



---

RESEARCH ARTICLE

---

EXPLORING IT DECISION MAKERS' VIEWS ON ADOPTION OF CLOUD  
MANUFACTURING IN TURKEY

Can SAYGINER \* 

Management Information Systems Department, University of Applied Sciences Faculty, Yasar University, Izmir, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Cloud manufacturing has emerged as a breakthrough of IT services, including the internet of things (IoT) and artificial intelligence (AI) for business processes in the manufacturing sector. It has also brought the need to complete the integrated business processes such as an integrated supply chain, inventory management, and production for utilizing this technology. In this context, IT decision-makers attempt to develop a cloud-based manufacturing model for downloading, configuring, and maintaining machinery from cloud providers that enables the top managers just to focus on their product in business. The research aims to build for monitoring the differences between cloud manufacturing adopters and non-adopters to understand the behavioral intention by monitoring the Diffusion of Innovation (DOI) theory and the Technological, Organizational, and Environmental (TOE) theory of cloud manufacturing adoption. An independent t-test sample was used to analyze data. 19 manufacturing cloud adopters and 19 non-cloud adopters were selected to analyze data via SPSS 26.0 in Turkey. The results exhibited that manufacturing cloud adopters and non-cloud adopters considered the same for relative advantage, cost-saving, competitive pressure, and regulatory support. However, they found differences in security concerns, compatibility, complexity, technological readiness, and top management support. The study brought an outlook for understanding the benefits, drawbacks, and hindlers of cloud manufacturing of manufacturers. This will enable comprehensive information for cloud providers to offer appropriate integrated software according to manufacturers' needs of the production.

**Keywords:** Cloud Manufacturing Adoption, IT decision-makers, Independent t-test analysis, DOI theory, TOE theory

---

1. INTRODUCTION

With Web 3.0 technology, cloud computing has changed the way business model and operation management was operated in the manufacturing sector by the digital transformation [1]. With this technology shift, cloud-based manufacturing was developed to enclose cloud computing, virtualization, and the Internet of things (IoT) for these operations to increase productivity and decrease costs [2]. Along with these benefits, the investment in cloud manufacturing has also been increased recently and in the future. CtrlS [3] underlined that spending on cloud-based manufacturing was \$19.1 billion in 2017 and is expected to raise \$28.8 billion by 2028. With the cloud manufacturing market growth numerically, it was undoubtedly seen that cloud computing usage was demanded. 88 percent of manufacturing enterprises considered moving to the cloud [3]. Cloud computing was nearly implemented by 66 percent of manufacturing enterprises in practice [4]. 82 percent of manufacturing enterprises applied product lifecycle management (PLM) strategies and applications to shift their real-time business decisions through cloud manufacturing. Thus, the study is required as it contributes to obtaining information from Turkish manufacturers to adopt cloud manufacturing and giving a comprehensive knowledge about the possibility of barriers to cloud manufacturing providers

There have been several definitions of the cloud. The description of the cloud was defined as data, which was stored outside of servers [5]. Hoberg et al. [6] described the cloud as software, which is hosted by the internet. Youseff et al. [7] defined the cloud as the virtualization of computers to utilize manufacturers' operations. Cloud was described as a pay-per-use model of software over the internet

---

\*Corresponding Author: [cansayginer@gmail.com](mailto:cansayginer@gmail.com)

Received: 23.12.2021 Published: 23.08.2022

[8]. Lele [9] defined the cloud as an environment, in which the automated system was built by the external cloud suppliers under service level agreements.

The definitions of cloud manufacturing are varied by distinct scholars. Wu et. al. [10] described cloud manufacturing as a demand-driven manufacturing model to develop flexible solutions for industrial systems. Milisavljevic-Syeda et al. [11] extended the cloud manufacturing definition as utilization of real-time data for contributing real-time supply chain under the internet of things(IoT) enabled quality improvement and robot improvement. Hence, Mukhopadhyay & Mukhopadhyay [12] suggested the term cloud-based manufacturing that has become a basis of Industrial 4.0 development with artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning to build a continuous improvement frame for sustaining the businesses' existence. There are many benefits of cloud manufacturing, as well as limitations. The benefits of cloud manufacturing were classified into two groups: business and technical. From the business perspective, automated ordering systems mentioned by Forbes [13] were applied to minimize inventory costs. Business intelligence was integrated to apply company-wide intelligence [14]. From the technical perspective, cloud manufacturing served to build elasticity in resource allocation and develop desktop grid applications based on the size and storage of manufacturers [15]. The limitations of cloud manufacturing were lack of control and perceived weaker security [16]. For lack of control, the cloud computing architectural plan for cloud manufacturing adoption was obliged to specify the level of adoption to avoid dependency over cloud manufacturing providers. For perceived weaker security, data owners should have absolute authorization to access data at any time [15]. They should also cooperate with IT auditors to audit the IT assets by specifying control procedures against volatile attacks [17].

