Technology-Driven Business Models in the Post-Pandemic Era: An Empirical Analysis

Mukund Purohit
Research Scholar, Department of Business & Entrepreneurship, Frankford International University, USA.
Registration No.: FIU20250227436

ABSTRACT

The business landscape across the world has been turned upside down by the COVID-19 pandemic, fast-tracking digital transformation projects and forcing businesses to rethink how they operate. This research paper empirically explores the development and performance of technology-enabled business models brought to life during and following the pandemic crisis. Leveraging substantive data from 500 companies across manufacturing, retailing, healthcare, financial service and technology in the years between 2019 to 2024 for an understanding of adoption cycles, implementation barriers and performance implications that follow digital business model innovation. The report uses fact-based analysis and quantitative methodologies like statistical analysis, correlation studies, and comparison of competitors to study important metrics concerning the digital adoption rates, revenue impact, operational efficiency improvement as well as customer engagement transformation. Results demonstrate that enterprises deploying a fully technology-driven approach experienced on average, 34.7% additional revenue to traditional approaches with 28.3% operational cost savings. The study lists 5 technology legs to drive post-pandemic business model innovation: cloud infrastructure, artificial intelligence and machine learning (AI/ML), Internet of Things (IoT) integration, blockchain applications, and advanced analytics platforms. Additionally, the research uncovers a powerful match between digital maturity and resilience of an organization that has highly digitalized companies performing 62% better in recovering from pandemic disruptions. This analysis offers important implications for executives, policymakers and technology strategists grappling with the challenges of post-pandemic economic recovery and digital transformation. The results add to existing literature by providing empirical evidence of the impact of technology-mediated business models and explaining patterns for sustainable digital innovation in changing market conditions.

Keywords: *Digital Transformation, Technology-Enabled Business Models, Post-Pandemic Economy, Digital Adoption, Business Model Innovation, Organizational Resilience 1.*

1. INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that the 2020-2021 global pandemic acted as an accelerator of business transformation, redrawing the lines for how companies run their businesses, derive value and interact with virtually all stakeholders. Just months after the outbreak began, businesses around the world confronted existential pressures that required among other things immediate and drastic action. the ability for business as usual to continue was tested Physical bricks and mortar based business models, physical face to-face transactions, traditional supply chains just couldn't handle the new world of

social distancing requirements, remote working mandates and a disrupted global logistics trade. This crisis situation pulled digital transformation timetables ahead at a pace that would have taken years or even decades to roll out. There were companies that had been thinking about the digital age as a gradual evolution and all of a sudden they realized, this is an existential matter. The pandemic rapidly compressed a decade of digital adoption into just months, becoming a natural experiment in radical forced innovation and business model adaptation.

Technology-based business models are not merely digitized versions of analogoffering and serving systems, but rather representing radical re-shaping of how value is created and exchanged through a strategic use of technology. They will tap into the new technologies, like AI, cloud, IoT (Internet of Things), blockchain and advanced analytics to generate new revenue streams from native digital products, drive efficiency in operations, deliver on customer experiences and differentiation. Contrary to the typical business model, in which technology plays a supportive role, tech-driven models place digital capabilities at the heart of strategy and value proposition design. The post-pandemic period has seen an unprecedented growth of such model adoptions across various vertical industries including and not limited to, production enterprises towards the adoption of corporation-centric factory floor (smart factory) concepts, retail sector's stride towards companywisesuperclosure omnizing (omni-channel) eco-systems building and health care providers taking advantage of the recent popu-larization for telemedical platforms. This is not just the domain of large corporations, however, as small and medium businesses have realised that digital capabilities are no longer a nice to have for business but a must-have.

1.1 The Evolution of Business Models in Crisis Contexts

While it is not a new idea that the business model evolves during times of crisis, but this may be the first time in contemporary economic history when pandemic crisis has seen at one and same time an instant and global impact: specifically due to its unprecedented scope, speed and synchrony. Past economic dislocations were usually confined to regions or industries, permitting gradual adjustment and the benefiting from the experience of early adopters. The pandemic, though, was a synchronized global crisis that required simultaneous innovation across all sectors and geographies. It was this simultaneity that removed the luxury of learn by observing and forced organizations to experiment, iterate, and adapt in real time — with no playbooks or best practices established. The crisis situation increased the relative weight of organizational agility, technological readiness and leadership vision as a determinant of survival and success consequences. “Two separate pieces of evidence – one looking at which organization were doing well and another to follow the recovery pattern for different types of industries in different regions all around the world, suggested strongly that the organizations which were digitally prepared pre-crisis appeared would come out strong post-crisis.

1.2 Technology as Base for the Business Model

Underpinning the shift towards technology-as-core is an enormous paradigmatic change in the ways organizations think and strategize. For business models that are based on technology, digital capabilities are not just enablers of operations; but also the means for creating value, differentiation and competitive advantage. This shifts shows up across a number of forms – products and service offers become increasingly digital, or are completely digital; customer interactions move predominantly to the digital space, guided by data for personalization; operations utilize automation,

AI or predictive analytics in optimisation; decisions get made using live insights rather than relying on periodic reporting cycles. The pandemic expedited this transition by showing that businesses that have built strong digital underpinnings were able to switch on pivots, preserve customer relationships and revenues despite physical constraints and those reliant on traditional models faced severe disruption or existential threats.

1.3 Research Objectives and Significance

The purpose of this empirical examination is to understand in depth the terrain of technology-based BM adoption, implementation, and performance implications in post-Covid setting. Goals for the primary research will focus on: measuring scientific and practical adoption levels of global digital business model framework in various industry sectors and size organizations; identifying key, level-appropriate technology components and integration patterns that correlate to successful implementations; assessing the correlation of investment needed in digital transformation with tangible business outcomes such as revenue impact, cost efficiencies achieved or market positioning at risk; exploring both challenges, risks encountered by organizations that pursued a technology-driven transition of their business models; creating an empirically-based framework disciplined enough to continue guiding sustainable digital innovations amid rapidly changing competitive market conditions. This study has implications for multiple stakeholders: business practitioners receive empirical evidence to justify and guide their investments in digital transformation; policy makers gain insights for structuring supporting infrastructure and regulatory environment; technology vendors learn about the market demand and adoption patterns for product development, while academic researchers now have reliable real-world cues that enrich the theory of business model innovation and literature on digital transformation.

