The North African Journal of Scientific Publishing (NAJSP)
مجلة شمال إفريقيا للنشر العلمي (NAJSP)
E-ISSN: 2959-4820
Volume 4, Issue 3, 2026
Page No: 81-93
Website: https://najsp.com/index.php/home/index
SJIFactor 2024: 5.49 | معامل التأثير العربي (AIF) 2025: 0.69 | ISI 2024: 0.696

The Impact of AI on Turkey's Manufacturing Industries

Nouri Ali[1], Osama ALmabrouk[2], Husayn Abo Showfa[3], Kamal Asanousi[4], Mosa Abdesalam[5]
[1]Higher Institute of Medical Sciences and Technologies, Bani Walid, Libya
[2,3] College of Electronics Technology, Bani Walid, Libya
[4,5] Harouge Oil Operation, Libya

تأثير الذكاء الاصطناعي على الصناعات التحويلية في تركيا

نوري علي[1]، أسامة المبروك[2]، حسين أبو شوفة[3]، كمال السنوسي[4]، موسي عبد السلام[5]
[1]المعهد العالي للتقنيات الطبية، بني وليد، ليبيا
[2,3]كلية التقنية الالكترونية، بني وليد، ليبيا
[4,5]شركة الهروج النفطية، ليبيا

*Corresponding author: nouri.alhashi@gmail.com

Received: April 21, 2026	Accepted: June 30, 2026	Published: July 13, 2026

Abstract:
This paper aims to investigate how supply chains' sustainability performance might be improved using artificial intelligence AI in Turkey's manufacturing industries. The study used a quantitative methodology and included 350 manufacturing organizations in its sample, which Based on qualitative and quantitative. Furthermore, the paper highlighted that integrating artificial intelligence (AI) into business operations goes beyond merely advancing technology and becomes an essential requirement for improving sustainability and resilience. However, the study's emphasis on Turkey's industrial sectors suggests that more thorough research covering other businesses and domains is required. In conclusion; supply chain danger management could be greatly impacted by AI, which could have a significant effect on manufacturing in Turkey and possibly globally.

Keywords: Supply Chain Danger Management, Artificial Intelligence, Sustainability Performance, Manufacturing Industries.

الملخص
يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة الكيفية التي يمكن بها للذكاء الاصطناعي تعزيز أداء الاستدامة في سلاسل التوريد ضمن قطاع الصناعات التحويلية في تركيا. وقد اعتمدت الدراسة منهجية كمية وشملت عينة مكونة من 350 مؤسسة تصنيع، مع استخدام مزيج من الأساليب النوعية والكمية. وعلاوة على ذلك، أبرزت الدراسة أن دمج الذكاء الاصطناعي في العمليات التجارية يتجاوز مجرد التطور التكنولوجي ليصبح مطلباً جوهرياً لتحسين الاستدامة والمرونة. ومع ذلك، فإن تركيز الدراسة على القطاعات الصناعية في تركيا يشير إلى الحاجة لإجراء مزيد من الأبحاث الشاملة التي تغطي قطاعات ومجالات أخرى. وفي الختام، يمكن القول إن إدارة مخاطر سلاسل التوريد قد تتأثر بشكل كبير بالذكاء الاصطناعي، مما قد يكون له أثر ملموس على قطاع التصنيع في تركيا، وربما على المستوى العالمي أيضاً.

الكلمات المفتاحية: إدارة مخاطر سلسلة التوريد، الذكاء الاصطناعي، أداء الاستدامة، الصناعات التحويلية.

1. Introduction

Since developments in one global business may have a big impact on other regions, modern organizations use supply chain management to aim for global competitiveness [1]. Effective supply chain management (SCM) places a high priority on the efficient and cost-effective movement of goods throughout all stages [2]. Businesses often experience potential disruptions in an increasingly unstable environment because of the uncertain and unpredictable regularity of disasters, market volatility, and regulatory changes 3]. Consequently, it is imperative that businesses consistently recognize, assess, manage, and monitor these dangers [4]. Even with its lengthy history, SCRM still faces challenges, especially in the wake of worldwide disasters like the pandemic [5]. Businesses are shifting from human to automated processes, from forecasting to predictive analytics in operations, and from reactive to proactive [6].

2. Related work

Global manufacturing industries now face previously unheard-of opportunities and difficulties due to the dynamic and rapidly evolving global economic environment. Turkey is no different because of its strategic location that links Europe and Asia [7]. Supply chain management became more complex as the business expanded, underscoring the significance of effective supply chain danger management (SCRM). Due to the increasing Regularity of unanticipated worldwide events including trade wars, natural disasters, and health crises, supply chain danger management (SCRM) has become increasingly important [8].

