

ADAPTIVE STABILITY AND WORKPLACE CULTURE AMID CONTINUOUS TECHNOLOGICAL DISRUPTION

Rahayu Mardikaningsih, Fayola Issalillah

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

correspondence: rahayumardikaningsih@gmail.com

Abstract - Organizations operating under persistent technological disruption and economic uncertainty can no longer rely on episodic models of organizational change. This article examines continuous transformation as an organizational capability for maintaining operational reliability while repeatedly reconfiguring technologies, processes, competencies, and working arrangements. An integrative literature review was conducted by synthesizing peer-reviewed studies and academic sources on digital transformation, organizational ambidexterity, resilience, digital HRM, workforce agility, Industry 4.0, psychological safety, employee engagement, and AI governance. The synthesis indicates that operational stability during continuous change depends on protecting critical functions, modularizing processes, maintaining skill redundancy, using bounded decentralization, improving observability, and governing transformation portfolios according to risk and reversibility. Sustainable innovation further requires psychological safety, continuous learning, ethical digital governance, employee voice, and leadership practices that prevent change saturation. Resistance should not automatically be treated as dysfunction because it may reveal design weaknesses, excessive workloads, ethical concerns, or declining trust. Continuous transformation is therefore most sustainable when organizations combine adaptive operational architectures with cultures capable of learning, questioning, and innovating without sacrificing reliability or human sustainability.

Keywords: continuous transformation, organizational resilience, digital transformation, workforce agility, psychological safety, digital HRM, sustainable innovation.

INTRODUCTION

Technological changes, shifts in competitive patterns, economic uncertainty, and changes in workforce structures have altered basic assumptions regarding how organizations maintain their continuity. Organizations find it increasingly difficult to rely on change models that start from a stable state, enter a transition period, and then return to a new equilibrium (Liyana, 2017). Rapidly unfolding digital transformation has brought changes to almost all aspects of professional life across various industry sectors (Darmawan, 2025). Digitalization causes processes, business models, working relationships, decision-making patterns, and workforce competencies to undergo renewal at an increasingly shorter tempo (Vargas-Hernández et al., 2025). Vial (2019) explains that digital transformation is related to organizational changes triggered by digital technology followed by strategic responses, changes in value creation pathways, structural adjustments, and the management of organizational barriers. This perspective positions change as a series of interrelated processes rather than a single event. Modern organizations need to maintain the capability to reorganize resources while keeping core operations running. The managerial challenge then shifts from how to manage a single change program to how to build an organization capable of changing repeatedly without losing operational reliability (Kutnjak, 2025).

The continuous transformation paradigm emerges from this need. This paradigm views the renewal of strategy, structure, technology, processes, and competencies as activities that continue for as long as the organization operates (Tanya et al., 2020). This idea differs from episodic change, which usually has a clear starting point, an end target, and a relatively defined stabilization period. Organizations that work through continuous change must be able to meet two seemingly opposing demands, namely exploiting processes that have already produced performance while exploring new ways of working (Hinsen et al., 2019). Employees are required to keep learning new skills, adapt to rapid changes in software interfaces, and work in teams (Putra et al., 2025). This learning process is easier to sustain when training is designed in a way that preserves cooperation and empathy among employees (Putra et al., 2024). O'Reilly and Tushman (2013) describe ambidextrous capability as an organization's capacity to carry out exploitation, which demands efficiency and control, together with exploration, which requires flexibility, autonomy, and experimentation. This perspective is relevant to continuous transformation because operational stability does not have to be understood as the absence of change. Stability can be built through reliable core systems, while learning, experimentation, and reconfiguration take place in a targeted way in the parts of the organization that need renewal. A flexible organizational structure helps the parts that need to change adjust without disrupting the parts that must remain stable (Darmawan & Mardikaningsih, 2023).

Continuous change is increasingly tied to human resource management. Digital technology is no longer limited to automating administrative work; it has entered recruitment, learning, performance measurement, workforce planning,

decision-making, and the management of employee experience (Pereira et al., 2025). Akhtar (2026) places the development of digital HRM as part of a change in work models that needs to be aligned with organizational sustainability and the development of new technologies. This shift shows that an organization's technical capability cannot be separated from the readiness of the people who use, interpret, and develop the technology. Maintaining a balance between technological efficiency and employees' psychological well-being is one of the important challenges in implementing digital HRM (Mardikaningsih & Wardoyo, 2025). Excessive digital monitoring can reduce employees' work autonomy and sense of professional responsibility (Mardikaningsih et al., 2024a). System updates that move too quickly can cause fatigue, role confusion, resistance, or loss of trust. Performance feedback that is late or inaccurate when work patterns change can also weaken employees' trust in the new system (Mardikaningsih et al., 2025). Conversely, change that is too slow can widen competency gaps and reduce the organization's ability to respond to the market. Continuous transformation requires regulating the rhythm of change so that technological improvement, human development, and operations management move in mutually reinforcing relationships. Positive psychological factors help employees stay engaged and committed to their tasks while change is under way (Darmawan & Mardikaningsih, 2022).

The main problem concerns the relationship between constant change and operational stability. Stability is commonly associated with standardization, consistent procedures, control, and predictability. Continuous change, by contrast, demands experimentation, reconfiguration, and fast decision-making. This tension raises questions about the mechanisms that allow organizations to renew themselves without damaging the continuity of service, quality, productivity, safety, or coordination. The problem becomes more complicated when technological pressure arrives together with rising capital costs, shifting demand, supply chain uncertainty, or economic weakening. Planned innovation strategies help businesses remain resilient and competitive when such pressures arrive at the same time (Mardikaningsih et al., 2024b). Organizations do not have the freedom to halt core activities while change takes place. They need an operating architecture that can absorb change gradually, separate experiments from critical processes, and reallocate resources without creating systemic disruption. Sustainable supply chain management principles can help keep operational performance sound while work processes are being renewed (Barzani et al., 2022). Studies of continuous transformation need to explain how stability can be redefined as the ability to maintain vital functions while structures and processes are being renewed.

