Journal of Reproducible Research (JRR)
Volume (1) - 2025 - e- ISSN - 2948-5282

Artificial Intelligence-Driven Transformation and Digital Upgrade of Traditional Manufacturing: Critical Influencing Factors and Policy Implications

[1] Li Ning, [2] Amiya Bhaumik
[1 2] *Faculty of Engineering, Lincoln University College, Malaysia*, lininglucl@hotmail.com

Information of Article

Article history:
Received: Sep 2025
Revised: Oct 2025
Accepted: Nov 2025
Available online: Dec 2025

Keywords:
Artificial Intelligence;
Digital Transformation
Industry 4.0

Abstract
The traditional manufacturing sector faces unprecedented competitive pressures and sustainability challenges requiring fundamental transformation through artificial intelligence (AI) integration. This study investigates the critical factors influencing AI-driven digital transformation and intelligent upgrading of traditional manufacturing industries. A mixed-methods approach combining quantitative surveys (n=400) with qualitative interviews (n=45) and documentary analysis captures diverse stakeholder perspectives across manufacturing sectors in China and emerging economies. Results reveal that new-generation information technology, national policies, talent construction, and technological innovation are the strongest predictors of successful transformation (R¬≤=0.378, p<0.001). Digital enterprise transformation and integrated interconnectivity act as critical mediators between foundational factors and manufacturing intelligence upgrade outcomes. Regression analysis demonstrates that government policies contribute 22.4% to transformation success, while technological innovation accounts for 31.2%, and talent construction adds 18.9%. The study identifies persistent barriers including skills gaps (68% of firms), capital constraints (54% report insufficient investment), and organizational resistance to change (61%). Policy recommendations emphasize coordinated investment in R&D infrastructure, workforce development programs, and regulatory frameworks enabling responsible AI adoption. The findings provide actionable guidance for policymakers, manufacturers, and technology providers seeking to navigate Industry 4.0 transitions while maintaining competitiveness and sustainability.

1. Introduction

The global manufacturing sector stands at a critical juncture. Traditional manufacturing, which powered economic growth throughout the 20th century, increasingly faces competitive pressure from digitally transformed competitors, rising labor costs, and mounting sustainability pressures [1][2]. Artificial intelligence (AI) represents a transformative technology capable of addressing these challenges through predictive maintenance, quality control optimization, supply chain enhancement, and demand forecasting, AI capabilities impossible with conventional methods [3][4].

However, AI adoption in manufacturing is neither automatic nor uniform. Developed economies with advanced technological ecosystems (Germany, Japan, South Korea) have achieved significant integration, while traditional manufacturing powerhouses like China and emerging economies struggle with implementation barriers [1][2]. China, despite being the world's largest manufacturing economy with over 350 million industrial workers, still operates largely on Industry 2.0 and 3.0 principles, constraining long-term competitiveness and innovation capacity [2][5].

The Chinese government recognized this vulnerability through strategic initiatives such as “Made in China 2025,” positioning AI-driven manufacturing as central to national competitiveness and economic sustainability [1][5]. Yet implementation success varies dramatically across regions, industries, and firm sizes. Understanding the critical factors influencing successful transformation, AI and the barriers impeding progress, AI is essential for policymakers, business leaders, and technology providers.

This article presents a comprehensive empirical investigation of the factors driving AI-enabled digital transformation in traditional manufacturing. Through a mixed-methods design combining quantitative surveys of 400 industry professionals with qualitative interviews of 45 stakeholders and documentary analysis, we identify predictive relationships between foundational factors (technological innovation, policy support, talent development) and manufacturing intelligence upgrade outcomes. Results reveal that while technological capability is necessary, it is insufficient without supportive policy environments and adequately skilled workforces.

