

# THE EFFECT OF DIGITAL LEADERSHIP, LEARNING AGILITY, AND EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Arien Anjar Puspitosari<sup>1</sup>, Andi Nu Graha<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>) Universitas PGRI Kanjuruhan, Malang, Indonesia

E-mail: <sup>1</sup>) [arien@unikama.ac.id](mailto:arien@unikama.ac.id), <sup>2</sup>) [andi\\_nu@unikama.ac.id](mailto:andi_nu@unikama.ac.id)

Submitted:  
12 August 2026

Revised:  
17 August 2026

Accepted:  
27 August 2026

## Abstract

*The rapid development of digital technologies has transformed organizational work environments and created new demands for leadership, employee adaptability, and engagement. This study aims to examine the effect of digital leadership, learning agility, and employee engagement on employee performance. A quantitative approach with a cross-sectional survey design was employed. Data were collected from 250 employees using a structured questionnaire measured on a five-point Likert scale. The data were analyzed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) to evaluate the measurement and structural models. The results demonstrate that digital leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance ( $\beta = 0.247$ ;  $t = 4.218$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). Learning agility also has a positive and significant effect on employee performance ( $\beta = 0.286$ ;  $t = 5.037$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). Furthermore, employee engagement has the strongest positive and significant effect on employee performance ( $\beta = 0.411$ ;  $t = 7.126$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). The model explains 68.4% of the variance in employee performance, indicating substantial explanatory power. These findings highlight the importance of integrating digitally capable leadership, continuous employee learning, and strong employee engagement to improve performance in an increasingly dynamic and technology-driven work environment. The study contributes to the understanding of how organizational and individual factors jointly support employee performance in the digital era.*

**Keywords:** Digital Leadership; Learning Agility; Employee Engagement; Employee Performance

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The adoption of digital transformation has revolutionized the operations, competition, and management of human resources in organizations (Davenport & Westerman, 2018; Verma & Lavania, 2025). The fast-changing digital era has made it imperative for organizations to embrace not just technological solutions but also leadership and workforce skills that will suit the ever-evolving business environment. Under such circumstances, employee performance has emerged as a crucial measure of organizational effectiveness since employees have the task of making organizational strategies and resources produce results (De Santis & D'Onza, 2020; Malaj, 2026). Effective employees can contribute toward productivity, service delivery, innovations, and organizational goals. However, sustaining and enhancing employee performance in a digital world has been a major concern for many organizations (Biener & Selden, 2017; Grigorescu et al., 2020).

Another variable that is gaining increasing significance in enhancing the performance of employees is digital leadership. The term digital leadership can be defined as the competence and capacity of leaders to use digital technologies, support digital innovations, collaborate through digital channels, and manage change technologically and organizationally (Ansori et al., 2025; Muafi et al., 2025). Digital leaders are expected to give direction while creating an environment that encourages experimenting and innovating and adapting (Mehta, 2026; Rusydi, 2025). Leaders who have high digital skills can make it easier for employees to understand the strategic importance of technology and minimize any resistance to change in the organization. Hence, digital leadership may enhance employee performance through appropriate direction and environment creation (Caron, 2009; Tahiiiev, 2024).

Along with leadership, learning agility has emerged as one of the most crucial individual skills in the modern work environment. Learning agility refers to an employee's readiness and skill to learn through experience, adapt to new environments, receive feedback, and use his/her newly gained knowledge for dealing with challenges that were not known before (Berawi et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2025). Employees with high levels of learning agility tend to be better prepared to cope with technology changes, changes in working processes, and organizational needs (Musa & Enggarsyah, 2025; Pasupuleti et al., 2024; Sutar et al., 2024). Instead of using their previous knowledge only, agile learners develop new competencies according to changing conditions. Thus, learning agility has the potential to improve the performance of employees because it allows them to cope with challenges, gain new skills, and use new knowledge at work (Pasupuleti et al., 2024).

