International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)
Volume 09 - Issue 07, 2026
www.ijlrhss.com || PP. 140-147

Digital Transformation and Enterprise Performance: Mechanisms, Boundary Conditions, and Future Research Directions

Sun Jiangbaihe[1*], Badrul Hisham Bin Kamaruddin[2]
[1]*City University Malaysia, City Graduate School, Menara City U, No. 8, Jalan 51A/223, 46100 Petaling Jaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia*
[2]*City University Malaysia, City Graduate School, Menara City U, No. 8, Jalan 51A/223, 46100 Petaling Jaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia*
**Corresponding author: Sun Jiangbaihe*

Abstract: Digital transformation is often associated with stronger innovation, productivity, resilience, and financial performance, yet the available evidence is not uniform. Some firms obtain measurable gains by integrating digital technologies, data, and organisational routines, whereas others face high transition costs, fragmented systems, implementation difficulties, or delayed returns. This focused review synthesises recent research, with particular emphasis on firm-level evidence, to explain this variation. Four value-creation mechanisms are examined: innovation and commercialisation, information processing and resource allocation, dynamic capabilities and resilience, and business model renewal. Within this broader framework, innovation investment and capital allocation efficiency are highlighted as two complementary firm-level pathways through which digital transformation may influence firm performance.The review also considers firm resources, governance, industry structure, institutional conditions, digital maturity, strategic alignment, and the time horizon used to assess performance. The reviewed evidence indicates that technology adoption alone provides an incomplete explanation of enterprise performance. Digital initiatives create value when they reshape decisions, routines, capabilities, and resource commitments in ways that fit the firm's operating context. The article proposes a focused research agenda centred on clearer construct measurement, stronger causal designs, integrated mechanism testing, broader research samples, and responsible digital transformation. Overall, digital transformation can improve enterprise performance, but the timing, magnitude, and sustainability of its effects depend on how transformation is implemented and how performance is measured.

Keywords: Digital Transformation, Firm Performance, Innovation Investment, Capital Allocation Efficiency

1. Introduction

Cloud computing, artificial intelligence, big-data analytics, industrial internet platforms, and mobile applications now shape routine business decisions. A manufacturer may use sensor data to schedule maintenance before a machine fails. A retailer can link online orders with store inventory in real time. A logistics firm may redraw delivery routes as traffic conditions change. These applications matter, but none of them alone proves that an enterprise has undergone digital transformation. Transformation involves a broader change in strategy, organisational arrangements, decision processes, and value creation [1]–[5].

This distinction is important because the performance evidence remains mixed. Meta-analytic and firm-level studies show that outcomes vary across technologies, sectors, performance measures, and time horizons [6], [7]. Some benefits emerge only over longer periods [7], while excessive digitalisation may generate nonlinear rebound effects [8]. The differences are not surprising, because a well-integrated production platform and a collection of disconnected software tools are both labelled digital even though their economic consequences are unlikely to be the same. Performance measures also capture different stages, which further complicates comparison. A project can improve production visibility before it raises return on assets, while market valuation may react before operational gains are realised.

The central issue is no longer limited to whether digital transformation is beneficial. A more useful question asks how value is produced, under which conditions it appears, and what costs accompany the process. A factory that installs predictive-maintenance software may reduce downtime within months. By contrast, an enterprise-wide data platform may require several years of cleaning records, redesigning responsibilities, and training staff before financial results become visible. These examples show why technology expenditure should not be treated as an automatic performance input.

Performance assessment can also distort managerial behaviour. If a digital programme is judged only by quarterly profit, managers may avoid data cleaning, employee training, and system integration because these activities raise current cost. If the same programme is judged only by the number of applications installed, weak

projects may survive because adoption is mistaken for value. A useful review must therefore examine both the mechanisms and the measures through which success is claimed.

