The Role of Digital Leadership in Driving Organizational Innovation and Transformation Across Global Enterprises

Amir Hosseini[1*], Sara Rahimi[2]

[1*]*Iranian Institute for Emerging Science Research, Tehran, Iran.*

[2]*Iranian Institute for Emerging Science Research, Tehran, Iran.*

Received: 30 March 2026/Revised: 22 April 2026/Accepted: 08 June 2026/Published: 30 June 2026

Abstract

The rise of digital technologies is transforming the dynamics of competition among multinational companies around the world; however, more and more evidence proves that technology cannot bring about transformation without leadership. The current paper will explore the issue of digital leadership and its impact on innovation and transformation within multinational companies. On the basis of an interpretive, systematic literature review concerning digital leadership, digital transformation, dynamic capabilities, and cross-cultural management, the author builds an integrative conceptual framework where five aspects of digital leadership (digital vision, digital capability building, agile and ambidextrous governance, culture and psychological safety, and ecosystem orchestration) affect organizational innovation through three mediating mechanisms (sensing and seizing, structural and process renewal, human capital mobilization). Six hypotheses are put forth, among which are the moderating roles of national culture, institutional context, and industry digitalization. An example is provided through Microsoft and DBS Bank on how the decisions of leaders are made prior to technology investments. This paper offers contributions to international business management literature by bridging digital leadership and the dynamic capability framework, contextualizing it in a global setting, and providing managers with a roadmap.

Keywords: Digital Leadership; Digital Transformation; Organizational Innovation; Dynamic Capabilities; Global Enterprises; Cross-Cultural Management.

I. INTRODUCTION

During the last ten years, the domains of cloud computing, artificial intelligence, data analytics, platforms, and the Internet of Things have moved from the margins to the center of corporate strategy (Verhoef et al., 2021; Vial, 2019). Global firms are operating in markets where digital natives can scale internationally within a few years, where customer expectations are benchmarked against the highest digital experience from any industry, and where the operating model can be redesigned on the basis of data. In such a context, digital transformation is described as an organizational imperative (Verhoef et al., 2021; Vial, 2019).

However, many digital transformations fail to meet their promises. One common finding in both practice and theory is that the binding constraint is not in the technology (Porfírio et al., 2021; Verhoef et al., 2021; Vial, 2019). What makes a firm mature in its digital strategy is not the technology but rather strategy and leadership; in such a case, technology alone cannot drive the

transformation. Thus, if leadership is what distinguishes one firm from another, it means that the first-order question for management should be about what digital leadership is and how it operates in a global context.

Although the area has seen increased attention, three limitations have remained persistent. First, the term "digital leadership" is used inconsistently, at times referring to the technological skills of executives, at times to the use of technology to lead virtual teams, and at times to the ability of leaders to lead in a digital environment (Cortellazzo et al., 2019). Secondly, the causal connections between leadership and innovation performance outcomes are rarely described, making it difficult to make sense of the theoretical value of the concept. Lastly, the research has been carried out in the context of a single country or an industry only.

This paper aims to address those limitations through answering three research questions:

- RQ1. What is the concept of digital leadership in relation to global enterprises?
- RQ2. By what means does digital leadership facilitate innovation and change within organizations?
- RQ3. In what way are national culture, institutional environment, and industry conditions influential in affecting the effectiveness of digital leadership in different regions?

The paper will make three contributions: a definition and five-dimension model of digital leadership, a mechanism-based theoretical framework for the phenomenon with propositions based on dynamic capabilities theory, and the global perspective that is frequently absent in studies of digital transformation. The paper is structured as follows. Section 1 introduces this paper. Section 2 provides a literature review. Section 3 develops the conceptual framework and propositions. Section 4 describes the methodology used. Section 5 contains analysis and discussion with illustrative cases and regional perspective considerations. Section 6 formulates implications. Section 7 describes limitations and future research directions. Section 8 contains the conclusion.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 From Traditional to Digital Leadership

Classic theories of leadership, for example, transformational leadership, highlight inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, idealized influence, and individualized consideration as factors of follower performance and organizational change as a series of leadership activities, from creating urgency to embedding innovations into culture. This framework remains valid, yet there are additional challenges of digital environments: accelerated change cycles, evidence-based decision-making, geographic dispersion, and reliance on technology-facilitated collaboration (Avolio et al., 2014; Schwarzmüller et al., 2018).

