DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION AND INNOVATION PERFORMANCE: EXPLORING THE ROLE OF DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES

Baoting Liu [1*]
Shun-Chieh Chang [2]
Praphaphan Wunsuk [3]
Qifeng Wei [4]
Pollawat Chintanaporn [5]

[1-5] Innovation College, North-Chiang Mai University
[*] **Corresponding Author, E-mail:** baoting.liu@northcm.ac.th

Abstract: The accelerating pace of digital transformation has fundamentally altered the competitive landscape, compelling organizations to reconfigure their capabilities to maintain innovation performance. This study investigates the mediating role of dynamic capabilities in the relationship between digital transformation initiatives and innovation performance outcomes. Drawing on dynamic capabilities theory and resource-based view, we develop a conceptual framework that examines how organizations leverage sensing, seizing, and transforming capabilities to translate digital investments into innovation advantages. Using a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative analysis of 312 manufacturing firms and qualitative insights from 24 in-depth executive interviews, our findings reveal that dynamic capabilities serve as critical mediators in the digital transformation-innovation performance relationship. Specifically, we find that sensing capabilities enable organizations to identify digital opportunities, seizing capabilities facilitate the mobilization of digital resources, and transforming capabilities drive the reconfiguration of organizational processes for innovation outcomes.

The results demonstrate that organizations with higher levels of dynamic capabilities achieve 23% greater innovation performance compared to those with limited capabilities. Furthermore, the study identifies three distinct pathways through which digital transformation enhances innovation: technology-driven innovation, process-driven innovation, and ecosystem-driven innovation. Our findings contribute to the growing body of literature on digital transformation by providing empirical evidence for the theoretical mechanisms underlying innovation performance improvements. The research offers significant managerial implications, suggesting that organizations should prioritize capability development alongside technology investments to maximize digital transformation benefits. Policy makers are advised to support capability-building initiatives that enhance organizational readiness for digital innovation.

Keywords: Digital Transformation, Innovation Performance, Dynamic Capabilities

Introduction

The contemporary business environment is characterized by unprecedented levels of technological disruption, with digital transformation emerging as a critical strategic imperative for organizational survival and growth (Vial, 2019; Westerman et al., 2014). Organizations across industries are investing billions in digital technologies, yet research consistently reveals a significant performance gap between digital investments and realized innovation outcomes (Bughin et al., 2018; Kane et al., 2015). This phenomenon, often referred to as the "digital transformation paradox," highlights a fundamental disconnect between technological capability acquisition and innovation performance enhancement.

Recent studies indicate that while 87% of organizations recognize digital transformation as a competitive opportunity, only 35% report successful innovation outcomes from their digital initiatives (MIT Sloan Management Review, 2020). This disparity suggests that digital transformation success extends beyond technology adoption to encompass broader organizational capabilities that enable effective resource allocation, process reconfiguration, and strategic adaptation (Bharadwaj et al., 2013; Yoo et al., 2012).

The resource-based view of the firm emphasizes that sustainable competitive advantages derive from valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable resources and capabilities (Barney, 1991; Peteraf, 1993). However, in the context of rapid technological change, static resources and capabilities may become obsolete or insufficient for maintaining competitive positions (Teece et al., 1997; Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000). Dynamic capabilities theory addresses this limitation by focusing on organizations' abilities to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly changing environments (Teece, 2007, 2014).

Dynamic capabilities encompass three primary dimensions: sensing capabilities that enable organizations to identify opportunities and threats, seizing capabilities that facilitate the mobilization of resources to capture opportunities, and transforming capabilities that drive continuous renewal and adaptation (Teece, 2007). These capabilities become particularly crucial in digital transformation contexts, where organizations must navigate technological complexity, market uncertainty, and competitive pressure simultaneously (Karimi & Walter, 2015; Yeow et al., 2018).

Despite growing interest in digital transformation and dynamic capabilities, limited empirical research examines their intersection and impact on innovation performance. Existing studies tend to focus on individual components rather than comprehensive frameworks that integrate digital transformation initiatives, dynamic capabilities, and innovation outcomes (Sebastian et al., 2017; Vial, 2019). Furthermore, most research relies on conceptual frameworks or single-case studies, limiting generalizability and theoretical development (Nambisan et al., 2017; Yoo et al., 2012).

The innovation performance literature reveals additional complexity, with researchers identifying multiple dimensions including innovation efficiency, innovation effectiveness, and innovation impact (Crossan & Apaydin, 2010; Lawson & Samson, 2001). Digital transformation may influence these dimensions differently, requiring nuanced analysis of capability-performance relationships. Moreover, contextual factors such as industry characteristics, organizational size, and competitive intensity may moderate these relationships, necessitating comprehensive empirical investigation.

Research Questions and Contributions

This study addresses three fundamental research questions that advance our understanding of digital transformation's impact on innovation performance through dynamic capabilities:

Research Question 1: How do dynamic capabilities mediate the relationship between digital transformation initiatives and innovation performance outcomes?

Research Question 2: What are the specific mechanisms through which sensing, seizing, and transforming capabilities influence innovation performance in digital transformation contexts?

Research Question 3: How do contextual factors moderate the effectiveness of dynamic capabilities in translating digital transformation investments into innovation advantages?

The study makes several significant theoretical and practical contributions. First, we extend dynamic capabilities theory by providing empirical evidence for capability-performance relationships in digital transformation contexts. Our research identifies specific pathways through which dynamic capabilities enable innovation performance improvements, addressing calls for more granular understanding of capability mechanisms (Peteraf et al., 2013; Schilke et al., 2018).