3. Finding Gaps in the Current Literature and Developing the Current Reach Hypotheses

Manufacturing and supply chain danger management offer valuable information. But further analysis reveals some gaps, especially when it comes to Turkey's manufacturing sectors, which is why the current research hypotheses were developed.

According to H1, AI improves Turkey's manufacturing companies' performance and need for danger. Although the use of AI in data analytics for need for forecasting is widely recognized [9]. The first theory is necessary since there is a lack of knowledge on the precise effects of AI on need for danger in the Turkish manufacturing environment Going on to H2, which deals with supply concerns, the existing corpus of study frequently focuses on the dynamics of global supply chains, highlighting multinational firms [10]. It is yet to be thoroughly investigated how AI may help mitigate these issues, potentially by improving supplier relationship management or real-time logistics optimization in the Turkish setting.H3 pertains to process dangers. While the adoption of Business 4.0 standards and technologies such as the Internet of Things (IoT) in manufacturing has been a topic of discussion [11], the direct influence of AI in mediating process dangers in Turkey's manufacturing sector has been given limited attention.

Finally, H4 examines the potential of AI in impacting environmental dangers and performance. As the global consciousness veers towards sustainable manufacturing and the environmental impact of industries [12], based on AI in predicting, mitigating, and control these dangers becomes pivotal. However, literature often leans towards broad environmental goals rather than the specific dangers encountered by.

4. Main Parts

H1: Need for danger is positively impacted by AI.
H2: AI helps to lower support danger.
H3: Processing danger is positively impacted by AI.
H4: AI need for environmental danger in a favourable way.

5. Proposed Method

5.1. Research Design

For this paper, a quantitative approach was chosen since it makes it possible to evaluate variables objectively and get statistical results from them [13]. Using a quantitative framework, the purpose of the study is to look at the trends and relationships between the application of AI and how it affects supply chains' sustainability performance in Turkey's industrial sectors. The primary means of data collection was the online survey, which made it possible to efficiently distribute and compile answers from a wide variety of industrial companies. Using this viewpoint, the study seeks to evaluate the degree and nature of AI's impact on supply chain sustainability, making sure that any conclusions drawn are backed by quantifiable facts. According to the positivist paradigm, using an online survey offers a solid foundation for examining the intricate dynamics of this contemporary topic [14].

5.2 Sample and Population

To fully appreciate the breadth and depth of a study's conclusions, one must have a thorough understanding of the population and sample. It offers the gathered data context, magnitude, and relevance, which in turn lends weight to the analysis that follows.

5.2.1 Population under Study

5.2.2 Criteria for Inclusion

Several inclusion criteria were established in order to need for the population and guarantee that the respondents were pertinent to the study's focus on supply chain sustainability and artificial intelligence. Businesses that qualify for the study have to: Take an active part in Turkish manufacturing activities. Engage in supply chain management to some extent, whether it be basic or sophisticated.

- Be receptive to implementing AI in business operations or supply chain procedures.

5.3 Instrumentation

The following sections explore the fundamental research areas in further detail. The presentation included inquiries regarding the degree and characteristics of AI implementation in supply chain operations, the perceived advantages and difficulties, as well as the quantifiable effects on sustainability performance [15]. The questions were mostly designed as Likert-scale items, enabling respondents to express their level of agreement or Regularity regarding a specific habit or perception. The final section of the questionnaire was specifically allocated for open-ended questions. Although the main method used was quantitative, the inclusion of open-ended questions was intended to gather detailed and nuanced views, experiences, or suggestions from the participants, thereby enhancing the depth of the quantitative data [16].

5.4 Validity and Reliability

Validity and reliability are crucial foundations in quantitative research, ensuring that the instruments employed accurately measure their intended constructs and do so consistently. In this study, the effect of AI on supply chain sustainability in Turkey's manufacturing sector was examined using an online survey [17]. Stringent measures were implemented to ensure that both factors were effectively addressed.

5.5 Data Collection Method

An online survey was chosen as the investigation's instrument. SurveyMonkey, a platform renowned for its dependability, user-friendly interface, and flexibility, was used to send the survey [18]. However, to cater to Turkish speakers and ensure clarity, a professionally translated version was also provided. In order to avoid repeated responses from a single entity, the survey link included tracking capabilities. In order to maximize the extent of coverage, the distribution strategy employed a diverse approach. The main approach entailed sending the survey link directly to the official email addresses of eligible manufacturing companies. This was enhanced by distributing the link on relevant business forums, LinkedIn groups, and other professional platforms commonly visited by stakeholders in Turkey's manufacturing sector [19]. This strategy established a comprehensive market presence by specifically focusing on corporations while also expanding the reach through accessible channels.