Another problem lies in work culture. Culture can be a source of continuity because it provides patterns of meaning, norms, habits, and expectations that help organizational members understand which actions are considered acceptable. However, a culture that clings too tightly to old procedures can turn into rigidity. Conversely, a culture that overly glorifies change can create ambiguity, fatigue, and experimental behavior without discipline. Strengthening character values combined with a positive psychology approach can help shape honest and responsible work attitudes (Saroni et al., 2025). Fatigue arising from constant connection to work can reduce quality of life and have negative effects on mental health in the long term (Hariani & Putra, 2025). The continuous transformation paradigm requires a culture that can preserve certain work identities while leaving room to correct assumptions, processes, and knowledge that are no longer adequate. This condition requires distinguishing between resistance rooted in the interest of defending the old status quo and caution that serves as a protective mechanism against bad change. Organizations need to understand resistance as information about trust, workload, the quality of change design, and perceptions of fairness, so that an adaptive culture is built not through uniform agreement but through the ability to process differences productively. Ethical leadership helps shape a positive and lasting work culture (Mardikaningsih et al., 2022).

The literature on digital transformation, organizational ambidexterity, strategic HRM, organizational resilience, and innovation culture has explained various components that organizations need in order to adapt. Even so, the relationship between operational stability and continuous change is still often discussed through separate frameworks. Some of the literature emphasizes technological efficiency and flexibility, while other studies focus on learning, leadership, employee engagement, or resistance to change. The conceptual gap lies in the lack of an adequate explanation of how organizations can maintain core operations while digital change continues to enter work processes, and how culture can restrain harmful behavior while still leaving room for innovation. This problem becomes more relevant as AI-based decisions, digital HRM, automation, and employee analytics increase the speed of change and widen the social consequences of technology. The development of digital technology also calls for clear rules and enforcement so that its social impact can be kept under control (Sediana et al., 2025). A synthesis across the literature is needed so that continuous transformation can be understood as an organizational capability that connects operations, technology, people, learning, and governance.

This article positions continuous transformation as an organizational capability to carry out repeated reconfiguration while maintaining a minimum threshold of operational reliability and the sustainability of working relationships. This position avoids the assumption that change must always be accelerated or that stability is identical to preserving the old state of affairs. The article's theoretical contribution lies in synthesizing the relationships among ambidexterity, digital HRM, resilience, operations management, psychological safety, and technology governance. Practically, the synthesis is directed at principles that allow organizations to determine which parts must remain stable, which parts can be experimented with, and which mechanisms connect the two. The article also positions adaptive culture as a system of norms that gives room for learning without removing discipline, accountability, and the protection of employee well-being. Clear limits on when an action can be justified and when it must be answered for are important so

that the freedom to experiment does not become an excuse to ignore accountability (Ardiansyah et al., 2025). This framework provides a basis for assessing the sustainability of change from the quality of organizational capacity, not from the number of change programs being run.

Based on those issues, this article aims to explain the organizational mechanisms that enable operational continuity while change is ongoing and to examine the capability of the continuous transformation paradigm in forming an adaptive work culture that supports long-term innovation. The first research question is: How can organizations maintain operational stability when undergoing continuous transformation amidst technology disruption and global economic uncertainty? The second research question is: To what extent is the continuous transformation paradigm capable of forming a work culture that is resistant to change while simultaneously supporting sustainable innovation in the long term? Both questions are placed in a sequential relationship. The first discussion examines the architecture of stability amidst change, while the second discussion examines the cultural characteristics that allow change to take place without diminishing the organization's learning capacity, trust, and innovation capability.

RESEARCH METHODS

This article uses an integrative literature review with a conceptual orientation in the fields of organizational management and human resources. This approach was chosen because the issue of continuous transformation involves literature from several fields that use different constructs and units of analysis. Snyder (2019) explains that integrative reviews are appropriate when the research objective is to combine perspectives to develop new conceptual understanding, while Tranfield, Denyer, and Smart (2003) emphasize the need for a transparent literature search and evaluation process in management research. The search was directed toward publications concerning digital transformation, organizational ambidexterity, organizational resilience, digital HRM, workforce agility, employee engagement, psychological safety, Industry 4.0, and AI governance. Prioritized sources include peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, and proceedings that possess traceable publisher identities. Publications were selected if they discussed adaptation mechanisms, operational continuity, digital change, workforce capacity, learning, leadership, or innovation capable of answering both research questions.

The selection was conducted through examinations of conceptual relevance, clarity of bibliographic identity, publisher traceability, and the interconnection of findings with the research questions. Sources with unverifiable identities, popular sources, and publications that merely mention digital change without organizational implications were excluded. The analysis employed comparative reading and thematic grouping. The categorization process followed the principles of qualitative content analysis set forth by Elo and Kyngäs (2008), particularly the preparation, organization, and reporting stages of categories. The literature was then compared based on units of analysis, change mechanisms, benefits, risks, and boundary conditions. The synthesis was not directed toward calculating effect sizes, but rather toward constructing explanations regarding the interrelationships of operational stability, flexibility, workforce development, learning culture, digital governance, and innovation. The final interpretation was formed through the search for consistent patterns, tensions among findings, and conditions explaining differences in outcomes across organizations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Operational Stability in Continuous Transformation

Operational stability in continuous transformation must be understood as the reliability of critical functions rather than an unchanging organizational state. Organizations can replace technologies, redesign workflows, or reorganize structures while maintaining service standards that form the basis of customer trust and internal coordination (Graessler & Grewe, 2025). Roy (2026) shows that E-HRM evolves from administrative tools into strategic capabilities related to organizational agility, data-driven decision-making, and broader digital change. These findings demonstrate that technology can strengthen flexibility when its implementation is supported by organizational readiness and human capacity. The application of flexible work systems enables organizations to optimize the potential of each individual by providing opportunities for employees to work through the most effective and efficient ways (Darmawan, 2024). Stability then depends on the ability to distinguish between components that may change rapidly and components requiring stronger protection. Payroll systems, security, safety, critical customer service, or compliance processes, for example, require low failure tolerance. Digital experiments need to be placed within an architecture that prevents local failures from escalating into widespread disruptions.

