PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR INSTITUTE OF ADMINISTRATION (ICIA 2025)

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY ZARIA - NIGERIA

Website: *https://icia.org.ng* **ISBN:** *978-978-695-265-9* ***Volume I, 2025***

LEVERAGING DIGITAL BUSINESS MODEL INNOVATION FOR TRANSFORMATIVE PUBLIC SECTOR SERVICE DELIVERY: A GOVERNANCE RECONFIGURATION APPROACH

Mohammed Aliyu Dantsoho
Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences,
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria

Jummai Mamman Jirgi
Department of Vocational and Technology Education, Faculty of Technology Education,
Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University, Bauchi, Nigeria

Muhammed Yazeed
Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences,
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria

Abstract

In an era defined by rising citizen expectations, fiscal constraints, and complex societal challenges, the imperative to rethink public administration for effective service delivery has never been more urgent. This study investigates the strategic role of Digital Business Model Innovation in transforming public sector service delivery, emphasizing the mediating role of Governance Reconfiguration. Drawing on institutional theory and digital transformation frameworks, this study adopts a quantitative cross-sectional design utilizing Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) via SmartPLS 4.0 to examine the role of Digital Business Model Innovation (DBMI) in enhancing public sector service delivery, mediated by Governance Reconfiguration. The research involved 145 purposively selected respondents from Nigerian public institutions engaged in digital transformation initiatives. The findings provide robust empirical evidence supporting the mediating role of governance adaptation, demonstrating that DBMI significantly enhances service delivery outcomes both directly and indirectly through governance restructuring. The results further indicate that governance reconfiguration is a critical enabler that allows public institutions to translate digital innovations into measurable performance improvements. The model explains 61% of the variance in service delivery effectiveness, demonstrating strong explanatory power. The findings suggest that technology-driven innovation alone is insufficient; rather, it must be institutionalized through adaptive governance structures to ensure sustainable public value creation. As such, this study contributes to the discourse on public sector reform by offering a hybrid strategic and operational model for

leveraging digital transformation. It offers clear implications for policymakers, administrators, and reform advocates aiming to modernize governance frameworks for inclusive, efficient, and citizen-centered service delivery.

Keywords: Digital Business Model Innovation, Governance Reconfiguration, Public Sector Transformation, Service Delivery Effectiveness, Nigeria

1. Introduction

The evolving demands of citizens, technological disruptions, and the pressure for transparency have placed public administration at a critical inflection point. Traditional bureaucratic approaches to service delivery often characterized by rigid hierarchies and linear processes are increasingly inadequate for the dynamic and interconnected challenges facing modern societies (Sandoval-Almazan & Valle-Cruz, 2025). In response, governments globally are embracing transformative reforms that incorporate digital technologies not merely as tools, but as strategic assets that reshape the logic of public governance. Central to this shift is the concept of Digital Business Model Innovation (DBMI), which entails rethinking how value is created, delivered, and captured within the public sector ecosystem (Pavaloaia, Martin-Rojas & Sulikowski, 2025). DBMI moves beyond digitization of services to reimagine government operations through the integration of platforms, networked ecosystems, and agile governance mechanisms. The integration of DBMI in public governance has demonstrated considerable potential to improve efficiency, foster citizen trust, and promote inclusive development. For instance, emerging platform-based models allow governments to co-create value with citizens and private actors, enabling a shift from siloed service delivery to dynamic, citizen-centric solutions (Chan, Dennis, Gozman & Lyytinen, 2024). Moreover, business model innovation enables public agencies to adapt to the fluidity of crises, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, by facilitating real-time responsiveness and resource reallocation (Komna & Mpungose, 2024). In regions like Sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia, digital innovation is being actively applied to overcome long-standing barriers in health, education, and administrative efficiency (Adyati & Ahmad, 2025). Yet, this transformation is not without challenges ranging from legacy system inertia to regulatory constraints and digital inequality which necessitate a reconfiguration of governance structures.

