Digital Leadership Impacts on Developing Dynamic Capability and Strategic Alliance based on Market Orientation
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Abstract

The in-depth study on the role of leadership especially digital leadership on the creation of strategic alliance and dynamic capability has not being explored. Hence, the purpose of this paper is to examine what are the roles of digital leadership in developing strategic alliance and dynamic capability based on market orientation. We argue that digital leadership behaviors have a stronger influence on the development of strategic alliance to drive dynamic capabilities based on market orientation. A quantitative method is used comprising 88 senior leaders of Indonesian telecommunication. The purposive sampling methods is used with the statistical tool is Smart PLS. The findings confirm the significant influence directly and indirectly between digital leadership and the development of strategic alliance and dynamic capabilities based on market orientation. The study has practical implication to take the priority in developing of digital leadership in enforcing the transformation. the limitations of study could be identified as the sample, time and used statistical tools, hence the further study can be extended in term of sample quantity, time horizon to become longitudinal research.
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1 Introduction

Industry resolution 4.0 dominated by Digital technologies have driven the change of paradigm in doing the business. The organization firms form the alliance to leverage the capabilities and fulfill the capability gap for driving sustainability. The alliance appears an interested topic by combining with business model innovation to maintain survival of the firms (43). The critical part of the firm success in alliance with partners was match with the company criteria in term of culture, decision making process and system in integrating with existing asset (8). Besides that, the innovation can be explored and exploited when the parties could perform trust and managing potential conflicting strategic choices (27). The disruptive era with digital technology imposes the market and customer become complex and force complexity on the market called by Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity, and Ambiguity (VUCA) (Pandit, Joshi, Sahay, & Gupta, 2018). The firm is required to have an orientation on the market and customers, while another challenge is to manage alliance capability with partners. On the previous study, in entrepreneurship environment that dealing with the complex and volatile environment, the firm shall apply the dynamic capability including the flexibility to form dynamic alliance with partners (36). The key success factor in managing partners is relationship with partners and maintain governance to provide trust with partners (44). The changing of environment and capability to more dynamic due to digital technology impact to the leadership behavior. In digital era, the leadership behavior will combine the leadership style with digital technology called by digital leadership (48). We contribute to this study on the role and influence of digital leadership within the alliance capability to perform the firms on dynamic capability-based market orientation as a distinct operational capability and determinant the relationship to support the alliance success.

In Management context the development of capabilities has been discussed intensively consist of routines activities and how the organization has capability to reconfigure to adapt with the dynamic change (1, 10, 40). Those dynamic adaption change focus on the capability of resource to adapt the change and reconfigure from routine operation (13). However, the previous study has not clear find the implication of dynamic capability in relation with performance whether it will direct or indirect influence. While some finding found that the dynamic capability has
indirect on performance through operational performance (10, 13, 36) and others recommend that dynamic capabilities have a direct influence on firm performance (9, 19). The development of dynamic capability has broad range of firm operational activities to support business development, innovation and alliance (37). In the business development, the dynamic capability has intensively discussed in development product and service innovation (6, 9, 25). While the dynamic capability mostly used for development innovation capability, especially for business model innovation (4, 37, 45). As regard with alliance capability, on the previous study, there has been no empirical study on the development dynamic capability o base on the alliance capability, nor the influence of digital leadership and market orientation on the context of digital transformation.

We argue that in digital era the firm that focus on market orientation and has the digital leadership based on market orientation has an effect directly or indirectly to form the alliance capability in development of dynamic capability. Market orientation is defined as an organization culture where it could be more effective and efficient in creating superior value of buyers to achieve superior performance firms (26). Market orientation in the context of organization have meaning that the customers has to be well known by firms as part of market intelligence where the information of customer have been disseminated across organization unit (32). The development of market orientation as part of organization culture could be driven from manager or leader vision of the firm (24). In the context of digital era, the leadership has the role to provide a tangible vision and direction based on the analysis of market and combine with resources to drive the alliance outcomes (38). The reason behind alliance is the construct of leadership behavior, cognitive and decision (31). Hence, leadership becomes a critical and influence in developing alliance capabilities. The combination of leadership competence and capability to optimize the use of digital technology called by digital leadership. However, the empirical study of relation of digital leadership directly or indirectly influence to alliance capability and dynamic capability as well as market orientation has not been intensively explored. Hence, this study aims on influence of digital leadership in making “capability-building” in term of organization behavior (market orientation, alliance capability and dynamic capability) to have a sustainability capability.