Digital HRM redesign strengthens the argument that technological change requires organizational configuration, not merely the installation of a new system. Ali, Fedorova, and Menshikova (2026) found that HRM digitalization is associated with data-driven decisions, automation, AI in talent management, and improved employee experience, but also with skill shortages, privacy concerns, and resistance. This picture shows that operational continuity is threatened when the speed of technology adoption outpaces the social capacity and competence of users. High technological pressure can trigger technostress that lowers staff performance and loyalty (Eddine & Darmawan, 2025). The way organizations respond to various changes through HRM policies not only affects the continuity of the company but also helps shape the

quality of working life more broadly (Mardikaningsih, 2025). Companies also bear responsibility for protecting employees' mental health amid digital productivity pressure (Khayru & Arifin, 2025). Organizations need to use a transition design that maintains the old operating path until the new system reaches a certain level of reliability. Parallel running, staged deployment, sandboxing, pilot projects, and rollback mechanisms are management logics that can reduce the risk of change. The basic principle is that organizations must gain the ability to learn from experiments without turning the entire operation into an experimental space. This separation provides an opportunity to make corrections before change is extended to critical functions.

Stability is also built through process flexibility, not absolute standardization. Putra and Darmawan (2026) examine the use of Industry 4.0 technology and show the conceptual relationship among automation, AI, cyber-physical systems, production efficiency, and process flexibility. Flexibility becomes valuable when organizations face demand variation, supply disruption, changes in product specifications, or cost pressure. Modern production technology can raise efficiency and process flexibility at the same time (Putra & Darmawan, 2026). Even so, flexibility without control limits can increase procedural variation and coordination difficulty. Organizations need to establish process modularity, that is, dividing the operating system into units that can be changed with minimal disruption to other parts. Digital infrastructure, data standards, system interfaces, and decision protocols need to be designed so that a change in one module does not force a complete redesign (Saghiri et al., 2025). Modularity provides a basis for continuous transformation because organizations can renew capabilities gradually while maintaining continuity in core processes. Technological speed also needs to be balanced with humane considerations so that an innovation culture does not overlook workers' needs (Darmawan, 2023).

Economic uncertainty adds to the need for discipline in resource allocation. Continuous transformation can be costly because organizations must finance new technology, training, data migration, process redesign, and periods of declining productivity during learning. When economic conditions weaken, investment in change competes with the need to preserve liquidity and efficiency (Bilousko et al., 2026). The relevant principle is not to stop change but to manage a portfolio of change. Initiatives directly related to reliability, structural cost savings, security, or demand adaptation need to receive different priority from experiments whose benefits remain highly uncertain. Organizations can use investment stages and termination criteria so that resources are not continually allocated to programs that fail to produce learning or value. Circular economy principles show that resources can be used more efficiently and sustainably (Mardikaningsih & Nuraini, 2022). This approach makes continuous transformation compatible with financial control. Capacity for change is measured not by the number of projects but by the ability to select, test, expand, or stop change in a disciplined manner.

The workforce dimension is a main buffer of continuity. Ross et al. (2026) link strategic HRM in a VUCA environment with workforce flexibility, continuous learning, reskilling, digital HR, empowerment, and adaptive leadership. This perspective shows that organizations that change often need a workforce with a broader range of competencies than highly specialized jobs allow. Cross-training, job rotation, skill inventories, talent mobility, and reskilling give organizations human redundancy that can be used when change shifts the workload. This redundancy is not waste when it is designed to protect critical functions during disruption. Dependence on one individual or one group of experts increases risk when technology, structure, or operating models change. Good knowledge management helps an organization maintain its advantage when people and roles shift (Darmawan, 2023b). Organizations that have a competency map and internal mobilization mechanisms are better able to redirect the workforce toward functions under pressure without losing service continuity. Sustained mental health support also keeps workforce loyalty intact while change takes place (Issalillah & Khayru, 2025).

The findings of Kocharyan, Hovhannisyan, Harutyunyan, and Malkhasyan (2026) on HRM digitalization in Armenia show that digital HR change can be linked to organizational excellence and employee retention when technological capability is aligned with organizational practice. The lesson to be drawn is that HR technology needs to function as change infrastructure, not just an administrative tool. Digital HR systems can provide data on competencies, training, performance, mobility, and workforce needs so that management has better visibility during the change process. This visibility supports stability because workforce allocation decisions can be made with faster information. Even so, data does not automatically improve decisions. Organizations still need governance over data definitions, input quality, access authority, interpretation, and correction mechanisms. If digital indicators are treated as a perfect representation of human ability, decisions can become rigid and reduce trust in the change system. Productivity measurement in the digital era needs to consider employee creativity and innovation, not just output figures (Darmawan, 2023c). The efficiency gains from technology also need to be shared fairly so that change does not create a sense of injustice among employees (Mardikaningsih & Hariani, 2025).

Stability under disruption also requires decentralized response capacity. Information about disruption often appears first at the operational unit, while formal decisions sit at higher management levels. A highly centralized structure can delay response, but unlimited decentralization can produce inconsistent decisions. Continuous transformation requires the principle of "bounded autonomy," that is, granting local authority within clear limits of goals, risk, budget, safety, and service standards. Teams can make quick adjustments as long as their actions remain within organizational guardrails (Xie et al., 2022). This model reduces the need to wait for approval for every modification while maintaining coherence. This capacity becomes more relevant when technology makes information available in real time. Big data analytics can

support the determination of policy direction and business projections (Khan et al., 2025). Decision-making can be placed closer to the problem, while senior management manages principles, portfolios, and risk limits.