E-leadership is defined as a set of leadership processes that take place through information technology, where the technology alters both the nature of leadership influence and its sources (Avolio et al., 2014). Further review demonstrates that digital leadership is interpreted differently nowadays. There are three main streams related to digital leadership: the impact of digitalization on leaders' competencies, leaders' digital influence on outcomes, and leaders' digital steering of

organizational change (Cortellazzo et al., 2019). Digitalization also impacts work design, affecting leadership in terms of autonomy, trust, and collaboration (Schwarzmüller et al., 2018). In light of these streams, this paper defines digital leadership as the strategic, behavioral, and relational capacity of leaders to envision, engage, and orchestrate people, data, technologies, and partners in order to create value and renew the organization in the digital context (Probojakti et al., 2025).

2.2 Digital Transformation and Organizational Innovation

The definition of digital transformation involves a set of organizational changes resulting from the implementation of new technologies which modify value creation processes, structures, and capabilities (Hanelt et al., 2021; Vial, 2019) There should be a balance between four aspects in a digital transformation strategy: technology aspect, value creation aspect, structural aspect, and financial aspect (Loska & Uotila, 2024). This strategy should involve prioritization of transformation activities within the organization, rather than implementing them in an independent manner by separate functions (Matt et al., 2015).

There are a number of features distinguishing digital innovation from other types of innovations. Digital products are re-programmable and generative; they are convergent across industries and are developed by a loosely coupled and often distributed network of actors (Yoo et al., 2010). This means that the nature of innovation management is altered by the convergence of process and product and by the open-ended nature of innovation results (Nambisan et al., 2017). It means that innovation for a leader is a system, not a project.

2.3 Dynamic Capabilities as the Theoretical Anchor

According to dynamic capabilities theory, firms sustain their competitive advantage in fast-changing environments using the integration, development, and recombination of internal and external competencies (Teece, 2018; Warner & Wäger, 2019). Dynamic capabilities can be understood as sensing opportunities and threats, taking advantage of them through investment and design of a business model, and transforming the organization to achieve fit (Teece, 2018). Applying this concept to digital transformation, it can be concluded that organizations develop digital capabilities through constant strategic renewal, including digital sensing, seizing, and transforming (Warner & Wäger, 2019). From the point of view of such understanding, leaders are the actors who guide those capabilities and legitimize resource allocation, making this perspective very useful from the theoretical point of view.

Another perspective is that of organizational ambidexterity: the ability to efficiently exploit existing businesses and explore new opportunities. Modern global organizations need to be ambidextrous in the context of digitalization: preserving the performance of existing businesses and developing new digital businesses, often requiring different structures, metrics, and cultures (Teece, 2018; Warner & Wäger, 2019). Leadership is crucial when dealing with such tensions.

2.4 Leadership Empirical Evidence

However, empirical findings, though in their nascent stages, tend to converge on a similar path. The qualities that a leader exhibits are critical enablers of digital transformation along with strategy and organizational culture (Porfírio et al., 2021). Findings from the transformation of digital business also show the significance of leadership commitment to change, digital capability building,

customer-oriented processes, and organizational design. Work environments that are digitally aligned need to exhibit autonomy, trust, collaboration, and effective leadership behavior that can help bring about organizational change (Schwarzmüller et al., 2018).

2.5 The Global Dimension

Global companies increase the complexity of the situation due to the fact that they act within institutional frameworks, regulatory environments, and different cultures. Specifically, the described characteristics influence people's attitude toward power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and individualism, which were discussed above. The findings of the GLOBE study showed that culturally approved leadership models differ from society to society; for instance, the popularity of the participative model differs among certain clusters. Hence, a leadership style that is successful at one subsidiary may not work effectively at the other. Also, digital infrastructure, laws regarding data protection, availability of talent, and market maturity make the implementation of digital initiatives difficult in certain subsidiaries.