2. LITERATURE SURVEY

The academic discussion on business model innovation and digital transformation has developed rapidly in the past two decades, especially accelerated since COVID-19. Pioneering work by Teece, showed how keeping these three elements in harmony intermediates the creational impact of a company's business model, to which end he underlined that competitive advantage increasingly depends on the continuous development and adaptation of the business model rather than being driven solely by technological evolution or product innovation. Zott and Amit further developed this concept by identifying activity systems as the primary level of analysis when examining business models, suggesting that value creation depends on the structure, content and governance of transaction structures. This systems focus was particularly applicable for interpreting technology-driven models in which interwoven digital platforms, data flows and ecosystem partnerships created the combinational value chains.

The literature on digital transformation, led by scholars such as Westerman, Bonnet and McAfee found that effective digitisation stretched beyond technology platforms to include culture of the organisation, capability of leaders and re-designing operational processes. Their empirical research found that so-called digital leaders—companies that are both strong in digital capabilities and leadership—outperform "digital laggards" on multiple measures, including revenue growth, profitability and market value. Then, the follow-up study from Vial performed a systematic literature review in order to identify 10 key dimensions of digital transformation: technologies used, value creation changes,

structural changes; financial; organizational and social related aspects among others. This holistic framework offered researchers a common language and scope for exploring the phenomena of digital transformation.

The overlap between business model innovation and digital transformation can be found in literature investigating how the use of digital technologies provide new forms of business models. Weill and Woerner suggested a framework to differentiate business models across two dimensions: (a) whether value is primarily delivered to end customers or ecosystem partners, and (b) if offerings are knowledge-intensive versus asset-intensive. Their study found that there was higher enterprise value and growth from digitally facilitated ecosystem models generating value by orchestrating partner capabilities compared to classic linear supply chain models. At the same time, studies of platform business models, as promoted by Parker, Van Alstyne and Choudary^ shows how digital platforms create value through enabling exchanges amongst different groups of users and aggregating network effects and data to create strong competitive positions.

The crisis that accompanied the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in a renaissance of research on crisis-induced innovation and forced digitalization. Research conducted by Priyono, Moin and Putri outlined rapid digitalization uptake in Southeast Asia's SMEs amid pandemic lockdowns – indicating that factors such as leadership commitment, employee digital literacy and technology infrastructure readiness are the cornerstones of successful digitization. Likewise, studies by Amankwah-Amoah, Khan and Wood focused on the ways in which crisis contexts accelerate decision-making processes, diminish organizational resistance to change and generate windows of opportunity for deploying hitherto stalled innovations. According to them, crises are potentially critical junctures where prevailing institutional logics and path dependencies may break down that in turn lead toward fundamental strategic reorientations.

Sector studies offered in-depth analysis of differences across sectors in the adoption of technology-enabled business models. Retail research saw omnichannel strategies, contactless payment systems and AI-fueled personalization engines at warp speed as firms such as Target and Walmart poured billions into digital infrastructure to battle Amazon’s online empire. Healthcare inquiries disclosed that telemedicine adoption exploded, and companies such as Teladoc saw an upward of 1000% increase in the volume of virtual consults during the early stages of pandemic. The manufacturing research has brought into focus the adoption of Industry 4.0, smart factory, predictive maintenance systems and digital twin solutions that have yielded significant productivity gains and quality improvement to early adopters.

The organization capability view based on dynamic capabilities theory provided explanations for differential performance results associated with the organizations' digital transformation efforts. Research indicated that effective technology-enabled BM adoption required developing three core capability clusters: sensing capabilities for ICT-based opportunities and threats detection, seizing capabilities for resources mobilization and investment, and transforming capabilities for ongoing renewal and reconfiguration. Gartner (2003) Several initiatives of new technology suffered failure in implementation for the organizations that are ed.izarre of the dynamic capability's absence despite a significant investment in high and advanced technologies, which demonstrates how much technological capacities by themselves are not enough without organizational competences to use resources.

Recent empirical studies have started to measure the performance outcomes of technology-enabled business models. Aggregate analyses across thousands of brands indicate that indicators of digital maturity are positively related to measures of financial performance, such as return on assets, revenue growth rates and market value. However, there was also evidence of significant variation in performance, with around 30% of digital transformation projects disappointing their anticipated effects. This variation led to explorative analyses of environmental factors that moderated the success of transformation, such as industry characteristics, regulatory pressure, intensity of competition, and company size.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research design used in our study applies from a positivist epistemological point of view, employing a quantitative analysis on technology-enabled business models adoption patterns, implementation features and performance outcomes after the pandemic. This is the tradition of information system and strategic management research, where substantial sample sizes can be used to generalize from evidence and build theory about technology's effects on organizational performance. The design promotes use of various data sources and analytical procedures to guarantee that the results are rigorous, accurate, and credible within the complexity and contextuality associated with natural business settings.

The population of study includes firms that experienced material digital transformation change events from 2019-2024 including those taking place in a pre-pandemic, pandemic phase as well as those happening during post pandemic recovery. This time limitation allows for comparison of adoption and performance trajectories across different crisis phases. A stratified random sample was used to ensure balanced representation in five indus-tries of interest: manufacturing, retail and e-commerce, healthcare and pharmaceuticals, fi-nancial services, technology services. Also, we found smaller and larger organizations indicating that size is likely a competition driver even within the two sectors studied here. This stratification approach represents the recognized diversity of digital transformation capabilities and resources that exist across organizations at various levels. The resulting sample involved 500 organizations with around 100 businesses in each sector, yielding sufficient statistical power to make intersectoral comparisons while preserving the representativeness of sample.

Data were collected using a mixed-method strategy incorporating both structured survey instruments and archival analysis of financial documents, supplemented by secondary information from industry reports and Web sites. The main survey instrument was derived in an iterative production process that included a literature review, expert consultations, and pilottesting in 30 organizations not used for the final sample. The questionnaire had 87 items in all, and was organized into six parts which included: organizational context and characteristics, patterns of digital technology adoption, activities for business model innovation related the use of digital technologies, challenges and enablers faced when implementing these innovations; performance outcomes generated with their use; and plans to pursue additional transformations in the future. Adoption of digital technology was ascertained for a range of areas: cloud infrastructure deployment, applications of artificial intelligence and machine learning, integration with the Internet of Things, implementation of blockchain, capabilities in advanced analytics and cybersecurity systems.

Business model innovation metrics included value proposition, customer segments, channels, relationships with customers, revenue stream, key resources, key operations activities,, partnerships and cost-related metric changes according to the business model canvas template. Performance results were measured by financial measures such as revenue growth, changes in profitability and cost efficiency, and operational measures such as customer satisfaction ratings, staff productivity ratios, and process cycle time reductions.

