

Analysis of power organization and political theory: The dynamics of complexity in the era of digital transformation

Agus Faisal Asyha¹, Yeni Astuti², Subandi Subandi³, Encep Syarifudin⁴, Deden Makbuloh⁵

Raden Intan State Islamic University Lampung, Indonesia^{1,2,3&5}

Sultan Maulana Hasanudin State Islamic University Banten, Indonesia⁴

agusfaisalasyha@radenintan.ac.id



Article History

Received on 5 August 2024

1st Revised on 10 August 2024

Accepted on 18 August 2024

Abstract

Purpose: This study aims to analyze the interconnection between organizational theory, power, and politics in the context of digital transformation, focusing on identifying new patterns in organizational power dynamics and their implications for management effectiveness

Research Methodology: This study adopts a qualitative meta-analysis of 150 academic articles from reputable journals (2000-2024) using Scopus, Web of Science, and JSTOR databases. The analysis used ATLAS.ti software for thematic coding and content analysis, with validation through expert panel reviews from 12 senior academics in the field of organizational theory.

Results: This study identifies five transformative patterns in organizational power: the digitization of authority, hybridization of power structures, emergence of virtual politics, reconfiguration of the influence base, and evolution of control mechanisms. The developed analytical framework integrates digital, structural, and relational dimensions in the analysis of an organization's power.

Conclusions: Digital transformation reshapes processes and power, requiring managers to adapt their strategies to balance authority, relationships, and virtual influence arenas.

Limitations: The major limitations include a focus on the formal organization of the technology and financial sectors and the dominance of literature from advanced economies. The research does not include a direct empirical analysis of power dynamics in purely virtual organizations.

Contribution: This study contributes to the development of contemporary organizational theory through the integration of digital perspectives in power analysis and provides a practical framework for organizational political management in the digital era.

Keywords: *Community, Economic Growth, Suburbs, Urban*

How to Cite: Asyha, A. F., Astuti, Y., Subandil, S., Syariffudin, M., & makbuloh, d. (2024) Analysis of power organization and political theory: The dynamics of complexity in the era of digital transformation. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic Business Studies*, 1(4), 271-284.

1. Introduction

The era of digital transformation has presented a new paradigm for understanding and analyzing organizational theory, especially related to power dynamics and organizational politics (Ernst & Koll, 2024). The complexity arising from the integration of digital technologies into organizational structures and processes demands a fundamental reconceptualization of classical theories of power and politics in the context of organizations. The evolution of the concept of organizational power has gone through several significant phases. Starting from Weber's classic perspective on bureaucratic authority, developing through Mintzberg's behavioral analysis of organizational politics, to a contemporary view

of power as a network phenomenon in the digital age (Ernst & Koll, 2024). Each phase contributes significantly to our understanding of organizational power dynamics; however, digital transformation presents new complexities that require deeper analysis (Chatterjee, Chaudhuri, Vrontis, & Giovando, 2023; Shahzad, Imran, & Butt, 2025).

In the contemporary context, organizational power can no longer be understood solely from a traditional hierarchical perspective. Digitalization has created a new arena for the manifestation and execution of power, where influence can flow through digital networks in patterns different from the formal structure of the organization. Castells, Fernandez-Ardevol, Qiu, and Sey (2009) proposed the concept of "network society" which emphasizes how power in the digital era operates through complex information and communication networks.

This transformation has significant implications for:

1. Organizational Structure
 - a. The emergence of hybrid structures that integrate physical and digital elements
 - b. Reconfiguration of traditional hierarchies towards a network model
 - c. Evolution of coordination and control mechanisms
2. Power Base
 - a. Shift from positional authority to digital expertise
 - b. The emergence of new technology-based sources of power
 - c. Transformation of the legitimacy mechanism of power
3. Political Dynamics
 - a. The emergence of a virtual political arena
 - b. The evolution of influence building strategies in the digital context
 - c. Reconfigure coalition formation processes

The development of artificial intelligence and machine learning technology adds a new dimension to the analysis of organizational power. Algorithms and automated systems are beginning to play a significant role in decision-making, creating new questions about the locus and nature of power in digital organizations.

This research aims to comprehensively analyze the transformation in the theory of power organization and politics in the digital era, focusing on the following:

1. Identify new patterns in the manifestation of organizational power
2. Analysis of the evolution of political dynamics in the digital context
3. Development of a theoretical framework for understanding contemporary organizational power and politics
4. Exploring practical implications for organizational management

The significance of this research lies in its contribution to the following:

- a. Development of organizational theories relevant to the digital age
- b. Provision of an analytical framework for management practitioners
- c. Identify key competencies for organizational political effectiveness
- d. A strategic guide to organizational transformation

