they expected these technologies to kill their jobs through automation. Soon, their response became favourable because workers comprehended that these technologies only automate their demanding muscular activities and improve their work conditions.


1 A team composed of technicians and managers led the I40 adoption. The technicians acted as
 2 facilitators between the production line workers and the management to reach both systems' joint
 3 optimisation (Mumford 2003). The management stated that the main issue was the speed of I40
 4 technologies, which hampered workers in the management of their operations. Accordingly,
 5 technology experts adjusted the speed of I40 technologies. Thus, workers can manage the
 6 machinery and I40 technologies to maximise production.
 7
 8
 9

10
 11 Lastly, the organisation maintained the traditional work systems to produce goods with a demand
 12 level which does not justify the high fixed costs of the I40 work systems.
 13
 14
 15

16 3.3 The Industry 4.0 Work System

17
 18 The I40 work system includes all the activities during the novel production and logistics units.
 19 Different kinds of robots take on hard muscular work previously performed by workers. By
 20 applying the sociotechnical lens, Figure 3 summarises the main components of the I40 work
 21 system.
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26

27 **Fig. 3** The Industry 4.0 Work System



28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44 Along the process, workers act as supervisors. They check whether the pieces of machinery are in
 45 compliance with guidelines and they evaluate the quality of the product at each production phase.
 46 The products are then placed on shelves and moved by autonomous fork trucks along the assembly
 47 line and eventually stored in the warehouse. Whether the workers mark the part as defective or
 48 damaged, the trucks deliver it to a secondary phase. Furthermore, technologies digitally trace the
 49 complete production process. The traceability of data concerns the lead time, the machines that
 50 processed the product, and the workers controlling or operating them.
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56

57
 58 Also, production line workers are in charge of providing feedback to technology experts to improve
 59 technology operations and avoid issues that occurred along the line.
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

4 Findings and discussion

This section presents the improvement of I40 work systems and their enabling factors and thus answers the research question.

4.1 Improvements in Industry 4.0 Work systems

I40 adoption led to improvement in the technical and social work systems. Table 3 summarises the improvements for both systems.

Regarding the technical systems, the organisation increased output quantity by 30% and the gamut of products offered to customers from 11 to 16. I40 adoption also reduced the lead time. I40 adoption increased the quality level of the products. In the traditional production process, the organisation only used traditional ceramics mixture. In contrast, in the I40 production system, the traditional ceramics mixture can be mixed with different minerals (such as gold and silver).

According to the CEO, these technologies allowed the organisation to govern their production processes, creating more practical and enduring products with a refined design, leading to a higher quality product.

Table 3 Industry 4.0 Work Systems Improvement

Improvements in Industry 4.0 Work Systems	
Technical Systems	Social Systems
- Output quantity increased by 30%	- Safer work environment
- Higher product quality	- Reduction of work incidents
- Increased gamut of products	- Higher job satisfaction
- Reduction of defects from 30% to 9%.	- Less intense work
	- Workers as supervisors
	- Better training program

Moreover, the shift of operations from workers to autonomous robots that took over all the physical work also contributed to reducing defects and damaged products during the transport, which decreased from 30% down to 9%. Still, thanks to the CPS, these technologies improved product tracking, reducing measures of order inaccuracy. CPS also continuously analyses information concerning the processes and provides comprehensive reports on the machinery status and predictions regarding future production trends.

Regarding the social systems, I40 adoption contributes to a safer and healthier work environment. The I40 technical system alleviated several issues, such as using dangerous materials that increase powder in the plant and pollution in the air. Furthermore, demanding muscular tasks are now performed by machinery, reducing the likelihood of workers coming to suffer from occupational

1 diseases. At the same time, the automation of such operations reduced the number of work
2 incidents, particularly in the handling phase of products, and increased the satisfaction and life
3 quality of workers. Also, workers enriched their tasks because they supervised technologies and
4 provided feedback to technology experts to improve I40 technology operations and avoid issues that
5 occurred along the line.
6
7