The remaining financial information was collected from secondary sources available in the public including annual reports, regulatory filings and share databases for the publicly listed companies. For those in the private industry, aggregated industry data and self reported financial measures were used directly from the survey instrument. This secondary data also supplied objective measures of performance, which complimented the self-reported survey responses and allowed for triangulation to validate findings. In addition, we collected archival data on technology investments, digital initiative announcements and transformation milestones from company websites, press releases and technology provider case studies. Additional industry publications issued by consultants providers, research shops and trade associations served as contextual market knowledge and comparative data points for interpreting organizational findings.

The analytic strategy combines descriptive statistics, inferential statistical analyses including correlation and regression modeling in order to investigate the relationship amongst variables and test study hypotheses. To describe the sample and generate baseline understanding of technology adoption rates, business model innovation prevalence and performance outcome ranges are presented in the form of descriptive statistics; including frequencies, means, standard deviations and a distributions. Comparative analysis by t-test and ANOVA investigates variations in adoption behavior and performance among industry segment, organizations' size, and time period. The correlations between technology investments, dimensions of business model innovation and performance measures are then examined to offer preliminary signs of relatedness worth further investigation. Multivariable regression analysis will identify predictive associations between independent factors such as the breadth of technology adoption, digital maturity level or quality of implementation, and dependent factors such as revenue growth, cost reduction or enhanced customer satisfaction in presence of organizational characteristics and contextual elements. Statistical analyses Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS 28.0 and R statistical software ($p<0.05$ significance level, unless otherwise stated).

4. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Table 1: Digital Technology Adoption Rates Across Industry Sectors (2019-2024)

Technology Domain	Manufacturing	Retail	Healthcare	Financial Services	Technology	Overall Average
Cloud Infrastructure	68% → 94%	72% → 96%	45% → 87%	81% → 98%	89% → 99%	71% → 95%
AI/ML Applications	34% → 71%	41% → 78%	28% → 64%	52% → 84%	67% → 92%	44% → 78%

IoT Integration	51% → 82%	38% → 69%	31% → 58%	24% → 47%	43% → 71%	37% → 65%
Blockchain	12% → 38%	18% → 44%	15% → 41%	34% → 62%	29% → 56%	22% → 48%
Advanced Analytics	56% → 88%	63% → 91%	48% → 79%	74% → 95%	81% → 97%	64% → 90%

The evidence summarized in Table 1 of accelerated adoption of digital technology is considerable across all sectors during the 2019-2024 period, and particularly dramatic from 2020 to 2021 pandemic years. Cloud infrastructure rose up as the most widely adopted foundational tech, climbing from 71% in 2019 to 95% in 2024 – indicating a rampant rise of 24 percentage points. This could be consistent with the sequence of infrastructure-first, where companies were spending on creating scalable and flexible computing environments before investing in higher-order applications. Financial services topped the list for cloud adoption at 98%, based on modernizing regulations, customer need for digital service, and fintech disruptors driving competition. The biggest percentage point surge in cloud adoption was healthcare (42 points) due to the need for telemedicine expansion, modernizing electronic health records and collaboration on research during COVID-19.

AITK:The Second Fastest Growing Category The second fastest growing product category were artificial intelligence and machine learning applications with overall adoption increasing 44% to 78%. The technology industry took the lead predictably, with 92% adoption, and financial services followed at 84%, AI is utilized in fraud detection, credit scoring, risk assessment and algorithmic trading; it offers significant competitive edge. The increase from 34% to 71% in AI adoption for manufacturing is a result of predictive maintenance systems, quality control automation and supply chain optimization algorithms taking over the factory floors. Recommendation engines, inventory optimization, demand forecasting and chatbot customer service systems are among the retail sector's 78% adoption peak. Compared to other industries, healthcare's adoption rate (64%) is considerably lower indicating continued barriers in regulatory compliance, data privacy and clinical requirements for AI-enabled diagnosis or treatment tools.

Integration of IOT shows variation by sector, in manufacturing being at 82%, led by factory sensors for equipment machine, real-time production monitoring, and handling systems automatic for materials. IoT retail adoption (smart shelf, RFID in-store inventory tracking and analytics on in store customer behaviour) is 69%. Adoption is lower in financial services (47%) because the sector is less reliant on physical asset monitoring but applications are emerging, such as smart ATMs and connected insurance telematics. Blockchain adoption ranks lowest among the technology domains despite growing significantly from 22% to 48% overall, and with financial services taking the lead at 62% adoption for use cases in cross-border payments, trade finance, and digital asset management. Blockchain use cases adopted in manufacturers (38%) are predominantly found within visibility and traceability of their supply chain and product provenance. Advanced analytics platforms reached 90% adoption, becoming nearly inescapable across all industries as companies saw the importance of data-based decision-making for overall competitive position.

Table 2: Business Model Innovation Dimensions and Implementation Rates

Innovation Dimension	Pre-Pandemic (2019)	Peak Pandemic (2020-21)	Post-Pandemic (2023-24)	Percentage Change
Digital Value Propositions	42%	73%	86%	+104%
Omnichannel Integration	38%	68%	81%	+113%
Platform Business Models	23%	41%	57%	+148%
Subscription Revenue Models	31%	54%	69%	+123%
Ecosystem Partnerships	28%	49%	64%	+129%
Data Monetization	19%	36%	52%	+174%
Automated Operations	45%	67%	83%	+84%
Personalization Engines	34%	59%	76%	+124%

The business model innovation data finds that the pandemic was a much more of a potent enabler for radical shifts in strategy, than just simple incremental technology adoption. Digital value propositions – offerings which are largely digital in nature or fully digital implementation – soared by over 100% (from 42% to 86%). This evolution mirrors the need to keep in touch with customers and income sources but without tactile interaction. Fitness (Peloton) education (Coursera, Udemy), entertainment (Disney+, Netflix) capture the quick flip to digital-first value propositions. The point during the pandemic shows the most rapid increase, as implementation rises from 42% to 73% in one year—an unprecedented pace of change in noncrisis market conditions.

Omnichannel integration (involving the fluid integration of physical and digital customer touchpoints) experienced 113% growth, with companies realizing that post-pandemic customers demand the flexibility to browse, buy, receive and return anywhere they want across all channels. Retailers that had omnichannel strategies that worked well reported 23–27% higher average order values and customer lifetime value and 18–21% more repeat purchase rates than those with weak or uncoordinated omnichannel. The data indicates that, in the study period, omnichannel went from a competitive advantage to a mere baseline requirement of any customer. The business models of "platforms", creating value by enabling interactions between users, were the fastest growing (148 per cent), but from a lower base. This expansion includes both firms enabling platformization (manufacturer adding a marketplace, healthcare provider connecting patients with specialists) and incumbent businesses joining ecosystems.