Technology architecture needs to follow a similar logic. Organizations that rely on digital systems for many functions require redundancy, interoperability, security, monitoring, and recovery. Continuous change increases the frequency of system modifications, so the risks of configuration errors and incompatibility between systems also rise. Observability becomes part of stability because management needs to know which change caused a drop in performance and how quickly a disruption can be localized (Maguire, 2025). Technology in the workplace can benefit some workers and disadvantage others, so the effects of change need to be monitored from the start (Darmawan, 2024). The principles of version control, testing, audit trails, separation of development and production environments, and access control can be translated into organizational mechanisms for keeping change reliable. The same logic applies to non-technical processes. Every change needs a baseline, indicators, a decision owner, an escalation path, and a correction mechanism. Without the ability to see the consequences of change, organizations risk piling up interacting changes without adequate understanding.

Stability measurement needs to be broadened so that it does not rely only on financial output. An organization can experience a short-term productivity gain while accumulating risks such as fatigue, turnover, declining quality, or fragile technological dependence. Poorly designed workforce management policies can also raise workers' health risks in the long term (Issalillah, 2025). Indicators of continuous change need to cover service uptime, quality, safety, error rate, lead time, delays, recovery capacity, learning, workload, and competence. A combination of leading and lagging indicators helps organizations catch disruption before it grows into greater performance damage. Measurement also needs to distinguish normal performance from performance during transition. A temporary productivity drop is acceptable if it is part of planned learning and produces improved capability after the adaptation phase. Conversely, repeated declines without learning signal weak change design (Näslund & Norrman, 2019). This approach prevents management from treating every fluctuation as a failure while also preventing the normalization of constant disruption.

Stability is also tied to the governance of change risk. Every initiative needs to be assessed by the size of the consequences of failure, the level of reversibility, system dependencies, and outcome uncertainty. Changes that are easy to reverse can be tested faster, while changes that are costly or hard to undo require stricter evaluation. This principle helps organizations match the speed of change to the character of the risk. Technology that touches personal data, safety, compensation, or career decisions requires different oversight from productivity applications with limited impact. The effect of technology on users' psychological well-being depends on conditions that either protect them or increase risk (Khayru & Issalillah, 2026). Continuous change is not a reason to lower the quality of governance. On the contrary, a high frequency of change increases the need for rules that are simple, consistent, and repeatable (Chittala & Inc., 2026). Good governance reduces coordination costs because organizational members know when experiments can be run independently and when decisions must go through stricter review. Empowering leadership helps team members work independently and raises their capacity for innovation (Darmawan, 2024).

Learning capacity ultimately becomes the link between change and stability. Organizations that only run projects without changing collective knowledge will face the same problems in the next wave of change. Every change needs to produce information about which assumptions were correct, design failures, missing capabilities, customer responses, and effects on employees. This knowledge needs to be translated into standards, playbooks, training modules, or architectural changes. In this way, the organization improves the quality of the next change. Knowledge sharing among members helps change deliver better performance (Mardikaningsih et al., 2026). Continuous transformation becomes more stable when past experience reduces future uncertainty. After-action reviews, post-implementation reviews, and cross-unit learning can prevent knowledge fragmentation. Values that are instilled consistently through guidance and role modeling are easier to sustain (Al Makrufah et al., 2025). The organization then has institutional memory strong enough to maintain consistency without freezing its ways of working.

Organizations maintain operations during continuous change by protecting critical functions, implementing changes modularly, using investment portfolios, building competency redundancy, decentralizing decisions within clear boundaries, strengthening observability, and managing risks based on reversibility and the consequences of failure. Digital HRM and Industry 4.0 technologies can increase flexibility, but their benefits depend on workforce readiness and governance. Stability does not arise from halting change, but from the ability to absorb change without losing essential functions. Once the operational architecture is able to maintain reliability, the subsequent issue shifts toward the cultural character that determines whether renewal can take place as productive learning or turns into a source of resistance, fatigue, and declining trust.

Adaptive Culture and Sustainable Innovation

The continuous transformation paradigm has the potential to shape an adaptive culture if change is positioned as part of how the organization learns, rather than as a series of programs continuously imposed on employees. A work culture that supports change requires norms acknowledging that procedures can be improved, assumptions can be questioned, and competencies need to be updated. In this context, encouraging employee involvement in various

sustainability initiatives becomes an important aspect in supporting the achievement of corporate sustainability goals (Hariani & Mardikaningsih, 2024). At the same time, organizations require relatively fixed elements, such as purpose, ethical principles, safety standards, or commitments to customers. The combination of a sufficiently stable identity and changeable methods provides psychological orientation to employees. Without such anchors, change is easily perceived as permanent uncertainty. An adaptive culture is therefore not a culture that always agrees to change, but one capable of distinguishing changes with strong justifications from those merely following technological trends or managerial preferences (Lauer, 2021).

Sofijanov et al. (2026) show that sustainable HRM, green training, green skills, digital readiness, and employee engagement are interrelated in organizations in North Macedonia. Their findings position training as an important mechanism linking HR practices with competency development, while the relationship between green skills and engagement appears stronger in organizations with higher digital readiness. The meaning for continuous transformation is that an adaptive culture is not built through change communication alone. Employees need resources to be able to carry out new behaviors. Development programs that aim to increase work resilience can be designed by considering the characteristics of perceived control that each individual holds (Darmawan & Mardikaningsih, 2025). Belief in one's own ability helps employees adjust to technological change (Mardikaningsih & Darmawan, 2022). When organizations demand adaptation without providing time to learn, access to training, or technical support, resistance can become a rational response to an imbalance between demands and capacity. Interpersonal skills training with a humane approach can help workers affected by automation (Hariani et al., 2025). Older workers also need support so they are not left behind when digital technology is introduced (Darmawan, 2023). Investment in learning signals that change is not a transfer of all adjustment risk to individuals, but a shared responsibility between the organization and its workforce.