The paradigm shift brought about by digital transformation requires not only an expansion of classical organizational theories but also the integration of interdisciplinary perspectives to better understand the fluid nature of power and politics (Huang, Gao, Peng, Yang, & Liu, 2023). Traditional theories focus on structural hierarchies, authority, and control mechanisms; however, the digital era compels scholars to adopt more holistic approaches that combine insights from information systems, communication studies, and sociology. Thus, organizational theory can better address the novel forms of influence and control that are emerging in technologically mediated environments. One of the most profound changes is the decoupling of authority from formal hierarchical positions (He et al., 2022). Whereas in the past, power was tightly bound to titles and ranks, in digitally transformed organizations, influence increasingly flows from expertise, information access, and digital presence. For instance, an employee with deep knowledge of data analytics or artificial intelligence systems may exercise greater

organizational influence than a mid-level manager lacking these skills. This transformation reflects the democratization of power, where authority can emerge from knowledge and technological literacy rather than positional hierarchy alone (Hu & Zhang, 2024).

The emergence of hybrid organizational structures is reshaping the enactment of coordination and control. Instead of relying solely on bureaucratic chains of command, organizations are experimenting with networked governance models in which digital tools enable decentralized decision-making. Virtual teams, cross-functional task forces, and platform-based collaborations allow organizations to leverage distributed expertise in real time (Jämsen and Sivunen, 2025; Kanon, 2024). However, this shift also creates challenges for managers, who must balance flexibility and innovation with accountability and coherence across the organization. In terms of political dynamics, digital platforms have created a new arena in which symbolic power, visibility, and narratives play central roles. The virtual political arena operates differently from traditional organizational politics because it is more transparent, instantaneous, and often technology amplified. For example, internal communication platforms or collaborative tools can become spaces where employees shape organizational discourse, challenge authority, and mobilize coalitions around shared concerns. Therefore, managers must recognize that influence is no longer confined to boardrooms or closed meetings but extends to digital forums, where legitimacy is contested and constructed in real time (Handke, Aldana, Costa, & O'Neill, 2024; Liu & Zhang, 2022).

Artificial intelligence and machine learning add another layer of complexity to organizational power. Algorithms can mediate decision-making processes, determining resource allocation, employee performance evaluation and customer engagement strategies. In this context, power is not only exercised by humans but is also embedded within technological systems. This raises critical questions: Who designs these algorithms? How transparent are their decision-making criteria? How can organizations ensure accountability when power is partially delegated to nonhuman agents? Such questions illustrate the need to reconceptualize power as a hybrid phenomenon that involves both human agency and technological mediation. From a managerial perspective, the digital transformation of power and politics has several implications for the public sector. First, leadership must evolve to include digital fluency as a core competency (Lai & Rau; Nilsson et al., 2025). Leaders who cannot navigate digital tools or understand technological systems risk losing their legitimacy in the eyes of their employees and stakeholders. Second, managers must develop new strategies for influence building that combine structural authority with relational and network-based approaches. This involves fostering trust, enabling open communication, and leveraging digital platforms as collaborative spaces rather than control. Third, organizations must pay attention to ethical considerations, ensuring that the use of technology in power relations does not result in exploitation, exclusion, or surveillance practices that undermine employee well-being and trust (Cheong, 2024; Papagiannidis, Mikalef, & Conboy, 2025).

The transformation of legitimacy mechanisms also deserves attention. In traditional organizations, legitimacy often stems from hierarchical authority and compliance with established rules. In the digital era, legitimacy is increasingly linked to transparency, inclusiveness, and responsiveness. Employees expect leaders to justify decisions openly, involve diverse voices in the decision-making process, and demonstrate adaptability in rapidly changing environments. Failure to meet these expectations can result in resistance, disengagement, or even digital forms of protest, such as collective action on social media platforms. At the theoretical level, this study contributes to the development of a new framework that integrates the digital, structural, and relational dimensions of organizational power. Such a framework recognizes that digital transformation does not erase classical power dynamics but overlays them with new complexities. Bureaucratic authority remains relevant, but it interacts with digital expertise, networked influence, and algorithmic mediation. Understanding these intersections is crucial for scholars and practitioners who aim to make sense of contemporary organizations (Albu & Christensen, 2024; Fu & Wang, 2024).

The practical significance of this study lies in providing management practitioners with actionable insights. Organizations undergoing digital transformation can use the proposed framework as a strategic guide to anticipate shifts in power relations and design adaptive structures that harness rather than resist these changes. For example, organizations might develop training programs to enhance digital literacy

among managers, establish ethical guidelines for algorithmic decision-making, or create inclusive digital platforms that encourage employee participation in governance. These initiatives not only strengthen organizational effectiveness but also build resilience against ongoing technological disruptions. Looking ahead, further research is needed to empirically investigate the manifestations of power in fully digital organizations such as remote-first companies or platform-based enterprises. These organizations offer unique contexts in which digital interactions dominate and traditional hierarchies are often minimized or reconfigured. Comparative studies across sectors and cultural settings would also enrich our understanding of how digital transformation shapes organizational power globally, revealing variations influenced by institutional, economic, and cultural factors (Ngaliman et al., 2025; Wijayanti et al., 2025).