Second, we contribute to the digital transformation literature by developing and testing a comprehensive framework that integrates technological, organizational, and strategic perspectives. Our mixed-methods approach combines quantitative analysis of performance relationships with qualitative insights into capability development processes, providing rich understanding of transformation dynamics (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017; Venkatesh et al., 2013).

Third, our research offers important managerial insights for organizations undertaking digital transformation initiatives. By identifying critical capabilities and their performance impacts, we provide actionable guidance for capability development strategies. The study also reveals contextual factors that influence transformation effectiveness, enabling more targeted implementation approaches.

Finally, we advance innovation performance measurement by developing multidimensional constructs that capture both efficiency and effectiveness aspects of innovation outcomes. This contribution addresses limitations in existing research that often relies on single-indicator performance measures (Crossan & Apaydin, 2010; Damanpour & Aravind, 2012).

Literature Review

Digital Transformation and Organizational Capabilities

Digital transformation represents a fundamental shift in how organizations create, deliver, and capture value through the strategic deployment of digital technologies (Bharadwaj et al., 2013; Fitzgerald et al., 2014). Unlike traditional IT implementations that focus on operational efficiency, digital transformation encompasses comprehensive organizational change that affects business models, operational processes, and customer experiences (Westerman et al., 2014; Sebastian et al., 2017).

The concept of digital transformation has evolved significantly since its introduction in the early 2000s. Initial conceptualizations focused primarily on technology adoption and digitization of existing processes (Tapscott, 1996; Negroponte, 1995). However, contemporary understanding recognizes digital transformation as a holistic organizational phenomenon that requires integration across technological, organizational, and strategic dimensions (Vial, 2019; Hanelt et al., 2021).

Research identifies four primary components of digital transformation: digital technology adoption, digital capability development, organizational structure adaptation, and strategic reorientation (Matt et al., 2015; Hess et al., 2016). Digital technology adoption involves the implementation of emerging technologies such as cloud computing, artificial intelligence, Internet of Things, and big data analytics (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014; Parker et al., 2016). Digital capability development encompasses the organizational processes and skills required to effectively leverage digital technologies for value creation (Bharadwaj et al., 2013; Yoo et al., 2012).

Organizational structure adaptation involves modifications to hierarchies, roles, and governance mechanisms to support digital initiatives (Kane et al., 2015; Singh & Hess, 2017). Strategic reorientation encompasses changes to business models, value propositions, and competitive positioning enabled by digital technologies (Zott et al., 2011; Amit & Zott, 2012). The integration of these components determines digital transformation effectiveness and organizational outcomes.

Dynamic capabilities theory provides a valuable lens for understanding how organizations navigate digital transformation challenges. Teece (2007) defines dynamic capabilities as "the firm's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly changing environments" (p. 1319). These capabilities enable organizations to adapt their resource bases and strategic positions in response to environmental changes, making them particularly relevant for digital transformation contexts.

The three-dimensional framework of dynamic capabilities encompasses sensing, seizing, and transforming capabilities (Teece, 2007, 2014). Sensing capabilities involve scanning, learning, and interpreting activities that enable organizations to identify opportunities and threats in their environment (Kindström et al., 2013; Teece, 2007). In digital transformation contexts, sensing capabilities enable organizations to identify emerging technologies, changing customer preferences, and competitive threats that require strategic responses.

Seizing capabilities encompass the processes and structures that enable organizations to mobilize resources and capture identified opportunities (Teece, 2014; Helfat & Peteraf, 2015). These capabilities involve decision-making processes, resource allocation mechanisms, and implementation structures that translate sensing insights into concrete actions. For digital transformation, seizing capabilities determine organizations' ability to invest in appropriate technologies, develop necessary skills, and implement transformation initiatives effectively.

Transforming capabilities involve the continuous renewal and adaptation of organizational assets, structures, and strategies to maintain competitive advantages (Teece, 2007; O'Reilly & Tushman, 2008). These capabilities enable organizations to reconfigure their resource bases, modify operational processes, and adapt strategic positions in response to environmental changes. Digital transformation requires significant transforming capabilities to successfully integrate new technologies with existing organizational systems and processes.

Innovation Performance and Digital Technologies

Innovation performance represents a multidimensional construct that encompasses organizations' ability to generate, implement, and commercialize novel ideas, products, services, or processes (Crossan & Apaydin, 2010; Damanpour & Aravind, 2012). The innovation literature identifies several key dimensions of innovation performance, including innovation input measures (R&D investment, innovation resources), innovation process measures (innovation speed, innovation quality), and innovation output measures (new product introductions, patent applications, revenue from new products) (Adams et al., 2006; Lawson & Samson, 2001).

Contemporary research increasingly recognizes innovation performance as encompassing both efficiency and effectiveness dimensions (Guan & Ma, 2003; Wang & Ahmed, 2004). Innovation efficiency refers to organizations' ability to transform innovation inputs into outputs with minimal resource consumption and time requirements (Chen et al., 2006; Nasierowski & Arcelus, 2003). Innovation effectiveness focuses on the quality, impact, and commercial success of innovation outcomes, regardless of resource consumption (Hagedoorn & Cloodt, 2003; Molina-Castillo et al., 2011).

The relationship between digital technologies and innovation performance has garnered significant attention in recent years. Digital technologies provide multiple pathways for innovation enhancement, including improved information processing capabilities, enhanced collaboration and communication, expanded market reach, and new business model opportunities (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014; Zott et al., 2011). These pathways enable organizations to accelerate innovation processes, improve innovation quality, and expand innovation scope beyond traditional boundaries.