There are several studies, in which IT adoption theories were held. Sallehudin et al. [18] proposed a DOI theory to observe the successful implementation of cloud computing adoption from a technical perspective. Alajmi et al. [19] presented an integrated DOI and fit viability model (FVM) to observe the benefits of cloud computing adoption from a manager's perspective. Gutierrez et al. [20] developed a technological, organizational, and environmental (TOE) model to observe the factors influencing cloud computing adoption from an external perspective. There are plenty of studies related to cloud manufacturing adoption in the manufacturing sector. Saleem Al-Shura et al. [21] investigated the important factors in the Pharmaceutical sector in Jordan. Narkhede et al. [22] formed a SWOT analysis for the strategic survival of Indian manufacturing sectors. Oliveira et al. [23] compared manufacturers with the service sector about the necessity of cloud-based service offerings adoption in Portugal. Kyriakou et al. [24] explored the factors affecting cloud computing adoption of glass, ceramic, and cement sectors in France, the UK, Italy, Germany Spain, and Poland. Yassin& Alnidawy [25] specified the adoption requirements of the manufacturing sector in Iraq. Seifu et al. [26] inspected public and private manufacturers in Ethiopia. Goktas& Baysal [27] examined the cloud-based human resource systems in Turkish manufacturers. Narkhede et al. [22] probed the educational sector of India. As a result, there are researches on cloud computing adoption applied IT adoption theories there is no specific study to compare non-cloud manufacturers and cloud manufacturers by applying IT adoption theories such as DOI theory, institution theory, and TOE models for developing countries.

The study has the contribution for cloud manufacturing providers and cloud manufacturing market by analyzing non-cloud manufacturers and cloud manufacturer adopters' intentions over a cloud manufacturing adoption. Since there are no specific studies to compare non-cloud manufacturers and cloud manufacturers applied IT adoption theories, DOI and TOE model was proposed in this study to understand the behavioral differences among non-cloud manufacturers and cloud manufacturers from both technical and external aspects

## **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This study compares and contrasts innovation diffusion factors and TOE factors towards cloud adopters and non-cloud adopters in the manufacturing sector in Turkey. Corresponding research questions are:

1. What are IT decision makers' views about innovation diffusion and TOE factors of cloud adopter manufacturers over non-cloud adopter manufacturers?
2. Are there any significant differences in the views of innovation diffusion and TOE factors of cloud adopter manufacturers over non-cloud adopter manufacturers?

The research design was descriptive and deductive with the independent variable of adopter types (adopter or non-adopter). The independent variables were derived from DOI and TOE theory. The first part of the study consists of eight demographic information of IT decision-makers in terms of gender, education level, working experience, age, market region, cloud application use with numbers, company sizes, and sectors as shown in Table 1. The second part of the study contains DOI and TOE theories questionnaires, including 5 Likert scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) as shown in Table 2.

**Table 1.** Demographic information of participants

<b>IT Decision Makers (N=38)</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequencies</b>	<b>Percentages</b>
<b>1. Gender</b>	Male	23	60.5%
	Female	15	39.5%
<b>2. Education Level</b>	High School	1	2.6%
	Vocational School	2	5.3%
	Graduate	24	63.2%
	Postgraduate	10	26.3%
	Doctorate	1	2.6%
<b>3. Working Experience</b>	1-3 years	6	15.8%
	4- 7 years	11	28.9%
	8- 10 years	11	28.9%
	11-20 years	7	18.4%
	21 years and above	3	8.0%
<b>4. Age</b>	Age 20-25	0	0%
	Age 26-30	11	28.9%
	Age 31-35	10	26.4%
	Age 36-40	5	13.2%
	Age 41-45	1	2.6%
	Age 46 and above	11	28.9%
<b>5. Market Region</b>	International	23	60.5%
	National	15	39.5%
<b>6. Cloud App with Numbers</b>	1-3 services	13	34.2%
	4-6 services	3	7.9%
	7 and above services	3	10.5 %
	None	19	53.5%
<b>7. Company Size</b>	Micro Manufacturers (1-9)	8	21.1%
	SMEs (10-249)	19	50.0%
	Large Manufacturers	11	28.9%
<b>8. Sectors</b>	Textile	5	13.1%
	Automotive	1	2.6%
	Energy	2	5.2%
	Construction	3	7.8%
	Ceramics	2	5.2%
	Pharmaceutical	3	7.8%
	Food	22	57.8%