In conclusion, the digital era has ushered in a fundamental rethinking of organizational power and political structures. The integration of digital technologies reshapes authority, structures, and political dynamics in ways that demand both theoretical innovation and managerial adaptation to new realities. By recognizing new patterns of influence, developing competencies for digital leadership, and ensuring the ethical use of technology, organizations can navigate this transformation more effectively and sustain their legitimacy in the eyes of stakeholders. This study underscores the urgency of developing contemporary organizational theories that not only reflect technological realities but also provide practical tools for managing the complexities of power and politics in the digital age.

2. Literature review

2.1 The Evolution of Organizational Power Theory

2.1.1 Classical Perspective

Classical organizational power theory, initiated by Putri (2022) with the concept of bureaucratic authority, emphasizes hierarchical structure and formalization of power. It further identifies five power bases – legitimate, reward, coercive, expert, and referent power – that form the foundation for understanding the sources of power in an organization. Mintzberg (1983) expanded this understanding by conceptualizing organizations as political arenas, where different interest groups interact and compete for resources and influence. Pfeffer (1981) added a strategic dimension by emphasizing the importance of resource dependency in organizational power dynamics. The development of organizational power theory did not stop at classical and strategic perspectives. Over time, scholars have highlighted the relational and network-based dimensions of power that emerge in complex organizational environments. Power is no longer viewed merely as a static attribute tied to position or resources but as something dynamic that is shaped through continuous interactions among actors. This relational view emphasizes negotiation, coalition building, and the role of informal structures that often exist alongside formal hierarchies. Informal leaders, opinion shapers, and experts in specific domains may wield significant influence even without formal authority, demonstrating the fluidity of organizational power in practice.

As organizations have become increasingly globalized and technology-driven, new layers have been added to the analysis of power and politics. The rise of digital communication platforms has introduced novel mechanisms for influence, visibility, and agenda-setting. Employees can now mobilize support, share ideas, and challenge decisions through digital forums that cut across organizational silos. This represents a shift from closed-door politics to more transparent and participatory organizational dynamics. The digital environment also accelerates the speed of political interactions, making influence building a continuous and often public process. Furthermore, the intersection of organizational power with culture and identity has received increasing attention. Power is not only about controlling resources or decision-making but also about shaping organizational norms, values, and narratives. Leaders who can align power with cultural meaning-making gain legitimacy that goes beyond their positional authority. In today's digital and multicultural organizations, this cultural dimension is amplified as diverse groups bring different expectations, communication styles, and perceptions of authority. Understanding how these dimensions interact with classical theories of bureaucratic, resource-based, and political perspectives is essential for building a comprehensive framework of organizational power suited to the complexities of the 21st century (Endriyon, Gunarto, & Murwiati, 2025; Wijayanti et al., 2025).

2.1.2 Contributions of Contemporary Theory

The development of network theory (Castells et al., 2009) brings a new perspective to the analysis of organizational power, emphasizing the importance of position and connectivity in socio-organizational networks. Theorization of distributed leadership Gronn (2002) and shared leadership Pearce and Conger (2002) further change the understanding of the distribution and exercise of power in the organization. The incorporation of network theory into organizational analysis marks a significant departure from traditional hierarchical views, as it situates power not simply in titles or resources, but in the strategic positioning of actors within networks of communication and collaboration. Connectivity is a crucial determinant of influence, as individuals or groups occupying central or bridging positions in a network can control information flows, mediate relationships, and facilitate coordination across different units. This highlights that organizational power increasingly operates in decentralized forms, where value lies in the capacity to build and sustain effective connections rather than in formal authority.

Building on this foundation, distributed and shared leadership theories provide a framework for understanding how leadership responsibilities are no longer confined to top management but are spread across multiple organizational levels. Distributed leadership emphasizes that decision-making authority and initiative can emerge at various nodes in an organizational network, fostering greater adaptability and responsiveness. Shared leadership extends this concept by suggesting that leadership is a collective process in which influence is exercised reciprocally among group or team members. Both perspectives challenge the traditional “leader-follower” dichotomy and reframe leadership as an evolving practice embedded within the interactions. These theoretical advancements have important implications for modern organizations undergoing digital transformation. In virtual teams, for instance, leadership and power often emerge from individuals who demonstrate expertise in technology, communication, or project management, regardless of their formal position. This reinforces the idea that effective leadership is contingent on relational dynamics, digital competencies, and the ability to mobilize collective intelligence. Consequently, organizations must design structures, cultures, and systems that not only acknowledge but also actively support distributed power and leadership, ensuring resilience and innovation in rapidly changing environments (Indriyani & Maryani, 2023).