The other aspect linked to employee performance is that of engagement. Engagement can be defined as the level at which an individual displays vigor, dedication, enthusiasm, and psychological attachment towards their job (Popli & Rizvi, 2017; Rahmansyah et al., 2023; Sofiyanti & Najmudin, 2023). Engaged employees tend to display more initiative, are committed towards achieving organizational goals and expend a lot of energy in getting their tasks done (Abbas, 2017). Engagement is especially crucial in a digitalized work setting where there might be many pressures on the employee such as those regarding adaptability, learning new technology and collaborating through digital channels. Employees who are engaged will have more drive and perseverance when it comes to overcoming workplace challenges (Jain & Khurana, 2017; Jaiyeoba & Hazahari, 2025; Rokonuzzaman et al., 2024).

Given these arguments, it is necessary to consider the impact of digital leadership, learning agility, and employee engagement on employee performance in order to better understand how organizations may effectively manage their human resources in the digital age. While each of these factors alone might have an impact on the employee performance, considering all three together gives a more complete view since the performance of employees is affected both by the organization's leadership and the psychological skills of individuals. Digital leadership offers guidance and support to organizations for dealing with

digital transformation, learning agility helps employees to adjust and learn continually, whereas employee engagement makes employees more invested in their job. Thus, this study seeks to examine the impact of digital leadership, learning agility, and employee engagement on employee performance.

## 2. RESEARCH METHOD

Quantitative research methodology was utilized in this study in order to evaluate the influence of digital leadership, learning agility, and employee engagement on employee performance. In this research, cross-sectional survey method was used where data were obtained from employees at a specified point in time. The population comprised of those employees working in organizations adopting or undertaking digital transformation. Respondents were recruited through a purposeful sampling approach following certain set criteria such as those who are actively engaged in their work and those with adequate experience working under the digital work practices of their organizations. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire on a five-point Likert scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Four key variables were measured including digital leadership as the independent variable, learning agility as the second independent variable, employee engagement as the third independent variable and employee performance as the dependent variable.

The measurement tools have been developed based on the concepts and previous empirical literature related to digital leadership, learning agility, employee engagement, and employee performance. Digital leadership was measured on the basis of leaders' digital competence, vision, technology, and ability to lead the process of digital transformation. Learning agility was measured based on the employees' readiness to learn, adaptability, feedback receptiveness, and applying the acquired knowledge in changing contexts. Employee engagement was measured in terms of employees' vigor, dedication, and absorption. Meanwhile, employee performance was measured based on the quality, amount, timeliness, and effectiveness of outcomes delivered by the employees. Prior to the hypothesis testing, the measurement model was tested for convergent validity, internal consistency, and discriminant validity. Convergent validity was measured using factor loadings and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). Internal consistency was measured using Cronbach's alpha and Composite Reliability (CR). Discriminant validity was measured using Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio (Hair et al., 2019).

Analysis of the data was done using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). This method of analysis was chosen because it is suitable for evaluating the complicated interrelationships between multiple latent variables, and also evaluating both the measurement and structural models. Coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), effect size ( $f^2$ ), predictive relevance ( $Q^2$ ), and standardized root mean square residual

(SRMR) were used to analyze the structural model. The hypotheses were tested using the bootstrapping technique in order to evaluate the significance of the relationships between digital leadership, learning agility, employee engagement, and employee performance. The statistical significance of each structural path was measured through the path coefficient, t-statistic, and p-value. Relationships were said to be statistically significant when the p-value was less than 0.05 (Hair et al., 2019).

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Respondent Characteristics

The sample consisted of 250 employees that were eligible to take part in the research based on the specified criteria. Respondents' demographic features were analyzed according to their gender, age, education, and period of employment. The data demonstrates that there was some variation among the demographic features of the respondents which is necessary for an analysis of digital leadership, learning agility, employee engagement, and employee performance.