Psychological safety is the foundation of a learning culture because innovation involves the possibility of mistakes, ignorance, and differences of opinion. Edmondson (1999) demonstrated the relationship between psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. This principle is highly relevant in continuous change. Employees need to be able to say that a new system is problematic, that targets are unrealistic, that an algorithm produces doubtful output, or that a new procedure raises risk, without fearing disproportionate interpersonal consequences. If critical voices are silenced, the organization may gain a false impression that change is accepted while problems keep growing beneath the surface. Resistance expressed openly can serve as a mechanism for detecting design weaknesses. An innovative culture requires the ability to judge criticism by the quality of its arguments and evidence, not by how well it matches the management agenda. Authentic leadership helps shape a positive work climate so that employees are more willing to raise problems (Mardikaningsih et al., 2022).

Skills such as sustainability-oriented leadership, communication ability, and the ability to adapt to rapid change have become highly needed (Mardikaningsih & Hariani, 2025). Leadership determines whether the pressure of change is turned into learning or fatigue. Darmawan (2026a) discusses the mechanism of empathic leadership in reducing psychological exhaustion caused by intensive AI use among digital native generations. Ideas such as authentic communication, acknowledging the limits of AI, adjusting performance metrics, peer support, and reducing cognitive load show that the ability to use technology does not remove the risk of fatigue. Even workers who are accustomed to technology can experience pressure when digital systems are used massively and keep changing. The balance between technological efficiency and psychological well-being needs to be maintained so that the pressure of change does not turn into fatigue (Mardikaningsih & Wardoyo, 2025). Changes in work patterns, such as remote work, affect work dynamics, psychological well-being, and employees' social relationships (Darmawan, 2023). The continuous transformation paradigm needs to acknowledge the limits of human attention capacity. Organizations that change too many procedures at once can create change saturation. Adaptive leadership needs to sequence changes, explain the reasons, stop old activities that are no longer needed, and preserve room for recovery. Employee mental health needs to be treated as part of work environment design, not merely an individual matter (Issalillah & Khayru, 2025).

Digital culture risks are also visible in digital HRM. Darmawan (2026b) found a negative relationship between digital attendance, online performance appraisal, electronic payroll, and employee retention in the sample of service companies he studied. This finding cannot be generalized as evidence that digital HRM always lowers retention, but it warns that digitalization perceived as excessive surveillance or overly impersonal interaction can reduce the desire to stay. In routine work that has been automated, employees still need strategies that maintain their knowledge and engagement (Darmawan, 2024). The implication for continuous transformation is that technical efficiency cannot be the only design criterion. Systems need to be assessed through user experience, perceived fairness, opportunities for clarification, autonomy, and the quality of human relationships. Organizations that turn every interaction into an automated process risk eroding the relational capital that is needed to carry out the next change. Technology can change social relations and solidarity among employees in the workplace (Eddine & Darmawan, 2025). An adaptive culture needs technology that expands human capacity, not one that replaces every form of dialogue.

Organizational innovation has become one of the important capabilities for companies facing dynamic and competitive environments (Mardikaningsih et al., 2024). AI governance adds an ethical dimension to innovation culture. Khayru et al. (2026) identify principles such as autonomy, transparency, procedural fairness, accountability, privacy, non-

maleficence, honesty, and solidarity in everyday AI use. At the organizational level, these principles can be translated into a cultural expectation that technological innovation must be accountable. The speed of experimentation does not justify ignoring privacy, algorithmic discrimination, or shifting responsibility to systems. A mature innovation culture does not measure progress by the number of AI applications used, but by the ability to create value without reducing the legitimacy of decisions. Human review mechanisms, algorithm audits, decision documentation, appeal channels, and limits on data use become part of the culture of change. When employees see that the organization has clear guardrails, trust in experimentation can increase.

Resistance needs to be reconceptualized as a phenomenon with several sources. Some resistance comes from loss of status, habits, or interests. Other resistance comes from lack of ability, unclear goals, bad experiences with earlier change, or valid ethical concerns. Treating all resistance uniformly will produce poor managerial responses. Organizations need to distinguish between defensive resistance, information-based resistance, and constructive dissent (Mikel-Hong et al., 2023). This approach keeps continuous transformation from turning into an ideology that treats every objection as an obstacle. An adaptive culture needs room to reject particular designs without rejecting the need to learn. This distinction protects the organization from two extremes, namely rigidity that rejects all renewal and uncritical change that accepts every technological innovation.

Sustainable innovation requires mechanisms that connect ideas to experiments and experiments to decisions. Innovation culture is frequently discussed as an openness to creativity, whereas organizations also require selection discipline. Employees need to know how to propose experiments, the resources available, the metrics used, when an experiment is considered successful, and when an initiative should be halted. Such procedures reduce the risk that innovation merely relies on individual sponsors or temporary enthusiasm. Continuous transformation achieves sustainability when experimentation becomes an institutionalized capability (Dobni & Wilson, 2023). Innovation portfolios, experimentation sprints, proofs of concept, cross-functional reviews, and learning documentation can build this pattern. The freedom to experiment then runs alongside accountability, allowing organizations to generate a variety of ideas without losing the ability to focus resources on valuable solutions.

Reward systems need to be consistent with the desired adaptive behaviors. Organizations cannot demand collaboration, learning, and experimentation if evaluations only reward short-term individual targets. Employees will adjust their behaviors according to the indicators that determine their careers and compensation. A continuous transformation culture requires a combination of outcome measures, learning, collaboration, quality of improvement, and contributions to collective capacity development. Mistakes from experiments conducted according to procedure need to be distinguished from negligence or standard violations. Without this distinction, the slogan "learning from mistakes" loses its credibility. Employees will avoid risks and choose to maintain old procedures if reasonable failures are still penalized. Conversely, tolerance without accountability can produce wasteful experiments. Reward systems need to reflect a balance between the courage to try and the quality of decisions.

An adaptive culture also requires an organizational identity strong enough to provide direction. Continuous change can reduce the sense of continuity if strategies, structures, priorities, and systems change without a consistent narrative. Identity does not have to take the form of a fixed slogan, but can consist of principles regarding the value created, the groups served, and the standards of behavior maintained. These principles help employees assess whether new innovations align with the reason for the organization's existence. When strategic direction is clear, methodological changes are not necessarily perceived as a loss of identity (Moss et al., 2017). Organizations can replace technologies or job designs while maintaining commitments to quality, safety, learning, or service. Such an identity reduces the need to maintain procedures simply because they are familiar. The culture is then able to maintain continuity of meaning while permitting changes in practice.