2.2 Digital Transformation and Organizational Power

2.2.1 Technological Impact Theory

Orlikowski (2000) developed a technology-in-practice framework that explains how technology shapes and is shaped by organizational practices. Zuboff (2019) Through surveillance capitalism theory, a new dimension of power in the digital era is revealed, where data and algorithms are a strategic source of power. The Technology-in-Practice perspective highlights the mutually constitutive relationship between technology and organizational routines. Technology is not merely a neutral tool applied within a fixed structure; it becomes embedded in day-to-day practices, shaping how work is done, how decisions are made, and how authority is enacted. Conversely, organizational actors also shape technology through patterns of use, customization, and interpretation, producing diverse outcomes even with the same technological system. This dynamic interaction underscores that organizational power in the digital era is closely tied to the appropriation and enactment of technologies within specific contexts. Individuals or groups who possess the skills to navigate and reinterpret these technologies often gain strategic advantages, becoming central to the organizational processes of innovation and control.

The emergence of surveillance capitalism extends this analysis by showing how data have evolved into a critical source of power. In digital organizations, information about behavior, preferences, and interactions is continuously captured, processed, and monetized. Algorithms play a decisive role in filtering information, predicting outcomes, and guiding organizational strategies. This creates a new locus of power situated within data infrastructures and algorithmic systems, which are often opaque and inaccessible to most organizational members. Those who control data analytics capabilities and algorithmic design effectively hold a disproportionate influence over decision-making processes, resource distribution, and even organizational culture. These developments challenge traditional notions of authority and legitimacy, as power increasingly resides not only in hierarchical roles but also in the

control of technological infrastructure. For management, this means recognizing data governance, digital ethics, and algorithmic transparency as essential dimensions of organizational policy. It also necessitates building competencies in critical digital literacy across all levels of the organization, ensuring that technology empowers, rather than disempowers, members of the organization. By situating technology as both a medium and source of power, contemporary organizations must rethink their strategies for leadership, accountability, and fairness in a digitally mediated environment.

2.2.2 Virtual Organization Theory

Virtual organization theory DeSanctis and Monge (1999) provides a foundation for understanding power dynamics in the digital context, while the concept of digital workplace (Kane, 2019). Expand the understanding of the manifestation of power in hybrid work environments. In the digital era, virtual organization theory emphasizes how networks of individuals and teams, often geographically dispersed, rely heavily on information and communication technologies (ICT) to collaborate and coordinate their activities. This framework highlights that power within virtual organizations is not solely determined by hierarchical authority, but also by control over digital resources, access to information, and the ability to influence communication flows. For example, an employee with high digital literacy and the capacity to utilize advanced collaboration tools may wield more practical power than one who holds a formal title but lacks digital competence. This shift underscores the importance of “knowledge power” and “network centrality” in contemporary organizations.

Meanwhile, the concept of the digital workplace, as articulated by Kane (2019), broadens this discussion by examining how hybrid work models reshape organizations’ control and empowerment. The digital workplace integrates both physical and virtual environments, enabling employees to perform tasks seamlessly across different locations. In such settings, power dynamics manifest in new ways, for instance, through the design of digital platforms that regulate visibility, monitoring, and performance evaluation. The rise of algorithmic management, where data-driven systems track productivity and guide decision-making, demonstrates how technology embeds new forms of control while simultaneously offering employees greater flexibility and autonomy in their work.

Furthermore, the convergence of virtual organization and digital workplace theories illustrates the tension between empowerment and surveillance in modern organizations. On the one hand, employees gain autonomy, flexibility, and the ability to collaborate across boundaries; on the other hand, they face the potential for increased oversight through digital monitoring tools. This duality suggests that power in hybrid environments is fluid and negotiated through both human interactions and technological infrastructure. Thus, leaders must balance fostering innovation and trust while managing accountability and controlling digitally mediated work systems.

2.3 Organizational Politics in the Digital Era

2.3.1 Digital Political Theory

Studies on e-leadership (Avolio, Wernsing, and Gardner, 2018) and virtual team dynamics (Gilson, Maynard, Jones Young, Vartiainen, and Hakonen, 2015) provide insight into the transformation of the political process in the digital context. Theory of digital influence Rogers (2013) provides a framework for understanding the mechanisms of influence in a virtual environment. In this regard, e-leadership illustrates how leaders must adapt their communication styles, decision-making strategies, and methods of mobilizing support in online environments where face-to-face interactions are limited or absent. Leaders in digital spaces rely heavily on technology-mediated communication tools, such as social media, video conferencing, and collaborative platforms, which significantly shape how they convey authority, inspire trust, and build legitimacy. Similarly, research on virtual team dynamics highlights that collaboration in political or organizational contexts is increasingly shaped by distributed teams that depend on digital networks for coordination. These dynamics underscore the growing importance of interpersonal trust, clarity of communication, and digital competence as the foundations of effective leadership in virtual political processes.

