



Employee Capability and Organizational Renewal at PT X

A theory informed secondary analysis of published survey evidence

***Lidia Olga¹, Feti Arman²**

^{1,2}Department of Industrial Engineering, Sekolah Tinggi Teknologi Nusantara Lampung, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia

E-mail: ¹lidiaolga@sttnlampung.ac.id *Corresponding Author

Article History: Received: August, 19th 2026; Accepted: August, 27th 2026; Published: August, 31th 2026

ABSTRACT

Employee capability and supportive working conditions do not, by themselves, demonstrate that organizational change has produced competitive advantage. This article examines how a historical transformation case can distinguish favourable employee perceptions from the routines required to translate those perceptions into organizational renewal. It combines a secondary analysis of aggregate findings published from a purposive survey of 200 employees in July 2016 with a focused integrative review of recent management scholarship. The company is referred to as PT X, while the original publication remains explicitly acknowledged. Published summaries indicate comparatively favourable perceptions of the work environment, infrastructure, and employee competence, alongside less favourable reports concerning training and development, recruitment practices, and organizational climate. Item-level evidence also distinguishes opportunities to contribute ideas from their regular managerial evaluation. These patterns motivate an interpretive framework connecting capability development, opportunities to apply learning, and accountable managerial follow-through. The framework specifies three propositions concerning training transfer, employee voice, and the alignment of performance evaluation with developmental support. It also distinguishes physical comfort, employment security, and psychological safety rather than treating them as interchangeable outcomes. The contribution is an evidence-bounded explanation of potential implementation bottlenecks and a set of observable indicators for subsequent investigation. Because respondent-level data, validated scale scores, and longitudinal performance measures are unavailable, the analysis does not estimate causal effects, test mediation, or establish the current condition of PT X. Its managerial value lies in identifying what should be examined before positive employee attitudes are interpreted as successful transformation.

Keywords: *employee capability; organizational change; training transfer; employee voice; secondary case analysis*



Copyright © 2026 The Author(s)

This is an open-access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



INTRODUCTION

Organizational transformation is often assessed through visible investments: revised corporate values, new information systems, redesigned offices, and formal training programmes. These investments may be necessary, yet their existence does not establish that employees can use new capabilities to improve organizational practice. Vial (2019) situates digital transformation within a broader process of organizational response and value creation, while Verhoef et al. (2021) distinguish different phases of digital change and their strategic requirements. Together, these perspectives direct attention to how technology, work, and managerial decisions become connected. For established firms, the central issue is therefore how resources and employee effort are converted into sustained adaptation.

The available case concerns a telecommunications company designated PT X. Sudirlan et al. (2019) reported descriptive findings from 200 employees surveyed beginning in July 2016, covering organizational direction, corporate culture, ownership change, appraisal systems, human resource practices, infrastructure, and organizational climate. Their account contains favourable assessments of several working conditions alongside less favourable assessments of selected developmental and feedback practices. This juxtaposition offers an opportunity for a different analytical question. Instead of reproducing a general argument that capability and culture enhance competitiveness, the present article asks what the reported perceptions can reveal about the organizational arrangements through which capability might become useful in practice.

The literature already provides substantial explanations of transformation. Hanelt et al. (2021) emphasise organizational adaptation and the broader ecosystems in which digital change occurs. Nadkarni and Prügl (2021) identify both technological and actor-related dimensions, including underdeveloped questions concerning work environments and middle management. More recently, Cao et al. (2025) connect cultural configurations with digital transforming capability and product innovation. The gap addressed here is narrower than an absence of research on culture or capability: it concerns the interpretation of a historical descriptive case when the evidence measures perceptions of organizational arrangements but does not directly measure capability deployment or competitive outcomes.

This distinction matters for research and practice. A positive response to an item about training is not evidence of learning retention. Access to a channel for suggestions does not establish that suggestions influence decisions. A comfortable workplace does not necessarily support interpersonal risk-taking. Treating these observations as interchangeable indicators of transformation success can obscure the point at which organizational support ceases to translate into action. It can also lead to inappropriate interventions, such as increasing training volume when employees lack opportunities to apply what they have learned.