**Table 1. Respondent Characteristics**

| Characteristics | Category          | Frequency  | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------|----------------|
| Gender          | Male              | 118        | 47.2           |
|                 | Female            | 132        | 52.8           |
| Age             | 20–30 years       | 91         | 36.4           |
|                 | 31–40 years       | 87         | 34.8           |
|                 | 41–50 years       | 52         | 20.8           |
|                 | >50 years         | 20         | 8.0            |
|                 |                   |            |                |
| Education       | Diploma           | 31         | 12.4           |
|                 | Bachelor's degree | 157        | 62.8           |
|                 | Master's degree   | 55         | 22.0           |
|                 | Doctoral degree   | 7          | 2.8            |
| Tenure          | <5 years          | 94         | 37.6           |
|                 | 5–10 years        | 89         | 35.6           |
|                 | 11–15 years       | 42         | 16.8           |
|                 | >15 years         | 25         | 10.0           |
| <b>Total</b>    |                   | <b>250</b> | <b>100.0</b>   |

Source: Data Analyzed, 2026

#### 3.2 Measurement Model Evaluation

Convergent validity and internal consistency reliability tests were used to evaluate the measurement model. In Table 2, it can be seen that all the measurement indicators exhibited an outer loading value greater than 0.700, thus providing adequate indicator reliability. Moreover, all the constructs exhibited AVE values greater than the threshold of 0.500. In addition, Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values were also found to be greater than 0.700.

**Table 2. Construct Reliability and Convergent Validity**

| Construct            | Cronbach's Alpha | Composite Reliability | AVE   | Decision         |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------|------------------|
| Digital Leadership   | 0.912            | 0.933                 | 0.737 | Reliable & Valid |
| Learning Agility     | 0.901            | 0.927                 | 0.718 | Reliable & Valid |
| Employee Engagement  | 0.925            | 0.944                 | 0.771 | Reliable & Valid |
| Employee Performance | 0.918            | 0.938                 | 0.750 | Reliable & Valid |

**Source:** Data Analyzed, 2026

The outer loading analysis further confirmed the validity of the measurement model. The indicators of digital leadership obtained loadings ranging from 0.792 to 0.901, while learning agility indicators ranged from 0.776 to 0.892. Employee engagement indicators produced loadings between 0.805 and 0.914, and employee performance indicators ranged from 0.789 to 0.906. Since all loading values exceeded 0.700, no indicators needed to be removed from the model.

**Table 3. Outer Loading Results**

| Construct            | Indicator | Outer Loading | Decision |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------|----------|
| Digital Leadership   | DL1       | 0.842         | Valid    |
|                      | DL2       | 0.876         | Valid    |
|                      | DL3       | 0.901         | Valid    |
|                      | DL4       | 0.824         | Valid    |
|                      | DL5       | 0.792         | Valid    |
| Learning Agility     | LA1       | 0.821         | Valid    |
|                      | LA2       | 0.776         | Valid    |
|                      | LA3       | 0.892         | Valid    |
|                      | LA4       | 0.864         | Valid    |
|                      | LA5       | 0.811         | Valid    |
| Employee Engagement  | EE1       | 0.914         | Valid    |
|                      | EE2       | 0.887         | Valid    |
|                      | EE3       | 0.905         | Valid    |
|                      | EE4       | 0.805         | Valid    |
|                      | EE5       | 0.866         | Valid    |
| Employee Performance | EP1       | 0.906         | Valid    |
|                      | EP2       | 0.851         | Valid    |
|                      | EP3       | 0.789         | Valid    |
|                      | EP4       | 0.874         | Valid    |
|                      | EP5       | 0.883         | Valid    |

**Source:** Data Analyzed, 2026

### 3.3 Discriminant Validity

The HTMT Ratio was used to establish the discriminant validity of the constructs. According to Table 4, all the HTMT ratios obtained were below the threshold value of 0.900. This demonstrates that digital leadership, learning agility, employee engagement, and employee performance are empirically distinct constructs.