Subscription models increased 123%, indicating a tectonic shift away from transactional to relationship revenue structures. Subscription-based models give businesses predictable recurring revenue streams, increased customer insights from ongoing engagement data, and chances for long-term value-driven services and relationship building. Tech businesses embraced software-as-a-service models, manufacturers rolled out equipment-as-a-service products, ala the industrial internet, automotive firms tinkered with subscription vehicle access and consumer goods launched subscription boxes for monthly refillables. Ecosystem partnership saw the highest growth at 129% as companies

realise that full customer solutions often need to be orchestrated across organisational boundaries. These types of collaborations include technology integrations, data sharing deals, cosponsored products and joint-operated platforms. Monetization of data, the phenomenon on the rise and quickly growing at 174 percent, underscores that - in addition to customer, operational, and market data being valuable assets - organizations are beginning to recognize them as such. AD Completions Implementation achieved 83%, reflecting labor availability challenges experienced through pandemic lockdowns, continued cost pressure and technology readiness allowing more complex AD-related tasks to be reliably automated. AI/ML-driven personalization engines were at 76% deployment, in line with consumer's expectations for highly personalized experiences, where such personal interactions deliver 5-8 x more return on marketing investment than traditional approaches.

Table 3: Performance Impact of Technology-Driven Business Models

Performance Metric	Traditional Models	Hybrid Models	Fully Digital Models	Statistical Significance
Revenue Growth (2020-2024 CAGR)	3.2%	18.7%	34.7%	$p < 0.001$
Operating Cost Reduction	4.1%	16.3%	28.3%	$p < 0.001$
Customer Acquisition Cost	+12.3%	-8.4%	-23.7%	$p < 0.001$
Customer Lifetime Value	+8.1%	+34.2%	+67.8%	$p < 0.001$
Employee Productivity Gain	5.3%	22.6%	41.2%	$p < 0.001$
Time-to-Market Reduction	7.2%	28.4%	52.6%	$p < 0.001$
Customer Satisfaction Score	6.8	7.9	8.6	$p < 0.001$
Digital Revenue Percentage	12%	43%	78%	$p < 0.001$

The study of the performance impact offers solid empirical evidence in favor of the business value of technology-based business models. Organizations were classified in three different groups according to the depth of their digital transformation: traditional (low level of integration and use of technology as support for business operations), hybrid (strong activity through the traditional channel together with digital initiatives often taking an omnichannel approach) and fully digital companies (those implemented a primarily or exclusively digital-based model; where technology is central to delivering value. These gaps in result performance between these groups capture the advantages of being a digitally mature business.

The rates of growth in revenue display a particularly stark contrast, with digital-only models seeing 34.7% CAGR compared to 3.2% for traditional approaches—a multiplier of 10.8x Multiplier effect - Combo In Aggregate, Enterprises Which are Only Digital News & Magazine (2016/2021) Of These Ne vs Trl Make over the next five years. These differences manifest in different forms — the ability of digital models to scale without commensurate investment; access to much larger geographic markets, without physical footprint constraints; faster product iteration and time-to-market advantage, as well as richer customer data that would support targeted win-back or retention moves. Hybrid models reported 18.7% CAGR proving that partial digitalization also brings significant benefits. These differences are not due to random variation but reflect systematic patterns, as demonstrated by statistical significance

testing (p 80% costs in some industries and regions), (2) cloud infrastructure eliminating capex associated with data centers, (3) AI-driven optimization of supply chains and operations, and (4) digital channels being cheaper to service than physical locations. Hybrid models in particular have delivered 16.3% cost improvements, and not all processes need to go full digital to be several times more efficient than they were before.

Cost increases for new customers are widely divergent, as traditional companies are experiencing 12.3% growth in the cost to acquire a customer—a result of more competition for attention and increasing ad costs per eyeball (and lower returns on older marketing channels). 24% of economics reduction customer acquisition cost campaigns Dynamic retargeting (are all fully managed strategies the targeting algorithms How do we go so far at a card! This 36-point spread makes a big difference when it comes to competitive dynamics and the relative acquisition of share. It's much of the same for customer lifetime value metrics, which reveal even more impressive trends: Digital models increase CLV by 67.8 percent, thanks to better personalization and ongoing engagement, subscription offerings and cross- and upselling capabilities driven by a full view of the customer and AI-based suggestions.

Productivity gains among workers in fully digital companies have averaged around 41.2% over the past two weeks as routine tasks are increasingly automated, and collaboration tools help workers integrate or collaborate more seamlessly than before COVID-19 hit; AI is augmenting human capabilities, not displacing them; and data-driven decisions increase, so does worker efficiency—if they can find answers to their questions right away rather than waiting for a response from someone, they save hours of time that previously might have been devoted to search or waiting on a decision—are four of the contributors. 52.6% for fully digital models, Source: Innosight 7.2% advantage from rapid prototyping capabilities (77d versus >200) ability to deliver fast iteration -agile development -advantage from direct customer feedback loops – continuous deployment/Branch measurement systems and a global sales process that provides consistent alignment with local variability in growing markets. Customer satisfaction scores reveal that digital is not a negative for customer perceptions when executed well, with fully-digital models scoring 8.6 compared to 6.8 with traditional approaches on a 10-point scale.

Table 4: Digital Transformation Challenges and Mitigation Effectiveness

Challenge Category	Prevalence Rate	Impact Severity (1-10)	Successful Mitigation Rate	Key Success Factors
Legacy System Integration	78%	8.2	52%	API layers, phased migration
Organizational Resistance	71%	7.8	61%	Change management, training
Cybersecurity Concerns	68%	9.1	47%	Zero-trust architecture, SOC
Data Quality Issues	64%	7.4	58%	Data governance, MDM systems
Skill Gaps	82%	8.6	43%	Upskilling programs, hiring

Budget Constraints	59%	7.9	38%	Phased implementation, ROI proof
Vendor Lock-in Risks	47%	6.8	65%	Multi-cloud, open standards
Regulatory Compliance	53%	8.4	54%	Compliance-by-design, audits

The challenges data offers valuable information on implementation issues that the organizations faced in transitioning to technology-based business models. With a severity of 8.6, skill gaps also surfaced the most common challenge for respondents (82%), however only 43% successful mitigation was realized – the lowest of all challenge types. This is indicative of the continued shortage of talent in emerging tech areas such as AI/ML engineering, cloud architecture, cybersecurity, data science, and digital product management. Companies reported that traditional sourcing methods were not enough in a "war for talent" with cost expectations exceeding many companies' budgets. Successful mitigation was a mix of internal upskilling being offered through training programs, partnerships with universities and community colleges, apprenticeship models (an associate starts his career at the top tier of Trane's pay matrix scale), and selective strategic hiring specifically hired to develop internal talent).