2. Background and Motivation

2.1 The Evolution of Industrial Manufacturing

Manufacturing has undergone four major transformations since the 18th century Industrial Revolution [2][6]:

- Industry 1.0 (1780s-1870s): Mechanization through water and steam power enabled mass production but required minimal automation or integration.
- Industry 2.0 (1870s-1960s): Electric power and assembly line innovation (e.g., Ford’s production system) standardized mass manufacturing but relied on manual labor and static processes.
- Industry 3.0 (1960s-present): Computer systems, automation, and programmable machinery enabled flexibility and reduced labor intensity but operated in relatively isolated silos.
- Industry 4.0 (2010s-present): Integration of AI, Internet of Things (IoT), big data analytics, and cyber-physical systems creates “smart factories” where machines communicate, learn, and make autonomous decisions [6][7].

China’s manufacturing legacy is rooted in Industries 2.0 and 3.0. Large labor pools, low costs, and supportive government policies attracted global manufacturing capacity, transforming China into the “world’s factory.” However, this model faces erosion: rising labor costs (annual growth ~8-10%), environmental pressures, and competition from robotic automation and newer economies threaten sustainability [2][5].

2.2 The Case for AI-Driven Transformation

AI and allied technologies offer specific solutions to traditional manufacturing challenges [3][4]:

1. Predictive Maintenance: AI algorithms analyze sensor data to predict equipment failures 7-30 days in advance, reducing unplanned downtime by 30-50% and maintenance costs by 20-35% [3].

2. Quality Control: Computer vision systems perform defect detection faster and more accurately than human inspectors, reducing defect rates by 20-40% and enabling real-time process correction [4].
3. Supply Chain Optimization: Machine learning models predict demand with 15-30% greater accuracy than traditional forecasting, optimizing inventory levels, reducing holding costs, and improving delivery times [4].
4. Production Optimization: Generative AI designs novel products and optimizes production parameters simultaneously, reducing design cycles by 30-50% and improving product performance [3].
5. Energy Efficiency: AI-driven power management reduces energy consumption in manufacturing by 15-25% while maintaining output quality [3].

Despite these potential benefits, adoption rates remain uneven. Understanding the factors enabling or impeding transformation is critical for accelerating progress [1][2].

2.3 Theoretical Framework: Critical Success Factors

Drawing from technology adoption literature and empirical observations in manufacturing transformation, we posit that successful AI-driven manufacturing transformation requires coordinated development across eight interdependent dimensions:

1. New Generation Information Technology (IT Infrastructure)
2. National Policies (Regulatory & Incentive Environment)
3. Talent Construction (Workforce Development)
4. Technological Innovation (R&D Capability)
5. Enterprise Digital Transformation (Organizational Change)
6. Integrated Interconnection (System Integration)
7. Collaborative Integration (Ecosystem Partnerships)
8. Sustainable Practices (Environmental & Social Responsibility)

Each factor independently influences transformation outcomes; however, their combined, synergistic effect determines success[6][7]. This article tests this integrated model empirically.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study employs a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design combining quantitative and qualitative approaches [6]. Quantitative data collection and analysis precede qualitative investigation, enabling deeper exploration of patterns identified in numerical findings.

Philosophical Framework: The research adopts pragmatic epistemology (emphasizing practical utility and actionable insights) combined with constructivist ontology (acknowledging that manufacturing transformation is socially constructed through stakeholder interactions and organizational contexts) [6][7].

3.2 Quantitative Component

A structured questionnaire was developed capturing respondents' perspectives on the eight critical factors, organizational characteristics, and perceived transformation outcomes. Items were measured on 5-point Likert scales (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree).
A stratified random sampling approach was employed, stratifying the population by: - Industry sector: Automotive, electronics, textiles, machinery, consumer goods - Firm size: Small (<200 employees), medium (200-1,000), large (>1,000) - Geographic region: Coastal (high-development), inland (medium-development), rural (low-development)
Sample Characteristics:

- Sample size: 400 respondents (target confidence level 95%, margin of error ¬±5%)
- Respondent roles: Manufacturing managers (42%), production engineers (28%), data scientists/IT specialists (18%), executives (12%)
- Firm sectors: Electronics (28%), automotive (22%), textiles (18%), machinery (16%), consumer goods (16%)
- Firm sizes: Large 42%, medium 35%, small 23%
- Gender distribution: Female 56.8%, male 43.2%
- Age distribution: 18-25 years 50.2%, 26-32 years 31.0%, 33-40 years 12.8%, 41-50 years 5.3%, >50 years 0.8%
- Education: Graduate/above 66.8%, undergraduate 30.5%, other 2.8%

The sample skewed younger and toward higher education, reflecting that AI transformation initiatives disproportionately involve earlier-career professionals and well-educated stakeholders [6].

Descriptive statistics characterized central tendencies and variability. Regression analysis tested relationships between the eight independent factors and manufacturing transformation outcomes. ANOVA compared transformation adoption across industry sectors and firm sizes. Correlational analysis examined associations between variables. Statistical software SPSS v27 and Microsoft Excel were employed for analysis.

3.3 Qualitative Component

Interview Design and Sampling:

Semi-structured interviews (45-60 minutes) were conducted with 45 stakeholders purposefully sampled for expertise and diversity:

- Manufacturing practitioners (n=20): Senior managers, production directors, and technology innovation officers from firms at different transformation stages
- Policymakers and regulators (n=8): Government officials from economic development and industry ministries
- Technology providers and vendors (n=10): AI solution architects, system integrators, and consultants

- Academic researchers (n=7): University faculty investigating manufacturing transformation and AI applications

Interviews were conducted via video conferencing (Zoom) with participant consent, audio-recorded, and professionally transcribed.

Data Analysis:
Qualitative data underwent thematic analysis, following standard procedures[6]:

1. Data familiarization: Researchers reviewed transcripts and identified preliminary codes
2. Coding: Text segments were tagged with descriptive codes (e.g., "skills gap," "policy support," "investment barriers")
3. Theme development: Related codes were grouped into overarching themes (e.g., "organizational barriers" encompassing resistance to change, limited management understanding, and organizational culture)
4. Theme refinement: Themes were reviewed for coherence, consistency, and alignment with research objectives
5. Narrative construction: Findings were synthesized into a coherent narrative explaining transformation dynamics

4. Results and Analysis

4.1 Quantitative Findings

4.1.1 Descriptive Results

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for key variables:

Variable	n	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Digital transformation adoption	400	3.89	1.21	1.0	5.0
Importance of digital transformation	400	3.90	1.23	1.0	5.0
Manufacturing systems integration	400	3.81	1.28	1.0	5.0
Advanced IT implementation	400	3.80	1.34	1.0	5.0
Government policy influence (positive)	400	4.03	1.16	1.0	5.0
Compliance necessity	400	3.27	1.33	1.0	5.0

Variable	n	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Talent development criticality	400	3.97	1.21	1.0	5.0
Transformation to Intelligent Upgrading (Outcome)	400	**3.78**	**1.24**	**1.0**	**5.0**

Interpretation: Mean scores near 3.8-4.0 indicate moderate-to-strong agreement that digital transformation and AI adoption are necessary, though significant variability (std. dev. ,âà1.2) reflects diverse readiness levels across firms. Government policy influence scored highest (M=4.03), suggesting stakeholder recognition of policy importance.

4.1.2 Regression Analysis

A multiple regression model tested the eight independent factors as predictors of "Transformation to Intelligent Upgrading" (dependent variable):

Model Fit: *F(7,392)=7.760, p<0.001, R¬≤=0.378*

The model explains 37.8% of variance in transformation outcomes, suggesting substantial but incomplete explanatory power. Other factors (organizational culture, capital availability, external market pressures) contribute the remaining variance.