The theory of digital influence complements these perspectives by explaining how this influence spreads through digital networks. Unlike traditional political influence, which depends on physical

presence, speeches, or direct mobilization, digital influence leverages algorithms, viral content, and network effects to reach broader audiences. This phenomenon demonstrates how political actors, activists, and organizations can harness social media to amplify their voices, create movements, and rapidly shape public opinion. Consequently, the digital era has transformed political power into a dynamic interplay between technological affordances, network structures, and the strategic use of influence mechanisms in virtual environments.

2.3.2 Network Politics

Social network theory in the digital context (Borgatti and Foster, 2003) helps explain new patterns in coalition formation and the exercise of power through digital networks. In the digital era, social network theory provides a powerful lens for understanding how relationships and interactions on online platforms shape political and organizational outcomes. Unlike traditional hierarchical structures, digital networks emphasize horizontal connections, where influence is derived from the density, centrality, and reach of an actor's position in the network. This means that individuals or groups with strategic ties to multiple clusters can act as brokers, facilitating coalition-building and amplifying collective action. In political contexts, these dynamics are visible in the formation of online communities and advocacy groups that transcend geographical and cultural boundaries of the country.

Moreover, digital networks enable the rapid diffusion of ideas, symbols, and narratives that strengthen solidarity and mobilize mass participation. The ability to share information virally creates opportunities for grassroots coalitions to challenge established power structures to gain power. Simultaneously, the design of digital platforms, including algorithms that shape visibility and engagement, plays a crucial role in determining whose voices are amplified or marginalized. This highlights the dual nature of power in digital networks, where empowerment and exclusion can occur simultaneously. Thus, social network theory not only explains how digital coalitions emerge, but also reveals the structural inequalities embedded in the architecture of online connectivity.

2.4 Hypothesis Development

Based on the literature review above, this study develops the following hypotheses:

H1: Digital Power Structure

H1a: Organizational digitalization is positively related to the decentralization of power.

1. Theoretical Foundations: Network theory (Castells et al., 2009).
2. Argument: Digital technology facilitates the distribution of power through networks, thereby reducing reliance on traditional hierarchies.

H1b: The rate of adoption of digital technologies is positively correlated with the emergence of new power sources.

1. Theoretical Foundation: Technology-in-practice framework (Orlikowski, 2000).
2. Argument: Digitalization creates a new power base that is based on technology and digital expertise.

H2: Virtual Political Dynamics

H2a: The intensity of virtual interactions has a positive effect on the complexity of organizational politics.

1. Theoretical Foundations: Virtual organization theory (DeSanctis & Monge, 1999)
2. Argument: The virtual environment creates a new political arena with complex dynamics.

H2b: Digital competence is positively correlated with political effectiveness in modern organizations.

1. Theoretical Foundations: E-leadership theory (Avolio et al., 2018)
2. Argument: The ability to navigate the digital environment is crucial for political success.

H3: Hybrid Power Mechanisms

H3a: The integration of digital systems increases the complexity of the organizational control mechanisms.

1. Theoretical Foundations: Surveillance capitalism theory (Zuboff, 2019)
2. Argument: Digital technology enables new forms of surveillance and control.

H3b: Hybrid work arrangements are positively related to the emergence of new power forms.

1. Theoretical Foundations: Digital workplace theory (Kane, 2019)

2. Argument: Hybrid work environments create the need for adaptive power mechanisms.

H4: Network Power Flow

H4a: Digital network density is positively correlated with the effectiveness of influence building.

1. Theoretical Foundations: Social network theory (Borgatti & Foster, 2003)
2. Argument: Network connectivity facilitates the spread of influence within organizations.

H4b: Platform-based interactions positively affect the formation of political coalitions.

1. Theoretical Foundations: Theory of digital influence (Rogers, 2013)
2. Argument: Digital platforms facilitate the formation and maintenance of these strategic alliances.

2.5 Theoretical Implications

The developed hypothesis has several theoretical implications.

1. Integration Requirement
 - a. The need for the integration of classical theory with digital perspectives
 - b. Development of a hybrid framework for power analysis
 - c. Reconceptualization of organizational politics
2. Methodological Implications
 - a. The need for research methods that can accommodate digital complexity
 - b. Development of new measurement instruments
 - c. Adaptation of data analysis techniques
3. Practical Considerations
 - a. Implications for organizational design
 - b. The need for new competency development
 - c. Change management strategies

2.6 Research Model Development

Based on the hypothesis developed, this study proposes an integrated research model that includes:

1. Independent Variables
 - Digital transformation intensity
 - Virtual interaction level
 - Technology adoption rate
 - Network connectivity density
2. Dependent Variables
 - Power structure configuration
 - Political effectiveness
 - Control mechanism complexity
 - Influence building success
3. Moderating Variables
 - Organizational size
 - Industry type
 - Digital maturity level
 - Cultural context

This research model provides a comprehensive framework for testing hypotheses and analyzing the interrelationships between variables in the context of digital transformation in organizations.

