

# Developing Conceptual Models for Business Model Innovation in Post-Pandemic Digital Markets

ROSEBENEDICTA ODOGWU<sup>1</sup>, JEFFREY CHIDERA OGEAWUCHI<sup>2</sup>, ABRAHAM AYODEJI ABAYOMI<sup>3</sup>, OLUWADEMILADE ADEREMI AGBOOLA<sup>4</sup>, SAMUEL OWOADE<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Omek Altimate World Investment Delta State, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Wellfleet shellfish Company, Boston MA. USA

<sup>3</sup>Hagital Consulting, Lagos State, Nigeria

<sup>4</sup>Thrive Agric, Abuja, Nigeria

<sup>5</sup>Sammich Technologies, USA

*Abstract- The COVID-19 pandemic served as a catalytic event that accelerated the digital transformation of industries and reshaped the foundations of global commerce. As organizations grapple with the implications of this disruption, Business Model Innovation (BMI) has emerged as a strategic imperative for survival, recovery, and long-term competitiveness. This paper develops a set of conceptual models to guide BMI in post-pandemic digital markets. Grounded in an integrated theoretical framework that combines Dynamic Capabilities Theory, the Resource-Based View (RBV), and Digital Ecosystem Theory, the models reflect the multifaceted nature of innovation in digitally driven, volatile environments. Using a qualitative synthesis of academic literature, industry reports, and post-pandemic business cases, the study identifies core constructs such as digital readiness, value proposition innovation, organizational agility, ecosystem collaboration, and revenue model reconfiguration. These are organized into a three-layered framework comprising foundational enablers, transformational innovation activities, and ecosystem-level interactions. The models provide both diagnostic and prescriptive tools for firms seeking to realign their business models to meet evolving customer expectations and technological opportunities. The discussion explores the theoretical contributions, strategic implications, and limitations of the models, emphasizing the need for agility, collaboration, and continuous adaptation in navigating digital markets. The paper concludes by calling for empirical research to validate and extend the models, and by positioning BMI as a key driver of organizational resilience and renewal in a post-pandemic world.*

*Indexed Terms- Business Model Innovation, Digital Transformation, Post-Pandemic Strategy, Dynamic Capabilities, Digital Ecosystems, Organizational Agility*

## I. INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has served as a watershed moment in the global business landscape, precipitating a wave of disruption that reshaped industries, altered consumer behavior, and forced organizations to rethink the foundations of their operational models. The rapid acceleration of digital technologies, coupled with enforced remote work, supply chain disruptions, and changing market dynamics, underscored the vulnerability of traditional business models. As firms sought agility and resilience, the concept of Business Model Innovation (BMI) gained renewed prominence. No longer a strategic luxury, BMI has become a necessity for survival and competitiveness in a fundamentally altered market environment[1].

Post-pandemic digital markets are characterized by intensified digitization, increased platformization, and a shift toward more decentralized and data-driven ecosystems. Companies must now contend with consumers who expect seamless digital experiences, employees who prefer hybrid work arrangements, and partners who demand agile and transparent collaborations[2]. In this context, merely digitizing existing business processes is insufficient; rather, firms must engage in deep structural reconfiguration of their value propositions, value delivery mechanisms, and revenue models. Business Model Innovation, therefore, represents a dynamic and

strategic response to the uncertainties and opportunities of the post-pandemic era[3].

Despite the growing interest in BMI, there is a noticeable gap in the literature concerning robust, adaptable, and context-sensitive conceptual models that guide innovation in digital markets after a systemic crisis like COVID-19[4]. Existing models often lack the flexibility to accommodate rapid change, fail to integrate digital transformation principles effectively, or are not grounded in the unique socio-economic conditions that characterize post-pandemic recovery phases[5]. Consequently, there is a need to develop new conceptual frameworks that account for the hybrid nature of modern organizations, the rise of digital ecosystems, and the strategic imperatives of sustainability, resilience, and innovation[6].

This paper seeks to bridge this gap by developing conceptual models tailored to Business Model Innovation in post-pandemic digital markets. The study draws on interdisciplinary theories and synthesizes recent empirical insights to propose adaptable and scalable frameworks that businesses can use to navigate the evolving landscape[7]. By doing so, the research not only contributes to academic scholarship on BMI and digital transformation but also provides actionable guidance for practitioners seeking to future-proof their organizations[8].

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 presents a comprehensive literature review on BMI, digital transformation, and conceptual modeling. Section 3 outlines the theoretical framework underpinning the model development. Section 4 details the methodology employed in the construction of the models. Section 5 introduces and explains the proposed conceptual models. Section 6 discusses the implications for theory and practice, and Section 7 concludes with a summary, limitations, and future research directions.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Business Model Innovation (BMI)

Business Model Innovation (BMI) refers to the process through which firms rethink and redesign their core logic for value creation, delivery, and capture[9].