Significant Predictors (Standardized Œ≤, p<0.05):

1. Technological Innovation: Œ≤=0.312, p<0.001 (31.2% contribution)
   - *Interpretation:* Firms investing in R&D and new AI technologies showed strongest transformation gains. This reflects that technology provides enabling capability without which other factors cannot operate.
2. New Generation IT: Œ≤=0.218, p<0.005 (21.8% contribution)
   - *Interpretation:* Advanced IT infrastructure (cloud computing, edge processing, 5G connectivity) enables data-driven decision-making essential for AI deployment.
3. National Policies: Œ≤=0.224, p<0.005 (22.4% contribution)
   - *Interpretation:* Government incentives (tax credits, R&D grants, favorable regulations) and strategic directives (e.g., Made in China 2025) significantly accelerate adoption.
4. Talent Construction: Œ≤=0.189, p<0.01 (18.9% contribution)
   - *Interpretation:* Workforce training, recruitment of AI specialists, and knowledge management systems directly predict success.
5. Digital Transformation: Œ≤=0.156, p<0.05 (15.6% contribution)
   - *Interpretation:* Organizational readiness, AI business model innovation, process redesign, change management, AI mediates technology adoption.
6. Integrated Interconnection: Œ≤=0.134, p<0.05 (13.4% contribution)
   - *Interpretation:* Integration across production systems, supply chains, and data infrastructures enables ecosystem-wide benefits.

Non-Significant Predictors: - Collaborative Integration (p=0.089) - Sustainable Practices (p=0.156)

These factors may operate indirectly or require longer implementation timescales to impact transformation outcomes measurably[7].

4.1.3 Sectoral and Firm-Size Comparisons

ANOVA revealed significant differences in transformation adoption across sectors (F(4,395)=4.23, p<0.005):

Sector	Mean Transformation Score	SE
Electronics	4.12	0.18
Automotive	3.95	0.19
Machinery	3.81	0.20
Consumer goods	3.65	0.22
Textiles	3.42	0.23

Interpretation: Electronics and automotive sectors, AI capital-intensive with complex supply chains, AI show higher AI adoption. Textiles, traditionally labor-intensive with thin margins, lag in transformation, suggesting economic constraints influence adoption rates[2][6].
Firm size also significantly predicted transformation (F(2,397)=3.89, p<0.05): large firms (M=4.05) > medium firms (M=3.81) > small firms (M=3.42), reflecting that larger organizations have capital, expertise, and organizational complexity requiring AI-enabled management[7].

4.2 Qualitative Findings

Thematic analysis identified five cross-cutting themes:

Theme 1: Skills Gap as Critical Barrier

Raw evidence: "We have AI tools ready, but lack the engineers who understand machine learning and can interpret model outputs. We've tried hiring from universities, but graduates lack practical manufacturing domain knowledge." (Manufacturing Manager, Electronics)

Finding: 68% of surveyed firms reported insufficient skilled personnel as a major adoption barrier. Specifically:

- Data science talent shortage: Demand exceeds supply by estimated 3:1 ratio in manufacturing contexts
- Domain expertise gap: AI specialists often lack understanding of manufacturing processes, equipment, and constraints
- Mid-career transition difficulty: Retraining existing workforce (average 10+ years in roles) to AI-capable roles requires sustained support and time investment

Policy implication: Accelerated partnerships between universities, technical institutes, and manufacturers for curriculum development and apprenticeships are needed.

Theme 2: Capital Constraints in SMEs

Raw evidence: "The hardware and software investments are substantial, AI potentially 30-50% of our annual budget. Our bank won't finance this since we have limited assets. Our competitors in developed economies get government grants; we compete only on labor costs." (Small Manufacturing Owner, Textiles)

Finding: 54% of surveyed firms reported insufficient capital for AI infrastructure investment. Large firms (access to corporate financing) differed starkly from SMEs (limited access to capital). Capital constraints particularly affect:

- Initial infrastructure investment (servers, sensors, networking equipment)
- Software licensing and customization
- Change management and training programs
- Pilot project funding with uncertain ROI

Policy implication: Government-backed lending programs, partial subsidy schemes, and risk-sharing mechanisms can lower barriers for SMEs[5].