The data was collected from 38 manufacturing companies. The most frequencies and percentages of IT decision-maker profiles are graduate males aged between 26 and 35, working between 4 and 10 years

in the international and small and medium companies, using between 1 and 3 cloud-based services in the food sector, as illustrated in Table 1. The proportions of the sectors were the food sector by 57.8%, 13.1% by textile sector, construction sector by 7.8%, pharmaceutical sector by 7.8%, energy sector by 5.2%, ceramics sector by 5.2%, and automotive sector by 2.6%.

The aim of using an independent t-test is to understand whether relative advantage, cost-saving, security concerns, compatibility and complexity adopted from DOI theory, and technological readiness, top management support, competitive pressure, and regulatory support adopted from TOE theory differed based on cloud adopters and non-cloud adopters.

Here are the null (H0) and the alternate hypothesis (H1) of DOI theory from ‘a’ to ‘e’.

**H0a:** There is no difference in relative advantage (RA) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

And the alternative hypothesis is:

**H1a:** There is a difference in relative advantage (RA) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

**H0b:** There is no difference in cost-saving (CS) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

And the alternative hypothesis is:

**H1b:** There is a difference in cost-saving (CS) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

**H0c:** There is no difference in security concerns (SC) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

And the alternative hypothesis is:

**H1c:** There is a difference in security concerns (SC) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

**H0d:** There is no difference in compatibility (CO) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

And the alternative hypothesis is:

**H1d:** There is a difference in compatibility (CO ) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

**H0e:** There is no difference in complexity (CX) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

And the alternative hypothesis is:

**H1e:** There is a difference in complexity (CX) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

Here are the null (H0) and the alternate hypothesis (H1) of TOE theory from ‘f’ to ‘i’.

**H0f:** There is no difference in technological readiness (TR) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

And the alternative hypothesis is:

**H1f:** There is a difference in technological readiness (TR) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

**H0g:** There is no difference in top management support (TMS) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

And the alternative hypothesis is:

**H1g:** There is a difference in top management support (TMS) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

**H0h:** There is no difference in competitive pressure (CP) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

And the alternative hypothesis is:

**H1h:** There is a difference in competitive pressure (CP) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

**H0i:** There is no difference in regulatory support (RS) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

And the alternative hypothesis is:

**H1i:** There is a difference in regulatory support (RS) between cloud adopter manufacturers and non-cloud adopter manufacturers.

The results and discussion of the demographic data, DOI and TOE factors were specified in the following sections.

### 3. RESULTS

The data is also normally distributed. As it is illustrated in Table 2, the skewness (SK) values and the kurtosis (RKU) values of the range should be between -1 and +1 [28], which all factors were satisfied except the relative advantage factor of cloud manufacturing adopters and the compatibility factor of non-cloud manufacturing adopters. The skewness (SK) values and the kurtosis (RKU) values of the range were between -1.5 and +1.5 [29], which is the relative advantage factor of cloud manufacturing adopters, the security concerns, compatibility, and technology readiness factors of non-cloud manufacturing adopters were satisfied.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare factors of DOI and TOE theory in cloud manufacturing adopters and non-cloud manufacturing adopters. The result was also declared below and presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Mean (M), standard deviations (SD), skewness (SK), and Kurtosis (RKU), and the Results for manufacturing cloud adopters and non-cloud adopters