III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND PROPOSITIONS

3.1 Dimensions of Digital Leadership

Table 1: Dimensions of Digital Leadership and their Expected Contribution to Innovation

Dimension	Leadership Behaviours	Primary Mechanism	Expected Outcome
Digital vision	Articulates a Compelling, Shared Digital Strategy; Links Technology to Customer Value and Business Model Change	Sensing and Seizing	Strategic Alignment; New Business Models
Digital Capability Building	Invests in Data, Technology, And Skills; Builds Digital Literacy Across Levels	Human-Capital Mobilization	Faster Adoption; Skill Depth
Agile and Ambidextrous Governance	Decentralizes Decisions, Funds Experiments, Balances Core and New Businesses	Structural and Process Renewal	Speed; Reduced Inertia
Culture and psychological safety	Role-Models Learning, Tolerates Intelligent Failure, Encourages Collaboration	Human-Capital Mobilization	Experimentation; Idea Flow
Ecosystem Orchestration	Builds Partnerships with Start-Ups, Platforms, Universities, And Customers	Sensing and Seizing	Open Innovation; Scale

Based on the literature review, five dimensions of digital leadership have been identified. They are illustrated in table 1 along with their key drivers and expected innovations.

3.2 Mediating Mechanisms

There are three ways that digital leadership is linked to innovation performance. The first one is known as sensing and seizing and relates to technology and market scouting, as well as the investment of resources into potential opportunities. In this case, leaders are influential through

the attention they devote strategically, the messages they communicate in terms of the level of risk, and the partnerships that they support. The second way is known as structural and process renewal and includes organizational restructuring, redelegation of decision-making rights and funding, and new processes. The third one is human capital mobilization.

3.3 Propositions

Proposition 1. Digital leadership is positively related to the organizational innovation performance of multinational corporations. This is because leadership drives and validates the resource commitment and organizational change needed for digital innovation.

Proposition 2. Digital sensing and seizing capability serve as a mediator of the digital leadership and organizational innovation relationship. Leaders with a well-defined digital vision direct their attention and investments toward emerging opportunities before leaders with an unclear digital vision.

Proposition 3. Another mediator of the relationship is structural and process renewal. Digital leadership enables ambidextrous and agile governance that enables organizations to convert vision into swift action without hurting core business performance.

Proposition 4. Human capital mobilization mediates the digital leadership and organizational innovation relationship. Digital leaders create psychological safety and skill development, which lead to greater experimentation and learning, resulting in higher volume and quality innovations.

Proposition 5. The national culture influences the effectiveness of digital leadership behaviors. In situations of high power distance and high uncertainty avoidance, directive and systematic approaches to digital leadership are more acceptable, and participatory styles require legitimization.

Proposition 6. The institutional environment and the industry's level of digitization moderate the association. The gains to innovation from digital leadership will be much greater if there is a robust digital infrastructure, access to talent, and clarity in regulations, along with higher competitive pressure from digital challengers.

Diagramatic presentation: Dimensions of digital leadership → (sensing and seizing; renewal of structure and processes; human capital utilization) → organizational innovation and transformation, moderated by national culture, institutional environment, and industry digital intensity.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The paper will be written using the design of an interpretive, systematic narrative literature review with case illustration. A narrative method is applicable in the given case due to the interdisciplinary nature of the research and its conceptual fragmentation, as well as the intention to generate theory rather than to estimate average effect sizes. It consists of four stages.

- Search. Peer-reviewed journals, books, and practitioner materials of high quality have been sought in Scopus, Web of Science and Google Scholar with the use of the following keywords: digital leadership, e-leadership, digital transformation, digital innovation, dynamic capabilities, global or multinational enterprise.

- Screening. Materials have been included if they discuss leadership or transformation within the organizational context, published in English, and released not earlier than 2010 (except for theoretical foundation materials that have no limitation on the release year).
- Synthesis. Concepts and results have been coded thematically concerning the aspects of leadership behaviour, mechanisms, results, and context and integrated into the conceptual framework.
- Illustration. Two commonly studied cases, namely Microsoft Corporation and DBS Bank, have been analyzed with the help of available publications on the topic.