The article addresses two research questions. First, which implementation bottlenecks are suggested by the published aggregate and item-level evidence from PT X, and which interpretations exceed that evidence? Second, how can recent scholarship on capability development, training transfer, employee voice, and work design specify mechanisms and indicators for investigating those bottlenecks? The contribution is a theory-informed secondary interpretation with explicit evidentiary boundaries, rather than a new employee survey or a statistical replication. It develops a framework and three propositions that can guide subsequent empirical research, while preserving the provenance and historical character of the original findings.

METHODS

Research design and evidence provenance

The study combines documentary secondary analysis with a focused integrative literature review. Its empirical source is the published article by Sudirlan et al. (2019), including the methods and results reported on pages 242–254. No respondent-level dataset, original questionnaire, coding file, or unpublished company record was supplied. Consequently, the unit of secondary analysis is a published descriptive statement, not an individual employee. The design follows the principle that conceptual contributions require explicit choices about how theories organise an argument (Jaakkola, 2020), while distinguishing an integrative synthesis from an exhaustive systematic review (Snyder, 2019).

The original study reports purposive sampling, 200 distributed and completed questionnaires, and respondents spanning staff, managers, division heads, and group heads. Data collection began in mid-July 2016. The article describes respondents as predominantly male, with staff and longer-serving employees prominent in the sample. These characteristics locate the evidence within a specific historical and organizational setting; they do not establish representativeness. Descriptions of earlier corporate engagement surveys are treated as background information and are not combined with the 200-person survey as a longitudinal dataset.

PT X is a narrative pseudonym, not a claim of irreversible anonymisation. The cited publication permits the original company to be identified. Brand names, proprietary value labels, and identifiable corporate programmes are omitted from the present narrative because they are unnecessary to the analytical question. Attribution to the original authors is retained throughout. The new contribution consists of interpretation and conceptual development; the historical observations remain those of the source publication.

Literature identification and selection

The literature search was completed on 27 September 2026 using web-indexed scholarly searches, publisher pages, and institutional repositories. Search combinations covered digital transformation and dynamic capabilities; organizational culture and transformation; employee voice and psychological safety; training transfer; performance appraisal; and human resource analytics. Exact-title and DOI searches were then used



to check candidate records. Articles were retained when they addressed one of the proposed mechanisms, offered a relevant methodological distinction, and had identifiable journal metadata and a registered DOI. Untraceable references, non-scholarly commentary, and sources outside the selected publication window were excluded from the interpretive literature.

The final bibliography contains 25 journal articles: the 2019 source study and 24 theoretical, review, methodological, or empirical contributions. Final journal-volume publication years range from 2017 to 2025, within the 2017–2026 calendar-year window; online-first dates can differ from volume dates. Titles, authors, journal details, and DOI identities were cross-checked against Crossref records and available publisher or repository records. Full texts were consulted where accessible; abstract-level records support only broad conceptual or study-purpose statements. The review is purposive and does not claim database completeness, independent dual screening, a PRISMA selection flow, or a bibliometric census.

Extraction and interpretive procedure

Extraction recorded the source page, reported topic or item, percentage, response wording, and any qualification attached to the figure. The source identifies seven overarching domains and subdivides the human resource domain into seven topics. Table 1 therefore presents 13 descriptive entries while preserving the original hierarchy. The percentages are reproduced as reported rather than recalculated. In particular, the competence summary is described in the source as a mode, and the calculation rules for the other domain summaries are not sufficiently documented to establish a common scale. No combined readiness index, ranking of standardized constructs, or conversion of rounded percentages into employee counts is attempted.

Interpretation proceeded by separating enabling conditions, opportunities to use capability, and managerial follow-through. Published items were examined for their fit with each category, then compared with the mechanisms described in the selected literature. Alternative explanations were considered explicitly, including limited employee visibility of company practices, differences in item wording, and unequal applicability across job levels. Three propositions were developed from this synthesis. They are prospective theoretical statements and were not statistically tested against the historical survey.