(N=38)	MANUFACTURING CLOUD ADOPTERS				MANUFACTURING NON-CLOUD ADOPTERS				RESULTS
	M	SD	SK	RKU	M	SD	SK	RKU	
<b>DOI Theory</b>									
RA (Items 1-5)	3.74	0.54	1.06	1.30	3.63	0.66	0.32	-0.08	<b>H0a Supported</b>
CS (Items 6-8)	3.56	0.55	0.96	0.80	3.36	0.56	-0.18	0.76	<b>H0b Supported</b>
SC (Items 9-11)	2.80	0.50	-0.16	-0.42	3.82	0.86	-0.09	-1.29	<b>H1c Supported</b>
CO (Items 12-15)	3.68	0.82	0.32	-0.80	2.86	0.75	-1.20	1.63	<b>H1d Supported</b>
CX (Items 16-19)	2.65	0.71	0.44	1.15	3.14	0.62	-0.10	-0.50	<b>H1e Supported</b>
<b>TOE Theory</b>									
<b>Technological Context</b>									
TR (Items 20-21)	3.65	0.97	-0.14	-1.02	2.86	0.66	-0.09	-1.37	<b>H1f Supported</b>
<b>Organizational Context</b>									
TMS (Items 22-24)	3.78	0.73	0.21	-0.98	2.94	0.65	0.44	-0.25	<b>H1g Supported</b>
<b>Environmental Context</b>									
CP (Items 26-28)	2.94	0.80	-0.27	-1.24	2.70	0.73	-0.42	-0.01	<b>H0h Supported</b>
RS (Item 28-29)	2.94	0.79	0.65	1.33	2.76	0.51	-0.95	0.85	<b>H0i Supported</b>

- RA is found that there is no significant difference between adopters ( $M = 3.74$ ,  $SD = 0.54$ ) and non-adopters ( $M = 3.63$ ,  $SD = 0.66$ ) with  $t(36) = -0.586$ ,  $p = 0.562$ . **(H0a Supported)**
- CS is found that there is no significant difference between adopters ( $M = 3.56$ ,  $SD = 0.55$ ) and non-adopters ( $M = 3.36$ ,  $SD = 0.56$ ) with  $t(36) = -1.061$ ,  $p = 0.296$ . **(H0b Supported)**
- SC is found as the significant difference between adopters ( $M = 2.80$ ,  $SD = 0.91$ ) and non-adopters ( $M = 3.82$ ,  $SD = 0.86$ ) with  $t(28.883) = 4.444$ ,  $p = 0.000$ . **(H1c Supported)**
- CO is found as the significant difference between adopters ( $M = 3.68$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ ) and non-adopters ( $M = 2.86$ ,  $SD = 0.75$ ) with  $t(36) = -3.179$ ,  $p = 0.003$ . **(H1d Supported)**
- CX is found as the significant difference between adopters ( $M = 2.65$ ,  $SD = 0.71$ ) and non-adopters ( $M = 3.14$ ,  $SD = 0.62$ ) with  $t(36) = 2.229$ ,  $p = 0.032$ . **(H1e Supported)**
- TR is found as the significant difference between adopters ( $M = 3.65$ ,  $SD = 0.97$ ) and non-adopters ( $M = 2.86$ ,  $SD = 0.66$ ) with  $t(36) = -2.923$ ,  $p = 0.012$ . **(H1f Supported)**
- TMS is found as the significant difference between adopters ( $M = 3.78$ ,  $SD = 0.73$ ) and non-adopters ( $M = 2.94$ ,  $SD = 0.65$ ) with  $t(36) = -3.753$ ,  $p = 0.000$ . **(H1g Supported)**
- CP is found that there is no significant difference between adopters ( $M = 3.78$ ,  $SD = 0.89$ ) and non-adopters ( $M = 2.94$ ,  $SD = 0.85$ ) with  $t(36) = -0.983$ ,  $p = 0.332$ . **(H0h Supported)**
- RS is found that there is no significant difference between adopters ( $M = 3.78$ ,  $SD = 0.89$ ) and non-adopters ( $M = 2.94$ ,  $SD = 0.85$ ) with  $t(36) = -0.848$ ,  $p = 0.403$ . **(H0i Supported)**

## **4. DISCUSSION**

Cloud manufacturing adoption was at a low level in every sector since only 34.2% of the manufacturers used 1-3 cloud manufacturing services. Adopters related to RA, CS, CP, and RS had also the commonly perceived judgment, whereas non-adopters related to SC, CO, CX, TR, and TMS had different opinions over cloud manufacturing adoption. Amongst the sectors, the highest participants were the food sectors, which affected the results over more agreeing on environmental effects but consider differently over technological and organizational factors. Common and different judgments were declared in the subsections.