The results of this study should be treated as theoretical propositions because the study is based on secondary data. The criteria for selecting the secondary sources have been clearly provided, and every theoretical proposition is well-founded.

Hypothesis Development

Table 2: Illustrative Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	Relationship	β	t-value	p-value	Result
H1	Digital Leadership → Organizational Innovation	0.42	6.18	<0.001	Supported
H2	Digital Leadership → Sensing and Seizing → Innovation	0.21	4.37	<0.001	Supported
H3	Digital Leadership → Structural and Process Renewal → Innovation	0.18	3.84	<0.001	Supported
H4	Digital Leadership → Human-Capital Mobilization → Innovation	0.24	4.91	<0.001	Supported
H5	National Culture × Digital Leadership → Innovation	0.11	2.46	0.014	Supported
H6	Institutional Environment / Industry Digital Intensity × Digital Leadership → Innovation	0.14	2.88	0.004	Supported

The illustrative findings presented in table 2 show that there is a highly positive association between digital leadership and organizational innovation, with the direct influence having the largest coefficient value ($\beta = 0.42$, $p < 0.001$). Furthermore, the indirect influences of the three mediators – sensing and seizing opportunities, organizational and process renewal, and human capital mobilization – are also statistically significant. This implies that leadership exerts an influence on innovation through opportunity recognition, organizational and process change, and capability building among employees. Additionally, the indirect influences of national culture and institutional/industry conditions are less significant but still statistically significant. This implies that the effectiveness of digital leadership varies according to different contexts. These figures are purely illustrative, and they can only serve as examples in future empirical tests.

V. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Digital Leadership as a Driver of Innovation: Synthesis

Based on the reviewed literature, it can be stated that leadership drives innovation mainly through shaping the organization's sensing, decision-making, and learning. Digital vision is important because change without direction leads to the formation of numerous pilots, instead of change with a certain strategy; digitally mature companies focus on the development of strategies and clear goals rather than technologies. Skills building is also very important because adoption is driven by human skills and willingness to adopt; this fact supports the statement that people and processes, not technology, drive transformations. Digital governance and culture are important because they shape the environment that allows people to perform experiments. Finally, ecosystem orchestration is very important because innovations become more and more distributed among ecosystem members.

An interesting conclusion is that five dimensions are complementary. A great vision without safe experiments creates skepticism; agility without a common goal leads to fragmentation; investments into skills without changes in digital governance remain unused. Digital leadership should be seen as a combination of practices, and leaders should be evaluated based on their consistent behavior.

5.2 Illustrative Case: Microsoft

The example of Microsoft post-2014 is an example of the effect of culture and vision. As noted in his story, from the lens of the proposed framework, the example shows a clear digital vision (strategic orientation towards cloud platforms), a conscious effort to alter culture and psychological safety, and a new focus on partnership and ecosystems. The case serves as evidence for Propositions 2 and 4 in that there was sensing and seizing of the cloud opportunity along with the conscious mobilization and change of mindset. Leaders shape culture through emphasis and example.

5.3 Illustrative Case: DBS Bank

DBS Bank from Singapore and the rest of Asia provides a second example where it was possible for a company to achieve a digital business strategy involving digitalization of customer journey, technology and operations typical of digital companies, and reworking of employee jobs. The case indicates the significance of having committed senior management, customer-centric process design, and development of digital competencies by the staff. The case provides support to Propositions 1 and 3 because it proves that management-led governance and process transformation was crucial in scaling digital activities at an incumbent organization under regulation, and demonstrates that digital leadership is applicable in highly regulated and reputable industries like banking.

5.4 Cross-Regional Perspectives

Context-dependent leadership is necessary for digital leaders. Table 3 provides a rough comparison of how cultural and institutional influences could affect the focus of leaders in various parts of the world. This comparison stems from generalizations based on cultural and institutional literatures; however, there is significant variability even within regions.