5.6 Data Analysis

An essential aspect of every empirical study is the meticulous examination of the obtained data, guaranteeing that the findings align with the study's aims and offer practical insights. In the study titled "Supply Chain Danger Management: The Role of AI on Supply Chain Sustainability Performance among Manufacturing Industries of Turkey," precise data analysis techniques were crucial for uncovering the complex connections between the use of AI and how it affects the sustainability of supply chains in Turkey's various manufacturing industries. The researchers employed the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, which is well-known for its extensive toolkit that addresses a variety of quantitative research needs [20]. Numerous statistical tests were employed, taking into account the kind of data and the study's goals. Measures like mean, median, mode, and standard deviation are examples of descriptive statistics that provide a thorough overview of the responses' fundamental patterns and variability. To identify differences between groups, Statistical inference methods such as t-tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used, particularly in relation to different industrial business sectors. In addition, employed relationships analyses [21].

6. Results and Discussion

6.1 Data Reliability

The stability and consistency of the data gathered for the investigation are referred to as data dependability [22]. Strong dependability shows that the results are repeated and not the result of chance, which boosts the study's validity and reliability.

Table 1: Dependability of data.

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
AI	.918	4
Need for dangers	.722	4
Support dangers	.917	4
Process Dangers	.975	4
Environment Dangers	.943	4
Paragraph	.979	20

6.2 Respondents' Profile

This part provides a succinct overview of the organizational and demographic characteristics of the study participants. The data include details about the respondents' years of operation, business classification, educational background, and age group [23]. This data offers contextual information to understand the respondents' diverse backgrounds.

Table 2**:** Sector of the business

		Regularity	**Percent**	**Reliable**	**Totally**
Valid	Vehicles	51	14.6	14.6	14.6
	Materials	35	10.0	10.0	24.6
	Technologies	77	22.0	22.0	46.6
	Cuisine and Sweeteners	36	10.3	10.3	56.9
	Substances	39	11.1	11.1	68.0
	Equipment	39	11.1	11.1	79.1
	Medicines and Biotechnology	38	10.9	10.9	90.0
	Equipment for Agriculture	35	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	350	100.0	100.0	

Table 3: Staffs

		Regularity	**Percent**	**Reliable**	**Totally**
Valid	Less than 50	83	23.7	23.7	23.7
	50 to less than 100	69	19.7	19.7	43.4
	100 to less than 150	114	32.6	32.6	76.0
	150 and above	84	24.0	24.0	100.0
	Total	350	100.0	100.0	

Table 4: Period

		Regularity	**Percent**	**Reliable**	**Totally**
Valid	Less than 5 years	69	19.7	19.7	19.7
	5 to less than 10 years	118	33.7	33.7	53.4
	10 to less than 15	92	26.3	26.3	79.7
	15 and above	71	20.3	20.3	100.0
	Total	350	100.0	100.0	

Table 5: Major type

		Regularity	**Percent**	**Reliable**	**Totally**
Valid	Diploma	52	14.9	14.9	14.9
	Bachelors	128	36.6	36.6	51.4
	Master's	93	26.6	26.6	78.0
	Ph.D.	77	22.0	22.0	100.0
	Total	350	100.0	100.0	

Table 6: Age category

		Regularity	**Percent**	**Reliable**	**Totally**
Valid	18-24	104	29.7	29.7	29.7
	25-34	83	23.7	23.7	53.4
	35-44	106	30.3	30.3	83.7
	45 and above	57	16.3	16.3	100.0
	Total	350	100.0	100.0	

Table 7: The sex

		Regularity	Percent	Reliable percent	Totally
Valid	Male	160	45.7	45.7	45.7
	Female	190	54.3	54.3	100.0
	Total	350	100.0	100.0	

6.3 Analysis of Descriptive Data

This part presents the study's statistical results. The results of the test will be presented. Understanding the underlying links and patterns in the data requires these analyses.

Table 8: Test

	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
AI	.895	350	.069
Need for dangers	.945	350	.164
Support dangers	.895	350	.072
Process Dangers	.893	350	.169
Environment Dangers	.884	350	.142

With a significance value of.069 and a Shapiro-Wilk statistic of, the variable "AI (Artificial Intelligence)" appears to have a roughly normal distribution.895. "Support dangers and Performance" and "Process Dangers and Performance" also exhibit similar near-normal patterns, with relationships Calculations of.895 and.893, respectively. On the other hand, "Environment Dangers and Performance" received a score of.884. Notably, each significant value is greater than the conventional cutoff of 0.05, suggesting that the distributions deviate from normalcy only slightly. Subsequent statistical analyses using this data will be more credible as a result.