Against this background, the review addresses three purposes. First, it clarifies the relationship between digital transformation and enterprise performance. It then organises the literature around four value-creation mechanisms, with particular attention to innovation and resource allocation. Finally, it identifies the main conditions that explain variation across firms and outlines a focused research agenda. The contribution lies in connecting streams that are often examined separately. Innovation research focuses on experimentation and commercialisation; operations research studies efficiency and coordination; information-systems research emphasises digital capabilities; strategy research considers business model renewal. Bringing these perspectives together gives a more realistic account of digital value creation.

2. Review Method

A focused literature review was used rather than a fully systematic review or statistical meta-analysis. The aim was analytical integration, not exhaustive coverage. Recent peer-reviewed studies were prioritised when they examined digital transformation at the firm level and reported performance outcomes, mechanisms, or boundary conditions. Searches used combinations of digital transformation, digitalisation, enterprise performance, innovation, resource allocation, resilience, dynamic capability, and business model. The selected sources include conceptual reviews, archival studies, surveys, case-based evidence, and one meta-analysis.

Each study was read for seven elements: the definition of digital transformation, the unit of analysis, the performance measure, the proposed mechanism, the contextual setting, the time frame, and the main limitation. Evidence from national or industry-level studies was used cautiously, since such research can illuminate infrastructure or value-chain conditions but cannot be treated as direct evidence of firm-level investment efficiency. This distinction is especially relevant for resource allocation, which may refer to capital and labour within a firm, factors across firms, or structural change across industries.

The synthesis does not calculate an average effect because the underlying studies use different designs and outcomes. Return on assets, total factor productivity, stock-market measures, innovation, environmental performance, and resilience are related but not interchangeable. The review instead asks why results differ and what a more comparable research design would need to report.

Greater weight was given to studies that defined the digital construct, explained the measure, and separated direct effects from mechanisms. Findings were treated more cautiously when digital transformation was represented by a broad label but the underlying indicator captured only technology use or disclosure. This approach does not remove disagreement, but it makes the source of disagreement easier to identify.

3. Digital Transformation and Performance

3.1 Conceptual Scope

Digitisation usually means converting analogue information into digital form. Digitalisation refers to using digital tools to improve an existing activity. Digital transformation goes further because technology begins to alter how the firm competes, organises work, allocates resources, or creates value [1], [2]. An electronic invoice is digitisation, while a cloud-based purchasing system represents digitalisation when it improves the existing procurement process. Transformation occurs when procurement data are connected with production planning, supplier evaluation, finance, and product design, allowing decisions to be reorganised around shared information.

Recent reviews and process studies describe transformation as a combination of technological change and organisational reconfiguration [3]–[5]. The technology is visible, while the complementary changes are often harder to observe. Skills, data quality, managerial attention, cross-functional authority, and incentives determine whether employees use digital information in daily decisions. This explains why the same platform can produce different results across organisations. One plant may use real-time defect data to adjust equipment settings immediately. Another may collect the same data but continue to rely on monthly meetings and manual approval chains.

A broad concept also creates a measurement problem, because survey scales may capture leadership, process integration, and employee capability. Annual-report text measures may capture managerial attention and disclosed activity. Technology investment records spending, while patents capture invention. Findings should remain within the boundary of the chosen proxy. A keyword count cannot establish that a firm has achieved mature integration, just as software expenditure does not demonstrate successful use.

3.2 Performance Outcomes and the Digitalisation Paradox

Enterprise performance is multidimensional. Accounting measures show realised financial outcomes but may decline during a costly transition. Market measures incorporate expectations and intangible value, though

they are sensitive to investor sentiment. Operational indicators capture cost, quality, delivery, capacity use, and reliability. Productivity measures compare outputs with inputs, while innovation indicators focus on patents, products, processes, or commercial results. Resilience becomes especially relevant when firms face disruption.

The meta-analytic evidence points to a positive average relationship between digital technology and performance, but the effect varies substantially across technologies, sectors, countries, and outcomes [6]. Firm-level studies also find that digital transformation can improve performance through cost reduction, operating efficiency, and innovation [7]. Small manufacturing firms in South Africa show a related pattern. Digital communication technologies support innovation, and innovation is associated with productivity gains [9]. Digital acquisitions can help traditional manufacturers build a digital knowledge base, which supports innovation and later performance [10].