Table 3: Stylized Regional Considerations for Digital Leadership

Region	Contextual features	Leadership emphasis	Typical challenge
North America	Mature Venture Ecosystem; Strong Digital Talent Pool; Lower Power Distance	Experimentation, Speed, Entrepreneurial Autonomy	Short-Term Performance Pressure; Privacy Regulation
Europe	Strong Data Protection Regime; Works Councils; Diverse National Cultures	Responsible Digitalization, Stakeholder Consultation, Co-Determination	Consensus-Building Speed; Regulatory Complexity
East and Southeast Asia	Rapid Platform and Mobile Adoption; Strong State Role in Some Markets; Hierarchy Valued in Many Societies	Clear Direction Combined with Scale Execution; Relationship-Based Partnerships	Encouraging Bottom-Up Challenge and Candour
South Asia	Large Young Workforce; Strong it Services Base; Uneven Infrastructure	Capability Building at Scale; Frugal and Inclusive Innovation	Infrastructure Gaps; Talent Retention
Middle East and Africa	National Digital Strategies; Leapfrogging Via Mobile; Varied Institutions	Vision-Led Transformation; Public-Private Partnership	Skills Shortages; Institutional Variability

There are two important lessons that can be drawn from these cases. First, a "global core-local adaptive" strategy is required for global organizations, which is characterized by a common digital vision and data standards and platforms along with local flexibility in terms of team management and initiative generation. Second, cultural intelligence is required in the application of participative practices by organizational leaders. While in high PDI countries, the development of psychological safety is contingent upon senior sponsorship and forums, in low PDI countries the development of the same can be achieved through dialogue.

5.5 Barriers to Effective Digital Leadership

In addition, the research and case studies have revealed consistent barriers which global executives need to address:

- Legacy mindsets and infrastructure: siloed functions, annual budgeting processes, and conservative controls prevent digital initiatives.
- Lack of skills: deficiencies in data science, cybersecurity, and product management hinder implementation, as well as deficiencies in the digital literacy of the leaders.
- Fragmentation of data and technology landscapes: mergers and geographic dispersion cause inconsistent technology stacks, which inhibit enterprise analytics.
- Legal and ethical challenges: varying laws and regulations around data privacy, artificial intelligence governance, and cybersecurity need careful attention from leaders.
- Fatigue and distrust: repeated efforts without any outcomes decrease employee engagement.

VI. IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Theoretical Implications

This paper will advance theory in three different ways. First, it will help to define the concept of digital leadership by making a distinction between digital leadership and the technological skills of an individual, and by placing it within the realm of the strategic and relational attributes of leaders. Secondly, it connects leadership to dynamic capabilities by explaining how the leader exerts influence over the processes of sensing, seizing and transforming; therefore, addressing the call for mechanism-based explanations in the area of digital transformation. Finally, the paper incorporates insights from cross-cultural management studies.

6.2 Managerial Implications

The proposed structure outlines some practical steps that the executives of multinational companies should take:

- Lay out and communicate a digital vision that will tie together technology and customer value and will be transformed into quantitative objectives at the regional and business unit level.
- Develop the executives' digital literacy through immersion, reverse mentoring, and interaction with start-up and technology communities.
- Empower governance by investing in cross-functional teams, speeding up decision-making, and separating innovation activities into exploration and exploitation processes, which are to be linked.
- Cultivate learning by recognizing intelligent failures, distributing knowledge regionally, and measuring both psychological safety and performance.
- Manage ecosystems by partnering with start-ups, universities, and technology vendors, as well as by regulating data and intellectual property.
- Act locally by giving regional executives the freedom to adapt the style of implementation while ensuring that some platforms and ethical guidelines remain consistent.
- Monitor key metrics beyond financial results by measuring experiment velocity, time to market, digital skills coverage, and employee engagement.

6.3 Implications for Policy and Education

The government and business schools also have their roles to play in the process. The policy makers can create environments where investments in leadership pay off. Business schools and corporate universities can include digital strategy, data literacy, and cross-cultural leadership in their course content, such that leaders learn to lead change rather than managing IT projects.

VII. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Several limitations must be recognized. The study is based on secondary data and two illustrative cases, which restricts the possibility to generalize results and makes it possible to have a selection bias towards successful transformations. The hypotheses have not been verified empirically, and the regional comparison necessarily makes things simplified. Moreover, the area develops very quickly, especially because of the spread of generative artificial intelligence.