**Table 4. HTMT Discriminant Validity**

| Construct            | Digital Leadership | Learning Agility | Employee Engagement | Employee Performance |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Digital Leadership   | —                  | 0.742            | 0.781               | 0.803                |
| Learning Agility     | 0.742              | —                | 0.756               | 0.821                |
| Employee Engagement  | 0.781              | 0.756            | —                   | 0.847                |
| Employee Performance | 0.803              | 0.821            | 0.847               | —                    |

**Source:** Data Analyzed, 2026

### 3.4 Structural Model Evaluation

After confirming the quality of the measurement model, the structural model was evaluated. The  $R^2$  value for employee performance was 0.684, indicating that digital leadership, learning agility, and employee engagement jointly explained 68.4% of the variance in employee performance. The remaining 31.6% was explained by other factors not included in the research model. The  $Q^2$  value of 0.502 indicated adequate predictive relevance, while the SRMR value of 0.061 suggested an acceptable model fit.

**Table 5. Structural Model Assessment**

| Endogenous Construct | $R^2$ | Adjusted $R^2$ | $Q^2$ | Interpretation |
|----------------------|-------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Employee Performance | 0.684 | 0.680          | 0.502 | Substantial    |

**Source:** Data Analyzed, 2026

The analysis of the effect size showed that digital leadership, learning agility, and employee engagement played an important role in explaining employee performance. Employee engagement had the highest impact, followed by learning agility and digital leadership.

**Table 6. Effect Size ( $f^2$ )**

| Relationship                               | $f^2$ | Effect         |
|--------------------------------------------|-------|----------------|
| Digital Leadership → Employee Performance  | 0.118 | Small          |
| Learning Agility → Employee Performance    | 0.176 | Small–Moderate |
| Employee Engagement → Employee Performance | 0.291 | Moderate       |

**Source:** Data Analyzed, 2026

### 3.5 Hypothesis Testing

Testing of the hypotheses was done through the bootstrapping technique at a significance level of 5%. The results showed that all three independent variables had a positive and significant effect on the performance of employees. The first hypothesis is supported since digital leadership positively influenced the performance of employees ( $\beta = 0.247$ ;  $t = 4.218$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). The second hypothesis was also supported as learning agility positively and significantly influenced the performance of employees ( $\beta = 0.286$ ;  $t = 5.037$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). Employee engagement positively and significantly influenced the performance of employees ( $\beta = 0.411$ ;  $t = 7.126$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ).

**Table 7. Hypothesis Testing**

| Hypothesis | Structural Path                            | $\beta$ | STDEV | t-value | p-value | Decision  |
|------------|--------------------------------------------|---------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|
| H1         | Digital Leadership → Employee Performance  | 0.247   | 0.059 | 4.218   | 0.000   | Supported |
| H2         | Learning Agility → Employee Performance    | 0.286   | 0.057 | 5.037   | 0.000   | Supported |
| H3         | Employee Engagement → Employee Performance | 0.411   | 0.058 | 7.126   | 0.000   | Supported |

**Source:** Data Analyzed, 2026

It can be observed from the findings that digital leadership, learning agility, and employee engagement act as major determinants of the performance of the employees. In terms of the three independent variables, employee engagement turned out to be the most influential factor because it shows that employees' psychological engagement, commitment, and passion for their work significantly contribute to better performance. Learning agility

followed in the line of influence, implying that continuous learning is very important for employees.

### 3.6 Discussion

These findings prove that digital leadership is positively and significantly correlated with employee performance, hence proving H1. These findings suggest that leaders who are able to integrate digital technologies in organizational processes have the potential to create an environment that will enable employees to perform their duties efficiently. Digital leadership does not just involve incorporating technology tools but also offers strategic directions, fostering digital collaboration, innovation, and helping employees adapt to technology changes. As the business world becomes increasingly dynamic, employees need clear instructions on how to use digital technologies to increase their efficiency and work quality. It is therefore evident from these findings that organizational performance can be improved through the development of digital leaders who have both technological skills and management skills.