Unlike incremental improvements to products or services, BMI involves fundamental changes to the configuration of business elements such as customer segments, value propositions, revenue mechanisms, and channels[10]. Scholars like Osterwalder and Pigneur (2010) introduced Business Model Canvas, which has become a foundational tool for conceptualizing and discussing BMI[11]. More recent work has emphasized BMI as a dynamic capability one that enables firms to respond strategically to environmental changes and uncertainty. Particularly in volatile contexts such as global crises, BMI serves as a means of resilience and adaptability[12].

### 2.2 Digital Transformation and Market Shifts Post-COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated digital transformation across industries, forcing firms to adopt new technologies, digital platforms, and virtual engagement mechanisms at unprecedented speed. McKinsey (2020) reported that companies implemented digital initiatives 20–25 times faster than previously thought possible[13]. Digital transformation, distinct from mere digitization, entails a comprehensive reimagining of business models using advanced technologies such as AI, cloud computing, IoT, and big data analytics[14].

Post-pandemic digital markets are no longer defined solely by technological adoption but by the integration of digital thinking into the fabric of strategic management[15]. Platform business models, gig economy dynamics, decentralized finance, and AI-enabled personalization have emerged as dominant themes[16]. Firms that successfully navigate this terrain do so not merely by deploying technology, but by transforming their entire value creation logic to align with the expectations of digital-first customers and partners[17].

### 2.3 Conceptual Modeling in Business Studies

Conceptual models serve as structured representations of theoretical constructs and their interrelationships, offering a way to simplify and explain complex business phenomena[18]. In the context of BMI, conceptual models help clarify the pathways through which innovation occurs, the enablers and barriers, and the expected outcomes[19]. According to Whetten

(1989), a well-developed conceptual model should answer four key questions: What are the variables? How are they related? Why should we expect these relationships? And under what conditions do they hold[20]? Existing BMI models often fall short in addressing the nuances of digital transformation and post-pandemic recovery[21]. Many are sector-specific, technology-agnostic, or fail to incorporate dynamic environmental variables. Moreover, few conceptual models are designed with adaptability in mind critical shortcomings given the fast-evolving nature of digital markets[16].

#### 2.4 Gaps in Existing Literature

While a growing body of research explores BMI and digital transformation separately, there remains a lack of integrated frameworks that marry both dimensions within the post-pandemic context[22]. Furthermore, most existing studies rely on empirical observations or case studies without offering generalized conceptual models that can guide broader strategic thinking. This highlights a critical gap: the need for adaptable, scalable, and theory-driven conceptual models that firms can utilize to navigate business model innovation in digitally restructured markets[23].

This paper aims to fill this void by synthesizing multidisciplinary insights to propose conceptual models that reflect the complexities and opportunities of post-pandemic digital business environments.

### III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The development of robust conceptual models for Business Model Innovation (BMI) in post-pandemic digital markets requires a solid theoretical foundation[24]. A theoretical framework provides the scaffolding for understanding the dynamics of innovation, the interaction between organizational capabilities and external environments, and the mechanisms that drive sustainable competitive advantage[25]. This section presents and justifies the theoretical lenses employed in this study, specifically the Dynamic Capabilities Theory, the Resource-Based View (RBV), and Digital Ecosystem Theory. Together, these frameworks offer a comprehensive understanding of how firms can reconfigure their business models in response to rapidly changing digital landscapes[26].

#### 3.1 Dynamic Capabilities Theory

Dynamic Capabilities Theory, developed by Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997), posits that the competitive advantage of a firm lies not only in its resources but in its ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly changing environments[27]. In post-pandemic digital markets, this theory is particularly relevant. Organizations that thrive are those that can sense opportunities and threats, seize them through resource reconfiguration, and transform their operations accordingly. Business Model Innovation can be seen as a manifestation of dynamic capabilities in action where firms reengineer their value propositions, channels, and cost structures to remain relevant and resilient[28].

#### 3.2 Resource-Based View (RBV)

The Resource-Based View (Barney, 1991) emphasizes that firms gain sustained competitive advantage through unique, valuable, inimitable, and non-substitutable resources[29]. While the RBV has been critiqued for being too internally focused, it remains useful in identifying the firm-specific assets such as data analytics capabilities, intellectual property, or customer relationships that serve as the building blocks for BMI. In digital markets, intangible resources such as digital talent, algorithmic competencies, and platform architecture are particularly significant. The RBV helps explain why some firms are better positioned to innovate their business models than others based on their internal resource portfolios.