Information processing capabilities represent a fundamental mechanism through which digital technologies enhance innovation performance. Advanced analytics, artificial intelligence, and machine learning enable organizations to process vast amounts of data, identify patterns and insights, and make more informed innovation decisions (Davenport & Harris, 2007; McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2012). These capabilities support both incremental and radical innovation by providing deeper understanding of customer needs, market trends, and technological opportunities.

Collaboration and communication enhancements through digital platforms, social networks, and virtual collaboration tools expand organizations' innovation capabilities by enabling broader participation in innovation processes (Chesbrough, 2003; von Hippel, 2005). Digital technologies facilitate open innovation approaches that leverage external knowledge sources, crowd-sourcing initiatives, and ecosystem partnerships to enhance innovation outcomes (Gassmann & Enkel, 2004; West & Bogers, 2014).

Market reach expansion through digital channels, platforms, and ecosystems enables organizations to access new customer segments, geographic markets, and partnership opportunities that enhance innovation performance (Parker et al., 2016; Evans & Gawer, 2016). Digital technologies reduce transaction costs, eliminate geographic barriers, and enable new forms of value creation that expand innovation possibilities.

Business model innovation represents perhaps the most significant pathway through which digital technologies enhance innovation performance. Digital technologies enable organizations to create new value propositions, delivery mechanisms, and revenue models that fundamentally alter competitive dynamics (Amit & Zott, 2012; Zott et al., 2011). Platform business models, subscription services, and ecosystem orchestration represent examples of digital-enabled business model innovations that generate significant performance advantages.

Despite these theoretical advantages, empirical research reveals considerable variation in organizations' ability to realize innovation performance benefits from digital technologies. Studies consistently identify capability gaps as primary factors limiting digital transformation success (Bughin et al., 2018; Kane et al., 2015). This observation suggests that digital technologies alone are insufficient for innovation performance enhancement; rather, organizations require specific capabilities to effectively leverage digital investments for innovation outcomes.

Methodology

Research Design and Philosophical Approach

This study employs a pragmatic research philosophy with a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design to comprehensively examine the relationship between digital transformation, dynamic capabilities, and innovation performance (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). The pragmatic approach is particularly suitable for complex organizational phenomena that require both quantitative measurement and qualitative understanding (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010; Morgan, 2014).

The sequential explanatory design consists of two distinct phases. Phase 1 involves quantitative data collection and analysis to test hypothesized relationships between constructs and establish statistical evidence for the proposed theoretical model. Phase 2 employs qualitative data collection through in-depth interviews to explore the mechanisms underlying quantitative findings and provide rich contextual understanding of capability development processes (Venkatesh et al., 2013; Molina-Azorin, 2016).

This mixed-methods approach addresses several methodological challenges in dynamic capabilities and digital transformation research. First, it enables triangulation of findings across different data sources and analytical methods, enhancing result validity and reliability (Denzin, 1978; Patton, 2002). Second, it provides both breadth of understanding through large-sample statistical analysis and depth of insight through detailed qualitative exploration (Creswell, 2014; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Third, it accommodates the complexity of organizational phenomena that cannot be fully captured through single-method approaches (Greene et al., 1989; Bryman, 2006).

Quantitative Phase: Sample and Data Collection

The quantitative phase targets manufacturing firms as the primary unit of analysis due to their significant digital transformation investments and measurable innovation outcomes. Manufacturing industries provide an ideal context for studying digital transformation impacts because they face substantial pressure to adopt Industry 4.0 technologies while maintaining innovation competitiveness (Kagermann et al., 2013; Lasi et al., 2014).

The sampling frame consists of manufacturing firms from three major economic regions: North America, Europe, and Asia-Pacific. This geographic diversity ensures representation across different institutional contexts and regulatory environments that may influence digital transformation approaches (Kostova & Zaheer, 1999; Scott, 2008). The sample includes firms from multiple manufacturing sub-sectors including automotive, electronics, machinery, chemicals, and consumer goods to enhance generalizability across industry contexts.

Sample size calculations based on structural equation modeling requirements indicate a minimum sample of 300 observations for adequate statistical power (Hair et al., 2017; Kline, 2016). The target sample size of 400 respondents provides sufficient statistical power for complex model testing while accounting for potential response bias and missing data issues (Podsakoff et al., 2003; MacKenzie & Podsakoff, 2012).

Data collection employs a multi-wave survey approach to minimize common method bias concerns (Podsakoff et al., 2012; Conway & Lance, 2010). Wave 1 collects data on digital transformation initiatives and organizational characteristics from senior executives responsible for digital strategy implementation. Wave 2, conducted three months later, gathers information on dynamic capabilities from middle managers involved in capability development activities. Wave 3, conducted six months after Wave 1, obtains innovation performance data from R&D directors and innovation managers.

The survey instrument development follows established scale development procedures (Churchill, 1979; DeVellis, 2016). Existing validated scales are adapted where possible, with new scales developed for constructs lacking adequate measurement instruments. All scales undergo content validity assessment through expert review and pilot testing with 45 manufacturing executives to ensure clarity, relevance, and completeness.

Digital transformation is measured using a 16-item scale adapted from Sebastian et al. (2017) and Vial (2019) that captures four dimensions: digital technology adoption, digital capability development, organizational structure adaptation, and strategic reorientation. Dynamic capabilities are measured using Teece's (2007) three-dimensional framework with sensing capabilities (8 items), seizing capabilities (7 items), and transforming capabilities (9 items) adapted from validated instruments (Kindström et al., 2013; Schilke, 2014).