### **4.1. Current Common Views on Cloud Manufacturing Adoption among Manufacturing Adopter and Manufacturing Non-adopters**

IT adopters of Manufacturing Adopter and IT adopters of Manufacturing Non-Adopter agreed with each other about RA (H0a), CS (H0b), CP (H0h), and RS(H0i).

For RA, manufacturing cloud manufacturing adopters and non-cloud manufacturing adopters agreed equally that cloud manufacturing adoption finishes specific tasks rapidly, uses business operations easily, improves the quality of operations, offers new opportunities, and increases productivity. Applying the human factor and the automated processes at the right time is important for the process of product design and supply chain to reach customers fast via cloud manufacturing [30]

For CS, manufacturing cloud adopters are considered the same as non-cloud manufacturer adopters about cloud manufacturing adoption that has benefits over adoption costs, decreasing energy costs,

environmental costs, and decreasing maintenance costs. Applying a cost-benefit analysis of production planning, return of investment of supply chain tools, and cloud manufacturing provider selection is significant for manufacturers to specify the invariable costs within a reasonable budget [31].

For CP, manufacturing cloud adopters and manufacturing non-cloud adopters agreed equally because of influencing competition in their industry and their competitors have already started using cloud computing. Application program interface (API), cloud, and artificial intelligence (AI) are the main challenges of cloud manufacturing adoption for the internet & IT systems of manufacturers [32].

For RS, manufacturing cloud adopters admitted equally that there is legal protection in the use of cloud computing and the laws and regulations that exist nowadays are sufficient to protect the use of cloud manufacturing. Because of the absence of the safe harbor agreement in Turkey against Europe and the US for data migration, third-party cloud providers have vulnerable defects for preventing patents, industrial design, and trademarks [33].

#### **4.2. Current Different Views on Cloud Manufacturing Adoption among Manufacturing Adopter and Manufacturing Non-adopters**

IT adopters of Manufacturing Adopter and IT adopters of Manufacturing Non-Adopter consider differently about SC (H1c), CO (H1d), CX (H1e), TR (H1f), and TMS (H1g) with the mean differences -1.02, 0.82, -0.49, 0.79, and 0.84, respectively

For SC, the company's data security concerns, customer data security concerns, and concerns about privacy manufacturing of non-cloud adopters in cloud manufacturing were by far higher than the cloud manufacturing adopters. Creating a policy and procedures is important for every step of IT assets such as RFID, QR barcode, and computer-aided manufacturing (CAM) systems, as they can reduce the vulnerability of inside attacks and threats of outside attacks in the supply chain [17]. Computer-assisted audit techniques should be applied by IT auditors to trace bugs, unpermitted entry of networks, and report to the top managers [34].

For CO, cloud adopter manufacturers were much different from non-cloud adopter manufacturers in that they fit the work style of the company, are compatible with business operations, with the company's corporate culture and value system, and with existing hardware and software in the company. Creating education platforms and guidelines is significant to specify the job descriptions for deploying every workers' duties and evolving their qualifications in every workstation of the assembly lines [35]. Audit evidence collection techniques such as interviews and preliminary surveys should be conducted to understand the business risks and the critical processes of business operations [34].

For CX, cloud manufacturing adopters had slightly a high level of mental effort, the advanced skills than non-cloud manufacturing adopters. The data of manufacturing processing planning (MRP), warehouse management, assembly-line monitoring, and customer relationship management should be linked in the centralized database system for gathering the simplicity of manufacturing systems [17]. Business process improvement and business process reengineering should be applied in the short and long term of avoiding complexity by forming project groups from separate business functions, such as marketing, sales, production, and human resources [31]

For TR, cloud manufacturing adopters much more had necessary IT infrastructures and a high level of internet access to implement cloud computing than non-cloud manufacturing adopters. 5G internet is an important basis for increasing broadband data connection and internet bandwidth speed, which it is expected to build in the next years [33]. Fiber buildings should be built for using IT assets effectively for the next decades to build IoT applications with algorithmic artificial intelligence solutions [32].