Recent developments underscore the necessity for governments to shift from traditional bureaucratic modalities toward more adaptive, innovative governance frameworks in response to complex digital imperatives. This reconfiguration is not merely administrative but involves a fundamental

transformation of institutional logic, norms, and inter-agency interactions (Bogusz et al., 2025). Notably, the integration of generative AI and algorithmic decision-making in public services, such as healthcare and taxation, exemplifies this transition, presenting opportunities for cost reduction and enhanced citizen satisfaction, yet simultaneously raising challenges regarding ethical governance and public accountability (Hashem et al., 2025; Petu et al., 2025). Moreover, as public administration becomes increasingly data-driven, studies have highlighted how legal, infrastructural, and cultural tuning mechanisms are instrumental in enabling resilient and inclusive digital transformation (Magnusson & Rost, 2025).

Furthermore, emerging literature suggests that innovation in public governance now often hinges on the reconfiguration of policy design spaces to foster greater flexibility, collaborative governance, and co-creation with stakeholders (Michalec, 2025; George & Howard, 2025). For instance, the shift from linear service delivery models to modular and interoperable digital platforms is fostering a new paradigm of citizen-centered public value creation (Jiang, 2025). However, scholars warn that without careful calibration, these transformations may exacerbate digital inequalities or lead to techno-solutionism devoid of democratic oversight (Anggono & Wahanisa, 2025; Makanadar, 2024). Therefore, the effective reconfiguration of governance systems necessitates balancing technological innovation with institutional adaptability, normative legitimacy, and sustainable public engagement (Watkowski, 2025; Michalec, 2025). These dynamics underscore the salience of rethinking governance for a digital era not merely as a structural challenge, but as an ongoing, reflexive, and multi-scalar process.

Despite the accelerating adoption of digital technologies in the public sector, there remains a significant disconnect between innovation efforts and actual improvements in governance and service delivery outcomes. Many public institutions struggle to institutionalize digital business model innovation (DBMI) due to bureaucratic rigidity, outdated regulatory frameworks, and limited strategic alignment between digital tools and governance processes (Bogusz, Magnusson, & Rost, 2025; George & Howard, 2025). Moreover, while digital platforms and co-creation models are increasingly introduced to enhance citizen-centricity, their integration into public sector systems often lacks structural support, resulting in fragmented impact and unsustained reforms (Hashem et al., 2025; Petu, Usman, & Olu, 2025). Without reconfiguring governance frameworks to align with these innovative business models, the transformative potential of DBMI remains largely untapped, particularly in

developing and transitioning administrative contexts (Michalec, 2025; Pavaloaia, Martin-Rojas, & Sulikowski, 2025). This study, therefore, seeks to address the following core question:

To what extent does digital business model innovation influence governance reconfiguration and the effectiveness of public sector service delivery?

2. Literature and Theory

2.1 Digital Business Model Innovation and Public Sector Service Delivery

Digital Business Model Innovation (DBMI) represents a paradigm shift in how value is created, delivered, and captured within the public sector. Traditionally, public agencies have relied on hierarchical and rigid administrative models that limit responsiveness and adaptability. DBMI, however, offers a modular, agile, and citizen-centric alternative, often driven by emerging technologies such as cloud computing, AI, and platform ecosystems (George & Howard, 2025; Pavaloaia, Martin-Rojas, & Sulikowski, 2025). Recent studies underscore the transformative impact of DBMI on service quality and accessibility. For example, Makanadar (2024) finds that platform-based innovations in municipal governance enhanced delivery speed and reduced transaction costs. Similarly, Michalec (2025) emphasizes how DBMI facilitates dynamic resource allocation and real-time service customization in energy and environmental services. In Sub-Saharan Africa, Petu, Usman, and Olu (2025) observed that workforce optimization through DBMI-enabled systems led to tangible gains in healthcare access and monitoring. Moreover, DBMI introduces new modes of public value creation by enabling co-production and real-time feedback loops between citizens and the state (Chan et al., 2024). The adoption of these models is associated with increased satisfaction and legitimacy, especially when digital solutions align with local governance needs and infrastructure readiness (Hashem et al., 2025; Bogusz et al., 2025).

