

Digital Mindset Management as a Foundation of Digital Transformation in Military Organization: Evidence from the Indonesia Army

Ikke Nodiyarjo^{1*}, Maman Suratman², Deden Sutisna³, Neuneung Ratna Hayati⁴

^{1,2,3,4} Department of Management Science, Faculty of Graduate School, Universitas Widyatama, Bandung 40124, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: ikke.nodiyarjo@widyatama.ac.id

Citation: Nodiyarjo, I., Suratman, M., Sutisna, D. & Hayati, N. R. (2026). Digital Mindset Management as a Foundation of Digital Transformation in Military Organization: Evidence from the Indonesia Army, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 11(1), 1546-1558. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v11i1.4123>

Published: January 08, 2026

ABSTRACT

Digital transformation in military organizations cannot be understood merely as the adoption of digital technologies, but rather as a complex organizational change that requires fundamental shifts in mindset, culture, and management practices. This study aims to examine how digital mindset management serves as a foundational element of digital transformation within a military organization. Using a qualitative research approach, data were collected through in-depth interviews, observations, and document analysis involving key, main, and supporting informants within an Indonesian Army regional command. Data were analyzed using source triangulation to ensure credibility and analytical rigor. The findings reveal that digital mindset plays a critical role in enabling technology to be meaningfully integrated into organizational practices. Digital mindset is managed not as an individual attribute, but as a collective and managerial process shaped through leadership, organizational culture, and daily work practices. The analysis further shows that the functions of Planning, Organizing, Actuating, and Controlling (POAC) remain relevant in managing digital mindset, although they operate in adaptive and non-linear ways consistent with the hierarchical and security-oriented nature of military organizations. This study contributes to the literature on digital transformation by demonstrating that digital mindset management constitutes a strategic foundation for sustainable digital transformation in military contexts, while also highlighting the importance of contextualizing transformation models to institutional characteristics and values.

Keywords: Digital Mindset; Digital Transformation; Military Organization; POAC

INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation has become a global phenomenon that fundamentally changes the way organizations design strategies, manage human resources, and carry out work processes (J. Zhang & Chen, 2024). The development of digital technologies such as cloud computing, artificial intelligence, big data, and network-based communication systems not only drives operational efficiency but also demands fundamental changes in organizational structure, work culture, and individual mindsets. In contemporary management literature, digital transformation is understood not merely as the adoption of information technology, but as a complex and multidimensional organizational process that involves the comprehensive reconstruction of an organization's values, practices, and identity (Vial, 2021). The success of digital transformation is increasingly recognized as depending not only on technological sophistication but also on the readiness of people and organizations to understand, accept, and internalize the logic of digital. Digital transformation in the public sector is no longer positioned merely as an administrative agenda, but as a strategic instrument to enhance governance effectiveness, policy responsiveness, and institutional accountability (Tkachenko et al., 2025). However, unlike business organizations, public institutions, especially those with security and defense mandates, face additional challenges

such as structural rigidity, adherence to formal hierarchies, and high sensitivity to information security. This situation makes digital transformation in defense organizations a complex process, rich with distinctive sociocultural dynamics (Kapotas, 2024).

In the context of military organizations, digital transformation is gaining increasing strategic significance alongside changes in the nature of conflict and global security (Prianto et al., 2025). Modern military operations no longer rely solely on physical strength and conventional weaponry but are increasingly determined by the ability to manage information, the speed of decision-making, and the integration of network-based systems. The digitalization of command, control, communications, intelligence, and surveillance systems places technology as a crucial element in maintaining operational advantage and defense readiness (Harsono et al., 2025). Nevertheless, digital transformation in military organizations cannot be reduced to merely technical issues or the procurement of systems. The success of digitalization heavily depends on how military personnel understand technology, adjust work patterns, and adopt new ways of thinking that align with the demands of the digital environment (Bozkus, 2023).

This is where the concept of a digital mindset becomes relevant as a fundamental foundation of digital transformation (Solberg et al., 2020). A digital mindset refers to a set of ways of thinking, beliefs, and cognitive orientations that enable individuals and organizations to view technology as a strategic opportunity, be open to change, and integrate learning, collaboration, and innovation into daily work practices (Attah et al., 2023). In organizations characterized by strong hierarchies, such as the military, a digital mindset does not develop naturally but requires systematic management through policies, leadership, and consistent managerial practices. Without a well-planned digital mindset management, digital transformation risks stopping at a symbolic level, where technology exists as an administrative artifact without bringing about substantive changes in behavior, culture, and organizational performance (Choi, 2020).

The phenomenon of failure or limitations in digital transformation due to weak mindset readiness has been widely identified across various sectors, including public organizations and institutions with highly bureaucratic structures. The literature shows that resistance to change, disparities in digital literacy, and the tendency to retain conventional work practices are often major obstacles to digitalization implementation (Omowole et al., 2024). In military organizations, these challenges become even more complex due to command-oriented leadership patterns, strict discipline culture, and concerns over information security risks (Subrahmanyam, 2025). This situation creates a gap between digital transformation policies at the strategic level and operational practices at the implementation level, ultimately hindering the achievement of transformation goals in a comprehensive manner.

In Indonesia, the digital transformation agenda has also become an integral part of efforts to modernize defense institutions, including the Indonesian Army. Various policies and programs have been designed to strengthen information systems, enhance interoperability, and leverage digital technology to support the execution of national defense tasks. The implementation of digital transformation within Indonesia's military organizations shows varying dynamics and is not yet fully uniform (Ismail et al., 2023). Differences in geographical context, infrastructure limitations, variations in human resource competencies, as well as organizational culture that is still oriented toward conventional approaches present specific challenges in the process of internalizing digital values. This condition indicates that the main issue of digital transformation in the Indonesian military organization does not solely lie in the technological aspect, but rather in how the digital mindset is managed as part of the managerial and organizational change process (Ringberg et al., 2024). Managing the digital mindset becomes crucial to bridge the gap between the vision of digital transformation and the operational reality in the field (Roman, 2024).

