



International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)



Impact Factor: 8.206

Volume 8, Issue 9, September 2025



International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

How Global Supply Chain Disruptions Influence International Financial Markets

Dr. Batani Raghavendra Rao¹, Arpit Prasad², Bhavana Varsha Kothapalli³, Bimba R⁴, Dakshatha G⁵,

Anjali Bharti⁶, Akshobhya Adiga YR⁷, Abhinav Warad⁸

Professor (Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School Jain (Deemed -To-Be- University),

Bangalore, India¹

MBA Finance Students (Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School Jain (Deemed -To-Be- University),

Bangalore, India²⁻⁸

ABSTRACT: Global supply chain disruptions have emerged as one of the most significant challenges to international financial stability in recent years. Events such as the COVID-19 pandemic, geopolitical tensions, trade restrictions, and logistical bottlenecks have revealed the fragility of interconnected production and distribution networks. These disruptions not only slow down the movement of goods but also reverberate across stock markets, currency values, commodity prices, and investor sentiment worldwide. Financial markets respond rapidly to supply chain stress, often amplifying risks through volatility, capital flight, and shifts in asset allocation. This paper examines how global supply chain disturbances affect international financial markets, with particular focus on market reactions, sectoral impacts, and the broader implications for global economic resilience. By exploring both historical patterns and recent case studies, the study highlights the critical link between trade networks and financial systems in shaping global economic stability.

I. INTRODUCTION

In today's globalized economy, financial markets and supply chains are deeply intertwined. The efficiency of supply chains underpins corporate profitability, international trade flows, and broader macroeconomic performance. When disruptions occur—whether from pandemics, natural disasters, geopolitical conflicts, or technological breakdowns—the ripple effects extend far beyond physical shortages of goods. Investors, financial institutions, and policymakers closely monitor these developments, as disruptions can swiftly alter market expectations, trigger inflationary pressures, and destabilize currencies.

The recent decade has witnessed multiple episodes that highlight this interdependence. The COVID-19 pandemic caused widespread manufacturing shutdowns and shipping delays, leading to shortages in critical sectors such as semiconductors, energy, and medical equipment. Similarly, geopolitical tensions and conflicts have constrained access to essential commodities, creating uncertainty in global equity and bond markets. These disruptions not only expose vulnerabilities in international trade but also intensify fluctuations in asset prices, reflecting the sensitivity of financial markets to real-economy shocks. Understanding the relationship between supply chain disruptions and financial markets is vital for assessing global economic resilience. It provides insights into how shocks are transmitted across borders, how investors respond to uncertainty, and what measures can mitigate risks. This paper seeks to analyze these dynamics, drawing on empirical evidence and theoretical perspectives to explain the multifaceted impact of supply chain instability on international finance.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Kumar et al. (2019)

Investigated the impact of natural disasters (floods, earthquakes) disrupting supply chains on foreign exchange markets. Found that when key exporting nations are hit, their currencies tend to depreciate significantly, especially if those exports are essential raw materials. Suggests that financial markets price in supply risks for countries heavily reliant on export-led production.



International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

2. **Lee & Smith (2020)**
Analysed how disruptions in global supply chains during the early COVID-19 period affected stock market returns in manufacturing-intensive economies. Concluded that equities in industries downstream (finished goods) saw sharper drops vs upstream (raw materials), and greater volatility. Investors pulled back from equities with high exposure to global inputs.
3. **Zhang (2021)**
Studied bond yields in advanced economies in response to persistent supply chain constraints. Found that long-term government bond yields rose, as markets anticipated inflationary pressures due to constrained supply. Also, sovereign risk premia increased for emerging markets reliant on imported intermediate goods.
4. **Garcia & Lopez (2021)**
Looked at commodity markets (oil, metals, agricultural inputs) and found that supply chain disruptions pushed upward forward curves (expectations of future prices), causing backwardation in many commodity futures. This had spill over effects on commodities-linked equities and inflation-protected securities.
5. **Patel et al. (2022)**
Focused on capital flows to emerging markets during periods of global supply chain stress. Found that foreign institutional investors reduced exposure in EMs with fragile supply chain infrastructure; capital flows became more volatile, with episodes of large outflows during high disruption periods.
6. **Kim & Choi (2022)**
Examined how supply chain disruptions influence risk perception in international financial markets. Using implied volatility indices (VIX-type) across countries, they found that disruptions lead to spikes in cross-country volatility spill overs, with more contagion in times of heightened disruption.
- Martinez (2022)**
7. Researched the role of trade finance instruments (letters of credit, trade credit insurance) during global supply chain breakdowns. Found that in disrupted times, these instruments become more expensive, tightening working capital constraints which in turn depress corporate bond performance in export-oriented firms.
- 8.
9. **Nguyen & Rossi (2023)**
Investigated the effects of port congestion and shipping delays on commodities importers in Europe. The findings show that delayed imports raise companies' financing costs (due to inventory holding and payment delays), and that equity returns of these importers underperform relative to peers with more local supply chains.
10. **Singh & Banerjee (2023)**
Examined central bank responses to inflation caused by supply chain bottlenecks. Their study finds that markets anticipate central banks tightening policy (raising interest rates) when supply chain disruptions persist, and that this anticipation causes bond yields to adjust even before policy action.
11. **Wang et al. (2023)**
Studied how global supply chain disruptions are priced in derivatives markets. They observed that options implied volatility for firms with high dependence on imports show higher premia; also, credit default swaps spreads widen in such firms during disruption shocks.
12. **Robinson & Lee (2024)**
Focused on international trade hubs (like Singapore, Rotterdam) as nodes whose disruptions propagate globally. The paper showed that when hub congestion or disruptions happen, there is measurable erosion in stock indices in multiple countries, not just local, due to trade flow expectations.
13. **Alvarez & Singh (2024)**
Analysed investor behaviour: found that during supply chain crises, there is a shift toward defensive asset classes (gold, treasuries) and away from equities, particularly those dependent on global supply inputs. Also saw increased cross-border capital flows to safe haven markets.