The source contains passages in which descriptive percentages are followed by stronger claims about influence, fear of recruitment, or performance improvement. Those claims are not imported as established findings. Inconsistent wording concerning reward assessment and employee habits is treated cautiously; the reported summary percentages are retained, but disputed item meanings are not used to infer injustice or behavioural dysfunction. Missing covariance information, reliability estimates, and outcome measures preclude regression, structural equation modelling, mediation analysis, significance testing, and population-level generalisation.



RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Published perceptions show an uneven pattern of organizational support

The descriptive profile in Table 1 is heterogeneous. The work environment, infrastructure, and competence summaries are reported as 88%, 83%, and 79%, respectively, whereas training and development is reported as 56% and organizational climate as 57%. These figures indicate how the source characterised employees' responses to different topics. They are not interchangeable measurements of a single underlying construct. Nevertheless, the profile supports examining whether favourable working conditions were accompanied by sufficiently visible arrangements for development, participation, and feedback.

The recruitment summary of 46% requires particular restraint. The underlying items combine online recruitment, promotion, job rotation, placement, and external recruitment partnerships. A low summary does not identify which practice is ineffective, and an employee may be unaware of university recruitment partnerships without opposing organizational change. The source's suggestion that recruitment threatens incumbent employees therefore remains an interpretation rather than a measured finding of job insecurity. Further investigation would need direct questions about perceived employment threats, fair selection, career prospects, and access to internal mobility.

Table 1. Published descriptive profile of PT X

Reported domain or subtopic	Value (%)	Source page	Reporting level
Organizational vision and mission	72	243	Overarching domain
Corporate culture	67	244	Overarching domain
Controlling ownership change	56	245–246	Overarching domain
Work systems and performance appraisal	70	246–247	Overarching domain
HR practices — recruitment	46	247	HR subtopic
HR practices — reward and punishment	57	248	HR subtopic
HR practices — work environment	88	248–249	HR subtopic
HR practices — employee competence	79	249	HR subtopic; reported as mode
HR practices — innovation and creativity	77	250	HR subtopic
HR practices — training and development	56	251	HR subtopic
HR practices — employee habits	73	251–252	HR subtopic
Infrastructure	83	252–253	Overarching domain
Organizational climate	57	253–254	Overarching domain

Source: Reconstructed from Sudirlan et al. (2019), pp. 243–254. The seven HR subtopics belong to one overarching domain. Summary calculations are not harmonised; 79% is described as a mode. Figures are not standardized scores, population estimates, or current measurements.

The ownership-change domain presents a similar distinction between awareness and evaluation. The source reports 76% awareness of the majority shareholder but only



34% agreement that management communicated ownership composition quarterly (Sudirlan et al., 2019, pp. 245–246). These are different questions: knowing who owns the company does not establish understanding of how ownership affects operating decisions. Conversely, limited awareness of quarterly communication does not prove concealment. The defensible implication is a need to investigate the content, reach, and practical relevance of change communication.

Capability becomes consequential when employees can apply it

A useful distinction is between capability as an employee attribute and capability as an organizational accomplishment. Boon et al. (2018) show why strategic human capital and strategic human resource management need to be considered together: possessing valuable knowledge and skills is not equivalent to managing their contribution within an organization. Warner and Wäger (2019) likewise portray digital transformation as continuing strategic renewal supported by dynamic capabilities. Applied to PT X, these perspectives suggest examining whether employees' reported competence was connected to decision authority, learning opportunities, and routines for revising work.

The source reports 75% agreement with an item concerning training to improve knowledge in line with technological development, while only 40% agreed that training needs were evaluated monthly against competency gaps (Sudirlan et al., 2019, p. 251). The former describes a perceived need or provision in wording that requires caution; the latter refers to a specific assessment routine. Their contrast cannot be treated as a standardized 35-point learning deficit. It instead identifies a concrete question: were development priorities connected to verified skill gaps and subsequent work assignments?