The interesting aspect of this research lies in its effort to examine digital transformation from a perspective that is rarely explored in depth, namely the management of a digital mindset within military organizations characterized by strong hierarchy, high discipline, and strict security sensitivity. Amid the acceleration of global digitalization, the urgency of this study is further reinforced because digital transformation in defense institutions cannot be equated with business sectors or civilian bureaucracy, given that its success heavily depends on the cognitive, cultural, and behavioral readiness of human resources to respond to technology-based changes. The gap that still appears between digital modernization policies and operational practices in the field indicates that the main issue is not merely the availability of systems or infrastructure, but how the digital mindset is understood, managed, and systematically internalized within organizational life (Irani et al., 2023). The novelty of this research lies in its positioning of digital mindset management as the conceptual and practical foundation of digital transformation within military organizations, rather than merely as a technical or individual variable, while also providing qualitative empirical evidence from the context of the Indonesian Army, which has so far been relatively underexplored in the international literature. Furthermore, the research problem is formulated as follows: 1) How is digital mindset management practiced, developed, and implemented to support digital transformation in military organizations; 2) How are the processes of planning, organizing, implementing, and monitoring the digital mindset carried out within a military organizational environment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature review on digital transformation shows a significant paradigm shift in understanding organizational change in the digital era (Omol, 2024). In the initial phase, digital transformation was often perceived as a process of adopting and utilizing information technology to improve organizational efficiency and productivity (Palad, 2022). This perspective places technology as the main variable that determines the success of change, so much of the research focus is directed at systems, infrastructure, and technology architecture (Pisoni et al., 2021). However, this approach has begun to be criticized because it is considered unable to explain why many digitization initiatives fail to produce substantive changes in work practices and organizational performance. Several researchers emphasize that digital transformation is not identical to technical digitization, but rather is a complex and socio-technical organizational process (Menzeffricke et al., 2021). In contemporary literature, digital transformation is understood as a multidimensional process involving the interaction between technology, organizational structure, culture, and human resources (Purwanto et al., 2023). The Rise of the Network Society suggests that modern organizations operate within the logic of a network society, where the ability to manage information, build connectivity, and adapt quickly becomes a key strategic resource (Rachmad, 2025). This perspective positions technology not merely as a tool, but as a catalyst for social and organizational change. In line with this, Understanding Digital Transformation emphasizes that digital transformation is an organizational change driven by digital technology and has a profound impact on the organization's structure, processes, and value proposition (Vial, 2021).

The theoretical debate intensifies as several studies distinguish between true digital transformation and organizational transformation merely enabled by information technology. Research by Ylinen (2021) shows that in digital transformation, technology plays a role in redefining the organization's identity and way of working, whereas in IT-based transformation, technology only functions as a support for existing processes. This distinction emphasizes that digital transformation requires a change in mindset, values, and the way the organization interprets technology. In this context, approaches that focus solely on technical aspects are considered insufficient to explain the dynamics of change occurring within the organization (Brunetti et al., 2020). Along with the development of this perspective, academic attention has begun to shift to the role of human resources and cognitive aspects in digital transformation. The concept of a digital mindset emerged as a response to the limitations of technocratic approaches. A digital mindset is understood as a set of beliefs, thinking orientations, and attitudes of individuals and organizations in viewing digital technology as a strategic opportunity for learning, innovation, and collaboration (Neeley & Leonardi, 2022). Several studies indicate that individuals with a strong digital mindset tend to be more adaptive to change, more open to experimentation, and better able to integrate technology into work practices (Wong et al., 2022). Nevertheless, the literature also emphasizes that a digital mindset is not purely individual but is shaped and influenced by organizational context, leadership, and prevailing managerial systems.

From the perspective of change management, debates arise regarding the extent to which mindset changes can be managed systematically. Classical approaches to organizational change often focus on stages of structural and procedural change, while contemporary approaches emphasize the importance of sensemaking processes and organizational learning. Research by Nordhall et al., (2025) asserts that sustainable change occurs when organizational actors are able to collectively make sense of the change and integrate it into their work identity. Within this framework, digital mindset management is seen as a continuous process that involves planning, organizing, implementing, and monitoring changes in thinking patterns and work behaviors, rather than merely a short-term training intervention. Empirical research in the public sector and organizations with high levels of bureaucracy shows that digital transformation often faces cultural and structural resistance (Syed et al., 2023).

Several international studies on defense modernization emphasize that digital transformation in the military is closely related to changes in doctrine, command and control systems, and network-based technology integration (Brown & Potter, 2020). However, these studies tend to focus on strategic and technical aspects, such as system interoperability, cybersecurity, and operational superiority, while the cognitive and managerial dimensions of human resources receive relatively less attention. These limitations have prompted criticism that military digital transformation risks becoming a top-down technocratic process if it is not accompanied by systematic personnel mindset management (Wrigley & Simons, 2025). Some qualitative studies in the defense context show that resistance to digitalization often arises not because of rejection of the technology itself, but due to unclear meaning, concerns about role changes, and organizational cultural unreadiness (Putra et al., 2023). Empirical studies on digital transformation in military organizations are still very limited, especially those using a qualitative approach and focusing on managing the digital mindset (Rofiq et al., 2023). Most research still focuses on modernization policies, procurement of defense equipment, or information system development, leaving a knowledge gap regarding how changes in digital mindset are negotiated and internalized at the organizational level (Mariscal & Cornish, 2025).

Theoretical Framework

Digital Transformation

The theory of digital transformation has evolved along with the increasing role of digital technology in reshaping the way organizations operate, interact, and create value (Omol, 2024). In its early stages, digital transformation was often understood as the process of adopting information technology to improve operational efficiency and the quality of organizational services. This perspective views technology as a rational instrument that can be implemented in a relatively linear manner through strategic planning, system investment, and adjustment of work procedures (Leyva-Vázquez et al., 2020). In this approach, digital transformation is positioned as a continuation of technology-based organizational modernization, with its success measured through technical indicators such as system integration, process automation, and increased speed of information flow. However, alongside the complexity of changes brought about by digital technology, that understanding has undergone a significant conceptual shift. Digital transformation is then understood as a multidimensional and socio-technical organizational process, where digital technology not only changes work tools but also affects organizational structure, patterns of power relations, work culture, and institutional identity (Jain & Mitra, 2025). From this perspective, digital transformation is seen as a process of organizational reconstruction triggered by digital technology and resulting in profound changes in how organizations perceive value, make decisions, and adapt to a dynamic environment. Technology is no longer understood as a neutral external factor but as an element that interacts dynamically with the social and human aspects within the organization (Volti & Croissant, 2024).