Positive findings should not hide the digitalisation paradox, since benefits may weaken when complexity, resource use, or coordination costs rise faster than capability. Ahmadova et al. [8] identify an inverted U-shaped relationship between home-country digitalisation and environmental performance. Although the outcome is environmental rather than accounting performance, the study illustrates a practical concern. A firm can gain from initial digital integration and then lose part of the benefit when extra systems increase energy use, duplication, or managerial burden.

In practice, the problem is common. An enterprise may buy several applications from different vendors, each with its own data definitions and user accounts. Employees then re-enter information or build spreadsheets to connect the systems. The firm has invested in more technology, but decision speed may not improve. Transition costs are also recorded before many benefits appear. Software, cybersecurity, consulting, training, and parallel operation of old and new systems can weaken short-term profit. Evidence from European firms also shows that greater use of digital technologies does not necessarily produce stronger innovation performance [11].

The timing of the metric matters as much as the metric itself. A maintenance system may first reduce emergency stoppages, then improve capacity utilisation, and only later influence profit. A customer-data project may raise conversion rates but also increase privacy and compliance costs. Studies that observe only the final financial figure can miss early operational gains, while studies that report only technical improvement may overstate the eventual economic return.

4. Value-Creation Mechanisms

4.1 Innovation and Commercialisation

Digital technologies broaden the information available for innovation. Customer complaints can be coded and compared with product returns. Production data may reveal recurring quality problems. Cloud collaboration allows engineers, suppliers, and sales staff to work on the same design. Simulation and digital twins can test alternatives before a physical prototype is built. These practices reduce search and experimentation costs, which can support product, process, service, and business model innovation.

Within this broader mechanism, innovation investment refers more narrowly to the commitment of firm resources to research, development, and experimentation, rather than to innovation output or commercial success.

Evidence supports this route, but the sequence is not automatic. Digitalisation promotes innovation among small manufacturers, and innovation contributes to productivity [9]. Chinese firm-level research also identifies innovation as a channel linking transformation with performance [7]. Yet the economic return depends on commercialisation. Patents and prototypes have limited value when a firm lacks complementary assets, customer acceptance, protection of intellectual property, or a route to market. Increased research activity can therefore coexist with weak short-term financial outcomes.

Absorptive and integrative capability matters. A firm must recognise useful information, connect it with existing knowledge, and convert it into a workable product or process. More data can help, but excessive data may overwhelm teams or reinforce established patterns. Usai et al. [11] show that different digital technologies have different innovation effects and that simply adding tools does not guarantee better results. A narrower technology portfolio linked to a defined problem may be more effective than a broad portfolio adopted for signalling purposes.

Commercial discipline is equally necessary, because a digital prototype may be technically successful but too costly for customers, difficult to service, or incompatible with existing equipment. Firms often learn more from a limited pilot with measurable user feedback than from a large launch built around internal enthusiasm. Innovation performance should therefore distinguish exploration, technical output, market introduction, and realised revenue.

4.2 Information Processing and Resource Allocation

The second mechanism concerns the quality of resource decisions. Firms allocate capital, labour, inventory, managerial attention, and technology under uncertainty. When information is delayed or fragmented, weak projects may continue while promising opportunities remain underfunded. Integrated databases, traceable workflows, and real-time dashboards can reduce these frictions. Better information may improve budgeting, capacity planning, investment appraisal, staffing, and supply-chain coordination.

Within this broader resource-allocation mechanism, capital allocation efficiency refers specifically to the extent to which firms direct capital investment toward economically justified opportunities while limiting severe overinvestment and underinvestment. It is narrower than general resource allocation, which may also include labour, inventory, technology, and managerial attention.

Chen et al. [12]find that digital transformation improves the operating efficiency of Chinese listed companies and identify capital and labour allocation as important channels. At the enterprise level, digital transformation is also associated with higher green total factor productivity through structural optimisation and green innovation [13]. These findings should not be merged into a single measure. Investment efficiency, factor allocation, asset turnover, and total factor productivity address related questions, but they operate at different analytical levels.

