



INDIAN JOURNAL OF
LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 7 OF 2026

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION



INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN – 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/>

Journal's Editorial Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/>

Volume 6 and Issue 7 of 2026 (Access Full Issue on – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-6-and-issue-7-of-2026/>)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 73059 14348 – info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in



© Institute of Legal Education

Copyright Disclaimer: All rights are reserve with Institute of Legal Education. No part of the material published on this website (Articles or Research Papers including those published in this journal) may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher. For more details refer <https://ijlr.iledu.in/terms-and-condition/>

ROLE OF DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION IN IMPROVING CORPORATE WORK EFFICIENCY

AUTHOR – ASHWINI S, STUDENT AT SCHOOL OF LAW, VELS INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND ADVANCED STUDIES (VISTAS)

BEST CITATION – ASHWINI S, ROLE OF DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION IN IMPROVING CORPORATE WORK EFFICIENCY, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 6 (7) OF 2026, PG. 113-118, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN – 2583-2344.

ABSTRACT

Digital transformation has emerged as one of the defining strategic imperatives of the twenty-first century, fundamentally reshaping how corporations organise work, deploy resources, and deliver value. This article investigates the role of digital transformation in improving corporate work efficiency across Indian manufacturing, financial services, and information technology sectors. Drawing on a mixed-methods research design – comprising survey data from 385 managerial respondents and qualitative case studies from six organisations – the study constructs and validates a Digital Transformation–Work Efficiency (DTWE) framework. Structural equation modelling results demonstrate that technology adoption breadth and integration depth account for

61.3 per cent of variance in efficiency outcomes, mediated through five principal pathways: process automation, knowledge management, communication infrastructure, data-driven decision-making, and workforce capability development. Findings confirm that strategic alignment and change management quality are the most consequential moderating factors, and that a technology-first, strategy-later approach consistently yields disappointing efficiency returns.

Keywords: *Digital Transformation, Corporate Work Efficiency, Process Automation, Artificial Intelligence, Organisational Performance.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The first two decades of the twenty-first century have witnessed an unprecedented convergence of technological capabilities, market pressures, and evolving consumer expectations, collectively precipitating the era of 'digital transformation.' Unlike prior waves of technological change – which involved incremental automation of discrete functions – digital transformation represents a holistic reimagining of how organisations create, deliver, and capture value through the integration of digital technologies across all aspects of business operations (Vial, 2019).

The global digital transformation market, valued at approximately USD 1.7 trillion in 2019, is

projected to grow at a CAGR of 23.9 per cent to exceed USD 6.8 trillion by 2030. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated corporate digital adoption timelines by an estimated three to seven years, underscoring digital preparedness as a critical determinant of organisational resilience (McKinsey Global Institute, 2020). In India, the Digital India initiative (2015), the National Digital Communications Policy (2018), and the Unified Payments Interface – processing over 10 billion transactions per month by 2024 – have created a distinctive enabling environment for corporate digital adoption.

Despite the proliferation of research on digital transformation, a significant gap persists regarding the precise mechanisms through

which it translates into measurable efficiency improvements. Much existing research is descriptive rather than explanatory, disproportionately drawn from advanced economies, and lacks sector-specific empirical depth. This study addresses these gaps through a mixed-methods investigation of Indian corporations across three sectors, constructing and validating the DTWE framework as both a theoretical and practical tool.

2. CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Digital transformation is operationalised in this study as a multidimensional construct encompassing: technology adoption breadth; integration depth (the degree of embedment in core processes); data utilisation maturity; organisational agility; and ecosystem connectivity. Corporate work efficiency is defined across four sub-dimensions: process efficiency, decision-making efficiency, communication efficiency, and human resource efficiency.