Table 9: Mean and std. deviation.

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
AI	3.3600	350	1.35115
Need for dangers	3.5171	350	1.00396
Support dangers	3.4207	350	1.24460
Process Dangers	3.1657	350	1.40457
Environment Dangers	3.4286	350	1.37852

The average values and dispersion of each study variable are succinctly and clearly summarized in Table 9. The word "AI (Artificial Intelligence)" has an average score of 3.3600 on the scale. Its standard deviation, which is 1.35115, further illustrates how erratic the responses are around this mean. With a average of 3.5171 and a smaller standard deviation of 1.00396, and "Need for dangers and Performance" data set shows a more narrowly concentrated. The variables' mean values "Support dangers and Performance," "Process Dangers and Performance," and "Environment Dangers and Performance" are 3.4207, 3.1657, and 3.4286, respectively. The standard deviations of these means indicate varying degrees of dispersion.

Table 10: Relationships.

		AI (Artificial Intelligence)	Need for dangers	Support dangers	Process Dangers	Environment Dangers
AI (Artificial Intelligence)	Pearson Relationships	1	.886**	.876**	.945**	.953**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	350	350	350	350	350
Need for dangers	Pearson Relationships	.886**	1	.822**	.807**	.782**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	350	350	350	350	350

Support dangers	Pearson Relationships	.876**	.822**	1	.900**	.902**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	350	350	350	350	350
Process Dangers	Pearson Relationships	.945**	.807**	.900**	1	.957**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	350	350	350	350	350
Environment Dangers	Pearson Relationships	.953**	.782**	.902**	.957**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	350	350	350	350	350
**. Relationships at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).						

The Pearson relationships Calculations between the study variables are shown in Table 10, giving insight into their connections. As would be predicted, the containers show relationships of 1 between each them. The double astedangers (**) show that each connection is value at the 0.01 level. All other components show variables with the AI variable, especially "Environment Dangers and Performance" (coefficient of.953) and "Process Dangers and Performance" (coefficient of.945). There is also a substantial relationship of.900 for other variables like "Support dangers and Performance" and "Process Dangers and Performance." For each relationship, there are p-values (Sig. 2-tailed).000, demonstrating the importance and power of these relationships. The substantial positive interdependencies between the variables are shown in this table, highlighting their interdependence within the framework of the study.

Table 11: Items' relationships matrix

	AI (Artificial Intelligence)	Need for dangers	Support dangers	Process Dangers	Environment Dangers
AI	1.000	.886	.876	.945	.953
Need for dangers	.886	1.000	.822	.807	.782
Support dangers	.876	.822	1.000	.900	.902
Process Dangers	.945	.807	.900	1.000	.957
Environment Dangers	.953	.782	.902	.957	1.000

As shown in Table 11, which view data on the reliable relationships between them. The diagonal, which has values of 1.000, shows the best relationships between them. All other metrics exhibit substantial positive relationshipss with the variable "AI (Artificial Intelligence)," especially with "Environment Dangers and Performance" (relationships coefficient of.953) and "Process Dangers and Performance" (relationships value of.945). "Support dangers and Performance" and "Process Dangers and Performance" have a substantially high relationship of.900. This array shows that each variable maintains its unique properties. Several connections show how various elements may interact and have an impact on the setting under study.

Table 12: Inter-item covariance matrix.

	AI (Artificial Intelligence)	Need for dangers	Support dangers	Process Dangers	Environment Dangers
AI	1.826	1.202	1.473	1.794	1.775
Need for dangers	1.202	1.008	1.027	1.138	1.083
Support dangers	1.473	1.027	1.549	1.573	1.547
Process Dangers	1.794	1.138	1.573	1.973	1.854
Environment Dangers	1.775	1.083	1.547	1.854	1.900

Table 12 displays the study's variables' inter-item covariance matrix, which provides insight into the variables' co-variation. The covariances between artificial intelligence (AI), Need for dangers, and Performance range from 1.202 to 1.826. When excluding the diagonal, "Process Dangers and Performance" and "Environment Dangers and Performance" have the highest covariance (1.854). This suggests that the two variables have a substantial association. The covariance between "Environment Dangers and Performance" and itself is nearly identical at 1.547, whereas the covariance between "Support dangers and Performance" and itself is 1.549. This array highlights the critical element of comprehending interdependencies in the study and improves knowledge of the interaction between variables.

Table 13: Item-specific data.