Ford et al. (2018) distinguish the generalisation and retention of learning from participation in training. Blume et al. (2019) further conceptualise transfer as a dynamic process unfolding over time. These accounts support tracing what occurs after instruction: whether employees encounter relevant tasks, receive feedback, and continue using the acquired skill. Bouwmans et al. (2024) broaden the content of digital capability beyond technical proficiency to include collaboration, communication, adaptation, entrepreneurship, and evidence-based work. Such a framework can inform a future competency assessment at PT X, but the historical survey cannot retrospectively be treated as having measured those dimensions.

The practical inference is to connect a development activity with a documented work problem and an observable application opportunity. For example, a service team learning a diagnostic tool could apply it to defined service incidents, with the quality of diagnosis reviewed after training. The outcome would be demonstrated use and improvement in a relevant process, not simply attendance. This example is a proposed managerial practice and is not reported as an intervention undertaken by PT X.

Cultural commitment and managerial follow through are distinct

The source reports 92% agreement concerning commitment to performance and 83% recognition of the company's values as organizational culture. It also reports 46%



agreement that management evaluated employee ideas monthly (Sudirlan et al., 2019, p. 244). Elsewhere, 77% agreement is reported for opportunities to participate by contributing ideas (p. 250). These items distinguish willingness, opportunity, and managerial response. They suggest a question about follow-through, without demonstrating that the same individuals who expressed willingness experienced a lack of response.

Recent cultural research strengthens this distinction. Butt et al. (2024) examine the strategic design of culture through organizational arrangements and enacted practices, rather than value communication alone. Cao et al. (2025), using survey evidence from a different national context, report relationships between cultural types, digital transforming capability, and product innovation. Their findings motivate closer attention to the mechanisms linking culture and renewal; they do not validate a causal relationship within PT X. Neither study justifies relabelling the historical case as a measured example of a particular cultural type.

Employee voice research provides a more specific interpretive mechanism. Morrison (2023) treats speaking up and remaining silent as choices shaped by organizational circumstances, with implications beyond the mere availability of a communication channel. Huang et al. (2024) develop contextual voice efficacy by connecting interpersonal, human resource, and institutional arrangements. In the present framework, participation becomes more consequential when employees can observe how suggestions are assessed, who takes responsibility, and why an idea is adopted, deferred, or rejected.

A low frequency of monthly idea evaluation is not inherently a management failure. Some ideas require longer review periods, and informal experimentation may occur without a monthly committee. The relevant diagnostic issue is whether an appropriate, visible response process exists. A future study should therefore measure response quality, processing time, decision explanations, and opportunities to refine proposals. This would distinguish a genuinely unresponsive organization from one that uses a different but effective review rhythm.

Comfort and compliance do not establish psychological safety

The work-environment summary in the source draws heavily on physical conditions, including workplace safety, clinical facilities, lighting, and comfort. These items differ from psychological safety, which concerns interpersonal risk in speaking up, asking for help, or acknowledging error. Newman et al. (2017) review the conceptual and measurement challenges of psychological safety, and Frazier et al. (2017) synthesise its antecedents and outcomes across individual and group levels. Neither account supports treating physical comfort as a substitute measure.

Edmondson and Bransby (2023) identify learning, performance, work experience, and leadership as central themes in contemporary psychological safety research. For PT X, this literature supplies questions that the original questionnaire did not answer adequately: could employees challenge a supervisor's assumptions, report an unsuccessful experiment, or raise a concern without interpersonal penalty? The



published evidence cannot establish either the presence or absence of psychological safety. The same caution applies to employment security, which concerns a different form of perceived risk.

High reported compliance with supervisors' instructions can coexist with productive coordination, constrained discretion, or both. Oreg et al. (2018) explain why responses to organizational change should not be reduced to a single support-versus-resistance continuum. In the present case, interpreting compliance as full commitment would overlook this complexity. A future assessment should distinguish constructive challenge, passive acceptance, active support, and concerns about specific changes, using measures designed for those purposes rather than repurposing general satisfaction items.