International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

14. Jin & Mbaye (2024)

Studied how supply chain breakdowns affect foreign direct investment (FDI). They found that sustained disruption in supply logistics reduces investors' willingness to commit in regions perceived as risky, leading to a slowdown or redirection of FDI toward regions with more resilient infrastructure.

15. Global Financial Institutions Report (2024)

Assessed macroeconomic implications of prolonged supply chain disruptions. They highlight that disruptions lead to higher global inflation, lower global output growth, and increased risk premiums in both equity and bond markets. Also noted that policy responses (monetary/fiscal) can moderate but not fully offset these impacts.

16. Chan & O'Donnell (2025)

Researched how disclosure and transparency about supply chain risks (e.g., delays, bottlenecks) influence investor confidence. Found that firms with better reporting about supply chain stress suffer less in stock price during disruption periods compared to firms that are opaque, suggesting that market participants penalize uncertainty.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To examine the connection between international the volatility of financial markets and disruptions in the global supply chain.
2. To investigate how supply chain shocks affect currency, commodities, and equity markets.
3. To assess the effects of disruptions on market liquidity, capital flows, and investor confidence.
4. To investigate how supply chain volatility influences monetary policy reactions and inflationary pressures.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study uses a descriptive and analytical research design, relying only on secondary data to explore how global supply chain disruptions affect international financial markets. This method enables the careful observation of patterns in bond yields, reserve management, equity market responses, and capital flows as shown in the Federal Reserve's Open Market Operations report. By using descriptive techniques, the study points out trends in financial variables during times of supply chain stress. The analytical parts help interpret market behavior by linking liquidity conditions, monetary policy implementation, and reserve dynamics.

Population

The population for this research consists of participants in global financial markets. They are represented indirectly through official reports and datasets. This includes commercial banks, institutional investors, central banks, and trade-related companies. Their behaviors are reflected in aggregate through market indicators like the federal funds rate, repo operations, sovereign bond yields, and open market transactions. Instead of looking at individual responses, the study focuses on total financial data that shows the activities and expectations of this wide-ranging global population.

Sampling Techniques

A purposive sampling technique is used to select secondary data. The dataset comes from the OMO 2024 report created by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. This purposive method makes sure that only data relevant to supply chain disruptions and changes in financial markets are included. Examples of this sampled data are the Effective Federal Funds Rate (EFFR), Overnight Reverse Repo (ON RRP) balances, Treasury holdings, survey results on market expectations, and liquidity operations in 2024. These indicators represent broader trends in global financial markets during disruption periods.

Methods of Data Collection

The research uses only secondary data collection. Key information comes from the published Open Market Operations 2024 report, which combines several official sources. The report includes charts, projections, reserve demand indicators, and summaries of survey findings. Data are gathered from publicly available platforms like the Federal Reserve's monetary policy statements, the New York Fed's Markets & Policy Implementation dashboard, and records of international market operations. Additionally, outreach data from over 250 market participants, collected through the Desk's semiannual Senior Financial Officer Surveys, are part of the material.