Legacy system integration was a challenge for 78% of businesses with an impact severity of 8.2, which shows that the tech debt collected throughout years in mature businesses has had its say. Respondents indicated that existing systems had business logic of significant importance, stored key data, and supported integral operations; this prevented complete replacement. But many of these systems had outdated APIs or used antiquated tech and sat on an architecture that was not amenable to the cloud (or real-time data). The success rate of 52% speaks to considerable investments in middleware layers, API development (integration points), replication tools and staged migration strategies to incrementally shift functionality from legacy systems into modern ones whilst maintaining operational continuity. Companies with successful mitigation usually formed integration teams which had other duties, documented everything about the system and bit by bit replaced legacy components going forward using strangler fig patterns.

Cybersecurity emerged with the strongest impact severity, scoring a high of 9.1 This outcome corresponds to negative cybersecurity breach effects such as financial loss, regulatory fines fallout (cost escalation), reputational damage and erosion of customer trust on cause-and-effect level. That 68% discovery and 47% acquisition shows that security is not solved, it's a problem you have to face every day. Companies cited an increased attack surface from cloud, remote work, IoT devices and third-party integration as creating vulnerabilities that traditional perimeter security models were not managing. Effective mitigation approaches revolved around zero-trust security architectures that did not assume trust and consistently verified elements, deployment of security operations centers to monitor all day every day; employing security-by-design approaches that incorporated as much security as possible into the development process, and regular penetration- testing vulnerability scanning.

Organizational resistance hit 71% of companies at 7.8 severity but gained the second-highest rate, 61%, of successful mitigation. This implies that even though human factors are notoriously difficult to handle, they do react well under good change management practices. Organizations that were able to surmount resistance did so by developing a range

of communication programs focusing on why and how the transformation was beneficial, involving employees in design and implementation activities, provided a lot of training and support, celebrated some early successes as momentum builders, engaged people proactively through an open dialogue rather than top down directives. The role of a strong leadership commitment surfaced as the primary success factor, while high-level executive sponsorship strongly predicted resistance reduction success.

Data quality concerns, which affect 64% of organizations, are especially challenging to AI/ML projects — they need clean and consistent data that is also complete so that it can be used to train models and deliver meaningful insights. Problems cited for organizations included missing data, mixed format between systems, duplicate entries, outdated information and the lack of common definitions. The 58% successful mitigation percentage reflects spending on frameworks/indexes for data governance, master data management systems and tools that monitor data quality plus the organizational processes around having a Data Steward. Budget constraints impacted 59% of organizations, yet only 38% successfully mitigated them -indicating that budgetary restrictions are fundamental limitations not as easily addressed with technical solutions. Enterprising organizations that were successful in allowing the return of their planned mitigation either approached phased implementation with a reasonable Time to ROI at early stages to justify further investments, used cloud platforms to avoid upfront capital expenses and focused on most impactful use-case making best of their limited resources for programs which yielded maximum returns.

Table 5: Industry-Specific Technology-Business Model Alignments

Industry	**Dominant Technologies**	**Primary Business Model Innovations**	**Average Implementation Timeline**	**Success Rate**
Manufacturing	IoT, AI, Digital Twins	Servitization, Predictive Services	18-24 months	67%
Retail	AI, Analytics, Cloud	Omnichannel, Personalization	12-18 months	71%
Healthcare	Cloud, Telemedicine, AI	Virtual Care, Remote Monitoring	24-36 months	58%
Financial Services	Blockchain, AI, Cloud	Embedded Finance, Open Banking	15-21 months	74%
Technology	AI, Cloud, Platforms	Platform Models, API Ecosystems	9-15 months	79%

In line with industry-specific alignment works, the successful technology-based business model innovation should be based on the alignment of technological capabilities and sector characteristics, customer needs and expectations as well as regulatory conditions. IOT, artificial intelligence and digital twins are the latest buzzwords reshaping manufacturing because of its focus on physical stuff, complex supply chains, and operational excellence. The most pervasive business model innovator – servitization-led a transformation from selling products to solving customer problems: manufacturing companies such as Rolls-Royce who sold engine thrust not engines and Michelin- who offered tire-as-a-service instead of tires. This revolution harnesses the IoT sensors that monitor machine condition and

performance, AI algorithms to predict maintenance needs and optimize operations, and digital twins to simulate physical assets for testing and optimization. The 18-24 month implementation effort is indicative of the challenges associated with instrumenting machines on the production floor, tying operational technologies in to IT systems and building new sales, delivery and support processes. The 67% figure is significant, but also points to the barriers that still exist for servitization transformations, with cultural clashes from product-centric businesses and pricing complexity on necessity-based models among them, as well as the need to develop new competencies in risk management and customer relationship management.

The retail technology stack: AI, advanced analytics, cloud to support the end-to-end customer experience and personalization engines. It makes sense, when you consider the 12-18 month retail implementation window is among the shortest – an indication of how mature retail technology is along with a deep ecosystem of Vendors offering package solutions and strong competitive pressure that drives rapid adoption. The 71% control-group success rate indicates that, although speedier, retail transformations are also more successful than manufacturing's platform-based servitization efforts. Key retail innovations include smooth online-to-offline or offline-to-online customer journey, unified inventory visibility across all channels, uniform product pricing and promotions for a consistent omnichannel experience and flexible fulfillment such as home delivery, store pickup and curbside collections. Personalization engines leverage customer browsing and purchase history, their intent in the moment, combining with that with contextual variables to provide product recommendations, marketing communications, and pricing and promotions at an individual level.

Healthcare's stretched out 24-36 month implementation schedule and lowered 58% success rate are evidence of unique industry obstacles that include punishing regulatory demands, patient privacy protections (such as HIPAA regulations), clinical validation requirements for diagnostic and treatment devices, and integration with complex legacy systems involving electronic health records and medical equipment. The pandemic has made rapid adoption of telemedicine at scale a reality with platforms such as Teladoc seeing 1000% uptick in consultation volumes, however, sustainable virtual care models must address provider reimbursement practices and cross-border licensing limitations to encourage industry uptake, access disparity by technology platform and integration of virtual care into clinical workflow rather than delivering services separately. Remote patient monitoring uses connected devices that monitor vital signs, symptoms and medication adherence in order to intervene more proactively with patients and prevent hospital readmissions. Healthcare technology developments have to trade-off technology advances against clinical efficacy, patient safety, clinician acceptance and regulatory aspects– a multi-dimensional optimisation that may explain low success rates despite substantial inputs in terms of investment and innovation activity.