2.1 Digital Leadership

The leadership style as a core competence in communication, computing, content and telecommunication to contribute functionality toward development of knowledge society by optimize the digital technology called as digital leadership (33). The digital leadership is the critical part to drive the transformation toward digital capability firms (28). The development of digital leadership consists of integration of culture and digital competence to utilize digital technology as part of leadership style to create value to the firm (24). Due to the nature of digital where the information can be assessed globally, real time, transparent, hence the leadership in digital era have following characteristics: (1) creative, (2) deep knowledge (3) strong network and collaboration, (4) loyal participation via vision (41) Another study, Zhu (2015) found similar characteristic of digital leadership consists of 5 style as follow (1) creative (2) thinkers, (3) global visionary and willing to collaborate, (4) inquisitive leader and (5) profound leader (48). In this study we use 5 dimension driven from Zhu as follow: creative, deep knowledge, Global vision and collaboration, thinker, inquisitive.

2.2 Dynamic Capability

The enhancement of study in resources base view as the anticipation of complex and dynamic environment creates Dynamic capability to address the organization capability to adapt with the change from existing routine resources, process, product and services to new capabilities (13, 37). The dynamic capability emphasized that the resources capabilities of organization can be created, extended and modified to align with the changing up to creating new paradigm of transformation (35). The transformation can be done integrating, building and reconfiguring the competence as part of sensing, seizing and transforming (10, 40). The capability development in dynamic capability consists of adaptive capability, strategic capability, management capability and innovation capability (24, 39).

2.3 Alliance Capabilities

Building up the alliance in history of management describes a special capability of the organization to cooperate with other partners to grow together and strengthen the position of participant called as alliance capabilities (10, 40). The coordination and integration of knowledge and resources to achieve a common goals become an critical for alliance to success (16, 38). In previous study, it finds that alliances are source of competitive advantages (16, 45). However, some potential risk associate the form of alliance could be break up (8, 42). The most reason fails in alliance related with the relationship with partners and maintain governance to provide trust with partners (16, 44). Lack of trust may lead to confusion impacts to the failure to achieve common objectives. Cravens & Piercy (2013) has defined the alliance capabilities consists of customer alliance, supplier alliance, lateral alliance and internal alliance. The vertical collaboration consists of the alliance between customer and supplier, while the horizontal alliance consists of collaboration between internal and lateral alliance. This study uses the dimension based on Craven’s definition.

2.4 Market Orientation

The market orientation explains the behavior of organization to focus on the market in all activities in development of product and services (26). There are two organization concept in Market orientation concept related with behavior and cultural approach (11). The behavior emphasis on the organization style in delivering service and product to increase customer engagement and experience (17). While the cultural approach focusses on the believe and the value proposition of organization to set the customers as the first priority. In the marketing orientation concept, the organization has the intelligence ability to adapt the
capability based on customer and market information and generate response to the market based on that information to enhance the firm performance. Hence, the organization based on market orientation has three intelligence capability as follow intelligence dissemination, intelligence generation and intelligence responsiveness (1, 32).

2.5 Hypothesis Development

The previous study on the relation between the leadership and market orientation has found that the leadership has influence to market orientation as part of organization behavior (22, 30) in the digital era, the previous research found the relation between digital leadership and market orientation (24), hence the formulation of hypothesis as follow: (H1) Digital leadership has significant impact to market orientation in the Indonesian telecommunication industry. Leadership contributes significant influence to maintain stability of alliance capabilities as found in previous studies (15, 34). This finding also is happen in digital era (24). According those previous, we formulate hypothesis as follow: (H2) Digital leadership has significant impact to alliance capabilities in the Indonesian telecommunication industry. The market orientation has been found as critical part in enhancing alliance capability, especially in marketing alliance (18, 46). This phenomenon impacts as well in digital era (24), hence the following hypothesis can be stated as follow: (H3) Market orientation has significant impact to alliance capabilities in the Indonesian telecommunication industry. The role of leadership in developing dynamic capability was found significant influence (37, 38), hence the hypothesis formulation can be stated as follow: (H4) Digital leadership has significant impact to dynamic capability in the Indonesian telecommunication industry. The market orientation has been found as part of dynamic capability of the organization behaviour (14, 24), hence it strengthens the hypothesis formulation that marketing orientation has influence to dynamic capability. (H5) Market orientation has significant impact to dynamic capability in the Indonesian telecommunication industry. While the alliance capability has been found has significant impact in driving dynamic capability (3, 16, 47). This previous study strengthening the third hypothesis where innovation management has relation to dynamic capability: (H6) Alliance capabilities has significant impact to dynamic capability in the Indonesian telecommunication industry.