The DTWE framework draws on three theoretical pillars. The Resource-Based View (Barney, 1991; Bharadwaj, 2000) establishes that efficiency gains derive not from technologies per se – available to all competitors – but from the distinctive organisational capabilities and human capital that enable some firms to exploit digital technologies more effectively. Dynamic Capabilities theory (Teece, Pisano & Shuen, 1997) directs attention to the capacity to sense, seize, and reconfigure in response to evolving digital environments. Sociotechnical systems theory (Trist & Bamforth, 1951; Mumford, 2006) cautions against techno-determinism, insisting that technological and social systems must be co-designed for optimal outcomes.

Subsequent research has confirmed that technology's efficiency potential is unlocked through strategic alignment, change management, and workforce capability development (Kane et al., 2019; Westerman, Bonnet & McAfee, 2014).

3. SURVEY

The study adopts a pragmatic, explanatory sequential mixed-methods design. In the quantitative phase, a structured survey was administered to 385 valid respondents – managers and executives at Deputy Manager level and above – across Indian manufacturing, financial services, and IT sectors, using stratified random sampling across three organisational size categories. Data were collected between September 2023 and February 2024.

The survey instrument measured digital transformation adoption (24-item scale), corporate work efficiency (18-item scale), five DTWE mediating variables, and moderating variables, all on seven-point Likert scales. Quantitative analysis applied descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in AMOS 26, and structural equation modelling (SEM). All sub-scales achieved alpha values above 0.80; the revised CFA model demonstrated good fit (CFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.051).

In the qualitative phase, six organisations were purposively selected for maximum variation across sector, size, and digital maturity: two manufacturing, two financial services, and two IT firms. Thirty-eight semi-structured interviews were conducted between October 2023 and March 2024. Thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) and cross-case comparison were applied. Triangulation across both data streams strengthens the credibility of conclusions.

4. THE DTWE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The DTWE framework positions digital transformation as an antecedent construct influencing corporate work efficiency through five distinct, interrelated mediating pathways, moderated by strategic alignment, organisational culture and change management, and environmental context.

4.1 Process Automation

Technologies including RPA, AI-powered workflow management, and ERP systems

reduce cycle times, eliminate manual errors, and reallocate human labour to higher-value tasks. The pathway's efficiency impact is moderated by process standardisation readiness and automation governance quality. Deloitte's (2019) global RPA survey documented average cycle time reductions of 60 per cent and cost reductions of 40 per cent for automated processes.

4.2 Knowledge Management

Digital knowledge management systems – enterprise wikis, AI-powered search tools, and video repositories – reduce knowledge access times, improve transfer accuracy, and preserve institutional knowledge against employee attrition. This pathway is moderated by knowledge culture and system quality, reflecting the sociotechnical principle that digital tools generate efficiency gains only within supportive organisational conditions (Alavi & Leidner, 2001).

4.3 Communication Infrastructure

Digital communication platforms compress the transaction costs of coordination, enabling asynchronous collaboration and reducing communication delays. Communication overload and digital fatigue can partially offset efficiency gains, making communication governance quality a critical moderating variable (Mazmanian, Orlikowski & Yates, 2013).

4.4 Data-Driven Decision-Making

This pathway represents the highest-value efficiency mechanism. Advanced analytics and AI-powered decision support systems enable faster, more accurate, and more consistent decisions at all levels – from automated operational rules embedded in ERP systems to strategic AI-powered forecasting (Davenport & Harris, 2007). Data quality, governance, and analytical capability are essential moderators; organisations that neglect data infrastructure consistently realise lower efficiency returns regardless of tool sophistication.

4.5 Workforce Capability Development

Digital learning platforms and AI-powered personalised training systems enable more efficient and scalable workforce development than traditional classroom models. Research on 'digital leadership' highlights the importance of senior leaders who frame transformation as employee empowerment, maximising efficiency returns across all DTWE pathways (Accenture, 2017). The pathway is moderated by learning culture and the coherence of the organisation's digital talent strategy.