3. Research methodology

This study adopts a qualitative meta-analysis approach with a systematic review of academic literature related to organizational theory, power, and politics in the period 2000-2024. The academic databases used were Scopus, Web of Science, and JSTOR. A total of 150 articles were analyzed using specific inclusion criteria related to relevance, methodology, and theoretical contributions. The data analysis process used ATLAS.ti software for thematic coding and content analysis, with the development of coding schemes through an iterative process involving multiple coders. The validity of the analysis was guaranteed through an expert panel review by 12 senior academics in the field of organizational theory, with a focus group discussion to validate the interpretation of the findings.

The analytical framework was developed through an iterative synthesizing process, integrating classical theoretical perspectives with contemporary observations of digital transformation. Multiple triangulation was applied to ensure the robustness of the analysis, including theoretical triangulation, data source triangulation, and investigator triangulation. Methodological limitations are recognized in terms of the focus on formal academic literature and the dominance of perspectives from advanced economies. However, the depth of analysis and rigorous methodological approach provide a solid foundation for comprehensively understanding the phenomena studied.

4. Results and discussions

4.1 Fundamental Transformation of Organizational Power

4.1.1 Digital Power Ecosystem

The analysis reveals the emergence of a digital power ecosystem characterized by:

1. Power Base Interconnectivity
 - a. Integration of traditional sources of power with digital capabilities
 - b. Emergence platform-based authority
 - c. Transformation of the legitimacy mechanism of power
2. Digital Resource Control
 - a. Data as a source of strategic power
 - b. Algorithmic governance mechanisms
 - c. Cloud infrastructure control
3. Network Power Dynamics
 - a. Virtual influence patterns
 - b. Digital coalition formation
 - c. Cross-boundary power flows

4.1.2 Hybrid Authority Structures

This research identifies the evolution of authority structures that integrate traditional and digital elements.

1. Dual-Mode Leadership
 - a. Combination of physical presence and virtual authority
 - b. Synchronous and asynchronous power exercise
 - c. Multi-channel influence building
2. Flexible Power Hierarchies
 - a. Dynamic authority redistribution
 - b. Situational power allocation
 - c. Context-specific leadership roles

4.2 Organizational Politics in the Digital Era

4.2.1 Virtual Political Arena

The analysis reveals the distinctive characteristics of the virtual political arena.

1. Digital Influence Tactics
 - a. Online presence management
 - b. Virtual coalition building
 - c. Digital reputation engineering
2. Technology-Mediated Power Play
 - a. Platform-specific political strategies
 - b. Digital resource leveraging
 - c. Virtual networking politics

4.2.2 Political Competence Evolution

This research identifies the transformation in political competence that is needed:

1. Digital Political Skills
 - a. Virtual influence capabilities
 - b. Online coalition management
 - c. Digital conflict resolution
2. Hybrid Political Intelligence

- a. Multi-context situational awareness
- b. Cross-platform political sensitivity
- c. Digital-physical integration competence

4.3 Organizational Power Dynamics

4.3.1 Power Flow Patterns

The analysis reveals new patterns in the organizational flow of power.

- 1. Network-Based Power Distribution
 - a. Decentralized authority structures
 - b. Peer-to-peer influence mechanisms
 - c. Collaborative power sharing
- 2. Digital Power Amplification
 - a. Technology-enhanced authority
 - b. Platform-enabled influence scaling
 - c. Digital leverage mechanisms

4.3.2 Control Mechanism Evolution

This study identifies the transformations in organizational control mechanisms.

- 1. Digital Surveillance Systems
 - a. Automated performance monitoring
 - b. Data-driven control mechanisms
 - c. AI-powered oversight
- 2. Hybrid Control Frameworks
 - a. Integration of traditional and digital controls
 - b. Multi-layer monitoring systems
 - c. Adaptive control mechanisms

4.4 Future Implications

4.4.1 Theoretical Development Needs

The analysis identifies the need for theoretical development.

- 1. Digital Power Theory
 - a. Integration of technology perspectives
 - b. Network-based power models
 - c. Virtual influence frameworks
- 2. Hybrid Political Theory
 - a. Multi-context political models
 - b. Digital-physical integration frameworks
 - c. Cross-boundary political dynamics

4.4.2 Practical Implementation Challenges

Research has revealed implementation challenges.

- 1. Digital Transformation Management
 - a. Power structure adaptation
 - b. Political system evolution
 - c. Leadership development needs
- 2. Organizational Design Requirements
 - a. Hybrid structure development
 - b. Digital capability building
 - c. Political system integration

4.5 Discussion Results

4.5.1. Fundamental Shifts in Organizational Power

This study identified five fundamental shifts in organizational power:

- 1. Digital Authority Emergence
 - a. Transformation of the legitimacy base of power

- b. Integration of technology in the exercise of power
 - c. Evolution of leadership mechanisms
- 2. Network Power Dynamics
 - a. Decentralized authority patterns
 - b. Virtual influence mechanisms
 - c. Cross-boundary power flows
- 3. Hybrid Political Systems
 - a. Integration of traditional and digital politics
 - b. Multi-channel political strategies
 - c. Adaptive political mechanisms

4.5.2. Framework Development

This research resulted in a comprehensive framework for digital power analysis.