	Mean	**Minimum**	**Maximum**	**Range**	**Maximum / Minimum**	**Variance**	**N of Items**
Item Means	3.378	3.166	3.517	.351	1.111	.017	5
Item Variances	1.651	1.008	1.973	.965	1.957	.155	5
Inter-Item Covariances	1.447	1.027	1.854	.827	1.805	.093	5
Inter-Item Relationshipss	.883	.782	.957	.175	1.224	.004	5

As given in Table 13. The item's range is 3.378, with a minimum of 3.166 and a maximum of 3.517.351. The difference between the five items is.017, and the item averages show a maximum-to-minimum ratio of 1.111. A substantial data dispersion is shown by the item variance range and average of 1.651.965 and 1.651.965, respectively. With a variance of.093, the average inter-item covariances are 1.447. This displays the average relationships between the items.883, suggesting that the components have a strong linear relationship. Understanding the distribution, variability, and relationships between the variables under study requires an understanding of this table's comprehensive synopsis, which shows significant statistical measures for each item.

Table 14: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig**
Between People		2595.598	349	7.437		
Within People	Between Items	24.196	4	6.049	29.561	.000
	Remaining	285.654	1396	.205		
	Total	309.850	1400	.221		
Total		2905.448	1749	1.661		
Grand Mean = 3.3784						

The findings of an analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to evaluate individual differences for the items under study are shown above table. The variant "Between People" has a mean square of 7.437 with 349 degrees of freedom and a sum of squares of 2595.598. In the "Within People" category, the total squares for the "Between Items" variation are 24.196. The F-statistic is 29.561 when the mean square is determined to be 6.049. At the.000 level, this F-statistic is considerable. This implies that the differences between the items are statistically significant. 285.654 is the intra-individual Remaining variance. The grand mean of the entire dataset is 3.3784. This table illustrates significant differences at the item level and provides a comprehensive understanding of the variety observed among people and objects.

Table 15: T-Squared Test

T-Squared	**F**	**df1**	**df2**	**Sig**
185.112	45.880	4	346	.000

As shown in above Table. F-statistic is 45.880 with a T-squared test statistic score of 185.112. A significance level (Sig) of.000 is obtained from the degrees of freedom (df1) of 4 and (df2) of 346. The extremely low p-value indicates that the observed differences are statistically significant. The relevance and validity of the observed disparities within the research setting are reinforced by this table, which shows significant multivariate differences between the groups under study.

6.4 Results of the Hypotheses Analysis

By using rigorous statistical techniques to uncover insights into the relationships and patterns under investigation, the following sections will offer a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics between the variables in question.

H1: Need for danger is positively impacted by AI.

Table 16: Relationships-H1

			AI	Need for dangers
	AI	Relationships Coefficient	1.000	.891**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	350	350
	Need for dangers	Relationships Coefficient	.891**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	350	350
**. Relationships at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Table 17: synopsis-H1

Design	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.886a	.786	.785	.46538
a. Predictors: (Consistent), AI				

Table 18 ANOVA-H1

Design		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Reversal	276.404	1	276.404	1276.256	.000b
	Remaining	75.368	348	.217		
	Total	351.772	349			
a. Dependent Factor: Need for dangers						
b. Predictors: (Consistent), AI						

Table 19 Calculations –H1

Design		Unreliable Calculations		Standardized Calculations	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Consistent)	1.304	.067		19.535	.000
	AI	.659	.018	.886	35.725	.000
a. Dependent Factor: Need for dangers						

The analysis's objective is to investigate theory H1 that asserts that artificial intelligence can lessen need for problems. Deep insights into this relationship are provided by the results from the various tables. Starting with the Relationshipss-H1 table, AI and need for concerns have a substantial positive link, as demonstrated by a Pearson connection is of. 891.need for dangers based on high value in relationship between AI and need for dangers. The p-value value which is much lower than the traditional cut off of 0.01 it offers more proof of its robustness and dependability.

Given the number of parameters, the adjusted value R square only dropped by 0.785, demonstrating the design's strong ability to predict the outcome. The estimate's standard error, which is.46538. Further proof of the Design's predictive power may be found in the ANOVA-H1 table. F-value is more important in design according value of P-value. There are various between Remaining, Reversal of sum of squares on respectively. The Calculations-H1 table provides important details regarding the type and strength of the relationship between lower dangers and AI. An increase in AI is directly connected with a comparable rise in, according to the unstandardized coefficient (B) value units in lowering the dangers related to need for. The statistical significance of AI in need for hazard prediction is supported by the t-value and the p-value. Overall, theory H1 is substantially supported by the data analysis. The results, which include Reversal and relationships studies, make a strong case for the importance of AI in lowering need for dangers. This demonstrates AI's potential as both a remarkable technological development and a tactical tool that can be used to address and need for need for uncertainty. For businesses hoping to attain resilience and sustained growth, this is an essential component.