5. FINDINGS

5.1 Quantitative Results

The direct effect of digital transformation adoption on corporate work efficiency is positive and statistically significant ($\beta = 0.41, p < 0.001$). Among the five mediating pathways, data-driven decision-making exhibits the strongest path coefficient ($\beta = 0.68$), followed by process automation ($\beta = 0.62$), workforce capability development ($\beta = 0.55$), communication infrastructure ($\beta = 0.49$), and knowledge management ($\beta = 0.43$). The model explains 61.3 per cent of variance in corporate work efficiency – high for a complex, multi-pathway SEM study. Bootstrapped mediation analysis (5,000 iterations) confirms statistically significant indirect effects through all five pathways.

Moderated mediation analysis identified significant interaction effects: strategic alignment amplifying the data-driven decision-making pathway ($\Delta R^2 = 0.038, p = 0.003$) and change management quality amplifying the workforce capability development pathway ($\Delta R^2 = 0.029, p = 0.011$). IT services firms demonstrated the highest digital transformation adoption and efficiency scores (DTA: $M = 5.67$; CWE: $M = 5.48$ on seven-point scales), followed by financial services and manufacturing, reflecting India's advanced IT sector maturity.

5.2 Qualitative Case Study Evidence

Case Organisation A – a large manufacturing conglomerate – achieved procurement cycle time reductions of 47 per cent, inventory cost reductions of 22 per cent, and a 38 per cent reduction in unplanned production downtime through IoT-based predictive maintenance within eighteen months of full ERP and IoT deployment. However, middle management resistance substantially delayed efficiency realisation, resolved only through a twelve-month change management programme encompassing communication campaigns, hands-on training, and plant-level digital champions. The Chief Digital Officer observed that 'the technology was ready before the people were.'

Case Organisation B – a mid-sized private bank – reduced retail loan processing time by 80.6 per cent (from 7.2 to 1.4 days) and documentation error rates from 12.3 per cent to 1.8 per cent through RPA. An AI credit scoring model improved risk prediction accuracy by 23 per cent, reducing non-performing asset creation by approximately 15 per cent. Critically, a fourteen-month data cleansing programme was required before analytics could be productively deployed, illustrating that data quality is 'the most underestimated element of the digital journey.'

Case Organisation C – a large IT services firm – achieved a 31 per cent increase in developer productivity and a 24 per cent reduction in code defect rates through AI-assisted coding tools. Its proprietary Knowledge Graph system reduced average knowledge search time from 22 minutes to 4.3 minutes per query. Cross-case analysis confirmed that the most substantial efficiency gains occurred consistently in organisations that: invested in foundational data infrastructure before advanced analytics; designed change management proportionate to the disruption involved; aligned digital initiatives with clear strategic priorities; and treated workforce capability development as a continuous

commitment rather than episodic training.

6. THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Three cross-cutting themes emerge from the qualitative evidence. First, the primacy of strategy over technology: organisations approaching digital transformation as a strategic endeavour – with clear efficiency objectives, explicit technology-to-outcome linkages, and engaged senior leadership – consistently realised the most substantial and sustainable efficiency gains, confirming Kane et al.'s (2019) assertion that strategy, not technology, drives digital transformation. Second, the centrality of data quality: governance and data quality management were critical, frequently underestimated determinants of efficiency gains. Third, the human change management imperative: the pace of efficiency improvement was substantially determined by the speed of human adaptation, requiring sustained investment in digital literacy, transparent communication, and employee involvement.

The study makes three primary theoretical contributions. First, the DTWE framework provides an integrated, multi-pathway account that synthesises the Resource-Based View, Dynamic Capabilities theory, and sociotechnical systems theory – in a manner no prior framework achieves independently. Second, empirical validation in an Indian emerging market context advances knowledge on digital transformation dynamics outside advanced economies. Third, the conceptualisation of corporate work efficiency as a four-dimensional construct, and the associated validated survey instrument, constitutes a replicable methodological contribution for future research.