Financial services enjoyed the highest success rates at 74% with a time-to-market of 15-21 months–they have been more digitally advanced early in their digital rethinking, afforded strong technology spend and were disrupted by fintech upstarts forcing incumbents to innovate constantly. Blockchain applications include cross-border payments that slash settlement times from days to minutes, while trade finance automates cumbersome documentation and verification processes, and digital asset management for cryptocurrencies and tokenized securities. Such AI apps include detecting fraud or insider threats by monitoring transaction patterns in a database, using alternative data

sources to improve credit scoring, assessing risk for loan underwriting and portfolio management based on statistical models of past behavior, and processing routine questions from customers (for example through chatbots). Embedded finance is simply banks and insurers selling products through non-financial platforms, such as retailers (for POS financing), rideshare (insurance) or e-commerce marketplaces (business loans), which result in new distribution channel driven by the demand to reach customers where they are. Open banking programs require APIs providing 3rdparty access to customer financial information with their consent, encouraging innovation of the ecosystem while having a significant impact on infrastructure and data governance.

Technology sector firms predictably led with a 79% success rate and the shortest inception-to-implementation timeframe (9-15 months), drawing on internal technology expertise, digital-native cultures, and deep experience with agile development. 71 - A new class of technology company emergence as platform business models Companies in the tech space are increasingly innovating by launching platform businesses, whether through marketplaces, app ecosystems or infrastructure layers on which others can create value. API ecosystems are strategic assets, and companies like Stripe, Twilio, and Salesforce have built entire businesses around being the easiest way to integrate payment processing or communications or CRM into an app. Advantages for the tech sector also include being closer to technical talent, organizational cultures such as those that encourage trial and error experimentation and rapid iteration, less onerous regulatory barriers relative to healthcare or financial services and customer sets that demand constant innovation and are already at ease with digital experiences. But with technological companies there is also a competition of technology and fast obsolescence, as well as platform concentration dynamics inducing winner-takes-most results, which means the markets are high-stakes competition environments.

The above industry cross-analyses show several patterns: (a) Implementations correlate inversely with digital maturity, i.e., sectors that are more digitally mature manage faster implementations; (b) Success rates correlate with regulatory complexity — critical in these perspectives because seasoned from a competitive one also — as highly regulated sectors see substantial investments still having to navigate additional implementation barriers; and (c) The alignment of technology and business model is central, successful firms picking technologies directly supporting significant strategic business model innovations rather than the adopting of technologies per se. The most successful organizations started by setting clear business objectives and customer value propositions, and then picking the right enabling technologies, rather than starting with technology capabilities or specific software packages alone and looking for a use." This is indicative of a strategic digital transformation approach compared to an opportunistic one.

Discussion and Critical Analysis

The empirical results of this study offer strong evidence on the transformational effects of technologically driven business models after the pandemic while also illuminating areas where caution, nuance and contextual relevance are needed. The performance gaps reported in Table 3, including fully digital business models growing their revenues by 34.7% compared to traditional models with a 3.2% growth in revenue, echo and extend past work of Westerman et al. who observed the same differences but at lower levels before the crisis. That this was an amplifying effect of a pandemic that produced circumstances — remote-work requirements, physical retail limits, supply chain breakdowns — that magnified the relative virtues of digital capabilities. Companies with strong digital underpinnings were able to

pivot quickly, while those relying on physical infrastructure had an existential crisis that demanded an emergency transfusion in a combat zone.

A comparison with precoronavirus digital transfor- mation research shows that several dimensions accelerate. In 2017-2018, Kane et al., found digital maturity to be somewhere in the range of approximately 15% of organizations with "digital maturing" status while this study finds by 2024, some16 43% were hybrid and nearly one out of five achieved fully digital—a combined achievement of over two-thirds getting at least partially programmed. This shortening of transformation time paths from decades to 2-4 years is an unheard-of velocity of change and has its consequences. Rapid change facilitated survival in a time of crisis, but organizations were faced with issues such as technical debt due to accelerated implementation and security risks resulting from deployment prior to proper testing and workers experiencing organizational stress due to lack of stability between changes.

The technology uptake patterns illustrated in Table 1 also show an intriguing departure from past theories of technology diffusion, specifically the general category of Rogers' (1962) diffusion of innovation model which anticipates step-wise adoption and S-curve based progression where first come adopters followed by early majority, late majority, and laggards. And the pandemic forced this gradual diffusion curve to be upset, resulting in an adoption spike but that tap included customers from earlier and later stages of a typical "bell shaped" diffusion. Jumping from 71% to 95% of adoption for cloud infrastructure in five short years, this is a rate of diffusion that enterprise technologies usually take between 15 and 20 years. This era of forced-adoption,forces important questions about sustainability— will the companies that were forced to take on these technologies continue to utilize and evolve them OR revert back (to some degree) as immediate crisis forces fade?

Business model innovation based on Table 2 shows that digital value propositions, omnichannel integration and subscription models were more widely adopted (69%-86%) than platform models, ecosystem partnerships and data monetization (52%-64%). Such a pattern indicates a hierarchy of difficulty in digital transformation, where innovations for customers tend to align with greater success than complex ecosystem orchestration or new forms of monetization. This insight contradicts the view in academia that platform models are by far the most common digital business model archetype. But while these platforms create enormous value and achieve outsize valuations in successful cases, high implementation complexity, demands for network effects scales and ecosystem coordination constricts widespread application. The majority of firms undergo digital transformation by evolutionarily improving on their existing business models rather than revolutionarily converting to platforms—insights that have substantive implications for both academics and practitioners.

When reading the impact performance data objectively, they are required to admit certain methodological issues and confounding variables. Breaking companies into traditional, hybrid, and fully digital models is an analytical convenience – these are not distinct types but rather points along a continuum of digital maturity. Organizations on the boundary between categories might more closely resemble rather than differ from those in neighboring categories, obscuring variation within category. Also, performance differentials may not only mirror the effects of digital transformation but also selection effects—companies achieving fully digital models might have been better managers (and in inherently better market positions or otherwise advantaged before their transitions) that contributed to

performance. Statistical controls of the organization size, industry sector, and pre-transformation performance levels were used in the paper to control this concern but unobserved heterogeneity does still represent a limitation.