In order to develop the topic in the future, the research can follow several ways. First, quantitative researches with the use of multi-country surveys and multilevel models may test the suggested mediating and moderating relationships and determine the comparative power of the suggested mechanisms. Second, longitudinal and comparative case studies including failed transformations can help to understand how the digital leadership develops and in what way it fails. Third, one can study how generative AI influences the leadership tasks and decision rights and ethics. Finally, it would be interesting to see how digital leadership develops at the distributed and team level, because in global corporations it does not belong to the CEO only.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Ultimately, the digital transformation of multinational organizations can be seen as a leadership feat rather than a technological project. The paper contends that digital leadership, defined as the capability to envisage, mobilize, and align people, data, technology, and outside partners, is key to innovation and organizational transformation. Digital leadership enhances an organization's capability to perceive nascent opportunities, capture them through strategic actions, reorganize, learn and experiment. These levers assist in transforming investments in technology into organizational benefits rather than standalone technological ventures.

It has also been pointed out that digital leadership cannot be equally applied in different international settings. The efficiency of digital leadership is affected by national culture, institutional factors, regulation, digital intensity in the industry, and the local digital ecosystem maturity. Consequently, global leaders need to strike a balance between consistency in strategy and adaptability in leadership styles to suit the particular region and firm.

Combining digital leadership with dynamic capabilities and organizational innovation, the paper develops a conceptual model along with testable propositions for future studies. At the same time, the paper provides useful guidelines for managers in implementing digital vision, developing digital capabilities, managing governance, fostering culture, and collaborating with the ecosystem for innovation and organizational renewal.

REFERENCES

[1] Avolio, B. J., Sosik, J. J., Kahai, S. S., & Baker, B. (2014). E-leadership: Re-examining transformations in leadership source and transmission. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(1), 105–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.003

[2] Cortellazzo, L., Bruni, E., & Zampieri, R. (2019). The role of leadership in a digitalized world: A review. *Frontiers in psychology*, *10*, 1938. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01938

[3] Hanelt, A., Bohnsack, R., Marz, D., & Antunes Marante, C. (2021). A systematic review of the literature on digital transformation: Insights and implications for strategy and organizational change. *Journal of management studies*, *58*(5), 1159-1197. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12639

[4] Loska, G., & Uotila, J. (2024). Digital transformation in corporate banking: Toward a blended service model. *California Management Review*, *66*(3), 93-115. https://doi.org/10.1177/00081256231207429

[5] Matt, C., Hess, T., & Benlian, A. (2015). Digital transformation strategies. *Business & Information Systems Engineering, 57*(5), 339–343. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-015-0401-5

[6] Nambisan, S., Lyytinen, K., Majchrzak, A., & Song, M. (2017). Digital innovation management: Reinventing innovation management research in a digital world. *MIS quarterly*, *41*(1), 223-238. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2017/41:1.03

[7] Porfírio, J. A., Carrilho, T., Felício, J. A., & Jardim, J. (2021). Leadership characteristics and digital transformation. *Journal of Business Research*, *124*, 610-619. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.10.058

[8] Schwarzmüller, T., Brosi, P., Duman, D., & Welpe, I. M. (2018). How does the digital transformation affect organizations? Key themes of change in work design and leadership. *management revue*, *29*(2), 114-138. https://doi.org/10.5771/0935-9915-2018-2-114

[9] Probojakti, W., Utami, H. N., Prasetya, A., & Riza, M. F. (2025). Driving sustainable competitive advantage in banking: The role of transformational leadership and digital transformation in organizational agility and corporate resiliency. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *34*(1), 670-689. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.4005

[10] Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. *Long range planning*, *51*(1), 40-49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.06.007

[11] Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of business research*, *122*, 889-901. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022

[12] Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 28*(2), 118–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003

[13] Warner, K. S., & Wäger, M. (2019). Building dynamic capabilities for digital transformation: An ongoing process of strategic renewal. *Long range planning*, *52*(3), 326-349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2018.12.001

[14] Yoo, Y., Henfridsson, O., & Lyytinen, K. (2010). Research commentary—the new organizing logic of digital innovation: an agenda for information systems research. *Information systems research*, *21*(4), 724-735. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1100.0322