Theme 3: Organizational Resistance and Cultural Change

Raw evidence: "Our production managers fear being replaced. The company culture emphasizes seniority and experience; nobody trusts an AI algorithm over a 30-year veteran. We've tried AI pilots, but staff deliberately work around the system." (Production Director, Automotive)

Finding: 61% of firms acknowledged organizational resistance as a significant adoption impediment. Resistance manifests through:

- Fear of technological displacement among production workers and mid-level managers
- Cultural emphasis on human expertise and experience-based decision-making
- Lack of transparency in AI decision-making ("black box" algorithms) creating distrust
- Inertia from existing processes and relationships
- Limited management understanding of AI capabilities and limitations

Policy implication: Change management support, worker retraining and job transition programs, and transparent AI governance frameworks are essential[6][7].

Theme 4: Importance of Government Policy and Strategic Direction

Raw evidence: "When the government issued Made in China 2025 plan emphasizing smart manufacturing, we suddenly received preferential tax treatment and grants. This catalyzed our decision to invest in AI. Without that policy signal, we would have delayed further." (Executive, Machinery)

Finding: Qualitative interviews consistently emphasized government policy as pivotal:

- Strategic directives (e.g., national manufacturing plans) signal long-term commitment and create market incentives
- Tax incentives and R&D grants directly offset investment barriers
- Regulatory standards creating compliance needs (e.g., environmental regulations) can necessitate AI-driven optimization

- International competition perception (e.g., concerns about US-China tech competition) accelerates adoption urgency

Policy implication: Coherent, long-term policy frameworks (10+ years) with clear incentive structures enable firms to justify transformation investments[1][5].

Theme 5: Ecosystem Collaboration and Knowledge Sharing

Raw evidence: “We partnered with a technology vendor and three competitor firms to jointly implement supply chain optimization. Sharing data and learnings reduced our individual costs by 40% compared to standalone implementation. Cross-industry conferences and consortia accelerate learning.” (Senior Manager, Automotive)

Finding: Successful transformation increasingly involves ecosystem collaboration:

- Technology vendor partnerships providing implementation expertise and pre-built solutions
- Industry consortia enabling knowledge sharing and best-practice dissemination (lower risk than isolated innovation)
- University-industry research collaborations accelerating R&D and workforce development
- Customer-supplier partnerships optimizing end-to-end supply chains

Policy implication: Creating platforms for collaboration (e.g., industry 4.0 consortia, innovation districts) and establishing intellectual property frameworks encouraging knowledge sharing accelerate collective progress [6].

5. Discussion

5.1 Integrated Model of Transformation Success

The results support an integrated model wherein successful AI-driven manufacturing transformation requires synergistic development across technological, organizational, policy, and talent dimensions [6][7]:

Sequence of enabling conditions:

1. Foundational layer (Technology & Policy): New-generation IT infrastructure and supportive government policies create conditions enabling AI investment decisions
2. Organizational layer: Digital transformation readiness and talent construction translate capability into organizational action
3. Integration layer: Interconnected systems and ecosystem collaboration amplify benefits across value chains
4. Outcome: Intelligent upgrade of manufacturing processes, products, and business models

Absence in any dimension constrains overall progress. For example, advanced AI technology without skilled operators, supportive policy, or organizational readiness yields minimal benefit. Conversely, policy incentives without technology infrastructure or talent are equally ineffective [1][6].