The role of middle managers is crucial because they translate the direction of change into workloads, priorities, and daily decisions. In many digital programs, strategies are formulated at the top level and technologies are provided by specialist functions, while operational consequences are absorbed by the teams. If middle managers lack the authority to adjust targets or halt old work, employees can experience an accumulation of demands (Chen, 2025). An adaptive culture requires a decommissioning mechanism, namely the termination of old processes, meetings, reports, or systems once the new replacement is stable. Without decommissioning, every wave of change adds layers of work. Fatigue is then not the result of negative attitudes toward change, but the result of organizational designs that fail to eliminate work complexity. Sustainable continuous transformation must possess the capability to reduce old work as quickly as the organization adds new work.

Cross-functional learning strengthens long-term innovation because digital problems rarely reside within the boundaries of a single department. AI systems in HR, for instance, involve technological, legal, data, psychological, operational, and human resource policy knowledge. Cross-functional teams allow criteria conflicts to be identified early. Technology designers might prioritize accuracy or speed, whereas HR assesses employee experience and fairness, while the risk function focuses on privacy and compliance. An adaptive culture does not erase these differences. It provides processes to integrate diverse knowledge into stronger designs. Cross-functional meetings, communities of practice, rotational assignments, and joint reviews can transform differing perspectives into sources of

learning. Innovation capacity then grows from the quality of interactions among expertise, rather than from a single innovation unit working in isolation.

The continuous transformation paradigm is capable of forming a work culture that is resilient to change while supporting innovation if organizations build psychological safety, provide learning, manage the pace of change, maintain human relationships, implement AI governance, distinguish dissent from defensive resistance, and align reward systems with learning. Resistance does not need to be entirely eliminated because some resistance functions as a correction mechanism against risky, unfair, or poorly designed changes. The culture that best supports innovation is not one without friction, but one capable of transforming friction into information. Innovation sustainability emerges when experiments have rules, failures are interpreted proportionally, old processes are phased out after being replaced, and organizational identity provides a relatively stable direction. Continuous transformation then becomes a cultural capability to change without losing trust, discipline, and the collective capacity to learn.

CONCLUSIONS

Continuous transformation can be understood as an organization's capability to carry out repeated reconfigurations while maintaining the reliability of critical functions that determine continuity. Operational stability does not require halting change; rather, it requires an architecture that distinguishes critical functions and experimental areas, applies modularity, maintains competency redundancy, provides observability, manages investment portfolios, and adjusts governance according to the consequences of failure. At the cultural level, continuous change can support innovation if the organization provides space for learning, psychological safety, constructive dissent, competency development, and responsible technology use. Resistance should not always be treated as a barrier because it may contain information regarding risks, fatigue, unfairness, or design weaknesses. The capacity to survive and innovate ultimately depends on the organization's ability to maintain principles that provide direction while allowing processes, structures, technologies, and competencies to undergo disciplined renewal.

Stability and change do not need to be positioned as mutually exclusive conditions. Stability can be defined as adaptive reliability, while change is understood as reconfiguration with bounded risk. This perspective brings together the concepts of ambidexterity, resilience, digital HRM, operational flexibility, and learning culture within a single framework. Studies on digital transformation need to pay greater attention to the pace of change, reversibility, human absorption capacity, and the interaction between technology governance and employee experience. Practically, management needs to assess change readiness through the quality of operational architecture, competencies, data, decision-making mechanisms, and levels of trust, rather than through the number of technologies adopted. Organizations also need to treat human sustainability as part of change design because long-term innovation is difficult to sustain if the burden of adaptation continues to increase without reducing work complexity.

REFERENCES

- Akhtar, S. (2026). Conclusion: Navigating the future of HRM and digital transformation: An alignment to sustainable development. In S. Iqbal (Ed.), *Digital HRM and emerging technologies* (pp. 230–252). Routledge.
- Al Makrufah, N. I., Aliyah, N. D., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2025). Instilling Religious Values in Generation Alpha Through Digital Parenting and the Role of Islamic Education Teachers. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(3), 65–73. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/272>
- Ali, R. H., A. Fedorova, & M. Menshikova. (2026). Redesigning HRM for the digital era: Evidence from a systematic literature review. *Procedia Computer Science*, 277, 1610–1620. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2026.02.199>
- Ardiansyah, M. F., Waskito, S., Khayru, R. K., Wijaya, K., & Pakpahan, N. H. (2025). The Position of Noodweer and Noodweer Ex cees as Grounds for Eliminating Criminal Liability. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(3), 44–50. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/269>
- Barzani, L. A., Darmawan, D., & Zulkarnain, M. A. B. (2022). The Application of Sustainable Supply Chain Management Principles in the Manufacturing Industry to Improve Operational Performance and Corporate Social Responsibility. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 1(1), 38–45.
- Bilousko, T., O. Lyman, N. Sereda, O. Kalinichenko, & S. Pylypiv. (2026). Change management strategies in conditions of global economic uncertainty. 613–622. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-85398-2_54
- Chen, Q. (2025). Middle managers' resistance to digital transformation in traditional enterprises and mitigation strategies. *Advances in Economics and Management Research*, 15, 1019–1023. <https://doi.org/10.56028/aemr.15.1.1019.2025>
- Chittala, S., & U. S. Inc. (2026). Risk-aware software releases: Using AI analysis and governance to reduce and resolve incidents quickly. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management*, 11(1s), 87–94. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v11i1s.14042>
- Darmawan, D. (2023). Innovation Culture That Balances Technological Speed with the Depth of Humanistic Thought. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 4(1), 47–54.
- Darmawan, D. (2024). Strategies for Enhancing Employee Knowledge and Engagement in Automated Routine Work. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 6(1), 65–71.
- Darmawan, D. (2024). The Influence of Empowering Leadership Style on Enhancing Team Members' Autonomy and Innovation Capacity. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 6(3), 48–55. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/232>