7. CONCLUSIONS

This study confirms that digital transformation is a powerful and empirically demonstrable driver of corporate work efficiency, explaining 61.3 per cent of efficiency variance through the five DTWE framework pathways. Data-driven

decision-making and process automation are the most powerful mediating mechanisms; workforce capability development ranks third – suggesting that digital talent investment is nearly as efficiency-consequential as technology investment itself, a finding with significant implications for resource allocation.

For corporate leaders, key imperatives include: institutionalising digital transformation governance with explicit accountability for efficiency outcomes; prioritising data infrastructure and governance before deploying advanced analytics; and designing workforce capability development as a continuous strategic investment. Chief Digital Officers should link technology investment decisions to DTWE pathway analysis relevant to their sector context rather than pursuing technology adoption for its own sake.

For policymakers, targeted support for mid-sized manufacturing firms – exhibiting the greatest gap between digital potential and current maturity – is essential, including subsidised cloud access, industry-specific advisory services, and SME co-investment programmes. Regulatory frameworks governing data governance should be designed to enable rather than impede legitimate data-driven efficiency improvement, with the draft Digital Personal Data Protection Act as a key vehicle.

References

1. Accenture. (2017). Harnessing revolution: Creating the future workforce. Accenture Strategy.
2. Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1), 107–136.
3. Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
4. Bharadwaj, A. S. (2000). A resource-based perspective on information technology capability and firm performance. *MIS Quarterly*, 24(1), 169–196.
5. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
6. Brynjolfsson, E., & Hitt, L. M. (1996). Paradox lost? Firm-level evidence on the returns to information systems spending. *Management Science*, 42(4), 541–558.
7. Davenport, T. H., & Harris, J. G. (2007). *Competing on analytics: The new science of winning*. Harvard Business School Press.
8. Deloitte. (2019). *Global robotic process automation survey 2019*. Deloitte Consulting LLP.
9. Fitzgerald, M., Kruschwitz, N., Bonnet, D., & Welch, M. (2014). Embracing digital technology: A new strategic imperative. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 55(2), 1–12.
10. Kane, G. C., Palmer, D., Phillips, A. N., Kiron, D., & Buckley, N. (2015). *Strategy, not technology, drives digital transformation*. MIT Sloan Management Review & Deloitte University Press.
11. Kane, G. C., Phillips, A. N., Copulsky, J., & Andrus, G. (2019). *The technology fallacy*. MIT Press. Mazmanian, M., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. (2013). The autonomy paradox. *Organization Science*, 24(5), 1337–1357.
12. McAfee, A., & Brynjolfsson, E. (2008). Investing in the IT that makes a competitive difference. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(7–8), 98–107.
13. McKinsey Global Institute. (2020). *How COVID-19 has pushed companies over the technology tipping point*.
14. McKinsey & Company.
15. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY). (2019). *India's*

trillion-dollar digital opportunity.

17. Government of India.
18. Mumford, E. (2006). The story of socio-technical design. *Information Systems Journal*, 16(4), 317–342.
19. NASSCOM. (2023). India technology sector: Annual strategic review 2023. National Association of Software and Service Companies.
20. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533.
21. Trist, E. L., & Bamforth, K. W. (1951). Some social and psychological consequences of the Longwall method of coal-getting. *Human Relations*, 4(1), 3–38.
22. van der Aalst, W. M. P., Bichler, M., & Heinzl, A. (2018). Robotic process automation. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 60(4), 269–272.
23. Verhoef, P. C., et al. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889–901.
24. Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 28(2), 118–144.
25. Westerman, G., Bonnet, D., & McAfee, A. (2014). *Leading digital: Turning technology into business transformation*. Harvard Business Review Press.



GRASP - EDUCATE - EVOLVE



INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

(Managed by L TO J LAW ASSOCIATES)

NO. 08, ARUL NAGAR, SEERA THOPPU,
MARUDHAANDA KURICHI, SRIRANGAM - 620102,
TAMILNADU, INDIA.

ISSN 2583-2344



9 772583 234004