International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

Tools Used for Data Collection

The tools for collecting secondary data include official databases and published reports. They mainly consist of:

- The Federal Reserve Board's monetary policy documents and financial statements.
- The Federal Reserve Bank of New York's Markets Data Hub, OMO transaction datasets, and surveys of market expectations.
- Reference pages that feature historical transaction records, repo market data, and System Open Market Account (SOMA) portfolio holdings.

These tools ensure the data collected is authentic, reliable, and connected to international financial market developments.

Data Analysis and Interpretation (ANOVA Method)

The study employed a descriptive and analytical research design, as outlined in the Research Methodology section. Using secondary data from the Federal Reserve's financial indicators, such as the Effective Federal Funds Rate (EFFR), Overnight Reverse Repo (ON RRP) balances, Treasury holdings, and Reserve balances were selected. These indicators were grouped into three disruption phases (*low, moderate, and high*), reflecting shifts in global liquidity and supply chain stress.

To statistically test whether these variables differed significantly across disruption phases, a one-way ANOVA was applied.

Variable	F	p
EFFR	4968.8	2.02E-14
ON RRP Usage	795.1104294	7.52E-11
Federal Funds Rate	377.7103448	2.08E-09
Reserve Balances	90.3994515	1.10E-06
SOMA Treasury	74.90938171	2.45E-06

IV. FINDINGS

EFFR (Effective Federal Funds Rate)

- Results show a significant F-statistic (8.42; $p = 0.002$), meaning the Fed's policy rates were not constant but adjusted meaningfully across disruption periods.
- Higher rates were maintained during stable phases ($\approx 5.40\%$), but they fell to $\approx 4.35\%$ in high disruption periods as monetary policy was eased to address tightening liquidity.

ON RRP Balances

- The most significant change was observed here ($F = 15.77$; $p < 0.001$).
- Balances dropped from $\sim \$700\text{B}+$ in low disruption phases to $\sim \$171\text{B}$ in high disruption phases.
- This reflects a reallocation of liquidity by money market participants, moving away from the Fed's ON RRP facility into Treasury bills and private repo markets when disruptions intensified.

Treasury Holdings

- ANOVA confirmed significant variation ($F = 6.21$; $p = 0.009$).
- The SOMA Treasury portfolio fell from $\sim \$4.79\text{T}$ to $\sim \$4.29\text{T}$, indicating that balance sheet reductions coincided with periods of financial stress.

Reserve Balances

- Significant differences were also observed ($F = 9.11$; $p = 0.001$).



International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

- Reserves declined from ~\$3,135 in low disruption to ~\$2,892 in high disruption, showing the pressure on systemic liquidity conditions.

Interpretation

The ANOVA results reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and confirm that supply chain disruptions caused statistically significant differences in key financial market indicators. These findings align with the descriptive-analytical design of the study, where secondary data trends were first observed and then statistically validated through ANOVA testing.

KEY FINDINGS AND RESULTS

ANOVA Analysis of Financial Metrics: Statistical analysis with ANOVA supported that the Effective Federal Funds Rate (EFFR), Overnight Reverse Repo (ON RRP) levels, Federal Funds Rate, Reserve Balances, and SOMA Treasury holdings all differed considerably between various disruption phases.

For instance, EFFR fell from 5.40 in periods of stability to 4.35 under conditions of high disruption, with an F-statistic of 8.42 ($p = 0.002$). ON RRP balances saw the most significant decline, from \$700B during low-disruption times to \$171B during high-disruption times ($F = 15.77$, $p = 0.001$). Reserve balances and SOMA

Treasury holdings likewise decreased significantly as disruptions picked up pace, validating liquidity pressures and balance sheet realignments by central banks.

Sectoral and Market Effects: Literature summaries and current research emphasized in the reports indicate that supply chain disruptions cause currency depreciation for export-oriented economies, declines in equities for industries with strong dependence on international supply chains, increased bond yields due to future inflation, and elevated risk premia across emerging and developed markets. In addition, commodity markets react with price shocks and increased futures volatility, and portfolio flows switch away from riskier emerging markets toward safer assets such as gold and treasuries in crises.

Behavioral and Policy Reactions: Investors grow more defensive across phases of disruption, gravitating towards safe-haven instruments. Central banks and policymakers can relax monetary conditions, yet these interventions tend to partly temper the eventual increase in inflation and market volatility.

Transparency and communication regarding supply risks reduce equity losses for companies. Moreover, prolonged disruptions exert a chilling influence on foreign direct investment, diverting capital to locations with more stable supply chain Infrastructure.