Digital systems can also make poor allocation more systematic, and a dashboard built on incomplete data may create confidence without accuracy. Historical data can preserve earlier bias, and centralised metrics may suppress local knowledge. For example, a maintenance algorithm may favour equipment with abundant records while underestimating a newer machine with limited data. Managers remain responsible for checking assumptions, balancing measurable and less measurable goals, and deciding when a model should be overridden.

Inventory planning offers a practical example, since a connected system can combine orders, production schedules, supplier lead times, and warehouse levels. This may reduce both stockouts and excess inventory. Yet a forecast trained on stable demand can fail during a sudden disruption. The value lies not only in prediction accuracy but also in whether managers can see the assumption, revise it, and coordinate a response across purchasing and production.

The strongest interpretation is therefore modest, because digital transformation changes the information architecture of allocation decisions. It can help capital and labour move toward more productive uses, but the outcome depends on data quality, governance, and judgement.

4.3 Dynamic Capabilities, Agility, and Resilience

Dynamic capabilities explain why technology produces value in some firms and not in others. Digital tools can improve sensing by providing faster market and operational information. They support seizing when modular platforms and analytics make experimentation less costly. Reconfiguration becomes easier when cloud infrastructure, automation, and connected workflows allow resources to be moved without rebuilding the entire operating system.

The evidence on digital acquisitions illustrates this process, as Hanelt et al. find that acquisitions can expand the digital knowledge base of established manufacturers. That knowledge supports digital innovation and, in turn, performance [10]. The result is not simply an ownership effect, because acquired knowledge must be integrated into routines, incentives, and decisions. A firm that isolates the acquired team may own new expertise without changing the core business.

Agility and resilience are related but distinct, since agility concerns speed and responsiveness while resilience includes absorbing a shock, maintaining essential functions, and adapting afterwards. Digital transformation can strengthen organisational resilience and support organisational performance during turbulent periods [14]. During a supply disruption, for example, a firm with shared supplier and inventory data can identify shortages earlier and compare alternative sources. Still, technology does not replace contingency planning, employee discretion, or trusted relationships.

The human dimension is central, and employees need both digital skills and enough authority to act on information. Leaders must connect projects to operational problems and manage tension between current output and experimentation. Organisational culture shapes whether data are shared and whether failed pilots become learning opportunities. Capability development is part of transformation, not an administrative task added after implementation.

Implementation often fails at the handover between technical and operating teams. A model may be accurate in testing but ignored on the shop floor because its recommendation arrives too late or conflicts with safety procedures. Joint design, clear escalation rules, and feedback from users can be more important than a small improvement in algorithmic accuracy.

4.4 Business Model Renewal and Customer Value

Digital transformation can change how a firm reaches customers and captures value. Manufacturers may add remote monitoring or outcome-based service contracts to physical products. Retailers can integrate stores, mobile applications, and delivery services. Subscription models, platforms, and data-supported services can generate recurring revenue and deepen customer contact. These changes become strategic when technology alters the value proposition rather than only reducing internal cost [1], [5].

Digitalisation and servitisation can work together to improve financial performance [15]. Yet a new revenue model also requires changes in pricing, sales incentives, support processes, data rights, and risk management. A machinery producer that offers uptime guarantees must monitor equipment reliably and bear part of the operational risk previously carried by the customer. The digital service cannot be separated from contractual design and maintenance capacity.

Ecosystem dependence creates another trade-off, because a platform may expand market access while increasing reliance on external infrastructure or data. A firm may gain customers but lose bargaining power. For example, a small producer can reach a national market through a large platform, yet changes in commission rates or ranking rules can quickly reduce the benefit. Performance research should therefore examine observable changes in revenue composition, customer retention, channel structure, and partner dependence instead of inferring business model renewal from general digital language.

5. Boundary Conditions

5.1 Firm Resources and Ownership and Governance

Firm size and age influence both opportunity and constraint. Large enterprises usually have finance, specialised staff, accumulated data, and bargaining power with technology vendors. They also carry legacy systems, layered approvals, and entrenched routines. Smaller firms face tighter budgets and skill shortages, but cloud services can let them adopt selected functions without building extensive infrastructure. A small manufacturer may replace a spreadsheet-based inventory process quickly, while a large group must connect several plants and incompatible enterprise systems.