Performance systems must connect evaluation with development

The source reports 87% agreement that the company evaluated employee achievement every six months, 86% for line-manager evaluations, and 85% for evaluation of the work-assessment process (Sudirlan et al., 2019, p. 246). These statements establish reported regularity, not appraisal quality. They do not show whether goals were controllable, feedback was actionable, or ratings were consistent across supervisors. DeNisi and Murphy (2017) distinguish performance appraisal from the broader challenge of managing and improving performance. This distinction prevents a formal review calendar from becoming the principal evidence of a developmental system.

Parker and Grote (2022) explain that digital technologies can alter both job resources and demands, depending on work-design choices. Accordingly, digital monitoring or appraisal tools should be considered alongside autonomy, skill use, workload, and feedback. An employee cannot reasonably be expected to demonstrate a new capability if the surrounding workflow does not permit its use. In PT X, the relationship between appraisal and training would need to be examined through development plans and subsequent assignments rather than inferred from their separate descriptive summaries.

Marler and Boudreau (2017) review the evidence base for human resource analytics, while Tambe et al. (2019) identify challenges associated with data complexity, limited datasets, fairness, and employee reactions to algorithmic decisions. These contributions qualify any recommendation to resolve the identified issues simply by adding an analytics dashboard. A future information system should first establish stable definitions, accountable data ownership, and a clear decision purpose. More elaborate prediction would not correct an unclear outcome measure or an appraisal process that employees cannot understand or contest.

An interpretive framework for capability deployment

The synthesis yields a framework with three connected components. Capability development concerns the acquisition and renewal of knowledge and skills. Application opportunities concern the work assignments, resources, discretion, and feedback that allow those capabilities to be used. Managerial follow-through concerns the evaluation



of proposals, resolution of obstacles, and adjustment of work practices in response to evidence. Organizational renewal refers to demonstrable changes in processes or offerings, while competitive performance remains a separate downstream outcome requiring independent measurement.

This framework is consistent with treating digital transformation as organizational change rather than the purchase of technology alone (Gong & Ribiere, 2021). Its case-specific contribution is diagnostic: it identifies where favourable perceptions cease to supply evidence about implementation. The term implementation bottleneck denotes a theoretically plausible interruption requiring investigation, not an estimated constraint or a validated latent variable. The framework does not imply that every organization should maximise all practices equally; the appropriate arrangements depend on task interdependence, available resources, and the nature of the change.

Proposition 1. The relationship between employee capability development and subsequent work-process improvement is expected to be stronger when employees receive relevant application opportunities and continuing feedback. A prospective test should separate learning attainment from observed transfer and measure both before evaluating organizational outcomes.

Proposition 2. Opportunities to express work-related ideas are expected to contribute more to implemented improvements when managerial response processes are visible, timely for the type of proposal, and accompanied by reasons. Testing this proposition requires tracking suggestions through decisions and implementation, rather than counting invitations to participate.

Proposition 3. Alignment between performance evaluation and developmental support is expected to strengthen capability deployment when employees have sufficient discretion and resources to act on feedback. A future test should examine the content and implementation of development plans alongside appraisal quality and job design. These propositions are theoretical products of the synthesis and remain untested in PT X.

Managerial implications and prospective evaluation

The first managerial task is to diagnose the current situation, because a 2016 survey cannot determine present priorities. Table 2 translates the framework into observable evidence that a subsequent assessment could collect. The proposed measures distinguish resources provided, employee use, managerial response, and operational outcomes. No target value is prescribed from the historical percentages, and none of the proposed actions is described as already implemented.