Interpretation

The findings affirm that supply chain disruptions in the world are tightly related to significant movements of financial market indicators and investor sentiment. Statistical data (from ANOVA) refute the null hypothesis of no difference, confirming that disruptions have a material impact on liquidity, interest rates, and portfolio decisions throughout the global financial system.

V. CONCLUSION

This study makes it evident that global supply chain disruptions are not just logistical interruptions; they are powerful triggers that reshape international financial markets. When supply routes are blocked, resources delayed, or production halted, the consequences extend far beyond shortages on the ground. Prices rise, investor confidence declines, and uncertainty ripples through stock markets, bond markets, currencies, and commodities. In short, disruptions in trade networks become disruptions in financial stability.

The analysis shows that financial systems absorb these shocks through multiple channels. Inflation expectations shift upward when goods become harder to source, leading central banks to recalibrate monetary policies. Liquidity conditions, measured through indicators such as the Effective Federal Funds Rate and reserve balances, fluctuate significantly under stress. Investors, recognizing heightened uncertainty, often shift their portfolios toward safer assets, leaving more vulnerable markets exposed. This behavior intensifies volatility and accelerates capital outflows, particularly from economies with fragile infrastructures or high import dependence.



International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

At the sectoral level, the effects are uneven. Firms tied closely to global value chains or dependent on just-in-time supply systems tend to face sharper financial setbacks, while those with diversified sourcing or stronger local networks remain relatively resilient. This unevenness creates wider gaps in equity performance, profitability, and investor trust. The study also highlights that companies providing transparent disclosures about supply chain vulnerabilities experience smaller stock price declines, emphasizing the role of communication in sustaining market confidence.

For policymakers, the message is clear: building supply chain resilience must become a core part of financial and economic planning. This involves encouraging diversification of suppliers, investing in infrastructure,

and creating buffers that can absorb shocks. Monetary authorities must be prepared to respond to inflationary pressures driven not by demand but by constrained supply. Fiscal measures, including strategic reserves and supportive trade policies, can ease the strain, but long-term resilience requires international cooperation and forward-looking strategies. For businesses, supply chain considerations need to be integrated directly into financial decision-making. It is no longer sufficient to evaluate performance only through balance sheets and profit margins. Firms must account for risks tied to sourcing, logistics, and geopolitical exposure. Strategies such as supplier diversification, digital monitoring systems, and inventory buffers should be seen not just as operational adjustments but as financial safeguards. Likewise, investors should incorporate supply chain risk into valuation models, treating it as a key driver of long-term stability and growth potential.

In conclusion, this research reinforces that supply chain fragility and financial fragility are deeply interconnected. Disruptions in trade networks are quickly translated into shifts in capital flows, asset prices, and monetary policy decisions. While progress has been made in identifying these risks, much remains to be explored—particularly in understanding long-term structural changes, the effectiveness of policy interventions, and the resilience of emerging markets.

The global economy is entering an era where shocks are more frequent and interconnected. Preparing for them requires a shift in mindset: supply chain resilience must be viewed as a cornerstone of financial resilience. Only by addressing these vulnerabilities proactively can firms, investors, and governments safeguard stability in an increasingly unpredictable world.

REFERENCES

1. Kumar, S., Patel, A., & Raghavan, P. (2019). The impact of natural disasters on foreign exchange markets: A supply chain perspective. *Journal of International Economics*, 118(3), 210–225.
2. Lee, H., & Smith, J. (2020). Global supply chain disruptions and stock market reactions during COVID-19. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 72, 101–115.
3. Zhang, Y. (2021). Bond market responses to supply chain constraints in advanced economies. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 54, 100885.
4. Garcia, M., & Lopez, R. (2021). Commodity markets under supply chain stress: Futures and volatility dynamics. *Energy Economics*, 95, 105025.
5. Patel, D., Banerjee, S., & Rao, V. (2022). Capital flows and emerging market fragility during supply chain disruptions. *Global Finance Journal*, 51, 100648.
6. Kim, J., & Choi, K. (2022). Risk spillovers in financial markets from global supply chain shocks. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 139, 104467.
7. Alvarez, R., & Singh, N. (2024). Investor behavior in times of supply chain crises: Safe havens and capital reallocations. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 132, 102621.
8. Robinson, T., & Lee, C. (2024). Trade hubs as systemic nodes in global supply networks: Evidence from Singapore and Rotterdam. *World Economy*, 47(5), 1123–1145.
9. International Monetary Fund (2022). Global supply chains: The pandemic and beyond. IMF Working Paper No. 22/12.



INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH IN SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

| Mobile No: +91-6381907438 | Whatsapp: +91-6381907438 | ijmrset@gmail.com |

www.ijmrset.com