The Figure 1 illustrates the research model of this study

3 Methodology

The empirical study is done through survey and questioner method with purposive sampling methods. The telecommunication company was a Unit analysis with the observer on senior leader with manager level above. The survey was done started from November 2017 until January 2018. According to Hair, et al (2014) the minimum required sample size is 52 respondents for the model with an endogenous construct has 2 arrows directed. 0.05 significance level, 80% statistical power and minimum R2 = 0.25 (12). However, this sample of this study was made up of 88 respondent. This sample is higher than the recommended sample with the following respondents: 75% was Manager and General Manager and the rest 25% was VP and Board leader. 88% respondents were men and 12% were women. 83% respondents come from network provider, while 17% from service providers. Data were collected via self-assessment through an online questionnaire and distributed through messenger, WhatsApp, Telegram and email. Since there is a limitation of data sample, the statistical a tool of analysis is SmartPLS.

4 Results and Findings

The measurement test is being used to measure the relationship between latent variables and their indicators and structural test to test the hypothesis and model.

| Table 1: Construct’s Reliability Test | | | |
| Digital leadership | Cronbach’s Alpha | rho_A | Composite Reliability | AVE |
|----------------------|-----------------|------|---------------------|-----|
| Deep Knowledge | 0.972 | 0.974 | 0.975 | 0.675 |
| Global Vision and Collaboration | 0.931 | 0.933 | 0.951 | 0.830 |
| Inquisitive | 0.945 | 0.946 | 0.960 | 0.858 |
| Thinker | 0.915 | 0.915 | 0.946 | 0.854 |
| creative | 0.872 | 0.875 | 0.912 | 0.723 |
| Market Orientation | 0.951 | 0.956 | 0.956 | 0.553 |
| Intelligent Dissemination | 0.791 | 0.821 | 0.866 | 0.622 |
| Intelligent Generation | 0.876 | 0.879 | 0.907 | 0.619 |
| Responsiveness | 0.920 | 0.927 | 0.935 | 0.646 |
| Alliances Capabilities | 0.959 | 0.960 | 0.964 | 0.709 |
| Customer Alliance | 0.857 | 0.859 | 0.933 | 0.875 |
| Internal Alliance | 0.948 | 0.949 | 0.975 | 0.951 |
| Lateral Alliance | 0.922 | 0.925 | 0.945 | 0.812 |
| Supplier Alliance | 0.908 | 0.912 | 0.943 | 0.845 |
| Dynamic Capabilities | 0.959 | 0.962 | 0.964 | 0.657 |
| Adaptive Capabilities | 0.917 | 0.918 | 0.948 | 0.858 |
| Innovation Capability | 0.817 | 0.826 | 0.892 | 0.734 |
| Management Capabilities | 0.915 | 0.922 | 0.940 | 0.797 |
| Strategic Capability | 0.851 | 0.865 | 0.900 | 0.694 |
4.1 Evaluation of Measurement

To measure Validity and reliability consists of following parameter:
- Cronbach alpha to test reliability with minimum threshold 0.7
- Composite Reliability with minimum threshold 0.7
- Average Variance Extracted (AVE), expected to be more than 0.5.

The result as follow. The convergent validity to assess the indicator where the value of the loading factor in t-value higher than 1.96 and p-value less than 0.05. The result shows in Table 2. Table 2 shows that all indicators have a path score higher than 0.7 with t-statistics has value higher than 1.96 and p-value was less than 0.05, it means all indicators has good convergent validity.