The socio-technical approach to digital transformation emphasizes that the success of change cannot be achieved solely through technology investment, but is highly determined by the organization's ability to manage changes in behavior, mindset, and work practices of the actors within it (Doz, 2020). Within this framework, digital transformation is understood as a process that unfolds non-linearly, full of uncertainty, and often results in consequences that are not entirely predictable. Therefore, digital transformation requires adaptive capabilities, continuous learning, and the organization's ability to negotiate the tension between stability and innovation (Chang et al., 2025). Although digital transformation theory offers a strong framework for understanding organizational change in the digital era, this theory is not without criticism. One of the main criticisms of digital transformation theory is its tendency to be normative and technologically deterministic (Hovorka & Mueller, 2025). Several researchers argue that the literature on digital transformation often assumes that the adoption of digital technology will inherently lead to improved performance, innovation, and organizational competitiveness (Shen et al., 2022).

Several studies indicate that many organizations claim to have undergone digital transformation, whereas what actually occurs is merely the digitization of existing processes without fundamental changes in the way the organization operates or thinks (Leonardi & Treem, 2020). This lack of clarity poses the risk of reductionism, where digital transformation is narrowed down to a purely technological project, failing to capture the cognitive, cultural, and managerial dimensions that truly determine the sustainability of change. The digital transformation theory is also criticized for being developed primarily from the context of business organizations in developed countries, hence its application in public and military organizations in developing countries requires conceptual caution (Morgan et al., 2020). Military organizations, with hierarchical structures, strict command systems, and high security sensitivity, face fundamentally different conditions compared to corporate organizations. Digital transformation in this context is not only about innovation and flexibility but also about issues of legitimacy, compliance, and control (Brunetti et al., 2020).

Digital Mindset

The theory of digital mindset stems from criticism of digital transformation approaches that place too much emphasis on technology and neglect the cognitive and cultural dimensions of human resources (Trenerry et al., 2021). Within this framework, a digital mindset is understood as a set of ways of thinking, cognitive orientation, and mental attitudes of individuals and collectives in interpreting, responding to, and utilizing digital technology as an integral part of work practices and organizational life (Nadkarni & Prügl, 2021). A digital mindset does not merely refer to technical skills or digital literacy, but rather encompasses psychological readiness to face change, openness to continuous learning, and the ability to view uncertainty as an opportunity for innovation and adaptation (Kotlyk et al., 2024). The development of the digital mindset theory is influenced by the traditions of cognitive psychology and organizational learning theory, which emphasize that human behavior in organizations is largely determined by how individuals understand reality and frame their experiences. In the context of digital transformation, the digital mindset serves as a cognitive lens that affects how organizational actors evaluate digital technology, whether as a threat to job stability or as a strategic means to enhance organizational effectiveness and relevance (Baiyere et al., 2025). This perspective emphasizes that a digital mindset is shaped through interactions between individuals and organizational structures, work culture, leadership systems, and prevailing managerial practices (Baumgartner et al., 2021). A digital mindset develops within a specific social context and is influenced

by the norms, values, and institutional expectations present in the organization. Therefore, strengthening a digital mindset requires a systematic and consistent managerial approach, rather than sporadic technical training interventions. The theory of a digital mindset also highlights the importance of a learning and experimentation orientation as a key element in facing digital changes (Rahmi et al., 2025). Individuals and organizations with a strong digital mindset tend to view mistakes as part of the learning process, are open to new work practices, and can quickly adapt to technological changes and environmental demands (Liu et al., 2023).

In organizations with hierarchical structures and high levels of formality, such as military organizations, a digital mindset has distinct characteristics and challenges (Schulte et al., 2020). A culture of discipline, adherence to commands, and emphasis on stability and standard procedures can limit the space for experimentation and flexibility often associated with digital logic. Nevertheless, the theory of digital mindset does not view these characteristics as absolute obstacles, but rather as a context that needs to be managed adaptively. A digital mindset in military organizations needs to be developed in ways that align with institutional values, such as loyalty, responsibility, and security, so that digital transformation is not perceived as a threat to the organization's identity, but as a means to strengthen institutional capabilities. A number of empirical studies indicate that the failure of digital transformation often stems from a weak internalization of the digital mindset, even though organizations have invested significant resources in technology (Chen et al., 2023). Disparities in digital literacy, misalignment between leadership vision and personnel understanding, and the absence of managerial mechanisms to collectively foster a digital mindset are major inhibiting factors (Sekar & Thomas, 2025). One major critique argues that the concept of a digital mindset risks becoming too normative and abstract, making it difficult to operationalize in managerial practice (Hildebrandt, 2024). Some researchers question the extent to which a digital mindset can be measured or observed empirically without reducing it to merely an individual attitude (Rauch, 2022). Other critiques highlight the potential for individualistic bias in digital mindset theory, which can divert attention from the structural and institutional responsibilities of organizations in creating conditions that support digital transformation (Singh et al., 2020).

POAC Theory

The POAC theory is one of the classic frameworks in management science that explains the basic managerial functions as an interconnected and continuous cycle (Asni, 2025). Management is a systematic process to ensure that organizational goals can be achieved effectively and efficiently through planning, organizing, implementing, and controlling. Although it originated from the context of classic industrial organizations, the POAC theory remains relevant today because it provides a flexible analytical structure for understanding how organizations manage resources, coordinate activities, and control change processes in various contexts, including public and military organizations. POAC emphasizes the importance of goal setting, determining strategic direction, and formulating policies and work programs as the foundation for all organizational activities (Indrawati & Wahira, 2025). In the context of digital transformation, planning is no longer merely oriented towards short-term targets or operational efficiency, but encompasses a long-term vision of how digital technology will change the way organizations work and create value. Effective planning in the digital era requires an organization's ability to read strategic environmental dynamics, anticipate uncertainty, and integrate aspects of technology, human resources, and organizational culture (Bozkus, 2023). In military organizations, the planning function holds a highly strategic position because it is directly related to defense mandates, operational readiness, and institutional security. Therefore, digital planning must be able to balance the demands of innovation with the principles of caution, discipline, and adherence to the command hierarchy.

The organizing function in the POAC theory is related to structuring, task allocation, resource allocation, and the creation of coordination mechanisms that enable plans to be implemented effectively (Putri et al., 2025). Organizing not only involves formal structural aspects but also work relationships, communication flows, and patterns of collaboration between units (Clarke, 2024). In the context of digital transformation, organizing faces new challenges because digital technology tends to promote cross-functional work, network-based collaboration, and role flexibility. For military organizations characterized by a hierarchical structure and clear division of authority, organizing in the digital era requires adaptation to ensure that the formal structure is maintained without hindering the flow of information and digital collaboration (Jerab & Mabrouk, 2023).