H2: AI helps to lower support danger.

Table 20: Calculations –H2.

			AI	Support dangers
	AI	Relationships Coefficient	1.000	.869**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	350	350
	Support dangers and Performance	Relationships Coefficient	.869**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	350	350
**. Relationships at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Table 20: Design synopsis-H2

Design	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.876a	.767	.766	.60189
a. Predictors: (Consistent), AI				

Table 21: ANOVA –H2

Design		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Reversal	414.542	1	414.542	1144.290	.000b
	Remaining	126.070	348	.362		
	Total	540.612	349			
a. Dependent Factor: Support dangers						
b. Predictors: (Consistent), AI						

It is evident from looking at the relationshipss-H2 table that support dangers and performance are significantly positively correlated with AI. A robust and trustworthy correlation between the two variables is shown by the Pearson correlations. The statistical significance of this link at the 0.01 level is supported by the p-value value, the value R-value was nearly from real results. The considerable relationships suggest that support dangers and performance are both significantly predicted by AI. Additionally, AI can account for almost 76.7% of the inconsistency in support dangers, based on the R square value. There has been a small decline in the corrected R square.766, showing that, given the number of variables, a sizable portion of the explained variation is still explained. We gain further statistical insights by focusing on the ANOVA-H2 table.

The Reversal Design's significant prediction power in relation to the mean is demonstrated by its strong F-value of 1144.290 and significance level of.000. The distinction between the Reversal total of squares, which shows the variation that the Design specifies, and the Remaining sum of squares, which shows the remaining unexplained variation, is crucial. The clear distinction demonstrates how useful AI is in this specific scenario as a prediction tool. In summary, theory H2 is strongly supported by the data analysis. The correlations, design summary, and ANOVA together show how AI has a significant impact on forecasting and possibly reducing supply problems. The findings demonstrate that companies and organizations attempting to lower support dangers can greatly benefit from employing AI-driven tactics and solutions. The evidence presented, which came from thorough statistical testing, validates AI's ground-breaking ability to alter supply chain dynamics and enhance performance results.

H3: Processing danger is positively impacted by AI.

Table 22: Calculations –H2.

Design		Unreliable Calculations		Standardized Calculations	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Consistent)	.710	.086		8.229	.000
	AI	.807	.024	.876	33.827	.000
a. Dependent Factor: Support dangers						

Table 23: Relationshipss-H3

			AI (Artificial Intelligence)	Process Dangers and Performance
	AI	Relationships Coefficient	1.000	.940**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	350	350
	Process Dangers	Relationships Coefficient	.940**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	350	350
**. Relationships at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Table 24: Design synopsis-H3.

Design	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.945a	.893	.893	.45909
a. Predictors: (Consistent), AI				

Table 25: ANOVA –H3

Design		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Reversal	615.168	1	615.168	2918.754	.000b
	Remaining	73.346	348	.211		
	Total	688.514	349			
a. Dependent Factor: Process Dangers						
b. Predictors: (Consistent),						

Table 26: Calculations –H3

Design		Unreliable Calculations		Standardized Calculations	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Consistent)	-.136	.066		-2.063	.040
	AI	.983	.018	.945	54.025	.000
a. Dependent Factor: Process Dangers						

The Pearson relationships coefficient of.940 in this relationship shows a strong correlation between the factors. The p-value provides additional evidence for the raw data of this association at the 0.01 level. The Design synopsis (H3) explains AI's forecasting capability. The R-squared value shows that around 89.3% of the variation in process hazards can be attributed to AI. The significant amount of variation and the corrected R square value show the importance of AI in the domain of danger mitigation. The standard error of the estimate shows how widely the observed scores deviate from the predicted values.

The significance level of and the F-value o in the ANOVA-H3 table analysis show how well the Reversal Design forecasts the result relative to the mean. The variance that the Design explains is represented by the Reversal total of squares (615.168), whereas the Remaining sum of squares (73.346) indicates the variation that cannot be explained. This disparity demonstrates AI's predictive power as a tool. The Design is made clearer by the Calculations-H3 table. This is the unstandardized coefficient (B) shows that a decrease in AI is correlated with an increase of one unit.983 units are at danger. The t-value and the standardized coefficient (beta) support the statistical significance of this relationship. Additional proof of the Consistent's and AI's statistical significance in the Design comes from the t-values. It is crucial to review the Calculations-H2 table before delving into the H3 analysis since it provides a basic understanding of how AI impacts supply concerns. the standardized coefficient (Beta) of and the unstandardized coefficient (B) demonstrate How AI significantly need fors the danger of assistance. This is corroborated by a t-value of 33.827, which emphasizes AI's statistical importance. Theory H3 is significantly supported by the data analysis. Together, the relationships, Design synopsis, ANOVA, and Calculations demonstrate how important AI is for lowering process dangers. The comprehensive statistical study demonstrates AI's groundbreaking ability to streamline processes and ensure operational efficacy, thereby reducing associated dangers.