Crossing the challenge landscape in Table 4 with existing transformation literature shows continuities as well as deviations. The most mentioned resistance of organizations (71%), has been a topic of study in the change management literature for more than forty years and confirms that human issues are still in practice challenging, despite technology advances. But the details of how they rose changed – today's resistance is largely focused on job security because of automation, privacy issues as a result of surveillance-enabled digital tools and hoo-boy-change-overload as opposed to straight change-aversion. The 82% of companies that are concerned about skill gaps is an amplified version of traditional skills issues in light of technology change that's faster and sides the talent of most workers further than before from what their company needs.

The highest impact severity, illustrated in the cybersecurity challenge at 9.1, also represents a new risk category well not covered in pre-digital transformation studies. Enterprises deployed wider and deeper digital footprints, which significantly increased the attack surface – with every connected device, cloud service and third-party integration becoming a potential point of compromise. The affect this month to large numbers of organizations by the SolarWinds compromise, which took over an organization-based software update function and was able to infect thousands of computer systems, and the Colonial Pipeline ransomware intrusion — which disrupted significant infrastructure in east coast energy distribution — illustrates that cyber risks are not just individual threats but system-wide. The 47% mitigation success rate – the lowest of all major classes – indicates security as an arms race that pit defenders against new forms of attacks, instead of driving permanent solutions.

The sector-specific patterns in Table 5 identify significant heterogeneity across sectors, which is often hidden by cross-industry studies. healthcare's modest 58% success rate and 24 -36 month timeline, is a striking comparison to that of the technology sector which boasts a success rate of 79-82%, with platinum transformations typically lasting only 9–15 months. An implication being drawn is that sector context plays such an influential role in transformational feasibility and outcomes. These variations imply that universal "best" practices are of limited relevance—successful approaches to transformation need to make allowance for the regulatory regime, customer base, market competition and legacy issues of a specific sector. Indeed, the difficulties of the health sector vividly illustrate how regulation developed for earlier technological epochs may actually inhibit otherwise valuable innovations. Telemedicine mandates of state-specific licensure, reimbursement incentives for in person care or liability frameworks opaque to AI supported Dx form barriers that are not present in a less regulated space.

Comparing the current findings with studies conducted by other authors in the post-pandemic period, we can note general agreement for trends in digital acceleration and strong variation of magnitudes and focus. A McKinsey Global Institute study found that the pandemic sped digital adoption by three to four years in both consumer and business categories, though this investigation reports even more dramatic acceleration in specific categories, such as telemedicine (essentially compressing a decade into months) and less in others, like blockchain (progressing two to three years faster). Such differences of the degree of readiness probably can depend on maturity – mature technologies such as cloud had the most significant benefits very soon after adoption became mainstream due to their immediate

applicability; or for emerging technologies such as blockchain, more time was needed before they could be widely deployed.

Particular interesting are the patterns from data monetization in Group 2, as presented in table 2., where we observe a significant growth of increased attention (+174%) but overall still low adoption (52%), and given also the rise of policy and public concern on data privacy algorithmic bias corporate surveillance. Enterprlses with data monetlzsltlon as a goal must considcr how to grapple with these complex ethlcal challenges that go beyond regulatory complaince: whether acceptable-use boundaries ha‘(, consent meanlng, what it means when consumers have no gcnulne alteratives and failrness in algorithmic decision-making. That view of corporate eagerness to monetize data and the increasingly skeptical public are in conflict, hinting at regulatory resentment that might slow data’s escalation. EU’s General Data Protection Regulations and California Consumer Privacy Act are early policy responses, with probable broader and enhanced data protection regimes across the globe.

The productivity of the individual Members recorded in Table 3 (41.2% gains for the fully digital organizations) calls for an enhanced understanding than crude efficiency numbers. While productivity gains can also advantage organisational performance, strong bodies of work in work design and occupational psychology have highlighted concerns around intensification—the tendency for workers to achieve more within the same available time by minimising slack, continually monitoring output and building-in algorithmic management systems that may generate non-sustainable levels of intensity and stress. Perhaps the shift to working from home that digital tools facilitated brought productivity gains through reduced commuting time and flexible scheduling, but it also had work-life blur implications as well as isolation consequences. See online supplementary appendix for further explanation): tourist mobility (far or near); business advantage; technological proclivity; efficiency perspective (online process), and HRD aspects: experimental learning, bridging digital divide, replicability inclination and explicit project assignment.

Fully digital organisations have competitive advantage due to 52.6% reduction in time-to-market compared to traditional procedures (7.2%). In fast-moving markets, the advantage of spotting an opportunity, devising a solution and iterating through trials with customers is huge over competitors. But this velocity introduces hazards of early launch, lackluster testing and accruing technical debt when speed-to-market becomes too much the priority over quality. A healthy middle between speed and rigor probably varies a bit by context -- life-affecting healthcare vs. consumer entertainment, for example -- but organizational cultures often have consistent velocity norms applied across an indiscriminate range of endeavors.

6. CONCLUSION

This empirical study offers a detailed view of business models changing significantly under technological adoption, in the postpandemic world. The study finds that companies that implemented technology-enabled business models outperformed those locked into legacy practices, with companies fully shifting to digital models registering 34.7% revenue growth, 28.3% operating costs savings and a 67.8% increase in customer lifetime value, significantly higher than was achieved by either hybrid or traditional players. These performance differences confirm the strategic relevance of digitalization and show that returns are not experienced evenly across Firms engaging in extensive instead

of limited digital transformation. The report details startling pace of technology uptake in all categories, with cloud infrastructure going mainstream at 95%, AI/ML applications to follow suit at 78% and advanced analytics not very far behind with more than nine out of ten (90%) implementations. This acceleration equates to a decades-long transformation timeline being compressed into 2-4 year cycle, fundamentally rewiring competitive dynamics and upping the ante for organizations that are behind the digital maturity curve.

Looking across sectors, we find significant sectoral differences in transformation and its timing and success, thereby questioning universal best practice assumptions as well as the significance of contextual fit. 24-36 months and 58% on a success rate basis to tech with 9-15 month timelines and the industry average in th e high seventies, suggesting wildly different regulatory burd en, legacy infrastructure tax, or digital maturity at starting points. This diversity indicates that effective types of changes depend on the nature of each sector and should, therefore, take such features into consideration instead of being based on general designs only. The business model innovation terrain is dominated by customer-centric changes such as omnichannel, personalization, and subscription models versus the more radical ecosystem orchestration and platform strategies of evolution trumping revolution in terms of enhancement of current operating models being more sustainable for most organizations.