8
9 Finally, the management proposed a better and articulated training program to encourage young
10 workers to become apprentices. Contrary to the traditional production process training that involved
11 only a short period of training on the job on the machines, the apprentice for I40 line initially
12 learned the artisanal mastery of crafting ceramics into the traditional work systems. They are then
13 moved into the I40 work systems when they have acquired enough knowledge of ceramic
14 production. Apprentices are also enrolled in vocational training to develop digital competencies to
15 manage these technologies. Thus, they contribute to maintaining a stable I40 production process.
16 Accordingly, this program allows developing proper competencies to work in the ceramic industry
17 and makes for more engaging work. Similarly, the management also enrolled experienced workers
18 in training courses to develop and enrich their digital skills.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **4.2 Enabling factors for Industry 4.0 adoption**

30 Applying the STP lens, this investigation pinpointed three sociotechnical enabling factors for an
31 effective I40 adoption: *a worker-centric work system, unchanged organisational value system and*
32 *status quo of workers, CPS for improving the production process, and an approach of not*
33 *controlling workers.*
34
35
36
37
38
39

- 40 • *Worker-centric I40 work system.* The traditional work systems rely mainly on artisanal
41 competences of workers for producing the goods. Human craft, as the CPO said, made
42 quality products. I40 technologies innovated work practices, reducing demanding and
43 mechanical movements that correspond to the absence of task significant elements and allow
44 for job enlargement. Indeed, the worker's role is increasingly fundamental during the
45 production process and through continuous feedback systems. Workers act as supervisors to
46 check control quality. Also, they provide feedback to technology experts to improve the
47 production process.
48
- 49 • *Unchanged organisational value system and status quo of workers.* Within the traditional
50 work system, the more competent workers have more experience and competences in
51 crafting ceramics. Instead, the I40 work system requires, beyond these qualifications, digital
52 competencies to deal with I40 technologies. These could cause issues on the organisational
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 value system and worker status quo within the organisation. For instance, a newly recruited
2 worker possessing higher digital competencies can be considered suitable by the
3 management to work on the I40 assembly line while more experienced workers who do not
4 have those competencies may not. The organisation carried out two actions to address this
5 issue: vocational courses and a training programme in the traditional assembly line for
6 newly recruited workers. Through the vocational courses, experienced workers filled the
7 gaps in their understanding of digital competence. In contrast, the training programme
8 maintained an unaltered organisational value system privileging the ownership of artisanal
9 competence over digital competences.

- 10 • *CPS for improving the production process, not to control workers.* I40 technologies are
11 often related to control issues because of increasing control and supervision over workers at
12 the operative level that employ these technologies to complete their tasks (Evans and
13 Annunziata 2012; Kagermann et al. 2013; Kang et al. 2016). In our case, CPS acquire data
14 along the entire production process, providing accurate real-time information to the
15 management in terms of production quantity and time for accomplishing tasks. The
16 organisation exploits this information to monitor the process rather than to control the
17 employees. Also, workers contribute to improving the production process by providing
18 feedback to technology experts, which implies that the workers take a proactive role.

32 33 34 **5 Conclusions, study limitation and implications**

35
36
37 The study's main contribution is to apply the STP to I40 adoption to illustrate the system
38 improvements and the sociotechnical enabling factors. We used the sociotechnical lens, proposing a
39 full narrative of all the events starting from the organisations' traditional work system, the I40
40 adoption process and the new I40 work systems.

41
42
43 The study has implications for researchers and practitioners. Regarding the implications for
44 practitioners, we investigated the I40 adoption process, which can be used as a guideline for similar
45 organisations implementing these technologies. Managers should also consider the users of
46 technologies during the I40 adoption. We highlighted how the management handles the workforce
47 to accept I40 technologies and the importance of training courses to build digital competencies. The
48 shakedown of I40 technologies occurs when workers perceive and comprehend that these
49 technologies increase organisational productivity, work practices and workforce conditions.

50
51
52 The study is useful for policymakers interested in developing incentives for I40 initiatives.
53 Incentives should be designed both for the purchase of these technologies and for training courses.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
Regarding the implications for researchers, the study provides further evidence that there is a need to treat I40 adoption as a larger sociotechnical matter rather than exclusively one of technical system delivery. To advance the topic of I40 adoption, we suggest investigating the barriers and workaround practices that impede successful adoption (Alter 2014). We also call for further studies to detect future digital competences to handle these technologies and investigate the appropriation process, employing the adaptive structuration theory or task-technology fit (DeSanctis and Poole 1994; Goodhue and Thompson 1995).