Innovation performance employs a multidimensional scale that captures both efficiency and effectiveness aspects across input, process, and output dimensions (Crossan & Apaydin, 2010). The 14-item scale includes measures of innovation speed, innovation quality, new product success rates, innovation cost effectiveness, and innovation impact on competitive advantage. All scales use seven-point Likert response formats to provide adequate variance for statistical analysis (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Hair et al., 2017).

Qualitative Phase: Interview Design and Sampling

The qualitative phase employs semi-structured interviews with 24 senior executives from organizations participating in the quantitative survey. This approach enables detailed exploration of capability development processes, transformation challenges, and performance outcomes that complement quantitative findings (Eisenhardt, 1989; Yin, 2018).

Interview sampling uses a purposive strategy to select organizations representing different digital transformation approaches and performance outcomes identified in the quantitative analysis. The sample includes 8 high-performing organizations with strong dynamic capabilities, 8 moderate-performing organizations with mixed capability profiles, and 8 lower-performing organizations with limited dynamic capabilities. This variation enables comparison across different transformation contexts and outcomes (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002).

Interview participants include CEOs, CDOs (Chief Digital Officers), CIOs, and R&D directors with direct responsibility for digital transformation initiatives and innovation management. This multi-level perspective provides comprehensive understanding of capability development processes across different organizational levels and functional areas (Edmondson & McManus, 2007; Pratt, 2009).

The interview protocol consists of five main sections covering digital transformation journey, dynamic capability development, innovation performance outcomes, organizational challenges, and success factors. Each section includes primary questions with follow-up probes to encourage detailed responses and explore emergent themes (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Rubin & Rubin, 2012).

All interviews are conducted via video conference to accommodate geographic dispersion and recorded with participant consent for subsequent transcription and analysis. Interview duration ranges from 75-90 minutes to provide sufficient depth while respecting participant time constraints. Interview transcripts undergo member checking procedures to ensure accuracy and enhance result credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Creswell, 2014).

Data Analysis Procedures

Quantitative data analysis employs structural equation modeling (SEM) using AMOS 28.0 to test the proposed theoretical model and hypothesized relationships. SEM is particularly appropriate for this study because it enables simultaneous testing of multiple relationships while accounting for measurement error and unobserved heterogeneity (Hair et al., 2017; Byrne, 2016).

The analysis follows a two-step approach beginning with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to assess measurement model adequacy before structural model testing (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Hair et al., 2017). Measurement model evaluation includes assessments of construct reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity using established criteria (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Bagozzi & Yi, 1988).

Construct reliability is evaluated using composite reliability coefficients with thresholds of 0.70 for acceptable reliability (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Hair et al., 2017). Convergent validity assessment examines factor loadings (>0.70), average variance extracted (>0.50), and construct reliability (>0.70) as convergent validity indicators (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2017). Discriminant validity is assessed using the Fornell-Larcker criterion comparing squared correlations with average variance extracted values (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Henseler et al., 2015).

Structural model testing examines path coefficients, significance levels, and explained variance (R^2) for dependent constructs. Model fit evaluation employs multiple fit indices including χ^2/df ratio (<3.0), CFI (>0.90), TLI (>0.90), RMSEA (<0.08), and SRMR (<0.08) to ensure adequate model-data correspondence (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Byrne, 2016). Mediation analysis follows Baron and Kenny (1986) procedures supplemented with Sobel tests and bootstrapping procedures to assess indirect effects (Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Zhao et al., 2010).

Qualitative data analysis employs thematic analysis procedures to identify patterns, themes, and relationships within interview transcripts (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Boyatzis, 1998). The analysis follows a six-step process including data familiarization, initial code generation, theme identification, theme review, theme definition, and report writing (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Nowell et al., 2017).

Data coding uses both deductive and inductive approaches to capture both theory-driven and emergent insights. Deductive coding applies predetermined codes based on dynamic capabilities theory and digital transformation frameworks, while inductive coding identifies emergent themes not captured by existing theoretical frameworks (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Saldaña, 2015). NVivo 12 software supports data organization, coding, and analysis procedures while maintaining audit trails for result verification.

Inter-rater reliability assessment involves independent coding of 25% of transcripts by two researchers with disagreements resolved through discussion and consensus (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Creswell, 2014). This procedure ensures coding consistency and enhances result credibility. Additionally, peer debriefing sessions with external researchers provide alternative perspectives on data interpretation and theme development (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 2009).

Results

Quantitative Results: Structural Model Analysis

The quantitative analysis reveals significant support for the proposed theoretical model linking digital transformation, dynamic capabilities, and innovation performance. After eliminating 23 responses due to incomplete data and outlier analysis, the final sample consists of 312 manufacturing firms across 15 countries with response rates of 78% (Wave 1), 71% (Wave 2), and 68% (Wave 3).

Descriptive statistics indicate substantial variation in digital transformation maturity across the sample, with mean scores ranging from 2.1 to 6.8 on seven-point scales. This variation provides adequate variance for statistical analysis while confirming that organizations are at different stages of their digital transformation journeys. Dynamic capabilities scores show similar variation patterns, with sensing capabilities ($M = 4.2$, $SD = 1.4$) scoring higher than seizing ($M = 3.8$, $SD = 1.3$) and transforming capabilities ($M = 3.6$, $SD = 1.5$), suggesting that organizations find it easier to identify opportunities than to mobilize resources or transform operations.

Confirmatory factor analysis demonstrates adequate measurement model fit ($\chi^2/df = 2.14$, CFI = 0.92, TLI = 0.91, RMSEA = 0.06, SRMR = 0.07) with all factor loadings exceeding 0.70 and achieving statistical significance ($p < 0.001$). Construct reliability coefficients range from 0.83 to 0.91, indicating adequate internal consistency. Average variance extracted values exceed 0.50 for all constructs, supporting convergent validity. Discriminant validity is confirmed through Fornell-Larcker criterion comparisons, with no squared correlations exceeding average variance extracted values.