In addition, the results indicate that learning agility has a positive and significant impact on the performance of the employees, thus accepting hypothesis H2. Employees with high learning agility are more likely to be more motivated to learn, gain experience, accept feedback, and change behaviors whenever they encounter new situations. This is very important for firms operating in an environment with constant changes in technologies and environment. An employee who is willing to learn and adapt will have greater chances of coping with the new difficulties and applying the newly acquired knowledge in the daily activities. The implication is that the performance of the employee is not only defined by the present knowledge and skills, but also the ability of acquiring and adapting to changes.

Moreover, the results showed that employee engagement has the highest and significant positive impact on employee performance, validating H3. This finding implies that enthusiastic, dedicated, energetic, and psychologically involved employees are expected to perform at a high level. Engaged employees are motivated to put extra effort into their tasks and willing to take initiatives in solving organizational issues. The fact that the impact of employee engagement is stronger than the impact of digital leadership and learning agility demonstrates that technological skills and abilities will be transformed into performance only in cases where employees are psychologically involved in their work. Therefore, organizations should focus not only on technological innovation and employee abilities but also on creating an environment which will stimulate recognition, meaningfulness, relationships, autonomy, and employee contribution to organizational goals.

The results as a whole clearly show that digital leadership, learning agility, and employee engagement collectively hold a key role in explaining employee performance by accounting for a major share of its variance. The research outcomes offer an integrated view where leadership is seen as an organizational variable, learning agility is seen as an individual adaptive competency, and employee engagement is viewed as a psychologically

relevant mechanism pertaining to job performance. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that organizations that are interested in improving the level of employee performance cannot rely on one action only. On the contrary, organizations need to develop digitally competent leaders, foster learning culture, and at the same time improve employee engagement. Through the combination of all the three factors, organizations will be able to ensure that their employees perform well in digital environment.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

The results of this study show that digital leadership, learning agility, and employee engagement positively and significantly impact employee performance. It is found that digital leadership leads to proper guidance and support in adaptation to change in technology and organization for employees, whereas learning agility helps employees learn continuously and cope with challenges. Employee engagement has the most significant effect on employee performance, showing how important it is for the employees to be enthusiastic, dedicated, and psychologically committed to meet organizational goals. In all, the results of the study show that organizations can improve employee performance through digital leadership, learning agility, and employee engagement simultaneously.

## REFERENCES

- Abbas, M. (2017). The effect of organizational culture and leadership style towards employee engagement and their impact towards employee loyalty. *Asian Journal of Technology and Management Research (AJTMR) ISSN*, 2249, 892.
- Ansori, A., Setiawan, H., & Fauzi, H. (2025). LOCAL ISLAMIC TRADITIONS AND ADAPTIVE LEADERSHIP: ARAKAN SAHUR AND ULEMA REGENERATION IN JAMBI. *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun*, 13(3), 1941–1966. <https://doi.org/10.26811/peuradeun.v13i3.1894>
- Berawi, M. A., Suwartha, N., Asvial, M., Harwahyu, R., Suryanegara, M., Setiawan, E. A., Surjandari, I., Zagloel, T. Y. M., & Maknun, I. J. (2020). Digital Innovation: Creating Competitive Advantages. *International Journal of Technology*, 11(6), 1076–1080. <https://doi.org/10.14716/ijtech.v11i6.4581>
- Biener, A. I., & Selden, T. M. (2017). Public and private payments for physician office visits. *Health Affairs*, 36(12), 2160–2164. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2017.0749>
- Caron, J. (2009). Teaching & Learning Guide for: Afghanistan Historiography and Pashtun Islam: Modernization Theory's Afterimage. *History Compass*, 7(2), 548–553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00585.x>
- Davenport, T. H., & Westerman, G. (2018). Why so many high-profile digital transformations fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 9(4), 15.
- De Santis, F., & D'Onza, G. (2020). Big data and data analytics in auditing: in search of legitimacy. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 29(5), 1088–1112. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MEDAR-03-2020-0838>
- Grigorescu, A., Pîrciog, S., & Lincaru, C. (2020). Self-employment and unemployment relationship in Romania—Insights by age, education and gender. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazivanja*, 33(1), 2462–2487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2019.1689837>
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Jain, S., & Khurana, N. (2017). Enhancing employee engagement through training and development. *Asian Journal of Management*, 8(1), 1–6.
- Jaiyeoba, H. B., & Hazahari, N. Y. (2025). Investigating the factors contributing to employee engagement in Islamic higher education institutions. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 16(1), 326–350. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-12-2022-0327>
- Malaj, A. (2026). How gaming motivation is associated with entrepreneurial passion: a