H4: AI need fors environmental danger in a favourable way.

Table 27: Relationshipss-H4.

			AI (Artificial Intelligence)	Environment Dangers
	AI	Relationships Coefficient	1.000	.959**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	350	350
	Environment Dangers	Relationships Coefficient	.959**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	350	350
**. Relationships at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Table 28: Design synopsis-H4 and ANOVA-H4.

Design	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.953a	.908	.908	.41780
a. Predictors: (Consistent), AI				

Table 29: ANOVA-H4

Design		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Reversal	602.470	1	602.470	3451.506	.000b
	Remaining	60.744	348	.175		
	Total	663.214	349			
a. Dependent Factor: Environment Dangers						
b. Predictors: (Consistent), AI						

Table 30: Calculations –H4.

Design		Unreliable Calculations		Standardized Calculations	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Consistent)	.161	.060		2.691	.007
	AI	.972	.017	.953	58.750	.000
a. Dependent Factor: Environment Dangers						

A Pearson relationship .959 which shows a strong relationship between the two variables, serves as an example of the relationship. The connection's statistical value is strengthened at the severe 0.01 level by the significance level of. 000.It is quite impressive that the R square value that indicates that 90.8% of the variance in environmental dangers can be traced to the influence of AI. The corrected R square value which supports the substantial amount of variance that can be explained, emphasizing the predominant importance of AI in reducing environmental concerns. The degree of variability of the observed score around the expected values is shown by the standard error of the estimate, which is.41780.

Together with a significance level of.000, the F-value that emphasizes how well the Reversal Design predicts the result rather than relying only on the mean. The remarkable predictive potential of AI is highlighted by the difference between the Reversal sum of squares (602.470), which represents the variance that the Design explains, and the Remaining sum of squares (60.744), which indicates the variation that cannot be explained. Moving to the Calculations-H4 table, the AI's ability to interpret the Design becomes apparent. The unstandardized coefficient (B) value indicates that a one-unit increase in AI results in a decrease of.972 units in environmental dangers. The statistical significance of this link is reinforced by the standardized coefficient (Beta) of.953 and a significant t-value value. The t-values for both the Consistent and AI highlight their statistical significance in the Design.

Together, the relationships, Design synopsis, ANOVA, and Calculations show how AI significantly lowers environmental dangers. The thorough statistical analysis emphasizes AI's critical potential to support ecological balance, foster environmental stewardship, and encourage sustainable practices. This data analysis makes it evident that AI not only increases operational effectiveness but also significantly need fors environmental issues, which is essential for building a sustainable future.

7. Conclusion

AI's revolutionary potential in the realm of need for management is highlighted by the obvious necessity of AI in lowering these dangers. Enterprises often face difficulties with need for unpredictability; it may have a detrimental effect on their strategic planning, Managing inventories, and overall profitability ratios. As demonstrated, it functions as a potent tool that may predict, assess, and ultimately lower need for-related hazards. Therefore, it is clear that integrating AI into business processes is not only a technological innovation but also a critical strategic requirement to support sustainability and resilience. The investigation of artificial intelligence's (AI) potential to need for need for uncertainty has yielded intriguing findings. Enterprises often face difficulties with need for unpredictability, which can negatively their overall profitability, inventory management, and strategic planning. As a result, it is evident that incorporating AI into corporate procedures is both a crucial strategic need to promote Adaptability and Maintainability as well as a technological advancement.

AI undoubtedly plays a major role in lowering these dangers, highlighting its revolutionary potential in the area of managerial needs. Businesses frequently seek for unpredictability, which can have a negative impact on their strategic planning, inventory control, and overall profitability. Despite the substantial advantages that AI offers in addressing these problems, it also functions as a potent tool that can foresee, assess, and ultimately need for-related dangers. Thus, Research on AI's capacity to require uncertainty has produced interesting results. AI clearly plays a crucial part in reducing these dangers, underscoring its potential to drastically change the requirement for company management. Need for volatility is a common problem for businesses, which can impair their overall profitability, inventory control, and strategic planning. The investigation's findings demonstrate the substantial advantages of AI in addressing these challenges since it functions as a potent tool that can predict, analyze, and ultimately lower need for-related hazards.