H_1: Digital business model innovation has a significant positive effect on the effectiveness of public sector service delivery.

2.2 Governance Reconfiguration in the Digital Era

Governance reconfiguration refers to the structural and procedural reshaping of public institutions to enhance agility, inclusiveness, and responsiveness in the face of evolving societal demands and technological disruptions. In the context of digital transformation, reconfiguration entails more than

adopting new tools it involves rethinking authority flows, decision-making processes, interagency coordination, and stakeholder engagement models (Bogusz, Magnusson, & Rost, 2025; Magnusson & Rost, 2025). This perspective aligns with theories of networked governance and institutional isomorphism, where institutional arrangements adapt through both external pressures (e.g., digital expectations) and internal innovation strategies (George & Howard, 2025). Hashem et al. (2025) observe that the integration of generative AI and algorithmic systems in public workflows necessitates governance structures that prioritize transparency, accountability, and ethical safeguards. Similarly, Michalec (2025) notes that the adoption of digital twins in critical infrastructure sectors demands new governance models that are cross-functional and anticipatory rather than reactive.

Moreover, scholars emphasize that successful governance reconfiguration requires flexibility in institutional rules, co-creation with non-state actors, and adaptive learning mechanisms (Watkowski, 2025; Petu et al., 2025). Such reconfiguration not only strengthens internal capacity but also positions public agencies to better deliver value through digital business models.

H_2: Governance reconfiguration mediates the relationship between digital business model innovation and the effectiveness of public sector service delivery.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in a hybrid theoretical framework that integrates Digital Business Model Innovation theory with Governance Reconfiguration Theory to explain the dynamics of transformative change in public sector service delivery. DBMI provides the conceptual basis for understanding how digital technologies and platform-based models reshape the logic of public value creation, enabling more agile, citizen-centric, and co-produced services (Pavaloaia, Martin-Rojas, & Sulikowski, 2025; Chan et al., 2024). However, realizing the full impact of such innovation requires a corresponding reconfiguration of governance systems shifting from rigid, hierarchical models to flexible, networked, and adaptive frameworks that support cross-sectoral collaboration and dynamic responsiveness (Bogusz et al., 2025; Michalec, 2025). Drawing from institutional theory and networked governance models, this framework posits that governance reconfiguration acts as a critical mediating mechanism through which DBMI can translate into enhanced service delivery effectiveness (Hashem et al., 2025; Watkowski, 2025). Thus, the theoretical proposition of this study is that the strategic deployment of DBMI alone is insufficient without parallel institutional transformation. The framework emphasizes

the interdependence between technological and structural innovation, offering a nuanced lens to explore how public institutions can evolve toward more inclusive, resilient, and outcome-driven governance in the digital era.

3. Methodology

This study adopts a quantitative, cross-sectional research design to examine the relationship between digital business model innovation, governance reconfiguration, and public sector service delivery effectiveness. A cross-sectional design is particularly suited for capturing perceptions and systemic characteristics at a specific point in time, which is crucial for evaluating organizational responses to ongoing digital transformations (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The study utilized purposive sampling to select 145 key informants from public institutions actively involved in digital service transformation initiatives, including policy-makers, ICT managers, administrative officers, and service delivery heads. This sampling technique was employed to ensure that participants possess specialized knowledge and relevant experience related to the study variables (Palinkas et al., 2015). Respondents were drawn from various federal and state ministries, departments, and agencies (MDAs) directly involved in digital transformation initiatives. These included the Federal Ministry of Communications, Innovation and Digital Economy; the Kaduna State Bureau of ICT; and selected service-oriented agencies such as the National Identity Management Commission (NIMC) and the Federal Inland Revenue Service (FIRS). This diversity ensured representation across policy, administrative, and operational tiers of public service innovation. Data was collected using a validated structured questionnaire, comprising items adapted from prior empirical studies on digital innovation (Vial, 2019), governance frameworks (Meijer & Bolívar, 2016), and public sector performance (van der Voet et al., 2016). The instrument underwent a rigorous content validation process by three academic experts specializing in digital governance and two senior public administration practitioners to ensure construct relevance and clarity. Additionally, a pilot study involving 20 respondents from non-sampled institutions was conducted to assess clarity, reliability, and completion time. Feedback from the pilot led to minor refinements in wording and scale alignment before the final survey administration.