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
The study focuses on the vertical integration of I40 technologies. A further step to study the digital ecosystem in the I40 realm is the horizontal integration of technologies among organisations. The STP reveals that the integration of novel technologies impacts the organisation's social system, which implements the technology and the organisation of the supply chain (Sony and Naik 2020). Since this discourse is underdeveloped, we encourage scholars to conduct qualitative research, particularly action research, ethnography, and exploration of a single case study to explore the sociotechnical consequences of horizontal integration of I40 technologies.

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
Moreover, we also encourage scholars to investigate the topic of the end-to-end integration of I40 technologies. In our case, this phase was successful because the technology developer designed all I40 technologies and their integrable control systems. Therefore, a promising research avenue is to consider the opposite situation by investigating the end-to-end integration of various I40 technologies of different technology developers. What are the sociotechnical consequences for the organisation?

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
Our study has some limitations. It is exploratory in nature and based on an organisation located in Italy. Our study results are mostly generalisable to organisations operating in the European context that share similar characteristics – industry type, firm size, and level of governmental support for the adoption of these technologies – to the Italian context. Nevertheless, we encourage researchers to investigate the vertical integration of I40 technologies in other contexts and countries, such as developing countries, Asian countries and North and South American countries.

53 54 55 **Conflict of interest**

56
57
58
On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

59 60 61 62 **Data availability**

1 The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author on
2 request
3
4
5

6 **References**

- 7
8
9 Alter, S. (2013) Work system theory: Overview of Core Concepts, Extensions, and Challenges for
10 the Future. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 14(2): 72–121
11
12 Alter, S. (2014) Theory of workarounds. *Communications of the Association for Information*
13 *Systems*, 34(1)
14
15
16
17 Blunck, E., & Werthmann, H. (2017) Industry 4.0 – an opportunity to realize sustainable
18 manufacturing and its potential for a circular economy. *DIEM: Dubrovnik International*
19 *Economic Meeting*, 3(1): 644–666
20
21
22
23 Bonekamp, L., & Sure, M. (2015) Consequences of Industry 4.0 on human labour and work
24 organisation. *Journal of Business and Media Psychology*, 6(1): 33–40
25
26
27
28 Bostrom, R. P., & Heinen, S. J. (1977) MIS Problems and Failures: A Socio-Technical Perspective.
29 Part I: The Causes. *MIS Quarterly*, 1(3)
30
31
32 Braccini, A. M., & Margherita, E. (2019) Exploring Organizational Sustainability of Industry 4.0
33 under the Triple Bottom Line: The Case of a Manufacturing Company. *Sustainability*, 11(1),
34 36. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11010036>
35
36
37
38 Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. L. (2015) Basics of Qualitative Research. In: S. P. Inc (ed) *Techniques*
39 *and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*
40
41
42
43 Dantas de Sena Junior, L. C., Alves da Silva, R. E., Mendonça Torres, L., Gomes de Sousa, Y., de
44 Medeiros, S. M., & Bittencourt Leite de Carvalho, J. (2016) Knowledge workers on
45 occupational hazards in the industry of ceramics. *International Archives of Medicine*, 9
46
47
48
49 de Sousa Jabbour, A. B. L., Jabbour, C. J. C., Foropon, C., & Filho, M. G. (2018) When titans meet
50 – Can industry 4.0 revolutionise the environmentally-sustainable manufacturing wave? The
51 role of critical success factors. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 132:18–25.
52 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.01.017>
53
54
55
56
57 Denzin, N. (2006) *Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook*. (A. Transaction, ed) (5th Ed.). Aldine
58 *Transaction*
59
60
61 DeSanctis, G., & Poole, M. S. (1994) *Capturing the Complexity in Advanced Technology Use:*
62
63
64
65

Adaptive Structuration Theory. *Organization Science*, 5(2): 121–147

1
2 Evans, P. C., & Annunziata, M. (2012) Industrial Internet: Pushing the Boundaries of Minds and
3
4 Machines