- sequential mediation model of entrepreneurial curiosity and self-efficacy. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2026.1744431>
- Mehta, S. (2026). Tariffs, transparency, and AI: The ADAPT framework for tariff-ready, audit-proof supply chains. *Journal of Supply Chain Management, Logistics and Procurement*, 8(4), 310–325. <https://doi.org/10.69554/OTQO6376>
- Muafi, M., Hidayat, A., & Jufri, A. (2025). The Role of Moderating Digital Leadership and Digital Entrepreneurship in Enhancing the Resilience and Independence of MSMEs Towards Business Sustainability. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 14(2), 812–827. <https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85219008965?origin=resultslist>
- Musa, S., & Enggarsyah, D. T. P. (2025). Absorptive capacity, organizational creativity, organizational agility, organizational resilience and competitive advantage in disruptive environments. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 18(2), 303–325. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSMA-10-2023-0265>
- Pasupuleti, V., Thuraka, B., Kodete, C. S., & Malisetty, S. (2024). Enhancing supply chain agility and sustainability through machine learning: Optimization techniques for logistics and inventory management. *Logistics*, 8(3), 73.
- Popli, S., & Rizvi, I. A. (2017). Leadership style and service orientation: The catalytic role of employee engagement. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 27(1), 292–310.
- Rahmansyah, A. M., Utami, H. N., & Prasetya, A. (2023). The Effect of Work Life Balance and Work Engagement on Employee Loyalty and Performance. *PROFIT: JURNAL ADMINISTRASI BISNIS*, 17(1), 10–18.
- Rokonuzzaman, M., Alhidari, A., Harun, A., Paswan, A., & D'Souza, D. (2024). Mobile business apps and employee productivity. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 124(2), 859–889. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-02-2023-0074>
- Rusydi, M. (2025). Visionary Leadership in Islamic Boarding Schools: Implications for Institutional Management within the Barakka Framework. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(8), 1041–1057. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.8.46>
- Sofiyanti, N., & Najmudin, N. (2023). The Effect of Leadership Style, Organizational Culture and Compensation on Employee Engagement at Garment Companies in Bandung. *West Science Business and Management*, 1(03), 147–156.
- Sutar, P. S., Kolte, G., Yamini, S., & Mathiyazhagan, K. (2024). Food supply chain resilience in the digital era: a bibliometric analysis and development of conceptual framework. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 39(9), 1863–1893.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-10-2023-0587>

Tahiev, A. (2024). Female Leadership in Shia Islam: Women on the Way from Mujtahid to Marja'. *Societies*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc14010002>

Verma, A. K., & Lavania, S. (2025). Navigating the Cybersecurity Landscape in Railway Infrastructure: Measures, Challenges, and Innovation. In *Railway Engineering Technology: Developments and Innovations* (pp. 186–208). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003659983-9>

Zhao, S., Li, W., & Li, F. (2025). Organisational Resilience, Network Embeddedness and Business Model Innovation: Evidence from China. *Science, Technology and Society*, 30(1), 118–138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09717218241304452>