### Table 2: Outer Path Analysis

| Path                          | Value     | T Statistics | P Values |
|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------|----------|
| AC1 < Adaptive Capabilities   | 0.952     | 81.615       | 0.000    |
| AC2 < Adaptive Capabilities   | 0.923     | 47.432       | 0.000    |
| AC3 < Adaptive Capabilities   | 0.903     | 31.933       | 0.000    |
| IC1 < Innovation Capability   | 0.891     | 35.205       | 0.000    |
| IC2 < Innovation Capability   | 0.894     | 42.861       | 0.000    |
| IC3 < Innovation Capability   | 0.780     | 13.266       | 0.000    |
| ID1 < Intelligent Dissemination| 0.596    | 6.286        | 0.000    |
| ID2 < Intelligent Dissemination| 0.842    | 20.859       | 0.000    |
| ID3 < Intelligent Dissemination| 0.886    | 30.422       | 0.000    |
| ID4 < Intelligent Dissemination| 0.798    | 16.659       | 0.000    |
| IG1 < Intelligent Generation  | 0.771     | 15.779       | 0.000    |
| IG2 < Intelligent Generation  | 0.746     | 12.691       | 0.000    |
| IG3 < Intelligent Generation  | 0.841     | 26.728       | 0.000    |
| IG4 < Intelligent Generation  | 0.756     | 17.440       | 0.000    |
| IG5 < Intelligent Generation  | 0.801     | 14.729       | 0.000    |
| IG6 < Intelligent Generation  | 0.800     | 20.016       | 0.000    |
| IT1 < Inquisitive             | 0.917     | 44.225       | 0.000    |
| IT2 < Inquisitive             | 0.940     | 50.155       | 0.000    |
| IT3 < Inquisitive             | 0.903     | 42.509       | 0.000    |
| IT4 < Inquisitive             | 0.946     | 60.843       | 0.000    |
| K1 < creative                 | 0.756     | 18.148       | 0.000    |
| K2 < creative                 | 0.910     | 44.238       | 0.000    |
| K3 < creative                 | 0.864     | 20.612       | 0.000    |
| K4 < creative                 | 0.864     | 18.724       | 0.000    |
| KC1 < Customer Alliance       | 0.939     | 69.343       | 0.000    |
| KC2 < Customer Alliance       | 0.932     | 55.984       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.974     | 114.883      | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.976     | 131.024      | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.863     | 17.670       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.930     | 59.702       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.884     | 31.691       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.924     | 57.638       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.931     | 53.247       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.935     | 48.674       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.892     | 25.266       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.919     | 49.926       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.862     | 26.142       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.881     | 27.405       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.909     | 43.326       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.916     | 49.775       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.930     | 62.631       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.927     | 48.383       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.844     | 23.352       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.901     | 33.932       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.913     | 50.880       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.905     | 38.725       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.768     | 15.081       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.873     | 24.085       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.698     | 9.855        | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.899     | 37.233       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.870     | 25.679       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.777     | 12.338       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.831     | 16.268       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.687     | 7.249        | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.879     | 40.292       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.902     | 38.465       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.771     | 15.444       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.771     | 12.236       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.925     | 44.026       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.921     | 47.473       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.879     | 17.214       | 0.000    |
| Path                          | 0.918     | 50.586       | 0.000    |
4.2 Structural Model (Inner Model)

On blindfolding score result, the $Q^2$ for the alliance capability has score 0.499, it means that the structural model has adequate predictive relevance with the complete figure of research model can be shown in Figure 2.

4.3 Hypothesis Testing

The partial Test of hypothesis to measure the significant direct relation between variable. The result of partial testing can be shown in Table 3. Table 3 shows that digital leadership has direct significant influence on market orientation, alliance capability, and dynamic capability. While the market orientation has direct influence on alliance capability and dynamic capability as the result of $T$-statistics has higher than 1.96 and P Values is less than 0.05. The alliance capability has no significant impact on dynamic capability. The simultaneous test to assess the indirect effect of independent variable to depend variable. The result can be seen in Table 4. Similar with the partial test result, the simultaneous Table 4 reveals that digital leadership has strong influence on dynamic capability alliance capabilities indirectly through market orientation. Since alliance capabilities has not significant influence on dynamic capabilities hence the path of digital leadership has no indirect significant on dynamic capability through alliances capability since the $t$-statistics result has less than 1.96 and p value more than 0.05.
4.4 Discussion and Implication

The study reveals that the issue in agility for incumbent still an issues in the development of dynamic capability based on alliance capability (20). Hence, the result of alliance capability has not influence on dynamic capabilities in Indonesia telecommunication industry. This finding reveals the study on the risk and the failure rate on the alliance success (8, 16). This results demonstrated even though the leaders has intention for collaboration (Global vision and collaboration T-score: 99.366), and the organization has focussed on responsiveness to the market (highest t-score in market orientation: 155.412), but the constraint related with the partners in term of right partners, the trust, the culture and common goals become an constraint in development of dynamic capability. Hence the incumbent firms still rely on the development of dynamic capability based on internal capability supported by market orientation behaviour. This finding reveals the concept of alliance based dynamic capability, where the trust and relation with the partners become an critical factors for the incumbent firms to form dynamic alliance capability (16) as shown in Figure 3.