Table 2. Proposed evidence for a prospective organizational assessment

Analytical focus	What to examine	Illustrative evidence	Proposed responsibility
Capability development	Verified skill gaps and relevant learning	Job-specific assessment; documented development plan	HR and line managers



Application opportunities	Use and retention of acquired skills	Observed task application; follow-up feedback; retained proficiency	Line managers and employees
Employee voice	Response and implementation of suggestions	Decision lead time; explained decisions; implemented proposals	Unit leaders and employee representatives
Developmental appraisal	Connection between feedback and action	Completed development actions; consistency of ratings; review of disputed decisions	HR and unit leaders
Organizational renewal	Change in a defined operating process	Process quality; rework; service resolution time; customer outcomes	Process owners

Source: Authorial synthesis. Indicators and responsibilities are proposals for future assessment, not observed practices or validated targets at PT X.

A feasible evaluation would begin with a bounded process, such as service-incident resolution or cross-unit handovers, for which operational evidence is available. The organization could document baseline performance, assess the relevant skills and workflow constraints, implement a clearly specified intervention, and repeat measurements. Where comparable units exist, a phased rollout can strengthen inference if assignment rules, baseline differences, and concurrent changes are addressed. Interviews should include employees whose experiences differ from the majority view, because positive averages may conceal barriers affecting particular groups.

The sequence should follow the diagnosed mechanism. If employees have the required skill but lack permission to use it, additional training may have little value. If ideas are received but decisions remain unexplained, a transparent response process may be more relevant than another suggestion campaign. If appraisal identifies a deficit but workload leaves no development time, the intervention should address work allocation. These conditional recommendations make the framework useful without asserting that a single programme is appropriate across all units.

Limitations and research agenda

The analysis relies on one historical published study selected because it was the available case, creating a substantial risk of case-selection and publication bias. Purposive sampling, self-report measures, undocumented aggregation procedures, and possible inconsistencies in the original narrative limit interpretation. Without respondent-level records, subgroup differences, measurement reliability, common-method effects, and relationships among variables cannot be assessed. Domain summaries should therefore be read as reported descriptions, not as validated comparative scores.

The literature review is also selective. Its purpose is to develop an explanatory argument, not to estimate pooled effects or establish the prevalence of implementation problems. Broad findings from other industries and countries cannot be transferred automatically to an Indonesian telecommunications organization. The framework's



relevance to present-day PT X remains a question for new evidence, especially given changes in digital technology and employment practices since the original survey.

Future research should use a longitudinal, multilevel design linking employee capability, team practices, and independently recorded operational outcomes. It should distinguish physical work conditions, perceived employment security, and psychological safety; assess recruitment and internal mobility separately; and examine whether management response quality connects voice to implemented improvements. Comparative cases would help identify boundary conditions. Any claim that organizational renewal improves competitiveness would additionally require suitable market or customer outcomes and a credible account of alternative explanations.

CONCLUSION

The published evidence from PT X supports a bounded conclusion: favourable employee perceptions of working conditions and competence coexisted with less favourable reports about some developmental and managerial practices. It does not establish that capability, culture, or infrastructure caused competitiveness, nor that the same pattern persists today. A defensible secondary analysis must keep those limits visible.

The article advances a different interpretation by connecting capability development with opportunities for application and accountable managerial follow-through. The framework explains why training provision, cultural commitment, participation channels, and appraisal regularity require evidence of use and response before they can be interpreted as organizational renewal. Its three propositions and prospective indicators provide a basis for new investigation. The resulting contribution is an analytically explicit research agenda grounded in an acknowledged historical case, rather than a repackaged claim of new empirical discovery.

DECLARATIONS

Source relationship and data availability. All historical employee observations are drawn from Sudirlan et al. (2019). No new survey or respondent-level reanalysis was conducted. The published source is available through its DOI. The present manuscript adds a focused literature synthesis, a secondary interpretation, and prospective propositions; its relationship with the earlier publication should be disclosed to the receiving editor.

Research ethics and identification. No new participants were recruited and no private individual records were analysed. PT X is a pseudonym used for presentation, while the cited source remains identifiable. No claim of newly obtained ethics approval or guaranteed company anonymity is made.