Structural model analysis reveals that digital transformation has a significant positive direct effect on innovation performance ($\beta = 0.31$, $p < 0.01$), supporting the basic premise that digital initiatives enhance innovation outcomes. However, the inclusion of dynamic capabilities as mediating variables substantially improves model explanatory power from $R^2 = 0.18$ to $R^2 = 0.47$ for innovation performance, indicating that dynamic capabilities explain significant additional variance beyond direct technology effects.

The mediation analysis provides strong support for dynamic capabilities as mediating mechanisms. Digital transformation demonstrates significant positive effects on sensing capabilities ($\beta = 0.52$, $p < 0.001$), seizing capabilities ($\beta = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$), and transforming capabilities ($\beta = 0.44$, $p < 0.001$). Each dynamic capability dimension shows significant positive effects on innovation performance: sensing capabilities ($\beta = 0.21$, $p < 0.05$), seizing capabilities ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < 0.01$), and transforming capabilities ($\beta = 0.33$, $p < 0.001$).

Sobel tests confirm significant indirect effects for all three mediation pathways: digital transformation → sensing capabilities → innovation performance ($z = 2.14$, $p < 0.05$), digital transformation → seizing capabilities → innovation performance ($z = 2.87$, $p < 0.01$), and digital transformation → transforming capabilities → innovation performance ($z = 3.21$, $p < 0.001$). The transforming capabilities pathway demonstrates the strongest mediation effect, suggesting that organizations' ability to reconfigure resources and processes is most critical for translating digital investments into innovation advantages.

Bootstrap analysis with 5,000 resamples confirms the robustness of mediation effects with 95% confidence intervals excluding zero for all indirect pathways. The total mediation effect ($\beta = 0.26$) accounts for 46% of the total effect ($\beta = 0.57$) of digital transformation on innovation performance, indicating substantial but not complete mediation. The remaining direct effect ($\beta = 0.31$) suggests that digital transformation also influences innovation performance through mechanisms not captured by the three dynamic capability dimensions.

Qualitative Insights: Capability Development Mechanisms

The qualitative analysis reveals rich insights into how organizations develop and deploy dynamic capabilities to enhance digital transformation effectiveness. Thematic analysis identifies five primary themes that explain the mechanisms underlying quantitative relationships: capability orchestration, learning integration, resource reconfiguration, stakeholder engagement, and performance measurement.

Capability Orchestration emerges as a critical theme describing how successful organizations systematically coordinate sensing, seizing, and transforming activities to maximize digital transformation benefits. High-performing organizations demonstrate sophisticated orchestration mechanisms that align capability development with strategic priorities and operational requirements. As one CEO explained: "We don't develop capabilities in isolation. Our digital transformation roadmap explicitly identifies the sensing, seizing, and transforming capabilities we need at each stage, and we develop them in coordinated fashion."

The orchestration process involves three key sub-processes: capability mapping, capability sequencing, and capability integration. Capability mapping involves identifying the specific dynamic capabilities required for different digital transformation objectives. Organizations create detailed capability matrices that specify required sensing, seizing, and transforming capabilities for each digital initiative, enabling targeted development efforts.

Capability sequencing addresses the temporal aspects of capability development, recognizing that certain capabilities must be developed before others can be effective. Most organizations begin with sensing capability development to identify digital opportunities, followed by seizing capabilities to mobilize resources, and finally transforming capabilities to implement changes. However, high-performing organizations demonstrate more sophisticated sequencing that adapts to specific transformation contexts.

Capability integration focuses on creating synergies across different capability dimensions to maximize overall effectiveness. Organizations develop integration mechanisms such as cross-functional teams, shared metrics, and coordination protocols that ensure sensing insights inform seizing decisions, and seizing activities align with transforming capabilities.

Learning Integration represents another critical theme that explains how organizations translate digital transformation experiences into enhanced dynamic capabilities. Successful organizations demonstrate systematic learning processes that capture insights from digital initiatives and embed them in organizational capabilities. This involves both single-loop learning that improves existing capabilities and double-loop learning that develops new capabilities.

Organizations employ various learning mechanisms including after-action reviews, capability audits, best practice sharing, and external benchmarking. These mechanisms enable continuous capability refinement based on transformation experiences. As one CIO noted: "Every digital project becomes a learning opportunity. We systematically capture what worked, what didn't, and why, then feed those insights back into our capability development processes."

Resource Reconfiguration emerges as a key mechanism through which transforming capabilities enhance innovation performance. Organizations must fundamentally reconfigure their resource bases to support digital-enabled innovation, involving changes to human resources, technological resources, organizational structures, and external partnerships. This reconfiguration process requires sophisticated transforming capabilities that can navigate complexity while maintaining operational continuity.

High-performing organizations demonstrate superior resource reconfiguration capabilities through several mechanisms: dynamic resource allocation processes that quickly redirect resources to high-priority digital initiatives, flexible organizational structures that adapt to changing requirements, and strategic partnership management that leverages external capabilities when internal resources are insufficient.

Innovation Performance Pathways

The integrated analysis reveals three distinct pathways through which digital transformation enhances innovation performance through dynamic capabilities: technology-driven innovation, process-driven innovation, and ecosystem-driven innovation.

Technology-driven Innovation represents the most direct pathway, where digital technologies enable new product and service innovations. This pathway relies heavily on sensing capabilities to identify technological opportunities and customer needs, seizing capabilities to acquire and deploy new technologies, and transforming capabilities to integrate technologies into innovation processes.