- 1. Digital Power Assessment Model
 - a. Power source evaluation metrics
 - b. Influence mechanism analysis
 - c. Impact measurement systems
- 2. Political Effectiveness Framework
 - a. Digital political skill assessment
 - b. Virtual influence evaluation
 - c. Hybrid political competence metrics

4.5.3. Implementation Guidelines

The results of this study led to the following implementation guidelines:

- 1. Organizational Design Recommendations
 - a. Hybrid structure development
 - b. Digital capability integration
 - c. Political system adaptation
- 2. Leadership Development Guidelines
 - a. Digital leadership competencies
 - b. Virtual influence capabilities
 - c. Political skill enhancement

4.5.4 Future Research Directions

The analysis identifies the following future research directions:

- 1. Theoretical Development Needs
 - a. Digital power theory expansion
 - b. Hybrid political model development
 - c. Cross-cultural framework integration
- 2. Empirical Research Requirements
 - a. Quantitative validation studies
 - b. Longitudinal impact analysis
 - c. Cross-sector comparative research

5. Conclusion

5.1 Conclusion

This study reveals that digital transformation has fundamentally changed the dynamics of power in modern organizations. Digitalization not only encourages the decentralization of organizational power structures but also creates new power bases that differ from the traditional model. Digital networks have become a key factor in the distribution and exercise of power, and virtual environments create political arenas with more complex dynamics. Digital competence is now a determining factor in the effectiveness of organizational politics, with digital platforms facilitating the formation of new strategic coalitions and alliances that were previously impossible to form.

The integration of digital systems into organizations has resulted in complex forms of organizational control. The emerging hybrid work environment requires more adaptive power mechanisms, with network connectivity being a crucial factor in building influence. This transformation not only changes the way power is exercised but also presents new challenges and opportunities in organizational politics.

5.2 Suggestion

Several directions can be considered for future research. First, the development of more robust methodologies for measuring digital variables, including longitudinal studies to understand temporal changes and the integration of qualitative methods for a deeper understanding. Second, contextual expansion through comparative studies across industries and cultures, as well as an in-depth analysis of the impact of specific digital technologies on power dynamics. Third, it focuses on practical applications by developing a framework for digital change management and digital leadership competency development programs.

Theoretically, efforts are needed to integrate classical theory with contemporary digital perspectives and to develop a more comprehensive model of digital organizational politics. Research on the intersection of digital power and organizational ethics is also an important area for further exploration. Considering these aspects, future research can provide a deeper understanding of the transformation of organizational power in the digital age.

5.3 Limitation

Although this study provides valuable insights, it has some limitations that need to be considered. Methodologically, this research model requires empirical validation, and the complexity of the moderating variables requires a large sample for valid testing. Contextual limitations also arise because the model may not be generalizable to all types of organizations, given the differences in digital maturity levels and local cultural influences that have not been fully accommodated. From a temporal perspective, rapid technological developments and the continuous evolution of hybrid work practices may affect the long-term relevance of the findings.

References

- Albu, O., & Christensen, L. (2024). Shadows in the Spotlight: Navigating Organizational Transparency in Digital Contexts. *Schmalenbach Journal of Business Research*, 76. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s41471-024-00190-6>
- Avolio, B. J., Wernsing, T., & Gardner, W. L. (2018). Revisiting the development and validation of the authentic leadership questionnaire: Analytical clarifications. *Journal of management*, 44(2), 399-411. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317739960>
- Borgatti, S. P., & Foster, P. C. (2003). The network paradigm in organizational research: A review and typology. *Journal of management*, 29(6), 991-1013. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(03\)00087-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(03)00087-4)
- Castells, M., Fernandez-Ardevol, M., Qiu, J. L., & Sey, A. (2009). *Mobile communication and society: A global perspective*: Mit Press.
- Chatterjee, S., Chaudhuri, R., Vrontis, D., & Giovando, G. (2023). Digital workplace and organization performance: Moderating role of digital leadership capability. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 8(1), 100334. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2023.100334>
- Cheong, B. C. (2024). Transparency and accountability in AI systems: safeguarding wellbeing in the age of algorithmic decision-making. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics, Volume 6 - 2024*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2024.1421273>
- DeSanctis, G., & Monge, P. (1999). Introduction to the special issue: Communication processes for virtual organizations. *Organization science*, 10(6), 693-703. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.10.6.693>
- Endriyon, E., Gunarto, T., & Murwiati, A. (2025). Measuring the achievements of smart economics in the smart village program in Lampung Province 2020-2024. *Studi Ekonomi dan Kebijakan Publik*, 3(1), 43-60. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/sekp.v3i1.5260>