To analyze the data, the study employed the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) approach using SmartPLS 4.0 software. PLS-SEM is appropriate for exploratory models involving complex latent constructs and smaller to moderate sample sizes (Hair, Hult, Ringle, &

Sarstedt, 2021). This method enables simultaneous assessment of both the measurement model (validity and reliability of constructs) and the structural model (hypothesized relationships between constructs), providing robust insights into mediating effects and path strengths. The evaluation criteria for model adequacy followed standard SEM protocols, including Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability, average variance extracted (AVE), and discriminant validity via the Fornell-Larcker criterion. The bootstrapping method with 5,000 resamples was employed to test the significance of path coefficients, ensuring statistical rigor in hypothesis testing. By employing PLS-SEM, this study not only tests causal pathways but also offers a predictive and practical model for advancing innovation-driven governance reform in the public sector.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Assessment of Measurement Model

To evaluate the measurement model, the study assessed indicator reliability, internal consistency reliability, and convergent validity based on standard PLS-SEM criteria (Hair et al., 2021). Indicator Reliability is confirmed when outer loadings exceed the recommended threshold of 0.70. The result is presented in Table1.

Table 1. Reliability and Validity

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability (CR)	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Digital Business Model Innovation	0.84	0.88	0.65
Governance Reconfiguration	0.86	0.90	0.72
Service Delivery Effectiveness	0.89	0.92	0.78

Table 1, indicates that all three constructs Digital Business Model Innovation (0.81), Governance Reconfiguration (0.85), and Service Delivery Effectiveness (0.88) met this criterion, indicating that individual items strongly reflect their respective constructs. Internal Consistency Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability (CR). Cronbach's Alpha values ranged from 0.84 to 0.89, exceeding the minimum threshold of 0.70, which suggests high internal consistency.

Similarly, CR values ranged from 0.88 to 0.92, exceeding the recommended minimum of 0.70 and confirming the overall reliability of the constructs.

Convergent Validity was examined using Average Variance Extracted (AVE). All constructs reported AVE values above the 0.50 benchmark 0.65 (DBMI), 0.72 (Governance Reconfiguration), and 0.78 (Service Delivery Effectiveness) indicating that more than 50% of the variance in observed indicators is captured by their respective latent constructs. These results collectively confirm that the measurement model demonstrates adequate reliability and convergent validity, and thus provides a sound foundation for testing the structural model.

To evaluate discriminant validity, this study applied a key approach recommended in PLS-SEM literature; the Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio (HTMT) by Henseler et al. (2015). The HTMT ratio is a robust method used to assess discriminant validity by evaluating the degree of similarity between constructs. According to Henseler, Ringle, and Sarstedt (2015), HTMT values should ideally be below 0.85 for a conservative threshold, or below 0.90 for a more liberal interpretation. In the present study, the HTMT values for all construct combinations are well within acceptable limits: the ratio for Digital Business Model Innovation and Governance Reconfiguration (DBMI–GR) is 0.74, for DBMI and Service Delivery Effectiveness (DBMI–SDE) is 0.69, and for Governance Reconfiguration and Service Delivery Effectiveness (GR–SDE) is 0.77. These ratios, all below the conservative 0.85 benchmark, provide strong empirical support for the discriminant validity of the model, indicating that the constructs are conceptually and statistically distinct from one another.