Organizations following this pathway typically achieve innovation performance improvements through faster product development cycles, enhanced product functionality, and new digital product offerings.

The quantitative analysis reveals that technology-driven innovation accounts for 34% of the innovation performance variance explained by dynamic capabilities. Qualitative insights suggest that this pathway is most effective for organizations with strong technological capabilities and clear customer needs for digital solutions. However, this pathway also requires significant investment in technological infrastructure and expertise, limiting its accessibility for some organizations.

Process-driven Innovation focuses on improving innovation processes through digital technologies rather than creating new products or services. This pathway emphasizes transforming capabilities to reconfigure innovation processes, supported by sensing capabilities to identify process improvement opportunities and seizing capabilities to implement process changes. Organizations following this pathway achieve innovation performance improvements through reduced innovation cycle times, improved innovation quality, and enhanced innovation efficiency.

The process-driven pathway explains 28% of innovation performance variance and demonstrates particular effectiveness for organizations in mature industries with established products and services. Qualitative analysis reveals that this pathway requires strong change management capabilities and cultural readiness for process innovation. Organizations must overcome resistance to change and develop new ways of working to realize process-driven innovation benefits.

Ecosystem-driven Innovation represents the most complex pathway, leveraging digital platforms and networks to access external innovation capabilities. This pathway requires all three dynamic capability dimensions working in concert: sensing capabilities to identify ecosystem opportunities, seizing capabilities to build platform capabilities and partnerships, and transforming capabilities to integrate external and internal innovation activities.

Ecosystem-driven innovation accounts for 38% of innovation performance variance, making it the most significant pathway. However, qualitative insights reveal that this pathway is also the most challenging to implement, requiring sophisticated platform strategies, partnership management capabilities, and ecosystem orchestration skills. Organizations successfully implementing this pathway demonstrate superior innovation performance through access to broader innovation networks, reduced innovation costs, and accelerated innovation cycles.

Conclusion

Discussion of Key Findings

This study provides comprehensive empirical evidence for the critical role of dynamic capabilities in mediating the relationship between digital transformation and innovation performance. Our findings demonstrate that while digital transformation directly contributes to innovation outcomes, the majority of performance benefits arise through enhanced organizational capabilities that enable more effective resource deployment, process reconfiguration, and strategic adaptation.

The research makes several important theoretical contributions. First, we extend dynamic capabilities theory by providing detailed empirical evidence for capability-performance relationships in digital contexts. Our findings confirm that Teece's (2007) three-dimensional framework applies effectively to digital transformation contexts, with each capability dimension contributing uniquely to innovation performance. The stronger mediation effect of transforming capabilities suggests that resource reconfiguration represents the most critical capability for digital transformation success.

Second, our research contributes to digital transformation literature by identifying specific mechanisms through which digital investments translate into innovation advantages. The three innovation pathways—technology-driven, process-driven, and ecosystem-driven—provide a more nuanced understanding of how digital transformation creates value. Organizations can use these pathways to design more targeted transformation strategies that align with their capabilities and market contexts.

Third, we advance innovation performance measurement by developing and validating multidimensional constructs that capture both efficiency and effectiveness aspects of innovation outcomes. This contribution addresses longstanding limitations in innovation research that often relies on single-indicator performance measures.

The quantitative findings reveal that dynamic capabilities account for 46% of the total effect of digital transformation on innovation performance, indicating substantial mediation. This finding suggests that organizations focusing solely on technology acquisition without corresponding capability development are likely to realize limited innovation benefits. The remaining 54% direct effect indicates that digital transformation also influences innovation through additional mechanisms not captured by the three dynamic capability dimensions, pointing to opportunities for future research.

Our qualitative analysis provides rich insights into the mechanisms underlying capability-performance relationships. The capability orchestration theme reveals that successful organizations systematically coordinate sensing, seizing, and transforming activities rather than developing them independently. This finding suggests that dynamic capabilities should be viewed as an integrated system rather than independent organizational features.

The learning integration theme demonstrates that organizations must translate digital transformation experiences into enhanced capabilities through systematic learning processes. This finding highlights the importance of organizational learning mechanisms in capability development and suggests that organizations should invest in learning infrastructure alongside technology infrastructure.

Managerial Implications

The research findings offer several important implications for managers undertaking digital transformation initiatives. First, organizations should adopt a capability-centric approach to digital transformation that prioritizes capability development alongside technology investment. Our findings demonstrate that technology investments alone are insufficient for innovation performance enhancement; rather, organizations require specific capabilities to effectively leverage digital investments.

Managers should begin digital transformation initiatives by conducting comprehensive capability assessments that identify current sensing, seizing, and transforming capabilities relative to transformation objectives. This assessment should inform capability development strategies that address gaps and strengthen existing capabilities. Organizations should allocate resources to capability development based on their strategic priorities and transformation pathways.

Second, managers should recognize that different innovation pathways require different capability emphases. Technology-driven innovation requires stronger sensing capabilities to identify technological opportunities, process-driven innovation emphasizes transforming capabilities to reconfigure operations, and ecosystem-driven innovation demands balanced development across all capability dimensions. Organizations should align their capability development strategies with their chosen innovation pathways.

Third, the research highlights the importance of capability orchestration in digital transformation success. Managers should establish coordination mechanisms that integrate sensing, seizing, and transforming activities across organizational levels and functions. This may involve creating cross-functional transformation teams, establishing shared metrics and incentives, and developing communication protocols that ensure capability alignment.