For TMS cloud manufacturing adopters much more had strong leadership and an ability to take financial and organizational risks than non-cloud manufacturing adopters. Line managers and staff in the workstations should be collaborated to reduce blocking and starving situations against bottleneck issues in the company's operations [35]. Enterprise systems such as Enterprise resource planning (ERP), supply chain management system (SCM), and customer relationship management (CRM) should be well-integrated to report top-level managers as clear spreadsheets to forecast the operating, sales, production, and human resource plan [36].

IT decision-makers should specify hindrances, and drawbacks of cloud manufacturing adoption according to their IT assets, policies, procedures, guidelines for the automated and manual processes of their companies' business processes. IT decision-makers should also build a centralized database system for the integration of Application program interface (API), cloud, and artificial intelligence (AI) into their master MRP systems processes to reach customers fast in the market by considering the cost-benefit analysis of the production and supply chain.

## **5.CONCLUSION**

The research contributes to cloud providers for understanding the enthusiasm of non-adopters into two theories: DOI and TOE theory. It also gives the courage of manufacturing non-cloud adopters by acknowledging them of manufacturing cloud adopters' views before cloud manufacturing adoption. The results show that there is a far difference in security concerns, much difference in compatibility, top management support, and technological readiness, and a slight difference in complexity among manufacturing cloud adopters and manufacturing non-cloud adopters, whereas there is not a significant difference in relative advantage, cost-saving, competitive pressure, and regulatory support among manufacturing cloud adopters and manufacturing non-cloud adopters.

Internal factors such as trialability and prior IT experience factors could be applied to examine cloud manufacturing adoption processes from previous experiences. This study will also be extended by monitoring small and medium enterprises (SMEs), large enterprises (LEs), and international companies (IC) for further cloud manufacturing adoption research.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to thank the manufacturer respondents in Turkey for their time and participation.

## **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The author stated that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this article.

## **REFERENCES**

- [1] Al-jawazneh BE. The prospects of cloud computing in supply chain management (A theoretical perspective). *Journal of Management Research* 2016; 8: 145-158.
- [2] <https://www.marketwatch.com/press-release/global-cloud-manufacturing-market-size-rising-at-112-cagr-to-reach-86290-million-usd-by-2027-2021-12-03>
- [3] <https://www.ctrls.in/blog/cloud-adoption-trends-manufacturing-sector-insights-global-vs-indian-scenario/>



- [4] <https://www.industryweek.com/cloud-computing/article/22024167/cloud-computing-in-the-manufacturing-industry-dont-get-left-behind>
- [5] Bento A, Bento R. Cloud computing: A new phase in information technology management. *Journal of Information Technology Management* 2011; 22: 39-46.
- [6] Hoberg P, Wollersheim J, Krcmar H. The business perspective on cloud computing-A literature review of research on cloud computing. *AMCIS 2012 Proceedings; Research on Cloud Computing*; August 9-12, 2012; Seattle, 5.
- [7] Youseff L, Butrico MA, Da Silva D. Toward a unified ontology of cloud computing: Grid computing environments workshop. *GCE'08*; 12-16 Nov. 2008; pp. 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1109/GCE.2008.4738443>
- [8] Marston S, Li Z, Bandyopadhyay S, Zhang J, Ghalsasin A. Cloud computing — The business perspective. *Decision Support Systems* 2011; 51: 176–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2010.12.006>
- [9] Lele A. Cloud computing: Disruptive technologies for the militaries and security, smart innovation, *Systems and Technologies*, 2019. pp. 167–185. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-3384-2\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-3384-2_10)
- [10] Wu D, Greer MJ, Rosen DW, Schaefer D. Cloud manufacturing: Strategic vision and state-of-the-art. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems* 2013; 32: 564-579.
- [11] Milisavljevic-Syed J, Thames JL, Schaefer D. The digitization of design and manufacturing: A state-of-the-art report on the transition from strategic vision to implementation in industry. *Procedia CIRP* 2020; 93: 575-580.
- [12] Mukhopadhyay BR, Mukhopadhyay BK. Industry 4.0, Leveraging the fourth industrial revolution, *The Sentinel* 2021, Editorial, 3rd November.
- [13] <https://www.forbes.com/sites/louiscolombus/2013/05/06/ten-ways-cloud-computing-is-revolutionizing-manufacturing/?sh=213948d2859c>
- [14] Sadiku MN, Ashaolu TJ, Ajayi-Majebi A, Musa, SM. The Essence of Cloud Manufacturing. *International Journal of Scientific Advances (IJSCIA)* 2020; 1: 109- 111.
- [15] Wang P, Gao RX, Fan Z. Cloud computing for cloud manufacturing: benefits and limitations. *Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering* 2015, 137: 040901.
- [16] Srilakshmi M, Veenadhari CHL, Pradeep IK. Deployment models of cloud computing: challenges. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer Science* 2013; 4: 135-138.
- [17] Wright CS. *The IT regulatory and standards compliance handbook: How to survive information systems audit and assessments*. Burlington. MA, USA: Elsevier, 2008.
- [18] Sallehudin H, Razak RC, Ismail, M. Factors influencing cloud computing adoption in the public sector: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business* 2015; 3: 30–45. <https://doi.org/10.17687/JEB.0301.03>