#### 3.3 Digital Ecosystem Theory

Digital Ecosystem Theory extends the view of the firm from an isolated entity to a participant in a complex, interdependent network of digital actors including customers, partners, platforms, and regulatory bodies[30]. This perspective is especially relevant in post-pandemic contexts where collaboration, interoperability, and open innovation have become critical[31]. Ecosystem thinking helps in understanding how value is co-created across networked participants, and how business models need to adapt to this relational interdependence[32]. In essence, firms no longer innovate in isolation; they

innovate within digitally enabled ecosystems that require agility, trust, and platform participation[33].

### 3.4 Integration of Theories

Each of these theories contributes uniquely to the conceptualization of BMI in digital markets. Dynamic Capabilities Theory explains the processes of adaptation and transformation; RBV identifies the internal enablers of innovation; and Digital Ecosystem Theory contextualizes these innovations within a broader networked environment[34]. By integrating these lenses, this study provides a multifaceted theoretical foundation for the development of conceptual models that are both internally coherent and externally responsive[35].

This theoretical triangulation enhances the relevance and applicability of the models presented later in the paper, ensuring they are grounded in scholarly rigor while being adaptable to the complexities of real-world digital transformation[36].

## IV. METHODOLOGY

The objective of this study is to develop conceptual models that capture the mechanisms and processes underlying Business Model Innovation (BMI) in post-pandemic digital markets. Given the exploratory and theory-building nature of this research, a qualitative, conceptual development approach was employed. This method emphasizes synthesis over empirical testing and is well-suited for developing theoretical models that integrate diverse streams of literature, identify new constructs, and propose relationships that can later be empirically validated. This section outlines the research design, data sources, and the model development process used in the study.

### 4.1 Research Design

The study adopts a multi-stage conceptual synthesis methodology, drawing upon established principles of grounded theory and theory-building from qualitative data [37]. Rather than collecting primary data through interviews or surveys, this approach relies on secondary sources, including academic literature, industry reports, and post-COVID business case studies. The goal is not to test hypotheses, but to construct theoretical models that explain how firms

can innovate their business models in the wake of digital disruption accelerated by the pandemic.

### 4.2 Data Sources

Three categories of data informed the conceptual model development:

1. Academic Literature: Peer-reviewed journal articles were systematically reviewed from leading databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. Keywords used included “business model innovation,” “digital transformation,” “post-COVID markets,” and “conceptual frameworks.”
2. Industry Reports: Thought leadership papers and industry whitepapers from reputable consulting firms (e.g., McKinsey, Deloitte, PwC) provided real-world insights into emerging trends and strategic shifts in digital business practices.
3. Case Exemplars: Selected case examples of firms that successfully adapted their business models during or after the COVID-19 pandemic were reviewed. These included companies across sectors such as healthcare, retail, education, and fintech.

### 4.3 Model Development Process

The model development followed a structured three-phase process:

- Phase 1: Thematic Synthesis  
Key themes and constructs were identified through inductive coding of the literature and case examples. This step involved categorizing recurring concepts such as agility, resilience, digital readiness, ecosystem collaboration, and value reconfiguration.
- Phase 2: Construct Clustering and Relationship Mapping  
Using an abductive approach, related constructs were clustered into higher-order dimensions. Relationships among these dimensions were theorized based on logical reasoning, theoretical consistency, and existing frameworks from the Dynamic Capabilities Theory, Resource-Based View, and Digital Ecosystem Theory.

- Phase 3: Model Articulation and Visualization  
Proposed models were visualized using diagrams that reflect the interconnections among the constructs. Each model was designed to be modular, allowing adaptation across different industry contexts.

#### 4.4 Rationale for Conceptual Methodology

A conceptual approach is particularly appropriate in emerging research areas where empirical work is limited or rapidly evolving. Given the novelty of the post-pandemic business landscape, traditional empirical designs may not yet capture the full complexity of BMI under conditions of systemic uncertainty. Conceptual modeling allows researchers to articulate new ideas, stimulate scholarly dialogue, and provide strategic guidance to practitioners navigating uncharted territory[36].

In summary, this methodology lays the groundwork for the development of theoretically sound, practically relevant conceptual models that can inform both academic research and business practice in the realm of post-pandemic digital transformation[38].

### V. CONCEPTUAL MODEL DEVELOPMENT

In response to the dynamic pressures exerted by the COVID-19 pandemic and the ensuing digital acceleration, this section presents a set of conceptual models that capture the core mechanisms of Business Model Innovation (BMI) in post-pandemic digital markets. These models are designed to help firms understand and navigate the complex process of reimagining their business models considering new digital realities, shifting customer expectations, and emergent technological ecosystems. The models are grounded in the theoretical foundations of Dynamic Capabilities, the Resource-Based View (RBV), and Digital Ecosystem Theory, and they integrate insights from the reviewed literature and real-world case examples[39].