The execution or actuating function in POAC emphasizes the role of leadership in motivating organization members to be willing and able to carry out the established plans (Aziwantoro, 2024). Execution includes the processes of directing, motivating, communicating, and fostering work behaviors that align with organizational goals. In the context of digital transformation, this function becomes very important because digital changes often require individuals to step out of their comfort zones, adopt new ways of working, and face uncertainty and learning risks. In a military organization, implementing change cannot rely solely on formal instructions, but also requires leaders to set an example by practicing digital values, such as openness to learning, using technology in decision-

making, and data-driven collaboration. Actuating in the digital era is not only about command, but also persuasive and educational in building the mental readiness and behavior of personnel.

The supervision or controlling function in the POAC theory focuses on the process of monitoring, evaluation, and correction to ensure that the implementation of activities proceeds according to the established plans and objectives (Hartono et al., 2023). Supervision is not only understood as a formal control mechanism but also as a means for organizational learning to improve performance and continuously adjust strategies (Beuren et al., 2022). The supervision function faces new challenges because changes often occur rapidly and do not always follow predictable patterns (Newman & Ford, 2021). Therefore, digital supervision requires more adaptive performance indicators, rapid feedback mechanisms, and the organization's ability to utilize data as a basis for evaluation. The controlling function has additional significance because it relates to accountability, discipline, and information security, so digital oversight must be carefully designed so as not to hinder innovation while still maintaining institutional control (Pisarkiewicz & Parcu, 2024). Although the POAC theory provides a systematic and easy-to-understand framework, it is not without criticism. One major criticism states that POAC tends to be mechanistic and linear, making it less sensitive to the complexity, dynamics, and uncertainty inherent in organizational change in the digital era. In digital transformation practice, the processes of planning, organizing, implementing, and controlling often occur simultaneously and overlap with each other, rather than as rigidly separate stages (Kretschmer & Khashabi, 2020). Other critiques point out that POAC is based on the assumption of environmental stability, whereas digital transformation actually occurs in a context of rapid and uncertain change.

METHODS

This study uses a qualitative approach with a descriptive-interpretative design to gain an in-depth understanding of digital mindset management as the foundation of digital transformation (Rohde & Mau, 2021). A qualitative approach is chosen because the focus of this research is not aimed at testing causal relationships between variables, but rather at understanding the processes, meanings, and managerial dynamics that occur within a complex organization rich in institutional values (Putra et al., 2025). Digital transformation and digital mindset are cognitive, social, and contextual phenomena, thus requiring a research approach that can explore the experiences, perceptions, and practices of organizational actors in a deep and reflective manner.

Data collection was carried out through three main techniques, namely in-depth interviews, observation, and documentation. Interviews were used as the primary technique to explore the informants' views, experiences, and interpretations regarding the process of digital transformation and the management of digital mindset within the military organization. The informant's position, and classification are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Research Informant

No	Informant	Position	Informant Criteria
1	Informant 1	Chief of Staff of the Regional Military Command	Key Informant
2	Informant 2	Head of the Expert Staff Group	Key Informant
3	Informant 3	Planning Assistant	Additional Informant
4	Informant 4	Intelligence Assistant	Additional Informant
5	Informant 5	Operations Assistant	Additional Informant
6	Informant 6	Personnel Assistant	Additional Informant
7	Informant 7	Logistics Assistant	Additional Informant
8	Informant 8	Territorial Assistant	Additional Informant
9	Informant 9	Head of Code	Key Informant
10	Informant 10	Head of Topography at the Regional Military Command	Key Informant
11	Informant 11	Head of Information and Data Processing of the Military Regional Command	Key Informant
12	Informant 12	Head of Command and Control Center	Key Informant
13	Informant 13	Head of Military Area Information	Key Informant
14	Informant 14	Head of Military Area Command Transportation	Key Informant

Source: Data processed by Author (2025)

Informants were purposively selected based on their involvement and strategic roles in the planning, decision-making, and implementation of digitalization policies (Muhoza et al., 2021). Interviews were conducted in a semi-structured manner so that the researcher had a guided framework of questions, yet still allowed informants to freely and in-depth express their perspectives, reflections, and empirical experiences. Observations were conducted to

capture the reality of organizational practices that are not always revealed through interviews. Through observation, the researcher examined work interaction patterns, the use of digital technology in daily activities, as well as behavioral and organizational culture dynamics related to the internalization of a digital mindset. This observation allows researchers to gain a contextual understanding of the alignment between informants' narratives and actual practices in the field, particularly in military organizations that have strong formal and informal norms (Damman & Day, 2024). Documentation is used as a supporting technique to enrich and verify data obtained from interviews and observations. The documents analyzed include internal policies, work guidelines, activity reports, as well as official archives related to digital transformation programs and human resource management. Document analysis helps researchers understand the policy framework, the strategic direction of the organization, as well as the formal record of digital transformation implementation, which serves as the context for managerial practices and organizational actors' behavior.

Data analysis was carried out gradually and simultaneously with the data collection process. Data from interviews, observations, and documentation were analyzed through the processes of data reduction, data display, and drawing conclusions interpretatively. To enhance the validity and credibility of the findings, this study applied source triangulation techniques, which involved comparing and contrasting information obtained from various informants, data collection methods, and documentary sources. Source triangulation allows researchers to identify consistencies, differences, and emerging patterns of meaning, so the research findings are not dependent on a single perspective (Meydan & Akkaş, 2024).

RESULT

Digital Mindset Management Practices Supporting the Digital Transformation of Military Organizations

The interview results indicate that digital transformation is understood as part of the strategic effort to modernize military organizations, which cannot be separated from changes in personnel mindsets. The informants emphasized that:

"Digital technology will only be effective if accompanied by mental readiness and a collective commitment to change. From the perspective of digital transformation, this view reflects the understanding that digitalization is not merely a system upgrade, but a reconstruction of how the organization operates. A digital mindset is seen as the foundation of strategic leadership that enables digital policies to be translated into operational practice without disrupting military discipline and hierarchy."

The interview with the fifth informant indicated that digital transformation supports operational effectiveness through improved digital-based coordination and communication. The informant emphasized that:

"Technology adaptation requires a change in personnel attitudes and work habits. A digital mindset is seen as the ability to integrate technology into operational work patterns without reducing the firmness of command.

These findings confirm that digital transformation in military operations is socio-technical in nature, as emphasized in digital transformation theory."