- Ernst, J., & Koll, H. (2024). Managerial pedagogy and organizational power dynamics in the context of neoliberal organizational transition. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 40(4), 101342. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2024.101342>
- Fu, J. S., & Wang, R. (2024). Multiple pathways to organizational legitimacy: Information visibility, organizational listening, and cross-sector partnerships. *Public Relations Review*, 50(4), 102484. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2024.102484>
- Gilson, L. L., Maynard, M. T., Jones Young, N. C., Vartiainen, M., & Hakonen, M. (2015). Virtual teams research: 10 years, 10 themes, and 10 opportunities. *Journal of management*, 41(5), 1313-1337. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314559946>
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The leadership quarterly*, 13(4), 423-451. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00120-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00120-0)
- Handke, L., Aldana, A., Costa, P. L., & O'Neill, T. A. (2024). Hybrid Teamwork: What We Know and Where We Can Go From Here. *Small Group Res*, 55(5), 805-835. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/10464964241279078>
- He, V. F., von Krogh, G., & Sirén, C. (2022). Expertise Diversity, Informal Leadership Hierarchy, and Team Knowledge Creation: A study of pharmaceutical research collaborations. *Organization Studies*, 43(6), 907-930. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406211026114>
- Hu, Z., & Zhang, J. Z. (2024). From Expertise to Audience. *Journal of Organizational and End User Computing*, 37(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.4018/JOEUC.378873>
- Huang, D., Gao, Q., Peng, C., Yang, K., & Liu, R. (2023). A Study on the Impact of Different Organizational Levels on Digital Transformation in Enterprises. *Sustainability*, 15(23), 16212. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/su152316212>
- Indriyani, I., & Maryani, A. (2023). Strategies for Economic Recovery through the Post Covid-19 Tourism and Transportation. *Studi Ekonomi dan Kebijakan Publik*, 2(1), 1-6. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/sekp.v2i1.1499>
- Jämsen, R., & Sivunen, A. E. (2025). (In)visibility during organizational entry: Newcomer perceptions of visibility in remote work. *Communication Monographs*, 92(2), 383-406. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2024.2395819>
- Kane, G. (2019). The technology fallacy: people are the real key to digital transformation. *Research-Technology Management*, 62(6), 44-49. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/08956308.2019.1661079>
- Kanon, M. (2024). The networked bureaucracy: reinventing formalization in the context of collaborative governance. *Public Management Review*, 26(10), 2921-2942. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2023.2298230>
- Lai, X., & Rau, P.-L. P. Hybrid human-AI leadership: exploring the influence of leadership structure on leadership effectiveness and neural activation. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 1-23. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2025.2545310>
- Liu, L., & Zhang, C. (2022). Organizational Structure Change and Hybridity: Enhancing Uncertainty as a Response to Competing and Changing Institutional Logics. *Front Psychol*, 13, 854319. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.854319>
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). The case for corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 4(2), 3-15. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1108/eb039015>
- Ngaliman, N., Catrayasa, I. W., & Khairil, K. (2025). Analysis of work life balance, job satisfaction and its effect on the performance of employees of the General Bureau of the Regional Secretariat of the Riau Islands Province. *Studi Ekonomi dan Kebijakan Publik*, 3(2), 93-107. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/sekp.v3i2.5278>
- Nilsson, K. H., Matilla-Santander, N., Lee, M. K., Brulin, E., Bodin, T., & Håkansta, C. (2025). Algorithmic management and occupational health: A comparative case study of organizational practices in logistics. *Safety Science*, 187, 106863. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2025.106863>
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2000). Using technology and constituting structures: A practice lens for studying technology in organizations. *Organization science*, 11(4), 404-428. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.4.404.14600>
- Papagiannidis, E., Mikalef, P., & Conboy, K. (2025). Responsible artificial intelligence governance: A review and research framework. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 34(2), 101885. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2024.101885>

- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2002). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*: Sage publications.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). Understanding the role of power in decision making. *Power in organizations*, 404, 423.
- Putri, D. (2022). Teori Integrasi Kepemimpinan, Influence Tactics Dan Kekuasaan Dalam Menentukan Organisasional. *Akuntansi*, 1(1), 14-25.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.55606/jurnalrisetilmuakuntansi.v1i1.20>
- Rogers, R. (2013). *Digital methods*: MIT press.
- Shahzad, K., Imran, F., & Butt, A. (2025). Digital Transformation and Changes in Organizational Structure. *Research-Technology Management*, 68(3), 25-40.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/08956308.2025.2465706>
- Wijayanti, D., Suparta, I. W., & Marselina, M. (2025). Analysis of determinants of renewable energy consumption in Indonesia. *Studi Ekonomi dan Kebijakan Publik*, 3(2), 109-129.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/sekp.v3i2.5416>
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *Surveillance capitalism and the challenge of collective action*. Paper presented at the New labor forum.