- Darmawan, D. (2024). The Role of Technology in Promoting or Hindering Gender Equality in the Workplace. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 6(2), 67–73.
- Darmawan, D. (2024). Workforce Diversity Management Strategies for Enhancing Innovation and Team Performance. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 5(2), 53–59. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/230>
- Darmawan, D. (2025). Work readiness, digital skills, and employability: A study on the moderating effect of digital skills among college students. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 5(2), 157–178.
- Darmawan, D. (2026a). Mechanisms of empathetic leadership in preventing psychological exhaustion from massive AI system use among the digital native generation. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 9(1), 7–15.
- Darmawan, D. (2026b). The influence of digital human resource management functions on employee retention: A study of digital attendance, online performance appraisal, and electronic payroll systems. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 9(3), 11–20.
- Darmawan, D., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2023). The Role of Flexible Organizational Structures in Enhancing Corporate Adaptability to Environmental Dynamics. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 3(1), 44–49.
- Darmawan, D., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2022). The Role of Positive Psychological Factors in Enhancing Employee Engagement and Commitment to Work Tasks. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 1(2), 37–45.
- Darmawan, D., & R. Mardikaningsih. (2025). The role of locus of control in shaping work resilience and strategies for coping with failure in the workplace. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(3), 18–25.
- Dobni, C. B., & G. A. Wilson. (2023). Measuring cultural readiness for innovation: Six essential questions. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 45(1), 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jbs-09-2022-0168>
- Eddine, B. A. S. & D. Darmawan. (2025). The Role of Technology in the Dynamics of Social Relations and Employee Solidarity in the Workplace. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(1), 37–44.
- Eddine, B. A. S., & Darmawan, D. (2025). The Impact of Technostress on Organizational Staff Performance and Loyalty. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(3), 51–58. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/270>
- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
- Elo, S., & H. Kyngäs. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- Graessler, I., B. Grewe, & M. Fritzen. (2025). The importance of structure in transformation chaos: A transformation framework. *AHFE International*, 198. <https://doi.org/10.54941/ahfe1006790>
- Hariani, M., & A. R. Putra. (2025). Digital communication social norms in the workplace and their relationship with employee collective solidarity. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(3), 26–35.
- Hariani, M., & R. Mardikaningsih. (2024). Encouraging employee engagement in sustainability initiatives to improve organization performance and sustainable achievement of social goals. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 6(3), 6–10.
- Hariani, M., Mardikaningsih, R., & Halizah, S. N. (2025). Soft Skills Training for Workers Affected by Automation Using a Technology-Based Humanistic Approach. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(1), 45–54. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/258>
- Hinsen, S., J. Jöhnk, & N. Urbach. (2019). Disentangling the concept and role of continuous change for IS research – A systematic literature review. In *Fortieth International Conference on Information Systems Proceedings*, 12, 1–17.
- Issalillah, F. (2025). Older Workforce Management Policies and Degenerative Disease Risks in Labor Intensive Industries. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 7(3), 53–62. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/243>
- Issalillah, F., & Khayru, R. K. (2025). Mental Health as an Organizational Construct: A Strategic Reorientation of Human Resource Management for Work Environment Design. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(3), 1–9.
- Issalillah, F., & Khayru, R. K. (2025). Mental Health Policies and Programs in Building Long Term Employee Loyalty. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 7(2), 39–47. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/239>
- Khan, M. A., Darmawan, D., & Islam, R. (2025). Big Data Analytics as a Strategic Decision Support for Policy Direction Determination and Business Projection in Organizations. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(2), 66–74. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/265>
- Khayru, R. K., & Arifin, S. (2025). Corporate Efforts and Strategies in Fulfilling Responsibility for Employee Mental Health in the Era of Digital Productivity Pressure. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 7(1), 44–52. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/235>
- Khayru, R. K., & Issalillah, F. (2026). Social Media and Psychological Well-Being of Youth: Mechanisms and Protective and Risk Conditions. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 9(1), 16–26. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/254>
- Khayru, R. K., A. R. Putra, & S. Arifin. (2026). Ethical principles and responsibility structures in daily use of artificial intelligence. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 9(3), 1–10.
- Kocharyan, M., A. Hovhannisyan, H. Harutyunyan, & A. Malkhasyan. (2026). Digital transformation of HRM practices in Armenia: Enhancing organizational excellence and employee retention. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence*, 20(1), 4910–4918. <https://doi.org/10.2478/picbe-2026-0358>
- Kutnjak, A. (2025). Key determinants of digital transformation: A preliminary investigation into essential elements of company change. In *International Scientific-Business Conference–LIMEN2024 Leadership, Innovation, Management and Economics: Integrated Politics of Research: Vol. 10. Selected papers* (pp. 69–78). Beograd: Association of Economists and Managers of the Balkans, Belgrade, Serbia. <https://doi.org/10.31410/limen.s.p.2024.69>
- Lauer, T. (2021). Change management: The path to achieve the goal. In *Change management: Fundamentals and success factors* (pp. 3–11). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-62187-5_1
- Liyanage, J. P. (2017). Perspectives on performance assessment and management. In *Value networks in manufacturing: Sustainability and performance excellence* (pp. 273–290). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-27799-8_16
- Maguire, L. (2025). Failure is inevitable, let's not pretend otherwise [Failure Mode]. *IEEE Software*, 42(5), 131–134. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ms.2025.3578155>
- Mardikaningsih, R. (2025). The deconstruction of work and HRM reconfiguration: Flexibility and employer branding in the digital era. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(2), 10–17.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & D. T. W. Wardoyo. (2025). Balancing technological efficiency and employee psychological well-being in hybrid work systems. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(1), 30–36.