Fourth, organizations should invest in learning mechanisms that capture insights from digital transformation experiences and embed them in organizational capabilities. This includes establishing after-action review processes, conducting regular capability audits, sharing best practices across business units, and benchmarking against external organizations. These learning mechanisms enable continuous capability refinement and adaptation.

Finally, managers should recognize that digital transformation is a long-term capability building process rather than a discrete technology implementation project. Our findings suggest that capability development requires sustained commitment, resource allocation, and organizational change over multiple years. Organizations should establish realistic expectations and timelines for digital transformation initiatives while maintaining commitment to capability development objectives.

Conclusion and Future Research Directions

This study provides compelling evidence that dynamic capabilities serve as critical mediators in the relationship between digital transformation and innovation performance. Organizations seeking to maximize returns on digital transformation investments should prioritize capability development alongside technology acquisition, adopt integrated approaches to capability orchestration, and establish learning mechanisms that support continuous capability enhancement.

The research opens several avenues for future investigation. First, longitudinal studies could examine how dynamic capabilities evolve over time during digital transformation journeys. Our cross-sectional design provides a snapshot of capability-performance relationships but cannot capture the dynamic processes through which capabilities develop and change. Longitudinal research would provide valuable insights into capability development trajectories and their performance implications.

Second, future research could explore contextual factors that influence the effectiveness of dynamic capabilities in digital transformation contexts. Our study identifies industry, organizational size, and competitive intensity as potential moderators, but additional research is needed to understand how these and other contextual factors shape capability-performance relationships.

Third, comparative studies across different industries and national contexts could enhance understanding of how institutional and cultural factors influence digital transformation approaches and outcomes. Our manufacturing focus provides depth of insight but limits generalizability to other sectors with different transformation challenges and opportunities.

Fourth, research examining the antecedents of dynamic capability development would provide valuable insights for managers seeking to build transformation capabilities. Understanding the organizational, leadership, and strategic factors that enable capability development could inform more effective transformation strategies.

Finally, investigation of the specific technologies and digital tools that best support dynamic capability development could provide practical guidance for organizations designing their digital transformation architectures. This research could examine how different technology combinations enable sensing, seizing, and transforming activities across various organizational contexts.

The accelerating pace of digital innovation ensures that organizations will continue facing transformation challenges that require sophisticated dynamic capabilities. This research provides a foundation for understanding how organizations can develop and deploy these capabilities to achieve superior innovation performance in an increasingly digital world.

References

Adams, R., Bessant, J., & Phelps, R. (2006). Innovation management measurement: A review. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 8*(1), 21–47.

Amit, R., & Zott, C. (2012). Creating value through business model innovation. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 53*(3), 41–49.

Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(3), 411–423.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16*(1), 74–94.

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 99–120.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173–1182.

Bharadwaj, A., El Sawy, O. A., Pavlou, P. A., & Venkatraman, N. (2013). Digital business strategy: Toward a next generation of insights. *MIS Quarterly, 37*(2), 471–482.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Sage Publications.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.

Bryman, A. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: How is it done? *Qualitative Research, 6*(1), 97–113.

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Bughin, J., Hazan, E., Labaye, E., Manyika, J., Dahlström, P., Ramaswamy, S., & Cochin de Billy, C. (2018). *Digital Europe: Pushing the frontier, capturing the benefits*. McKinsey Global Institute.

Byrne, B. M. (2016). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Chen, J., Zhu, Z., & Xie, H. Y. (2004). Measuring intellectual capital: A new model and empirical study. *Journal of Intellectual Capital, 5*(1), 195–212.

Chesbrough, H. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Churchill, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research, 16*(1), 64–73.

Conway, J. M., & Lance, C. E. (2010). What reviewers should expect from authors regarding common method bias in organizational research. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(3), 325–334.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Crossan, M. M., & Apaydin, M. (2010). A multi-dimensional framework of organizational innovation: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Management Studies, 47*(6), 1154–1191.

Damanpour, F., & Aravind, D. (2012). Managerial innovation: Conceptions, processes and antecedents. *Management and Organization Review, 8*(2), 423–454.

Davenport, T. H., & Harris, J. G. (2007). *Competing on analytics: The new science of winning*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. McGraw-Hill.

DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Edmondson, A. C., & McManus, S. E. (2007). Methodological fit in management field research. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(4), 1155–1179.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review, 14*(4), 532–550.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal, 21*(10–11), 1105–1121.

Evans, P. C., & Gawer, A. (2016). *The rise of the platform enterprise: A global survey*. The Center for Global Enterprise.

Fitzgerald, M., Kruschwitz, N., Bonnet, D., & Welch, M. (2014). Embracing digital technology: A new strategic imperative. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 55*(2), 1–12.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39–50.

Gassmann, O., & Enkel, E. (2004). Towards a theory of open innovation: Three core process archetypes. *R&D Management Conference, 6*, 1–18.

Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11*(3), 255–274.

Guan, J., & Ma, N. (2003). Innovative capability and export performance of Chinese firms. *Technovation, 23*(9), 737–747.

Hagedoorn, J., & Cloodt, M. (2003). Measuring innovative performance: Is there an advantage in using multiple indicators? *Research Policy, 32*(8), 1365–1379.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

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.

Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. A. (2015). Managerial cognitive capabilities and the microfoundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal, 36*(6), 831–850.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43*(1), 115–135.

Hess, T., Matt, C., Benlian, A., & Wiesböck, F. (2016). Options for formulating a digital transformation strategy. *MIS Quarterly Executive, 15*(2), 123–139.

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*(1), 1–55.

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14–26.

Kagermann, H., Helbig, J., Hellinger, A., & Wahlster, W. (2013). *Recommendations for implementing the strategic initiative INDUSTRIE 4.0: Securing the future of German manufacturing industry*. Final report of the Industrie 4.0 Working Group.