The tenth informant explained that digital transformation serves as a means to improve the accuracy and reliability of spatial data. The informant revealed:

"A digital mindset is understood as the ability to utilize digital mapping technology analytically and strategically. These findings indicate that technology only adds value when personnel have a mindset capable of interpreting digital data as a basis for decision-making."

The eleventh informant indicated that digital transformation is highly dependent on the integration and management of data across units. The informant revealed:

"A digital mindset is seen as the willingness to share information and work collaboratively based on data. This perspective aligns with digital transformation theory, which emphasizes the importance of connectivity and integration as characteristics of a digital organization."

The twelfth informant explained that:

"Digital transformation supports real-time decision-making through technology-based command systems. A digital mindset is understood as the ability to think quickly, adaptively, and based on digital information without disregarding command principles. This finding confirms that digital transformation in military organizations requires cognitive changes aligned with the hierarchical structure."

The thirteenth informant commented on digital transformation as follows:

"Digital transformation changes the way organizations manage public communication and information. A digital mindset is seen as an awareness of the importance of transparency, speed, and accuracy of information in the digital era. This perspective emphasizes that digital transformation not only has an internal impact but also affects the organization's relationship with the external environment."

Based on interviews with key, primary, and additional informants, it can be concluded that digital transformation in military organizations is widely understood as an organizational change process that goes beyond merely adopting technology. Informants consistently emphasized that digital technology only serves as an enabler, while the success of the transformation is largely determined by the readiness of personnel's mindset and mental attitude in interpreting and utilizing the technology. These findings reinforce the view in digital transformation literature that rejects a technological-deterministic approach and places the human dimension at the center of organizational change (Mora et al., 2022). Digital transformation in the military context emerges as a socio-technical process that demands a reconstruction of ways of thinking, working, and coordinating, without eliminating core values such as discipline, hierarchy, and institutional security (Mattila, 2021).

POAC Digital Mindset of Military Organizations

The interview results indicate that in the planning aspect, the digital mindset is understood by the first informant as a strategic direction that must be established from the policy level. The first informant stated, "Digital transformation is not just about the system; what should be planned from the start is the personnel's way of thinking to be ready to face technological changes." This view is reinforced by another informant from the expert staff element who added, "Conceptually, the digital direction already exists, but the development of the mindset is not always detailed in planning documents, so it often develops through leadership directives." However, there is a differing view from planning informants who stated that 'Digital mindset planning is still being carried out according to operational needs and has not yet been fully based on a systematic digital competency map.' This difference indicates that digital mindset planning has been recognized strategically, but the level of formality and depth still varies.

The second informant stated that "the organizational structure continues to operate as usual, but digital systems make cross-unit coordination faster and more efficient." This view is supported by a data processing informant who mentioned that "the work culture is starting to shift towards data-based practices, although digital collaboration between units still faces structural barriers." However, a territorial informant cautioned that "digital organization cannot be standardized because regional conditions and infrastructure greatly affect unit readiness."

The third informant emphasized that "the leadership's example in using digital technology is the main factor for personnel to be willing to follow changes." The fourth informant added that "a digital mindset cannot be formed through orders, but through guidance and habituation in daily work." On the other hand, the fifth informant expressed a pragmatic view that "digital adaptation often occurs due to job demands, not because of an initial readiness of mindset."

The sixth informant stated that "digital monitoring must be strict because the risk to information security is much greater compared to manual systems." This view was reinforced by the seventh informant, who conveyed that "digitalization should not reduce command control, so validation and monitoring must still be centralized." Conversely, the eighth informant criticized that "digital monitoring is still focused on procedural compliance and has not yet been directed at assessing the development of personnel's digital mindset and behavior."

Based on the interview results, it can be concluded that the management of a digital mindset in military organizations occurs through managerial practices that substantially reflect the functions of POAC, although they are not always carried out formally or systematically. At the planning stage, the informants view a digital mindset as a strategic foundation for digital transformation that must be established from the outset through policy direction and leadership exemplification. The planning for digital mindset development has not been fully based on a systematic competency map, so in practice, it still evolves adaptively according to operational needs and human resource readiness (Marlapudi & Lenka, 2024).

At the stage of organization and implementation, interview results show that the military organizational structure remains the main framework, while digital systems function as enhancers of coordination, data integration, and acceleration of work processes (Danilova, 2024). The digital mindset is manifested through technology-based work practices, especially when driven by active leadership and real operational needs (Shahzad, 2024). Nonetheless, the implementation of the digital mindset occurs gradually and unevenly, influenced by differences in unit functions, regional conditions, and personnel work habits. This indicates that actuating a digital mindset cannot be separated from the context of the organization and the inherent work culture.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that digital transformation in military organizations cannot be understood merely as a process of technology adoption, but rather as an organizational change that heavily relies on managing the digital mindset through managerial functions. The interview results reinforce views in the digital transformation literature that reject a techno-deterministic approach and emphasize the socio-technical nature of digital change.

In line with digital transformation theory, this study finds that technology serves as an enabler, while changes in personnel mindset and behavior become key factors for the sustainability of the transformation (Zhang et al., 2022). These findings support the argument that the failure of many digital transformation initiatives is not due to technological limitations, but rather due to weak management of human and cognitive aspects within the organization (Haefner et al., 2021). This research also expands and simultaneously challenges the literature that tends to assume that digital transformation requires high flexibility, decentralization, and individual autonomy. In the context of military organizations, the findings indicate that a digital mindset actually develops within a framework of hierarchy, discipline, and strong control. A digital mindset is not understood as unlimited freedom to experiment, but rather as a mental readiness to utilize technology in a controlled, safe, and responsible manner (Athota, 2021). These findings refute the normative view in some digital transformation literature that idealizes flat and agile organizational models as universal prerequisites for digital change, showing that the institutional context greatly determines the form and direction of transformation.