Older firms possess experience, brands, and customer relationships, yet may be constrained by outdated architecture. Younger firms often start with more recent tools but may lack stable processes and complementary assets. Age or size should not be treated as a simple advantage. The relevant issue is how resources, routines, and rigidity interact.

Ownership and governance shape objectives, financing, risk tolerance, and accountability. State-owned enterprises may have stronger policy support and investment capacity. Private firms may face sharper market pressure and funding constraints. Neither pattern is universally superior, and board oversight matters because digital programmes affect cybersecurity, privacy, employee monitoring, and capital allocation. A transformation plan needs a clear priority, since different goals require different projects and evaluation periods. Cost reduction, innovation, customer access, and organisational learning require different projects and evaluation periods.

Stage-gate governance can reduce waste without stopping experimentation. A small pilot can be assessed against one operational problem, followed by a decision to scale, revise, or stop. This is more informative than approving a multi-year programme with vague targets and reviewing it only after most resources have been committed.

5.2 Industry and Institutional Context

Industry differences are substantial because digital technology interacts with different production systems and customer relationships. Sensors and industrial internet applications can improve maintenance and quality control in manufacturing. Digital channels reshape service delivery and customer contact. In regulated sectors, traceability may improve, but restrictions on data access can slow implementation. Oduro et al. [6]show that sector and technology intensity explain part of the variation in performance effects. Asset intensity, data density, modularity, regulation, and supply-chain complexity are often more informative than a simple manufacturing-service distinction.

The institutional setting also affects returns, because digital infrastructure, intellectual-property protection, education, finance, and data regulation influence cost and adoption. Weak infrastructure raises the expense of reliable connectivity. Limited human capital delays implementation. Uncertain data rules can discourage collaboration. At the same time, firms in less-developed regions may obtain large gains when digital tools reduce severe information or market barriers.

National- and industry-level evidence can provide useful institutional context, but it should not be treated as a substitute for firm-level analysis. National digitalisation indicators and firm-level investment efficiency address different analytical questions. Cross-country and multilevel research should therefore distinguish

general organisational mechanisms from effects generated by specific policy, institutional, or reporting environments.

5.3 Digital Maturity and Strategic Alignment

Transformation develops in stages, with early digitalisation often improving an isolated process before later stages require shared data, cross-functional integration, organisational redesign, and coordination with partners. Maturity is not the number of technologies installed, but the degree of alignment among technology, data, skills, governance, and strategy.

Both underinvestment and overinvestment can cause problems, as too little investment leaves fragmented systems that cannot create scale benefits. At very high levels, digitalisation may also create rebound effects through greater resource use and pollution [8]. A common infrastructure that supports several applications may be more valuable than multiple stand-alone pilots. Strategic alignment also changes evaluation. A predictive-maintenance project should be judged against downtime and maintenance cost, while a customer platform may need measures of retention and service revenue.

Transformation intensity must therefore be interpreted alongside coherence. Normal and excess digital transformation should not be interpreted in the same way, because they are associated with different performance horizons [7].

5.4 Time Horizon and Performance Measurement

Digital transformation commonly moves through investment, organisational adjustment, and value realisation. Costs are immediate, while benefits may be delayed. During implementation, accounting profit can fall even when information quality, production reliability, or innovation capability improves. A short panel may classify a viable programme as a failure simply because the observation period ends before the return appears.

Different outcomes also respond at different speeds, because market value may react to announcements while operational indicators improve after processes stabilise. Innovation requires development and commercialisation, while accounting returns may appear later. Zhai et al. [7] report different performance horizons for normal and excess digital transformation, while nonlinear evidence shows that digitalisation outcomes can change after a threshold [8].

Longitudinal studies should use lags, event-time designs, or maturity measures when data permit. Several outcomes are often needed, since cost, quality, productivity, innovation, resilience, accounting performance, and market value should not be compressed into a single claim about success.