In the future, few trends and concluding remarks can be drawn from this study. First, the digital divide between high and low digitally proficient organizations will increase, with performance differences becoming so large that unsustainable positions may force exits from markets or consolidation as more digitally mature competitors use higher efficiency, better knowledge of their customers and a faster pace of innovation to grab share. Second, the viability of fast digital transformation is uncertain – will crisis-driven quick-and-dirty implementations need to be mitigated in their wake when the dust has settled, or can organisations continue to build out from accelerated running starts? Third Digital talent gap will grow as transformation initiatives outpace schools of learning and new generation automation and AI challenges bidding for limited human capabilities. Fourth, there will be developments in the regulatory environment to respond to new concerns involving data privacy, algorithmic discrimination, and tech monopolies; some technology uses may come under pressure while making space for (narrower) compliance-oriented products.

REFERENCES

[1] D. J. Teece, "Business Models, Business Strategy and Innovation," *Long Range Planning*, vol. 43, no. 2-3, pp. 172-194, Apr. 2010.

[2] C. Zott and R. Amit, "Business Model Design: An Activity System Perspective," *Long Range Planning*, vol. 43, no. 2-3, pp. 216-226, Apr. 2010.

[3] D. Westerman, C. Calméjane, D. Bonnet, P. Ferraris, and A. McAfee, "Digital Transformation: A Roadmap for Billion-Dollar Organizations," *MIT Center for Digital Business and Capgemini Consulting*, pp. 1-68, 2011.

[4] G. Vial, "Understanding Digital Transformation: A Review and a Research Agenda," *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 118-144, Jun. 2019.

[5] P. Weill and S. L. Woerner, "Thriving in an Increasingly Digital Ecosystem," *MIT Sloan Management Review*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 27-34, Summer 2015.

[6] G. G. Parker, M. W. Van Alstyne, and S. P. Choudary, *Platform Revolution: How Networked Markets Are Transforming the Economy*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2016.

[7] A. Priyono, A. Moin, and V. N. A. O. Putri, "Identifying Digital Transformation Paths in the Business Model of SMEs During the COVID-19 Pandemic," *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 104-125, Dec. 2020.

[8] J. Amankwah-Amoah, Z. Khan, and G. Wood, "COVID-19 and Business Failures: The Paradoxes of Experience, Scale, and Scope for Theory and Practice," *European Management Journal*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 179-184, Apr. 2021.

[9] G. C. Kane, D. Palmer, A. N. Phillips, D. Kiron, and N. Buckley, "Strategy, Not Technology, Drives Digital Transformation," *MIT Sloan Management Review and Deloitte University Press*, vol. 14, pp. 1-25, Jul. 2015.

[10] E. M. Rogers, *Diffusion of Innovations*, 5th ed., New York: Free Press, 2003.

[11] C. Matt, T. Hess, and A. Benlian, "Digital Transformation Strategies," *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 339-343, Oct. 2015.

[12] N. Dragicevic, A. Ullrich, J. Tsui, and M. Gronau, "A Machine Learning Approach to Modeling Product Innovation Using Digital Transformation," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 96151-96162, 2020.

[13] S. Verhoef, K. Hekstra, and T. M. Hult, "Digital Supply Chain Performance: The Role of Digitalization in Operational and Supply Chain Performance," *Journal of Operations Management*, vol. 67, no. 6, pp. 715-739, Sep. 2021.

[14] R. Kohli and N. P. Melville, "Digital Innovation: A Review and Synthesis," *Information Systems Journal*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 200-223, Jan. 2019.

[15] A. Bharadwaj, O. A. El Sawy, P. A. Pavlou, and N. Venkatraman, "Digital Business Strategy: Toward a Next Generation of Insights," *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 471-482, Jun. 2013.

[16] J. Reis, M. Amorim, N. Melão, and P. Matos, "Digital Transformation: A Literature Review and Guidelines for Future Research," in *World Conference on Information Systems and Technologies*, Springer, 2018, pp. 411-421.

[17] S. Nambisan, K. Lyytinen, A. Majchrzak, and M. Song, "Digital Innovation Management: Reinventing Innovation Management Research in a Digital World," *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 223-238, Mar. 2017.

[18] M. Fitzgerald, N. Kruschwitz, D. Bonnet, and M. Welch, "Embracing Digital Technology: A New Strategic Imperative," *MIT Sloan Management Review*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 1-12, 2014.

[19] J. W. Ross, C. M. Beath, and A. Quaadgras, "You May Not Need Big Data After All," *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 91, no. 12, pp. 90-98, Dec. 2013.

[20] T. H. Davenport and G. Westerman, "Why So Many High-Profile Digital Transformations Fail," *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 9, pp. 15-22, Mar. 2018.

[21] C. L. Iacovou, I. Benbasat, and A. S. Dexter, "Electronic Data Interchange and Small Organizations: Adoption and Impact of Technology," *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 465-485, Dec. 1995.

[22] M. L. Markus and D. Robey, "Information Technology and Organizational Change: Causal Structure in Theory and Research," *Management Science*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 583-598, May 1988.

[23] Y. Yoo, O. Henfridsson, and K. Lyytinen, "Research Commentary—The New Organizing Logic of Digital Innovation: An Agenda for Information Systems Research," *Information Systems Research*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 724-735, Dec. 2010.

[24] A. Tiwana, B. Konsynski, and A. A. Bush, "Research Commentary—Platform Evolution: Coevolution of Platform Architecture, Governance, and Environmental Dynamics," *Information Systems Research*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 675-687, Dec. 2010.

[25] M. Iansiti and K. R. Lakhani, "Digital Ubiquity: How Connections, Sensors, and Data Are Revolutionizing Business," *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 92, no. 11, pp. 90-99, Nov. 2014.

[26] W. Fichman, B. L. Dos Santos, and Z. Zheng, "Digital Innovation as a Fundamental and Powerful Concept in the Information Systems Curriculum," *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 329-353, Jun. 2014.

[27] L. D. W. Thomas and E. Autio, "Innovation Ecosystems in Management: An Organizing Typology," in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*, Oxford University Press, 2020.

[28] K. Schwertner, "Digital Transformation of Business," *Trakia Journal of Sciences*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 388-393, 2017.

[29] P. C. Verhoef, T. Broekhuizen, Y. Bart, A. Bhattacharya, J. Q. Dong, N. Fabian, and M. Haenlein, "Digital Transformation: A Multidisciplinary Reflection and Research Agenda," *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 122, pp. 889-901, Jan. 2021.

[30] A. Osterwalder and Y. Pigneur, *Business Model Generation: A Handbook for Visionaries, Game Changers, and Challengers*, Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2010.