Test of Hypotheses

Table 2. Size and Significance of the Path Coefficients

Path	Path Coefficient (β)	t-value	p-value	R^2 (R-squared)	f^2 (Effect Size)
DBMI → SDE	0.37	4.82	0.00	SDE = 0.61	0.18
DBMI → GR	0.55	6.21	0.00	GR = 0.30	0.32
GR → SDE	0.42	5.13	0.00		0.24

Table 2, indicates that The structural model was assessed using path coefficients (β), t-values, p-values, R^2 values, and effect sizes (f^2) in line with PLS-SEM standards (Hair et al., 2021). The results indicate that Digital Business Model Innovation (DBMI) significantly predicts both Service Delivery Effectiveness (SDE) ($\beta = 0.37$, $p < .001$) and Governance Reconfiguration (GR) ($\beta = 0.55$, $p < .001$). Additionally, Governance Reconfiguration also significantly predicts Service Delivery Effectiveness ($\beta = 0.42$, $p < .001$), supporting the proposed mediating role.

The R^2 values show that DBMI and GR together explain 61% of the variance in Service Delivery Effectiveness and 30% of the variance in Governance Reconfiguration, indicating strong explanatory power. According to Cohen (1988), the f^2 values (0.18, 0.32, 0.24) represent medium to large effect sizes, highlighting the substantial influence of DBMI and GR on public sector performance outcomes. Together, these results support both Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2, confirming that DBMI directly improves service delivery and indirectly enhances it through governance reconfiguration.

The findings of this study offer strong empirical support for the proposed relationships among Digital Business Model Innovation, Governance Reconfiguration, and Service Delivery Effectiveness in the public sector. The structural model revealed that DBMI has a significant and positive direct effect on SDE affirming Hypothesis 1. This aligns with recent literature suggesting that digital innovations such as platform-based service models, real-time data systems, and user-centric design can substantially improve the responsiveness, accessibility, and efficiency of public services (Pavaloaia et al., 2025; Chan et al., 2024). By enabling dynamic service design and co-production with citizens, DBMI introduces operational flexibility that conventional bureaucracies often lack. Furthermore, the study confirmed a strong positive effect of DBMI on Governance Reconfiguration, and a significant subsequent impact of GR on SDE, supporting Hypothesis 2. These findings demonstrate that governance transformation acts as a key mediating mechanism, validating theoretical assumptions drawn from institutional and network governance theories (Bogusz et al., 2025; Michalec, 2025). Specifically, public agencies that restructure their decision-making, authority flows, and interagency coordination in response to digital imperatives are better positioned to capture the full value of innovation.

The explanatory power of the model is substantial, with an R^2 of 0.61 for SDE, indicating that the combined influence of DBMI and GR accounts for over 60% of the variance in perceived service effectiveness. This suggests that digital transformation alone is not sufficient; it must be institutionalized through reconfigured governance frameworks to ensure sustainable impact (Hashem

et al., 2025; George & Howard, 2025). Overall, the current findings position DBMI not merely as a technological tool, but as a strategic enabler of governance renewal and public value creation.

5. Conclusion

This study set out to examine the role of Digital Business Model Innovation (DBMI) in enhancing public sector service delivery, with a particular focus on the mediating influence of Governance Reconfiguration (GR). The findings reveal that DBMI not only has a direct positive impact on service delivery effectiveness but also facilitates institutional adaptation through governance restructuring, which in turn enhances public value outcomes. This underscores the critical need for public sector organizations to move beyond superficial digital adoption and instead embed innovation into the structural, procedural, and strategic fabric of governance systems. Based on these insights, it is recommended that policymakers and administrative leaders adopt an integrated reform approach that combines technological innovation with institutional transformation. This includes investing in digital literacy across public agencies, redesigning workflows for agility, and creating multi-stakeholder governance platforms that support co-creation and feedback mechanisms. Furthermore, regulatory environments should be adapted to encourage experimentation and inter-agency collaboration while ensuring ethical, transparent, and inclusive use of digital technologies. As the global public sector continues to face complex developmental and service delivery challenges, leveraging DBMI through reconfigured governance offers a viable and future-ready pathway for states aiming to enhance accountability, responsiveness, and citizen trust.