5
6 Goodhue, D. L., & Thompson, R. L. (1995) Task-Technology Fit and individual performance. *MIS*
7
8 Quarterly, 19(2): 213–236
9

10
11 Kagermann, H., Wolfgang, W., & Helbig, J. (2013) Recommendations for implementing the
12
13 strategic initiative INDUSTRIE 4.0. Working Group. Acatech, Frankfurt Am Main, Germany.,
14
15 82. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.1205.8966>

16
17 Kamble, S. S., Gunasekaran, A., & Sharma, R. (2018). Analysis of the driving and dependence
18
19 power of barriers to adopt industry 4.0 in Indian manufacturing industry. *Computers in*
20
21 *Industry*, 101: 107–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2018.06.004>

22
23 Kang, H. S., Lee, J. Y., Choi, S., Kim, H., Park, J. H., Son, J. Y., ... Noh, S. Do. (2016) Smart
24
25 manufacturing: Past research, present findings, and future directions. *International Journal of*
26
27 *Precision Engineering and Manufacturing - Green Technology*, 3(1): 111–128.
28
29 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40684-016-0015-5>

30
31 Kumar, N., Stern, L. W., Anderson, J. C., Stern, L. W., & Anderson, J. C. (1993) Conducting
32
33 interorganizational research using key informants. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(6):
34
35 1633–1651

36
37 Land, F. (2000) Evaluation in a Socio-Technical Context. In Basskerville, R., Stage, J., and
38
39 DeGross, J.I., *Organizational and Social Perspectives on Information Technology*. Boston,
40
41 Kluwer Academic Publishers

42
43 Langley, A. (1999) Strategies for Theorizing from Process Data. *Academy of Management*, 24(4)

44
45 Leavitt, H. J. (1964) Applied organization change in industry: Structural, technical and human
46
47 approaches. In *New perspectives in organisational research* (Wiley)

48
49 Lee, J., Bagheri, B., & Kao, H. A. (2015) A Cyber-Physical Systems architecture for Industry 4.0-
50
51 based manufacturing systems. *Manufacturing Letters*, 3

52
53 Leonardi, P. M. (2012) Materiality, sociomateriality, and socio-technical systems: What do these
54
55 terms mean? How are they different? Do we need them? In: P. M. Leonardi, B. A. Nardi (ed),
56
57 *Materiality and Organizing: Social Interaction in a Technological World*. Oxford

58
59 Liao, Y., Deschamps, F., Loures, E. de F. R., & Ramos, L. F. P. (2017) Past, present and future of
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Industry 4.0 - a systematic literature review and research agenda proposal. *International*
2 *Journal of Production Research*, 55(12), 3609–3629

3
4 Locke, K. D. (2001) *Grounded theory in management research*. London: SAGE Publications

5
6 Lyytinen, K., & Newman, M. (2008) Explaining information systems change: A punctuated socio-
7 technical change model. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 17(6)

8
9
10 Margherita, E. G., & Braccini, A. M. (2020a) Exploring the socio-technical interplay of Industry
11 4.0: a single case study of an Italian manufacturing organisation. In *Proceedings of the 6th*
12 *International Workshop on Socio-Technical Perspective in IS Development (STPIS 2020)*,
13 June 8-9, 2020. CEUR Workshop Proceedings (CEUR-WS.org)

14
15
16 Margherita, E. G., & Braccini, A. M. (2020b) Industry 4.0 Technologies in Flexible Manufacturing
17 for Sustainable Organizational Value: Reflections from a Multiple Case Study of Italian
18 Manufacturers. *Information Systems Frontiers*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-020-10047-y>

19
20
21 Margherita, E. G., & Braccini, A. M. (2020c) Organizational Impacts on Sustainability of Industry
22 4.0: A Systematic Literature Review from Empirical Case Studies. In: R. Agrifoglio, R.
23 Lamboglia, D. Mancini, & F. Ricciardi (eds.) *Digital Business Transformation Organizing,*
24 *Managing and Controlling in the Information Age* (pp. 173–186). Springer.
25 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47355-6_12