6. Research Agenda and Conclusion

6.1 Measurement and Causal Design

Construct validity remains a priority. Annual-report keyword indicators are scalable, but they may capture managerial attention and disclosure strategy as well as implementation. Text measures can be compared with software assets, technology investment, digital patents, recruitment, platform use, or survey-based maturity indicators. Each proxy should be described narrowly. A disclosed digital-transformation index is not the same as operational maturity.

Causal identification also requires care, because better-performing firms have more resources for technology and optimistic managers may disclose more digital activity. Firm and year fixed effects reduce some bias, but they do not solve reverse causality. Credible external shocks, phased policy changes, matched samples, instrumental variables, trend tests, and placebo tests can strengthen inference when their assumptions are defensible. Complexity should not be added for appearance, since the design must fit the question and available data.

Basic reporting practices would already improve comparability, and studies should disclose the technology categories, text dictionary or survey items, missing-data rules, transformation of skewed variables, and timing of measures. They should also explain whether performance is assessed in the same year or after a lag. These details often determine whether two apparently similar findings can be compared.

6.2 Integrated Mechanisms and Broader Samples

Mechanisms are often tested one at a time, although they may operate together. Better information can guide resources toward research. Innovation creates new investment opportunities. Dynamic capabilities determine whether managers can reconfigure assets, and business model renewal influences whether innovation reaches customers. Future studies should compare indirect effects and examine when mechanisms complement or compete with one another.

Evidence should also extend beyond listed companies and heavily studied economies. Small private firms, family businesses, public enterprises, and organisations in emerging markets face different constraints.

Their digitalisation may depend more on vendor services, informal knowledge, or owner decisions. Comparative studies can show whether the same mechanisms operate under different labour markets, financing systems, and digital infrastructures.

A particularly relevant direction is to examine innovation investment and capital allocation efficiency jointly as parallel mediating pathways between digital transformation and firm performance. Innovation investment represents growth-oriented value creation, whereas capital allocation efficiency represents efficiency-oriented value realisation.

6.3 Responsible Transformation

Performance assessment should include costs that are easy to overlook. Cybersecurity incidents, privacy risks, algorithmic bias, increased monitoring, skill displacement, employee workload, and energy use can reduce the net value of a programme. A system that raises short-term output but weakens safety or employee retention is not an unqualified success. Responsible transformation requires governance, training, clear data rights, and attention to stakeholders.

Platform dependence also deserves direct measurement, because digitalisation may improve the focal firm's efficiency while shifting value or control to technology providers. Data access, interoperability, switching cost, and bargaining power affect whether benefits remain with the enterprise.

6.4 Conclusion

Recent research generally links digital transformation with improved enterprise performance, but the relationship is conditional. Value can be created through innovation, better information and allocation, stronger dynamic capabilities, and renewed business models. None of these pathways works through technology alone, since skills, governance, organisational redesign, and strategic fit determine whether digital possibilities become operating results.

Firm resources, ownership, industry, institutions, maturity, and evaluation period help explain conflicting findings. Productivity or innovation may improve before financial returns. Poor coordination can raise costs even when the technology itself functions as intended. From the selected literature, the most useful conclusion is not that more digitalisation always produces more value. Performance improves when digital initiatives address a concrete problem, are integrated into decisions and routines, and are assessed over an appropriate period.

This review is focused rather than exhaustive, and a systematic review with reproducible screening would support broader generalisation. Even so, the synthesis clarifies a practical research direction. Future work should ask how, when, and for which firms digital transformation creates value, while keeping measurement claims close to the evidence.

7. References

[1] P. C. Verhoef, T. Broekhuizen, Y. Bart, A. Bhattacharya, J. Q. Dong, N. Fabian, and M. Haenlein, “Digital Transformation: A Multidisciplinary Reflection and Research Agenda,” Journal of Business Research, CXXII, pp. 889–901, 2021.

[2] C. Gong and V. Ribiere, “Developing a Unified Definition of Digital Transformation,” Technovation, CII, Article 102217, 2021.