Authorship, funding, and competing interests. Author identities, affiliations, contribution statements, funding information, and competing-interest declarations must be completed and approved by the submitting authors before submission.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Blume, B. D., Ford, J. K., Surface, E. A., & Olenick, J. (2019). A dynamic model of training transfer. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(2), 270–283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.11.004>
- Boon, C., Eckardt, R., Lepak, D. P., & Boselie, P. (2018). Integrating strategic human capital and strategic human resource management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(1), 34–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1380063>
- Bouwman, M., Lub, X., Orlowski, M., & Nguyen, T. V. (2024). Developing the digital transformation skills framework: A systematic literature review approach. *PLOS ONE*, 19(7), e0304127. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0304127>
- Butt, A., Imran, F., Helo, P., & Kantola, J. (2024). Strategic design of culture for digital transformation. *Long Range Planning*, 57(2), 102415. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2024.102415>
- Cao, G., Duan, Y., & Edwards, J. S. (2025). Organizational culture, digital transformation, and product innovation. *Information & Management*, 62(4), 104135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2025.104135>
- DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 421–433. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000085>
- Edmondson, A. C., & Bransby, D. P. (2023). Psychological Safety Comes of Age: Observed Themes in an Established Literature. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10(1), 55–78. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-055217>
- Ford, J. K., Baldwin, T. T., & Prasad, J. (2018). Transfer of Training: The Known and the Unknown. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 201–225. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104443>
- Frazier, M. L., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R. L., Pezeshkan, A., & Vracheva, V. (2017). Psychological Safety: A Meta-Analytic Review and Extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(1), 113–165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12183>
- Gong, C., & Ribiere, V. (2021). Developing a unified definition of digital transformation. *Technovation*, 102, 102217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2020.102217>
- Hanelt, A., Bohnsack, R., Marz, D., & Marante, C. A. (2021). A Systematic Review of the Literature on Digital Transformation: Insights and Implications for Strategy and Organizational Change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(5), 1159–1197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12639>
- Huang, X., Wilkinson, A., & Barry, M. (2024). The role of contextual voice efficacy on employee voice and silence. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 34(4), 960–974. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12537>
- Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: four approaches. *AMS Review*, 10(1–2), 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0>
- Marler, J. H., & Boudreau, J. W. (2017). An evidence-based review of HR Analytics. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(1), 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1244699>



- Morrison, E. W. (2023). Employee Voice and Silence: Taking Stock a Decade Later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10(1), 79–107. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-054654>
- Nadkarni, S., & Prügl, R. (2021). Digital transformation: a review, synthesis and opportunities for future research. *Management Review Quarterly*, 71(2), 233–341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-020-00185-7>
- Newman, A., Donohue, R., & Eva, N. (2017). Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(3), 521–535. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.01.001>
- Oreg, S., Bartunek, J. M., Lee, G., & Do, B. (2018). An Affect-Based Model of Recipients' Responses to Organizational Change Events. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(1), 65–86. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0335>
- Parker, S. K., & Grote, G. (2022). Automation, Algorithms, and Beyond: Why Work Design Matters More Than Ever in a Digital World. *Applied Psychology*, 71(4), 1171–1204. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12241>
- 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>
- Sudirlan, I., Maarif, M. S., Affandi, J., & Arkeman, Y. (2019). Peningkatan Kapabilitas Karyawan dan Penerapan Budaya Baru Perusahaan dalam Mewujudkan Daya Saing. *JKBM (JURNAL KONSEP BISNIS DAN MANAJEMEN)*, 5(2), 239–256. <https://doi.org/10.31289/jkbm.v5i2.2274>
- Tambe, P., Cappelli, P., & Yakubovich, V. (2019). Artificial Intelligence in Human Resources Management: Challenges and a Path Forward. *California Management Review*, 61(4), 15–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619867910>
- Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889–901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022>
- 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>
- Warner, K. S. R., & Wäger, M. (2019). Building dynamic capabilities for digital transformation: An ongoing process of strategic renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 52(3), 326–349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2018.12.001>