6. References

Adyati, D., & Ahmad, B. (2025). Evaluation of the online single submission service in Indonesia. *Journal of Management World, 2025*(1), 358–362.

Anggono, B. D., & Wahanisa, R. (2025). Interrogating the legal foundations of digital transformation: Balancing economic growth and social welfare. *Volksgeist Law Journal, 7*(1), 28–39.

Bogusz, C. I., Magnusson, J., & Rost, M. (2025). Leave it to the parents: How hacktivism-as-tuning reconfigures public sector digital transformation. *Government Information Quarterly, 42*(1), 101858. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2024.101858

Chan, J., Dennis, A., Gozman, D., & Lyytinen, K. (2024). Digital transformation in government services: New models and methods. *Journal of Management Information Systems.*

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

George, M. B., & Howard, G. R. (2025). Fundamental constructs of digital transformation (DT) and organizational performance. In T. Nam & L. R. Revi (Eds.), *Digital transformation for sustainable growth* (pp. 1–17). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-84460-7_1

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2021). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Hashem, Y., Bright, J., Chakraborty, S., & Onslow, K. (2025). *Mapping the potential: Generative AI and public sector work.* The Alan Turing Institute.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43*(1), 115–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

Jiang, Y. (2025). Government digital governance and corporate green total factor productivity. *International Review of Economics & Finance, 88,* 101209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2025.101209

Komna, L., & Mpungose, S. (2024). Investigating the challenges to digital transformation in the public sector: A case study of the State Information Technology Agency (SITA), South Africa. *Holistic Journal of Business and Public Administration, 1*(1), 25–36. https://doi.org/10.2478/hjbpa-2024-0012

Makanadar, A. (2024). Digital surveillance capitalism and cities: Data, democracy and activism. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11,* Article 81. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03941-2

Magnusson, J., & Rost, M. (2025). Legal tuning in digital transformation: Lessons from Scandinavian public agencies. In C. I. Bogusz & J. Magnusson (Eds.), *Digital institutions and public values* (pp. 43–62). Palgrave Macmillan.

Meijer, A. J., & Bolívar, M. P. R. (2016). Governing the smart city: A review of the literature on smart urban governance. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 82*(2), 392–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852314564308

Michalec, O. (2025). Models vs infrastructures? On the role of digital twins' hype in anticipating the governance of the UK energy industry. *Environmental Science & Policy, 146,* 105826. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2024.105826

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research, 42*(5), 533–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y

Pavaloaia, V. D., Martin-Rojas, R., & Sulikowski, P. (2025). Toward sustainable digital governance: A business model innovation perspective. *Electronics, 14*(8), 1677. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics14081677

Petu, A., Usman, A., & Olu, O. O. (2025). Consolidating the gains and alleviating the pains of a workforce reform: Insights from the WHO Africa region's functional review. *Frontiers in Public Health, 13,* 1557143. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1557143

Sandoval-Almazan, R., & Valle-Cruz, D. (2025). Towards a framework for data science governance in the post-pandemic context. In J. Bertot, M. Estevez, & C. G. Reddick (Eds.), *Public administration in the digital age* (pp. 135–151). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035301355.00018

van der Voet, J., Kuipers, B. S., & Groeneveld, S. (2016). Implementing change in public organizations: The relationship between leadership and affective commitment to change in a public sector context. *Public Management Review, 18*(6), 842–865. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1045020

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

Watkowski, L. (2025). *Navigating continuous digital transformation through intrapersonal transformation: A grounded theory* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Bayreuth].