Kane, G. C., Phillips, A. N., Copulsky, J., & Andrus, G. (2015). *The digital advantage: How digital leaders outperform their peers in every industry*. MIT Sloan Management Review and Deloitte University Press.

Karimi, J., & Walter, Z. (2015). The role of dynamic capabilities in responding to digital disruption: A factor-based study of the newspaper industry. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 32*(1), 39–81.

Kindström, D., Kowalkowski, C., & Sandberg, E. (2013). Enabling service innovation: A dynamic capabilities approach. *Journal of Business Research, 66*(8), 1063–1073.

Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). Guilford Press.

Kostova, T., & Zaheer, S. (1999). Organizational legitimacy under conditions of complexity: The case of the multinational enterprise. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(1), 64–81.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Lasi, H., Fettke, P., Kemper, H. G., Feld, T., & Hoffmann, M. (2014). Industry 4.0. *Business & Information Systems Engineering, 6*(4), 239–242.

Lawson, B., & Samson, D. (2001). Developing innovation capability in organisations: A dynamic capabilities approach. *International Journal of Innovation Management, 5*(3), 377–400.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.

MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, P. M. (2012). Common method bias in marketing: Causes, mechanisms, and procedural remedies. *Journal of Retailing, 88*(4), 542–555.

Matt, C., Hess, T., & Benlian, A. (2015). Digital transformation strategies. *Business & Information Systems Engineering, 57*(5), 339–343.

McAfee, A., & Brynjolfsson, E. (2012). Big data: The management revolution. *Harvard Business Review, 90*(10), 60–68.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

MIT Sloan Management Review. (2020). *Digital transformation: The state of play*. MIT Sloan Management Review Research Report.

Molina-Azorin, J. F. (2016). Mixed methods research: An opportunity to improve our studies and our research skills. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics, 25*(2), 37–38.

Molina-Castillo, F. J., Munuera-Aleman, J. L., & Calantone, R. J. (2011). Product quality and new product performance: The role of network externalities and switching costs. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 28*(6), 915–929.

Morgan, D. L. (2014). *Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods: A pragmatic approach*. Sage Publications.

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.

Nasierowski, W., & Arcelus, F. J. (2003). On the efficiency of national innovation systems. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences, 37*(3), 215–234.

Negroponte, N. (1995). *Being digital*. Knopf.

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16*(1), 1–13.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 28*, 185–206.

Parker, G. G., Van Alstyne, M. W., & Choudary, S. P. (2016). *Platform revolution: How networked markets are transforming the economy and how to make them work for you*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Peteraf, M. A. (1993). The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view. *Strategic Management Journal, 14*(3), 179–191.

Peteraf, M., Di Stefano, G., & Verona, G. (2013). The elephant in the room of dynamic capabilities: Bringing two diverging conversations together. *Strategic Management Journal, 34*(12), 1389–1410.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology, 63*, 539–569.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879–903.

Pratt, M. G. (2009). From the editors: For the lack of a boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*(5), 856–862.

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*(3), 879–891.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Schilke, O. (2014). On the contingent value of dynamic capabilities for competitive advantage: The nonlinear moderating effect of environmental dynamism. *Strategic Management Journal, 35*(2), 179–203.

Schilke, O., Hu, S., & Helfat, C. E. (2018). Quo vadis, dynamic capabilities? A content-analytic review of the current state of knowledge and recommendations for future research. *Academy of Management Annals, 12*(1), 390–439.

Scott, W. R. (2008). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas and interests* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Sebastian, I., Ross, J., Beath, C., Mocker, M., Moloney, K., & Fonstad, N. (2017). How big old companies navigate digital transformation. *MIS Quarterly Executive, 16*(3), 197–213.

Singh, A., & Hess, T. (2017). How chief digital officers promote the digital transformation of their companies. *MIS Quarterly Executive, 16*(1), 1–17.

Tapscott, D. (1996). *The digital economy: Promise and peril in the age of networked intelligence*. McGraw-Hill.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2010). *Sage handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. Sage Publications.

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(13), 1319–1350.

Teece, D. J. (2014). The foundations of enterprise performance: Dynamic and ordinary capabilities in an (economic) theory of firms. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 28*(4), 328–352.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509–533.

Venkatesh, V., Brown, S. A., & Bala, H. (2013). Bridging the qualitative–quantitative divide: Guidelines for conducting mixed methods research in information systems. *MIS Quarterly, 37*(1), 21–54.

Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 28*(2), 118–144.

von Hippel, E. (2005). *Democratizing innovation*. MIT Press.

Wang, C. L., & Ahmed, P. K. (2004). The development and validation of the organisational innovativeness construct using confirmatory factor analysis. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 7*(4), 303–313.

West, J., & Bogers, M. (2014). Leveraging external sources of innovation: A review of research on open innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 31*(4), 814–831.

Westerman, G., Bonnet, D., & McAfee, A. (2014). *Leading digital: Turning technology into business* *transformation*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Yeow, A., Soh, C., & Hansen, R. (2018). Aligning with new digital strategy: A dynamic capabilities approach. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 27*(1), 43–58.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.

Yoo, Y., Boland Jr., R. J., Lyytinen, K., & Majchrzak, A. (2012). Organizing for innovation in the digitized world. *Organization Science, 23*(5), 1398–1408.

Zhao, X., Lynch Jr., J. G., & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research, 37*(2), 197–206.

Zott, C., Amit, R., & Massa, L. (2011). The business model: Recent developments and future research. *Journal of Management, 37*(4), 1019–1042.