From the perspective of digital mindset theory, the results of this study reinforce the view that a digital mindset is a collective capability shaped through leadership practice, organizational culture, and work experience, rather than merely an individual attribute. Interview findings show that a digital mindset grows when leaders set an example, integrate technology into decision-making, and frame digitalization as part of organizational professionalism. This supports previous research that emphasizes the role of leadership in shaping cognitive readiness for digital change (Veseli et al., 2025). However, this study also critiques the overly individualistic approach to digital mindset, because in a military context, developing a mindset without support from structures, policies, and monitoring systems risks creating disorder and resistance (Spitaletta et al., 2024). The integration of research findings with POAC theory shows that managerial functions remain relevant in managing digital transformation, even though they no longer operate in a linear and mechanistic manner (Lanzolla et al., 2020). This study supports criticisms of classical POAC theory as rigid and unresponsive to dynamic changes, but at the same time demonstrates that POAC can function as an adaptive framework when understood as an interacting cycle (Asni, 2025). In military organizational practice, digital mindset planning is carried out strategically yet adaptively, organizing is conducted differentially according to function and context, implementation heavily relies on leadership and operational needs, and supervision focuses on security and compliance. These findings enrich management literature by showing that POAC is still relevant in the digital era, as long as it is interpreted contextually and not normatively.

CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATION

This study concludes that digital transformation in military organizations is an organizational change process that is socio-technical in nature and cannot be reduced to mere technology adoption. Empirical findings indicate that a digital mindset serves as a cognitive and cultural foundation that determines the extent to which digital technology can be internalized into work practices, decision-making, and organizational coordination. In the military context, a digital mindset is understood as the readiness to think adaptively and strategically in utilizing technology in a disciplined, safe manner, and aligned with institutional values. Through the POAC lens, this study shows that managing a digital mindset occurs adaptively and contextually, where planning is strategic but gradual, and organizing proceeds differentially according to function and region. Implementation is highly dependent on leadership exemplars and operational demands, with supervision placing more emphasis on compliance and security aspects rather than organizational learning. These findings enrich the digital transformation literature by showing that transformation models emphasizing flexibility and decentralization are not universal, but must be adapted to the characteristics of hierarchical and control-oriented military organizations.

Based on these findings, the policy implications emphasize the need to make digital mindset management a strategic agenda in the digital transformation policies of the military organization. Digitalization policies should not only focus on technology procurement but also systematically integrate the development of a digital mindset into human resource policies and leadership development. Leaders need to be positioned as key actors in internalizing the digital mindset through role modeling, vision communication, and continuous learning, while organizational and supervisory policies need to be designed flexibly to accommodate variations in functions, regions, and unit readiness levels without neglecting the principles of discipline and institutional security. Nevertheless, this study has limitations because it was conducted in a single military organizational context using a qualitative approach, so the findings cannot yet be generalized to all defense institutions or other public organizations and still leave room for further research with more diverse contexts, methods, and perspectives.

REFERENCE

- Alojail, M., & Khan, S. B. (2023). Impact of digital transformation toward sustainable development. *Sustainability*, 15(20), 14697.
- Asni, A. (2025). The role of POAC management functions in enhancing the quality of counseling guidance services for students in schools in Indonesia. *Jurnal Konseling Dan Pendidikan*, 13(1), 89–101.
- Athota, V. S. (2021). Why mindset matters in a digital age. In *Mind over matter and artificial intelligence: building employee mental fitness for organisational success* (pp. 1–15). Springer.
- Attah, R. U., Ogunsola, O. Y., & Garba, B. M. P. (2023). Leadership in the digital age: Emerging trends in business strategy, innovation, and technology integration. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*, 6(9), 389–411.
- Aziwanto, J. (2024). POAC Analysis Based on the Qur'an as a Sharia Management Function. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 4(2), 4041–4055.
- Baiyere, A., Salmela, H., Nieminen, H., & Kankainen, T. (2025). Assessing digital capabilities for digital transformation—The MIND framework. *Information Systems Journal*, 35(1), 6–38.
- Baumgartner, C., Hartl, E., & Hess, T. (2021). New workplace, new mindset: Empirical case studies on the interplay between digital workplace and organizational culture. *International Conference on Wirtschaftsinformatik*, 91–107.
- Bellantuono, N., Nuzzi, A., Pontrandolfo, P., & Scozzi, B. (2021). Digital transformation models for the I4. 0 transition: Lessons from the change management literature. *Sustainability*, 13(23), 12941.
- Beuren, I. M., Santos, V. dos, & Bernd, D. C. (2022). Effects of using the management control system on individual performance with the intervenience of feedforward and organizational learning. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 26(4), 1042–1060.
- Bozkus, K. (2023). Organizational culture change and technology: Navigating the digital transformation. In *Organizational Culture-Cultural Change and Technology*. IntechOpen.
- Brown, E. M., & Potter, L. A. (2020). *Army Futures Command Concept for Intelligence 2028*.
- Brunetti, F., Matt, D. T., Bonfanti, A., De Longhi, A., Pedrini, G., & Orzes, G. (2020). Digital transformation challenges: strategies emerging from a multi-stakeholder approach. *The TQM Journal*, 32(4), 697–724.
- Chang, C.-H., Chen, Y.-S., & Tseng, C.-W. (2025). Digital transformation anxiety: absorptive capacity, dynamic capability, and digital innovation performance. *Management Decision*, 63(3), 734–755.
- Chen, Y., Li, R., & Song, T. (2023). Does TMT internationalization promote corporate digital transformation? A study based on the cognitive process mechanism. *Business Process Management Journal*, 29(2), 309–338.
- Choi, I. (2020). Moving beyond mandates: Organizational learning culture, empowerment, and performance. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 43(8), 724–735.
- Clarke, A. E. (2024). Social worlds/arenas theory as organizational theory. In *Social organization and social process* (pp. 119–158). Routledge.
- Damman, E., & Day, C. (2024). Charming the generals: the study of Africa's security elites. *Conflict, Security & Development*, 24(6), 701–724.
- Danilova, O. (2024). *The DoD's Application of Data Analytics in Financial Management: How to Achieve Competitive Advantage through Data Integration*. Acquisition Research Program.
- Doz, Y. (2020). Fostering strategic agility: How individual executives and human resource practices contribute. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(1), 100693.
- Haefner, N., Wincent, J., Parida, V., & Gassmann, O. (2021). Artificial intelligence and innovation management: A review, framework, and research agenda☆. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 162, 120392.
- Han, S. J., & Stieha, V. (2020). Growth mindset for human resource development: A scoping review of the literature with recommended interventions. *Human Resource Development Review*, 19(3), 309–331.
- Harsono, C. F., Sutanto, S., & Harefa, F. (2025). Technology Adaptation as a Decision-Making Priority in Responding to the Revolution in Military Affairs for National Defense. *International Journal of Humanity Advance, Business & Sciences (IJHABS)*, 2(4), 351–364.
- Hartono, D., Aliyah, H., Safitri, O., & Ciputri, O. (2023). Analysis of The Implementation of The Management Planning, Organizing, Actuating, Controlling in BES PPJA (Case Study of The Santri Executive Board of The Jagad 'Alimussirry). *Journal Intellectual Sufism Research (JISR)*, 6(1), 12–28.
- Hildebrandt, Y. (2024). *The Digital Mindset: Theoretical Foundation and Empirical Evidence*. Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg, Fakultät Wirtschaftsinformatik und
- Hovorka, D. S., & Mueller, B. (2025). Speculative foresight: A foray beyond digital transformation. *Information Systems Journal*, 35(1), 140–162.
- Imran, F., Shahzad, K., Butt, A., & Kantola, J. (2021). Digital Transformation of Industrial Organizations: Toward an Integrated Framework. *Journal of Change Management*, 21(4), 451–479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2021.1929406>