26
27
28 Margherita, E. G., & Braccini, A. M. (2021) Managing the Fourth Industrial Revolution: A
29 Competence Framework for Smart Factory. In: Hamdan A., Hassanien A.E., Razzaque A.,
30 A.B. (ed.) *The Fourth Industrial Revolution: Implementation of Artificial Intelligence for*
31 *Growing Business Success*. *Studies in Computational Intelligence*. Springer.
32 https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-62796-6_23

33
34
35 Margherita, E. G., & Bua, I. (2021) The role of Human Resource Practices for the development of
36 Operator 4.0 in Industry 4.0 organisations: A literature review and a Research Agenda.
37 *Businesses*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/businesses1010002>

38
39
40 Müller, Julian M. (2019) Assessing the barriers to Industry 4.0 implementation from a workers'
41 perspective. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 52(13): 2189–2194.
42 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2019.11.530>

43
44
45 Müller, Julian Marius, Buliga, O., & Voigt, K. I. (2018) Fortune favors the prepared: How SMEs
46 approach business model innovations in Industry 4.0. *Technological Forecasting and Social*
47 *Change*, 132: 2–17

48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Mumford, E. (2003) Redesigning Human Systems. IGI Global
- 2 Prause, G., Atari, S., Prause, G., & Atari, S. (2017) On sustainable production networks for Industry
3 4.0. Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues, Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Center,
4 4(4): 421–431
5
6
7
- 8 Ruggieri, A., Braccini, A. M., Poponi, S., & Mosconi, E. M. (2016) A Meta-Model of Inter-
9 Organisational Cooperation for the Transition to a Circular Economy. Sustainability, 8(11):
10 1153. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su8111153>
11
12
13
- 14 Sarker, S., Chatterjee, S., Xiao, X., & Elbanna, A. (2019) The Sociotechnical Axis of Cohesion for
15 IS discipline: its historical legacy and its continued relevance. MIS Quarterly 43(3): 695–719
16
17
18
- 19 Sarker, S., Chatterjee, S., & Xiao, X. (2013) How “Sociotechnical” Is Our IS Research? An
20 Assessment and Possible Ways Forward. In: R. Baskerville, & M. Chau (eds), Proceedings of
21 the 34th International Conference on Information Systems. ICIS 2013, 1–24
22
23
24
- 25 Sawyer, S., & Jarrahi, M. H. (2014) Sociotechnical Approaches to the Study of Information
26 Systems. In Computing Handbook, 3rd ed. In: A. Tucker, & H. Topi (eds), Computing
27 Handbook: Information systems and information technology, 3rd Edition. Boca Raton, FL:
28 Taylor & Francis.
29
30
31
32
- 33 Sayar, D., & Er, Ö. (2018) The Antecedents of Successful IoT Service and System Design: Cases
34 from the Manufacturing Industry. International Journal of Design, 12(1): 67–78
35
36
37
- 38 Sony, M., & Naik, S. (2019a) Critical factors for the successful implementation of Industry 4.0: a
39 review and future research direction. Production Planning and Control: 1–17.
40
41 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2019.1691278>
42
43
- 44 Sony, M., & Naik, S. (2019b) Key ingredients for evaluating Industry 4.0 readiness for
45 organizations: a literature review. Benchmarking. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-09-2018-0284>
46
47
- 48 Sony, M., & Naik, S. (2020) Industry 4.0 integration with socio-technical systems theory: A
49 systematic review and proposed theoretical model. Technology in Society, 61: 101248.
50
51 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101248>
52
53
- 54 Stock, T., & Seliger, G. (2016) Opportunities of Sustainable Manufacturing in Industry 4.0.
55 Procedia CIRP, 40: 536–541. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2016.01.129>
56
57
- 58 Trist, E. (1981). The sociotechnical perspective: The evolution of sociotechnical systems as a
59 conceptual framework and as an action research program. Perspectives on Organizational
60
61
62
63
64
65

Design and Behavior. John Wiley and Sons, New York

Von Bertalanffy, L. (1972) The History and Status of General Systems Theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 15(4)

Walsham, G. (2006) Doing interpretive research. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 15(3), 320–330. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ejis.3000589>

Yin, R. K. (2002) *Case study research: Design and methods*. (SAGE Publications, Ed.) (Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks, CA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65