The development of dynamic capabilities is emphasised by the strong adaptive capability and management capability decision. This finding reveals the previous study that with the dynamic capability could enable an organization innovation to sense market change in detecting the weak signals, seize opportunities and threats to develop scenario and mitigate the risk, partly transform the new paradigm and reshape their environment to navigate volatile future environments in turbulence environment (37, 40).

In Digital era, the navigating in dynamic environment and a VUCA requires special leadership who combine the leadership capability and optimize the digital technology as part of opportunity to enhance the top line and mitigate the threat. Leaders must develop the individual capacity and competence to better manage uncertainty and create organizations adapt with strong dynamic capabilities. Leaders has to defines vision and for growth and develop a vision of the future. The finding of the result of the study align with the phenomenon where the most important on digital leadership is global vision and collaboration follow by thinker and deep knowledge. This finding is revealed the previous study done by Shoemaker (2018) and Zhu (2015). The thinker and inquisitive are related with challenge and interpretation of the leaders to have ability to sense of the market change and support the seizing of the opportunity and mitigate the threat by having curiosity. The next capability is required from digital leadership are deep knowledge. This capability is related with the decision making based on deep knowledge due to the digital technology support. The deep knowledge is part of continuous learning of leaders. The last capability is creativity, where in digital era is critical to unleash numerous business model innovation. The emerge of Internet of things (IoT) has enable the connecting all industry parties. The combination of collaboration with virtual connectivity could mutate the new paradigm and form a remarkable innovation.

Table 4: Simultaneous Hypothesis Testing Result

| Path | Standard Deviation | T Statistics | P Values | Remarks   |
|------|--------------------|--------------|----------|-----------|
| Alliances Capabilities -> Dynamic Capabilities | 0.152 | 0.093 | 1.636 | 0.102 | not supported |
| Digital leadership -> Alliances Capabilities | 0.556 | 0.079 | 7.028 | 0.000 | Supported |
| Digital leadership -> Dynamic Capabilities | 0.189 | 0.089 | 2.129 | 0.033 | Supported |
| Digital leadership -> Market Orientation | 0.754 | 0.044 | 16.950 | 0.000 | Supported |
| Market Orientation -> Alliances Capabilities | 0.376 | 0.079 | 4.776 | 0.000 | Supported |
| Market Orientation -> Dynamic Capabilities | 0.639 | 0.073 | 8.758 | 0.000 | Supported |

Simultaneous Hypothesis Testing Result

| Path | SD  | T-Statistics | P-Values |
|------|-----|--------------|----------|
| Digital leadership -> Market Orientation - > Alliances Capabilities | 0.283 | 4.798 | 0.000 |
| Digital leadership -> Alliances Capabilities -> Dynamic Capabilities | 0.084 | 1.640 | 0.101 |
| Digital leadership -> Market Orientation -> Alliances Capabilities -> Dynamic Capabilities | 0.043 | 1.456 | 0.146 |
| Digital leadership -> Market Orientation -> Dynamic Capabilities | 0.482 | 7.942 | 0.000 |

Digital leadership is a central on development of dynamic capability that enable the firm capability in transforming the digital capability. The continuous learning to adapt the changing take significant role on development digital leadership.

Figure 3: Dynamic Alliance Capability Framework (16)

The digital leadership is a central on development of dynamic capability that enable the firm capability in transforming the digital capability.
5 Conclusion

The digital leadership has significant influence in driving market orientation, alliance management, and dynamic capability. However, the alliance management has not significant influence in development dynamic capability due to the potential failure of alliance with partners related constraints with trust, culture and common goal. Hence, the incumbent firms’ choices the development of dynamic capability through development of internal organization that focus on market orientation. This study has limitation in term of sample size, methodology, time study, and research model hence further development the study can be enhance through enhancing the sample not only for ICT and Indonesia market, it can be across industry and countries. The sample and methodology were also limited; hence the future study can be enhanced through enhancement the sample and methodology of the research use large sample and advance statistical tool analysis. The longitudinal study can be enhancing to assess the long-term impact of digital leadership influence.
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