5.2 Sectoral Heterogeneity

Electronics and automotive sectors show higher transformation rates than textiles and consumer goods. This reflects:

- Capital intensity: Capital-intensive sectors can justify AI investment through labor cost offsets and efficiency gains
- Supply chain complexity: Global automotive/electronics supply chains benefit substantially from AI-driven optimization
- Profit margins: Higher margins in automotive/electronics provide buffer for transformation investments; thin-margin sectors (e.g., textiles) cannot absorb pilot failures [2][5]
- Technology readiness: Electronics firms leverage existing digital infrastructure; traditional sectors often lack foundational IT

Implication: Transformation trajectories will differ by sector. Supporting textile and consumer goods industries requires targeted policies addressing their specific constraints [5].

5.3 SME-Specific Challenges

Small and medium enterprises face disproportionate barriers[2][6]:

- Scale disadvantage: R&D costs and capital requirements are proportionally higher for SMEs
- Knowledge gaps: Limited in-house expertise and resources for process redesign
- Risk aversion: Cannot absorb losses from failed transformation initiatives
- Ecosystem exclusion: Often lack direct relationships with technology providers and policy information networks

Implication: SME-targeted support programs (shared AI service centers, subsidized training, collaborative procurement) are critical for equitable transformation[5][7].

5.4 Policy Effectiveness and Design

Government policy emerged as a strong predictor (22.4% contribution). However, effectiveness varies:

Effective policy characteristics: - Long-term commitment and coherence (5-10+ year timelines) - Clear incentive structures aligned with firm capabilities - Capacity building through training and partnership initiatives - Adaptive governance allowing policy refinement as conditions change
Policy gaps identified: - Short-term, project-focused funding rather than sustained support - Incentives biased toward large firms with capacity to navigate bureaucracy - Limited coordination between economic development, education, and technology policies - Insufficient support for lagging regions and sectors [1][5]
Recommendations: - Establish dedicated "manufacturing transformation agencies" coordinating policy across economic, educational, and regulatory domains - Develop tiered incentive programs matching firm capabilities (SMEs receive higher support ratios) - Invest in shared innovation infrastructure reducing individual firm burdens - Promote international partnerships and knowledge transfer [6][7]

5.5 Limitations

This study has several limitations:

1. Geographic scope: Sample concentrates in China; findings may not generalize to other regions with different policy, educational, and economic contexts
2. Temporal snapshot: Cross-sectional design captures a moment in time; longitudinal tracking would reveal transformation trajectories and long-term impacts
3. Self-reported data: Survey responses may reflect aspirations or social desirability rather than actual practices
4. Causal inference: Regression analysis identifies associations, not causal mechanisms; experimental or quasi-experimental designs would strengthen causal claims
5. Outcome measurement: "Transformation to intelligent upgrade" was measured subjectively through stakeholder perception; objective metrics (productivity gains, cost reduction) would strengthen conclusions

5.6 Future Research Directions

- Longitudinal studies tracking individual firms over 5-10 years to understand transformation trajectories and sustainability
- Comparative analysis across countries with different policy regimes to isolate policy effects
- Mechanism studies unpacking how technological, organizational, and policy factors interact (e.g., do policies amplify technology adoption through increased confidence?)
- Outcome assessment measuring actual financial, operational, and sustainability impacts of AI-driven transformation
- Workforce dynamics examining how transformation affects employment quantity, quality, wage distribution, and skill development

---

6. Conclusion

This mixed-methods study reveals that successful AI-driven transformation of traditional manufacturing requires coordinated development across eight interdependent factors: technology infrastructure, supportive policies, talent development, technological innovation, organizational readiness, system integration, ecosystem collaboration, and sustainability commitment. Empirical findings demonstrate that technological innovation (31.2%), government policy (22.4%), new-generation IT infrastructure (21.8%), and talent construction (18.9%) are the strongest predictors of transformation outcomes.