- Indrawati, I., & Wahira, W. (2025). POAC-based Principal Management Model in Planning the PAUD Unit Annual Program. *Journal of Social Science and Economics (JOSSE)*, 1–12.
- Irani, Z., Abril, R. M., Weerakkody, V., Omar, A., & Sivarajah, U. (2023). The impact of legacy systems on digital transformation in European public administration: Lesson learned from a multi case analysis. *Government Information Quarterly*, 40(1), 101784.
- Ismail, A., Hidajat, T., Dora, Y. M., Prasatia, F. E., & Pranadani, A. (2023). *Leading the digital transformation: Evidence from Indonesia*. Asadel Publisher.
- Jain, V., & Mitra, A. (2025). Digital Transformation and Organizational Culture: A Sociological Examination of Employee Interactions in Modern Workplaces. In *Organizational Sociology in the Digital Age* (pp. 203–218). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
- Jerab, D., & Mabrouk, T. (2023). The evolving landscape of organizational structures: A contemporary analysis. *Available at SSRN 4584643*.
- Kapotas, S. (2024). Digital Transformation of Organizations and Their Organizational Cultures: A Case Study in a National Defense Industry. *Journal of Strategic Innovation and Sustainability*, 19(3), 45–68.
- Kotlyk, A., Lin, L., & Yantao, L. (2024). *Innovations as a way to adapt to uncertainty conditions*.
- Kretschmer, T., & Khashabi, P. (2020). Digital transformation and organization design: An integrated approach. *California Management Review*, 62(4), 86–104.
- Lanzolla, G., Lorenz, A., Miron-Spektor, E., Schilling, M., Solinas, G., & Tucci, C. L. (2020). Digital transformation: What is new if anything? Emerging patterns and management research. In *Academy of Management Discoveries* (Vol. 6, Issue 3, pp. 341–350). Academy of Management Briarcliff Manor, NY.
- Leonardi, P. M., & Treem, J. W. (2020). Behavioral visibility: A new paradigm for organization studies in the age of digitization, digitalization, and datafication. *Organization Studies*, 41(12), 1601–1625.
- Leyva-Vázquez, M., Quiroz-Martínez, M. A., Portilla-Castell, Y., Hechavarría-Hernández, J. R., & González-Caballero, E. (2020). A new model for the selection of information technology project in a neutrosophic environment. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 32(1), 22.
- Liu, N.-C., Wang, Y.-C., & Lin, Y.-T. (2023). Employees' adaptation to technology uncertainty in the digital era: an exploration through the lens of job demands–resources theory. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 71, 7286–7297.
- Mariscal, J., & Cornish, D. (2025). *Strategic Alignment at Speed: Modernizing NSW's Capability Development through Digital Transformation*. Acquisition Research Program.
- Marlapudi, K., & Lenka, U. (2024). Unlocking the potential: redefining talent and competency mapping for Industry 4.0. *Management Research Review*, 47(11), 1805–1832.
- Mattila, J. K. (2021). *Transdisciplinary Approach in Studying Organisational Transformations: A case study in Evolution of Military Enterprises*.
- Menzeffricke, J. S., Wiederkehr, I., Koldewey, C., & Dumitrescu, R. (2021). Socio-technical risk management in the age of digital transformation-identification and analysis of existing approaches. *Procedia CIRP*, 100, 708–713.
- Meydan, C. H., & Akkaş, H. (2024). The role of triangulation in qualitative research: Converging perspectives. In *Principles of conducting qualitative research in multicultural settings* (pp. 98–129). IGI Global.
- Mora, L., Deakin, M., Zhang, X., Batty, M., de Jong, M., Santi, P., & Appio, F. P. (2022). Assembling sustainable smart city transitions: An interdisciplinary theoretical perspective. In *Sustainable smart city transitions* (pp. 1–27). Routledge.
- Morgan, F. E., Boudreaux, B., Lohn, A. J., Ashby, M., Curriden, C., Klima, K., & Grossman, D. (2020). *Military applications of artificial intelligence: ethical concerns in an uncertain world*.
- Muhoza, P., Saleem, H., Faye, A., Gaye, I., Tine, R., Diaw, A., Gueye, A., Kante, A. M., Ruff, A., & Marx, M. A. (2021). Key informant perspectives on the challenges and opportunities for using routine health data for decision-making in Senegal. *BMC Health Services Research*, 21(1), 594.
- Nadkarni, S., & Prügl, R. (2021). Digital transformation: a review, synthesis and opportunities for future research. *Management Review Quarterly*, 71(2), 233–341.
- Neeley, T., & Leonard, P. (2022). Developing a digital mindset. *Harvard Business Review*, 100(5–6), 50–55.
- Newman, S. A., & Ford, R. C. (2021). Five steps to leading your team in the virtual COVID-19 workplace. *Organizational Dynamics*, 50(1), 100802.
- Nordhall, O., Hörvallius, J., Nedelius, M., & Knez, I. (2025). Employees' experiences of personal and collective work-identity in the context of an organizational change. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1382271.
- Omol, E. J. (2024). Organizational digital transformation: from evolution to future trends. *Digital Transformation and Society*, 3(3), 240–256.
- Omowole, B. M., Olufemi-Philips, A. Q., Ofadile, O. C., Eyo-Udo, N. L., & Ewim, S. E. (2024). Barriers and drivers of digital transformation in SMEs: A conceptual analysis. *International Journal of Frontline Research in Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(2), 19–36.