- Mardikaningsih, R., & Darmawan, D. (2022). The Role of Self-Efficacy in Predicting Employee Adaptability to Technological Change in the Workplace. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 2(3), 43–55.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & Hariani, M. (2025). The Implementation of Distributive Justice in Allocating Efficiency Gains Generated by Technology. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 7(3), 45–52. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/242>
- Mardikaningsih, R., & M. Hariani. (2025). Building green skills to support sustainable economic transition in the workplace. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 7(2), 6–10.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & Nuraini, R. (2022). Implementation of Circular Economy Principles for Sustainable Waste Management in the Industrial Sector. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 1(3), 41–47.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & Wardoyo, D. T. W. (2025). Balancing Technological Efficiency And Employee Psychological Well-Being In Hybrid Work Systems. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(1), 30–36. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/246>
- Mardikaningsih, R., Halizah, S. N., Darmawan, D., Masithoh, N., & Nuraini, R. (2022). Examining the Role of Authentic Leadership in Shaping Positive Work Climate and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 2(1), 52–59.
- Mardikaningsih, R., Halizah, S. N., Hariani, M., Darmawan, D., & Nuraini, R. (2025). Performance Feedback Accuracy Decline and Delay in Hybrid Work Arrangements. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 7(1), 53–62. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/236>
- Mardikaningsih, R., Halizah, S. N., Nuraini, R., & Darmawan, D. (2022). The Role of Ethical Leadership in Shaping a Positive and Sustainable Organizational Culture. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 2(2), 48–55.
- Mardikaningsih, R., Hariani, M., Darmawan, D., Halizah, S. N., & Nuraini, R. (2024). The Impact of Digital Monitoring on Employee Work Autonomy and Professional Responsibility. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 5(3), 60–67. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/231>
- Mardikaningsih, R., Hariani, M., Issalillah, F., & Nuraini, R. (2024). Organizational Innovation Strategies as Drivers of Business Resilience and Competitiveness in the Global Environment. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 6(3), 56–65. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/233>
- Mardikaningsih, R., Wardoyo, D. T. W., & Haryono, N. A. (2026). Green knowledge sharing as a mediating mechanism: The effects of green HRM and environmental awareness on environmental performance with green transformational leadership as a moderator. *Journal of Intelligent Decision Making and Information Science*, 3(2), 1968–1987.
- Mikel-Hong, K., N. Li, J. (Joya) Yu, & X. Chen. (2023). Resistance to change: Unraveling the roles of change strategists, agents, and recipients. *Journal of Management*, 50(6), 1984–2011. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063231198189>
- Moss, S., I. D. B. Butar, C. E. J. Härtel, G. Hirst, & M. Craner. (2017). The importance of stability in the midst of change: The benefits of consistent values to strategic implementation. *The Australasian Journal of Organisational Psychology*, 10, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ORP.2017.1>
- Näslund, D., & A. Norrman. (2019). A performance measurement system for change initiatives: An action research study from design to evaluation. *Business Process Management Journal*, 25(7), 1647–1672. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-11-2017-0309>
- O'Reilly, C. A., III, & M. L. Tushman. (2013). Organizational ambidexterity: Past, present, and future. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27(4), 324–338. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2013.0025>
- Pereira, É. A., C. Nevez, M. G. Portela, L. Sardinha, É. A. Pereira, M. G. Portela, & L. Sardinha. (2025). Digital transformation in human resources management: Strategies for a competitive future. *E3*, 10(1), 47–67. <https://doi.org/10.29073/e3.v1i1.997>
- Putra, A. R., & D. Darmawan. (2026). The application of Industry 4.0 technology in enhancing efficiency and flexibility of production processes. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 9(2), 1–8.
- Putra, A. R., Arifin, S., & Darmawan, D. (2024). Gamification-Based Learning that Preserves Cooperation and Empathy Among Employees. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 5(1), 43–50. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/229>
- Putra, A. R., D. Darmawan, & S. Arifin. (2025). Integration of spiritual values into employee development programs during digital transformation. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 5(1), 381–400.
- Ross, A., D. Swain, Kamini, M. Srivastava, G. Khari, & E. Rastogi. (2026). Strategic HRM in a VUCA environment: Building organizational resilience through agile workforce practices. *International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories*, 2026, 6461–6470.
- Roy, A. (2026). Exploring E-HRM as a catalyst for global digital transformation in organizations. *Discover Global Society*, 4(253), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44282-026-00583-4>
- Saghiri, S., M. Mohammadipour, & V. Mirzabeiki. (2025). Revisiting operations agility and formalizing digitalization in response to varying levels of uncertainty and customization. *Production Planning & Control*, 36(7), 925–949. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2024.2321290>
- Saroni, I., El-Yunusi, M. Y. M., Mardikaningsih, R., Kumiaty, N., & Ghozali, S. (2025). Character Education Based on Akhlakul Karimah Enriched with Modern Positive Psychology Approaches. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(2), 55–65. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/264>
- Sediana, A., Saputra, R., Hardiansah, R., Darmawan, D., & Khayru, R. K. (2025). Eradication of Digital-Based Gambling: Dynamics of Law Enforcement In Indonesia. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(1), 55–63. <https://ejournalisse.com/index.php/isse/article/view/259>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Sofijanov, E., T. Koutroukis, L. Pushova Stamenkova, & M. Majhosheva. (2026). Sustainable HRM and employee engagement in the digital era: The role of training and green skills in North Macedonia. *Societies*, 16(147), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc16050147>
- Tanya, S.-B., M. John, & C. L. Cary. (2020). Corporate transformation. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.12237638>
- Tranfield, D., D. Denyer, & P. Smart. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375>
- Vargas-Hernández, J. G., F. J. G. Ávila, & O. C. Vargas-González. (2025). The evolving landscape of digital organizational transformation. In *Evolving strategies for organizational management and performance evaluation* (pp. 563–580). IGI Global Scientific Publishing <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-0149-5.ch026>
- Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 28(2), 118–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003>
- Xie, Y., K. C. Desouza, & M. M. Jabbari. (2022). On organizational robustness: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 31(1), 105–120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12423>