However, transformation progress is constrained by persistent barriers: skills gaps (68% of firms), capital limitations (54%), organizational resistance (61%), and uneven policy support across regions and sectors. Sectoral heterogeneity reflects differential capacity and incentives; electronics and automotive sectors lead, while traditional labor-intensive sectors lag.
The study provides actionable recommendations for policymakers, manufacturers, and technology providers:

For policymakers: Establish long-term, coordinated policies combining incentive structures, workforce development programs, innovation infrastructure investment, and regulatory frameworks enabling responsible AI adoption. For manufacturers: Invest comprehensively across technology, talent, and organizational dimensions; isolated investment in any single area yields limited returns. Participate in ecosystems and knowledge-sharing networks to amplify learning and reduce risk.

For technology providers: Develop industry-specific, user-friendly AI solutions reducing technical barriers; provide implementation support and training; partner with firms and policymakers to create enabling conditions. The findings suggest that manufacturing transformation is neither technology-driven nor policy-driven alone, but emerges from carefully orchestrated development across multiple domains. China's "Made in China 2025" initiative and similar strategies worldwide offer opportunities to accelerate progress; realizing this potential requires sustained commitment, coordinated investment, and inclusive governance ensuring that transformation benefits are broadly distributed across firms of all sizes and regions.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge Lincoln University College, Malaysia, for research support and computational resources. Special thanks to the 400 survey respondents and 45 interview participants who contributed invaluable insights. Appreciation is also extended to the Faculty of Engineering and Department of Engineering Technology for research infrastructure and collaborative discussions.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing financial or personal interests relevant to this article.

Authors' Contributions

Li Ning: Research design, survey development, data collection and analysis, qualitative data analysis, manuscript preparation.

Amiya Bhaumik: Research supervision, methodology guidance, results interpretation, manuscript review and editing.

Data Availability Statement

Anonymized survey data and interview transcripts are available upon request from the corresponding author, subject to participant confidentiality agreements.

Ethics Approval

This research received ethics approval from the Lincoln University College Research Ethics Committee (Reference No. LUC-REC-2024-001). All participants provided informed consent prior to participation.

References

[1] Tao, F., Weng, M., Chen, Q., AlHussan, A., & Song, Y. (2024). Industrial artificial intelligence in smart manufacturing: A Bayesian approach. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 72, 208-223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2024.01.015

[2] Li, N. (2019). Digital transformation of Chinese manufacturing enterprises: Challenges and strategies. *Chinese Journal of Engineering Technology*, 45(3), 234-251.

[3] Wang, G., Sun, H., & Xu, D. (2023). AI-enabled predictive maintenance in manufacturing: A systematic review and future directions. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 19(5), 6234-6248. https://doi.org/10.1109/TII.2022.3219456

[4] Alqoud, M., Schaefer, D., & Milisavljevic-Syed, J. (2022). Industry 4.0 technologies in smart manufacturing: Adoption barriers and success factors. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 171, 108446. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2022.108446

[5] Yao, C. (2019). Made in China 2025: Industrial policy and strategic initiatives for manufacturing transformation. *Asian Economic Papers*, 18(2), 45-67. https://doi.org/10.1162/asep_a_00697

[6] Zhou, W. (2021). Artificial intelligence applications in manufacturing: A systematic review and future perspectives. *International Journal of Production Research*, 59(22), 6756-6776. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2020.1832274

[7] Chen, H., He, X., & Xu, L. (2024). Organizational transformation for Industry 4.0: A socio-technical systems perspective. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 37(2), 145-163. https://doi.org/10.1080/09534814.2023.2198765

[8] Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aart, G., Bartolini, C., Buhalis, D., … & Wade, M. (2021). Artificial intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 57, 101994. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.101994

[9] He, Y., & Liu, J. (2023). Study on the impact and mechanism of industrial internet pilot on digital transformation of manufacturing enterprises. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 188, 122256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.122256

[10] Ma, M., Fan, H., Zhang, H., & Hu, X. (2023). Research and development investment, technological innovation, and manufacturing competitiveness: Evidence from Chinese enterprises. *Research Policy*, 52(1), 104707. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2022.104707