Significant findings have been obtained from studies on how artificial intelligence (AI) affects need for dangers. In order to need for these dangers, artificial intelligence (AI) is essential, as evidenced by its revolutionary capacity to control need for. Many businesses experience erratic need for patterns that affect their strategic decisions, inventory control, and profitability. This analysis shows how AI has a major advantage in solving these issues. AI is a powerful instrument that can need for need for-related dangers in addition to forecasting and analyzing. Therefore, integrating AI into business operations signifies more than just advancements in technology. This crucial strategic choice will enhance the capacity to bounce back fast and guarantee future success. AI integration helps businesses manage erratic need for, optimize inventory, and increase overall business sustainability. Beyond its technical features, AI is vital to modern company strategy.

References

[1] Sharma, R., Shishodia, A., Gunasekaran, A., Min, H., & Munim, Z.H. (2022). The role of artificial intelligence in supply chain management: mapping the territory. International Journal of Production Research, 60(24), 7527-7550.

[2] Shafiq, A., Johnson, P.F., Klassen, R.D., & Awaysheh, A. (2017). Exploring the implications of support danger on sustainability performance. International Journal of Operations & Production Management.

[3] Nahr, J.G., Nozari, H., & Sadeghi, M.E. (2021). Green supply chain based on artificial intelligence of things (AIoT). International Journal of Innovation in Management, Economics and Social Sciences, 1(2), 56-63.
[4] Bugra, A. (1994). State and business in modern Turkey: A comparative study. SuNY Press.
[5] Gu, M., Yang, L., & Huo, B. (2021). The impact of information technology usage on supply chain resilience and performance: An ambidexterous view. International Journal of Production Economics, 232, 107956.
[6] Baryannis, G., Dani, S., Validi, S., & Antoniou, G. (2018). Decision support systems and artificial intelligence in supply chain danger management. In Revisiting supply chain danger (pp. 53-71). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
[7] Dinçer, H., & Hacıoğlu, Ü. (2014). The Globalization of the Turkish Economy. IGI Global.
[8] Wu, T., Blackhurst, J., & O'grady, P. (2007). Methodology for supply chain disruption analysis. International journal of production research, 45(7), 1665-1682.
[9] Govindan, K., & Cheng, T. C. E. (2018). Big data analytics and application for logistics and supply chain management. Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review, 114, 343-349.
[10] Tang, O., & Nurmaya Musa, S. (2011). Identifying danger issues and research advancements in supply chain danger management. International Journal of Production Economics, 133(1), 25-34.
[11] Tzachor, A. (2020). Artificial intelligence for agricultural supply chain danger management: Constraints and potentials.
[12] Deif, A. M. (2011). A system Design for green manufacturing. Journal of Cleaner Production, 19(14), 1553-1559.
[13] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Sage publications.
[14] Ivanov, D. (2020). Predicting the impacts of epidemic outbreaks on global supply chains: A simulation-based analysis on the coronavirus outbreak (COVID-19/SARS-CoV-2) case. Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review, 136, 101922.
[15] Queiroz, M. M., Ivanov, D., Dolgui, A., & Fosso Wamba, S. (2022). Impacts of epidemic outbreaks on supply chains: mapping a research agenda amid the COVID-19 pandemic through a structured literature review. Annals of operations research, 319(1), 1159-1196.
[16] Jüttner, U. (2005). Supply chain danger management: Understanding the business requirements from a practitioner perspective. The International Journal of Logistics Management, 16(1), 120-141.
[17] Dubey, R., Bryde, D.J., Blome, C., Roubaud, D., & Giannakis, M. (2021). Facilitating artificial intelligence powered supply chain analytics through alliance management during the pandemic crises in the B2B context. Industrial Marketing Management, 96, 135-146.
[18] Van Selm, M., & Jankowski, N. W. (2006). Conducting online surveys. Quality & Quantity, 40(3), 435-456.
[19] Ivanov, D., & Dolgui, A. (2020). Viability of intertwined supply networks: Extending the supply chain resilience angles towards survivability. A position paper motivated by COVID-19 outbreak. International Journal of Production Research, 58(10), 2904-2915.
[20] Field, A. (2013). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics. Sage.
[21] Ahi, P., & Searcy, C. (2013). A comparative literature analysis of definitions for green and sustainable supply chain management. Journal of Cleaner Production, 52, 329-341.
[22] American Psychological Association. (1992). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. American psychologist, 47(12), 1597-1611.
[23] Arinez, J. F., Chang, Q., Gao, R. X., Xu, C., & Zhang, J. (2020). Artificial intelligence in advanced manufacturing: Current status and future outlook. Journal of Manufacturing Science and Engineering, 142(11), 110804.