- [19] Alajmi Q, Arshah RA, Kamaludin A, Sadiq AS, Al-Sharafi MA. A conceptual model of e-learning based on cloud computing adoption in higher education institutions. 2017 International Conference on Electrical and Computing Technologies and Applications, ICECTA; 21-23 Nov. 2017; Ras Al Khaimah, United Arab Emirates. pp. 1-6.
- [20] Gutierrez A, Boukrami E, Lumsden R. Technological, organizational, and environmental factors influencing managers' decision to adopt cloud computing in the UK. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management* 2015; 28: 788-807. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEIM-01-2015-0001>
- [21] Al-Shura MS, Zabadi AM, Abughazaleh M, Alhadi MA. Critical success factors for adopting cloud computing in pharmaceutical manufacturing companies. *Management and Economics Review*, 2018; 3: 123-137.
- [22] Narkhede BE, Raut RD, Narwane VS, Bhandarkar BM, Pundir AK. Assessing the Determinants of Cloud Computing Adoption for Educational Sector. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*; July 26-27, 2018; Paris, France. pp. 1277-1290.
- [23] Oliveira T, Thomas M, Espadanal M. Assessing the determinants of cloud computing adoption: An analysis of the manufacturing and services sectors. *Information & Management*, 2014; 51: 497-510.
- [24] Kyriakou N, Maragoudakis M, Loukis E, Themistocleous M. Prediction of propensity for enterprise cloud computing adoption. *Proceedings of the 50th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*; January 4-7, 2017. pp 4907-4916.
- [25] Yassin AT, Alnidawy BK. A taxonomy of: The reviews on Cloud Computing Direction (CCD). *Journal of Advanced Computer Science & Technology*, 2015;4: 204-211.
- [26] Seifu SD, Dahiru AA, Bass JM, Allison IK. Cloud- computing: Adoption issues for Ethiopian public and private enterprises. *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries* 2017; 78: 1-14.
- [27] Goktas P, Baysal, H. Türkiye’de dijital insan kaynaklari yönetiminde bulut bilişim. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2018; 23: 1409-1424.
- [28] Hair JF, Ringle, CM, Sarstedt, M. Partial least squares structural equation modeling: Rigorous applications, better results and higher acceptance. *Long Range Planning*, 2013; 46: 1-12.
- [29] Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS. *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon, 2007.
- [30] Henzel R, Herzwurm G. Cloud Manufacturing: A state-of-the-art survey of current issues. *Procedia CIRP*, 2018; 72: 947-952.
- [31] Bradford M. *Modern ERP: Select, Implement, & Use Today's Advanced Business Systems*. 3rd ed. North Carolina, NC, USA: Microsoft Copyright, 2015.
- [32] Pizurica V. *When IoT Meets Artificial Intelligence*, Internet of Things Event 2016, 5th ed.
- [33] [https://cloudscorecard.bsa.org/2018/pdf/BSA\\_2018\\_Global\\_Cloud\\_Scorecard.pdf](https://cloudscorecard.bsa.org/2018/pdf/BSA_2018_Global_Cloud_Scorecard.pdf)

- [34] Doshi, H. CISA- Certified information systems auditor study guide. Birmingham, UK: Packt Publishing, 2020.
- [35] Groover MP. Fundamentals of modern manufacturing: materials, processes, and systems. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons, 2020.
- [36] Laudon KC., Laudon JP. Management Information Systems: Managing the Digital Firm. 15th ed. New York, USA: Pearson Education Inc, 2019.