- Palad, J. B. (2022). Strategies for improving organizational efficiency, productivity, and performance through technology adoption. *Journal of Management and Administration Provision*, 2(3), 88–94.
- Pisarkiewicz, A. R., & Parcu, P. L. (2024). *Empowering Regulatory Agility: Bridging the Technological Gap for Effective Digital Markets Oversight*.
- Pisoni, G., Molnár, B., & Tarcsi, Á. (2021). Data science for finance: Best-suited methods and enterprise architectures. *Applied System Innovation*, 4(3), 69.
- Prianto, A. L., Amri, A. R., & Ilik, G. (2025). Digital transformation on national security strategy: A bibliometric analysis. *Advanced Research in Intelligence and National Security*, 1(1), 1–28.
- Purwanto, A., Purba, J. T., Bernarto, I., & Sijabat, R. (2023). Investigating the role digital transformation and human resource management on the performance of the universities. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, 7.
- Putra, A. P., Ibrahim, K. H., Endarti, E. W., & Sunyoto, K. (2025). A critical review of land transport management in Indonesia: Does it support CO2 emission reduction? *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 12, 101972.
- Putra, A. P., Wasiaturrehman, W., & Supeno, E. (2023). Transforming Green Accounting Strategies in Online Transportation: A Critical Analysis. *AFRE (Accounting and Financial Review)*, 6(3), 372–383.
- Putri, N. S. R., Wardhani, P. K., Muda, K., Hirol, H., & Anwar, K. (2025). Implementation of Management Process To Achieve Municipal Solid Waste Management (MSWM) Efficiency—A Systematic Literature Review. *Srinwijaya Journal of Environment*, 10(2), 65–74.
- Rachmad, Y. E. (2025). From Degree to Competence: Human Resource Management Strategies in the Gen Z Era. *United Nations Development Programme*.
- Rahmi, E., Darmansyah, D., Yulastri, A., & Handrianto, C. (2025). Bridging Entrepreneurship Education and Digital Transformation: A Novel Experiential Learning Model for Entrepreneurial Mindset Development. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(4), 640–660.
- Rauch, R. (2022). Digital mindsets: Notion, theoretical foundation and examination access. In *Digital Mindsets: The Analysis of a Multidimensional Construct* (pp. 9–34). Springer.
- Ringberg, T., Rydén, P., & Jacobsen, P. Ø. (2024). Digital transformation requires the right managerial mindset. In *How to Achieve Societal Impact through Engaged and Collaborative Scholarship* (pp. 110–136). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Rofiq, A., Hussein, A. S., & Ekawati, P. D. (2023). Digital Military Leadership in Digital Transformation. *1st Brawijaya International Conference on Business and Law (BICoBL 2022)*, 153–162.
- Rohde, P., & Mau, G. (2021). “It’s selling like hotcakes”: deconstructing social media influencer marketing in long-form video content on youtube via social influence heuristics. *European Journal of Marketing*, 55(10), 2700–2734.
- Roman, F. M. G. (2024). *Bridging Digital Transformation Gaps in Southeast Asia*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Schulte, B., Andresen, F., & Koller, H. (2020). Exploring the embeddedness of an informal community of practice within a formal organizational context: A case study in the German military. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(2), 153–179.
- Sekar, A., & Thomas, Y. (2025). *Cultivating Digital DNA: The Role of Strategic Leadership Towards Fostering a Digital Organizational Culture*.
- Shahzad, M. U. (2024). Core competencies for digital leadership development: a perspective from the lens of paradox theory. *The Bottom Line*, 37(4), 454–472.
- Shen, L., Zhang, X., & Liu, H. (2022). Digital technology adoption, digital dynamic capability, and digital transformation performance of textile industry: Moderating role of digital innovation orientation. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 43(6), 2038–2054.
- Singh, A., Klarner, P., & Hess, T. (2020). How do chief digital officers pursue digital transformation activities? The role of organization design parameters. *Long Range Planning*, 53(3), 101890.
- Solberg, E., Traavik, L. E. M., & Wong, S. I. (2020). Digital mindsets: Recognizing and leveraging individual beliefs for digital transformation. *California Management Review*, 62(4), 105–124.
- Spitaletta, J. A., Matthaeus, M. M. B., & Guadian, M. (2024). Cyber Considerations of a Resistance Operating Concept. *MILITARY REVIEW*, 1.
- Struijk, M., Angelopoulos, S., Ou, C. X. J., & Davison, R. M. (2023). Navigating digital transformation through an information quality strategy: Evidence from a military organisation. *Information Systems Journal*, 33(4), 912–952.
- Subrahmanyam, S. (2025). The Paradigm Shift in Leadership Owing to Technological Development. In *Leadership Paradigms and the Impact of Technology* (pp. 381–406). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
- Syed, R., Bandara, W., & Eden, R. (2023). Public sector digital transformation barriers: A developing country experience. *Information Polity*, 28(1), 5–27.
- Tkachenko, V., Kotviakovskiy, Y., & Zinchenko, S. (2025). Contemporary European Concepts of Public Administration in the Context of Digital Transformation and their Legal Framework. *Public Administration and Law Review*, 1 (21), 99–109.

- Trenerry, B., Chng, S., Wang, Y., Suhaila, Z. S., Lim, S. S., Lu, H. Y., & Oh, P. H. (2021). Preparing workplaces for digital transformation: An integrative review and framework of multi-level factors. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 620766.
- Veseli, A., Hasanaj, P., & Bajraktari, A. (2025). Perceptions of Organizational Change Readiness for Sustainable Digital Transformation: Insights from Learning Management System Projects in Higher Education Institutions. *Sustainability, 17*(2), 619.
- Vial, G. (2021). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *Managing Digital Transformation, 13*–66.
- Volti, R., & Croissant, J. (2024). *Society and technological change*. Waveland Press.
- Wong, S. I., Solberg, E., & Traavik, L. (2022). Individuals' fixed digital mindset, internal HRM alignment and feelings of helplessness in virtual teams. *Information Technology & People, 35*(6), 1693–1713.
- Wrigley, C., & Simons, M. (2025). *Creativity in military complexity: design, disruptors and defence forces*. Taylor & Francis.
- Ylinen, M. (2021). Digital Transformation in a Finnish Municipality. *Tampere University*.
- Zhang, J., & Chen, Z. (2024). Exploring human resource management digital transformation in the digital age. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy, 15*(1), 1482–1498.
- Zhang, X., Xu, Y., & Ma, L. (2022). Research on successful factors and influencing mechanism of the digital transformation in SMEs. *Sustainability, 14*(5), 2549.