[3] A. Hanelt, R. Bohnsack, D. Marz, and C. Antunes Marante, “A Systematic Review of the Literature on Digital Transformation: Insights and Implications for Strategy and Organizational Change,” Journal of Management Studies, LVIII (5), pp. 1159–1197, 2021.

[4] S. Nadkarni and R. Prügl, “Digital Transformation: A Review, Synthesis and Opportunities for Future Research,” Management Review Quarterly, LXXI (2), pp. 233–341, 2021.

[5] L. Wessel, A. Baiyere, R. Ologeanu-Taddei, J. Cha, and T. Blegind Jensen, “Unpacking the Difference between Digital Transformation and IT-Enabled Organizational Transformation,” Journal of the Association for Information Systems, XXII (1), pp. 102–129, 2021.

[6] S. Oduro, A. De Nisco, and G. Mainolfi, “Do Digital Technologies Pay Off? A Meta-Analytic Review of the Digital Technologies/Firm Performance Nexus,” Technovation, CXXVIII, Article 102836, 2023.

[7] H. Zhai, M. Yang, and K. C. Chan, “Does Digital Transformation Enhance a Firm’s Performance? Evidence from China,” Technology in Society, LXVIII, Article 101841, 2022.

[8] G. Ahmadova, B. L. Delgado-Márquez, L. E. Pedauga, and D. I. Leyva-de la Hiz, “Too Good to Be True: The Inverted U-Shaped Relationship between Home-Country Digitalization and Environmental Performance,” Ecological Economics, CXCVI, Article 107393, 2022.

[9] C. Gaglio, E. Kraemer-Mbula, and E. Lorenz, “The Effects of Digital Transformation on Innovation and Productivity: Firm-Level Evidence of South African Manufacturing Micro and Small Enterprises,” Technological Forecasting and Social Change, CLXXXII, Article 121785, 2022.

[10] A. Hanelt, S. Firk, B. Hildebrandt, and L. M. Kolbe, "Digital M&A, Digital Innovation, and Firm Performance: An Empirical Investigation," European Journal of Information Systems, XXX (1), pp. 3–26, 2021.
[11] A. Usai, F. Fiano, A. Messeni Petruzzelli, P. Paoloni, M. Farina Briamonte, and B. Orlando, "Unveiling the Impact of the Adoption of Digital Technologies on Firms' Innovation Performance," Journal of Business Research, CXXXIII, pp. 327–336, 2021.
[12] C. Chen, Y. Zhang, and S. Wang, "Digital Transformation and Firm Performance: A Case Study on China's Listed Companies in 2009–2020," Digital Economy and Sustainable Development, I, Article 18, 2023.
[13] J. Wang, Y. Liu, W. Wang, and H. Wu, "How Does Digital Transformation Drive Green Total Factor Productivity? Evidence from Chinese Listed Enterprises," Journal of Cleaner Production, CDVI, Article 136954, 2023.
[14] Z. He, H. Huang, H. Choi, and A. Bilgihan, "Building Organizational Resilience with Digital Transformation," Journal of Service Management, XXXIV (1), pp. 147–171, 2023.
[15] M. Abou-Foul, J. L. Ruiz-Alba, and A. Soares, "The Impact of Digitalization and Servitization on the Financial Performance of a Firm: An Empirical Analysis," Production Planning & Control, XXXII (12), pp. 975−989, 2021.

Author Profile

Sun Jiangbaihe obtained a bachelor's degree from Shanghai Lixin University of Accounting and Finance in China in 2019, and a master's degree from Harbin Institute of Technology in China in 2021. Currently, she is pursuing a doctoral degree in Business Administration at City University of Malaysia. Her research interests include digital transformation, firm performance, innovation investment, and capital allocation efficiency.

Badrul Hisham Bin Kamaruddin received his Ph.D. from Universiti Utara Malaysia in 2007. He is currently an Adjunct Professor at the CityGraduate School, City University Malaysia. His research interestsinclude corporate finance, Islamic finance, supply chain finance,production efficiency, and Islamic entrepreneurship.