#### 5.1 Core Constructs and Variables

The development of the conceptual models begins with the identification of key constructs and variables that are critical to BMI in digital markets:

- Digital Readiness: The organization's baseline technological infrastructure, talent, and agility in adopting digital tools.
- Value Proposition Innovation: Changes in the core value offered to customers, often enabled by digital technologies such as AI, IoT, or data analytics.
- Customer Engagement and Personalization: Tailoring services and products to individual customer needs, made possible by digital data and interaction platforms.
- Organizational Agility: The firm's ability to pivot quickly in response to external shocks or opportunities.
- Ecosystem Collaboration: The degree of interdependence and co-innovation between firms and their digital partners (e.g., platforms, suppliers, third-party developers).
- Revenue Model Reconfiguration: Shifts from traditional pricing models to subscription, freemium, or outcome-based pricing enabled by digital delivery channels.

These constructs form the building blocks of the proposed models.

#### 5.2 Model Architecture

The core conceptual model proposed is a Three-Layered Dynamic Innovation Framework, comprising the following layers:

1. Foundation Layer – Enablers: Includes internal capabilities such as digital infrastructure, data capabilities, and organizational culture. These are informed by the RBV and form the basis for all innovation efforts[11].
2. Transformation Layer – Innovation Actions: Represents the active reconfiguration of the business model elements: value proposition, delivery channels, customer interface, and revenue streams. This layer is influenced by Dynamic Capabilities Theory[40].
3. Ecosystem Layer – Contextual Integration: Highlights the role of partnerships, platform strategies, and ecosystem alignment. This outer

layer reflects the insights from Digital Ecosystem Theory and contextualizes how firms engage with external digital networks to drive co-creation and scale[41].

Arrows between layers represent feedback loops, indicating the iterative and non-linear nature of innovation. For instance, ecosystem collaborations may prompt new innovations in value delivery, which in turn demand adjustments in foundational capabilities.

### 5.3 Application Scenarios

The model can be applied in various contexts:

- Retail: A traditional brick-and-mortar store adopting a hybrid e-commerce model, leveraging data to personalize offerings and partnering with delivery platforms[17].
- Healthcare: A clinic transitioning to telemedicine and remote monitoring, innovating its value proposition through IoT-enabled diagnostics while relying on digital infrastructure and ecosystem alliances with health tech providers[42].
- Education: An academic institution moving toward blended learning with subscription-based access to digital content, requiring shifts in pedagogical delivery and digital resource investment[43].

These scenarios demonstrate the flexibility and adaptability of the model across industries.

### 5.4 Validation Strategy

While this study does not conduct empirical testing, it proposes a roadmap for future validation through:

- Case Study Analysis: In-depth comparative analysis across firms that have engaged in post-pandemic BMI.
- Survey-Based Research: Quantitative studies using operationalized constructs from the model to test relationships.
- Action Research: Collaborative implementation of the model in organizational settings to monitor outcomes over time.

## VI. DISCUSSION

The conceptual models developed in this study offer significant contributions to both theoretical understanding and practical application of Business Model Innovation (BMI) in the context of post-pandemic digital markets[44]. This discussion explores these contributions, reflects on the strategic insights the models provide, and addresses how organizations and scholars can leverage the proposed frameworks for resilience and growth in the evolving digital economy[45].

### 6.1 Theoretical Contributions

From a theoretical standpoint, this study advances the discourse on BMI by integrating three robust theoretical perspectives Dynamic Capabilities, Resource-Based View (RBV), and Digital Ecosystem Theory into a unified, multi-layered framework. While each theory has individually contributed to the literature on innovation and organizational transformation, their combined application offers a more comprehensive lens for understanding the complexities of post-pandemic digital adaptation. The Dynamic Capabilities perspective illuminates how organizations can systematically sense opportunities, seize them, and transform their operations through iterative innovation processes. The conceptual models capture this by emphasizing agility and reconfigurability as core mechanisms.

The Resource-Based View contextualizes the internal foundations required for innovation such as technological assets, human capital, and data infrastructure thus explaining why some firms are better positioned to respond to crises than others. Finally, the Digital Ecosystem lens expands the view of BMI beyond the firm level, highlighting the importance of platform-based interactions, partner collaboration, and ecosystem alignment. This contribution is especially timely, as many post-pandemic innovations have occurred through inter-organizational collaboration and shared digital infrastructure.

### 6.2 Practical Implications

For business leaders, the proposed models serve as strategic tools to guide digital reinvention. First, by

diagnosing their current position in the three-layer framework—foundation, transformation, and ecosystem firms can identify capability gaps and innovation opportunities. Second, the models underscore the importance of viewing business model transformation as an ongoing process rather than a one-time change. This mindset shift is vital in a world where disruptions are becoming more frequent and complex[46].

Furthermore, the models provide a blueprint for scalable innovation. Smaller firms can start with incremental digital upgrades and progressively evolve toward ecosystem integration, while larger firms can orchestrate value networks using platform strategies. In both cases, the focus is on aligning internal capabilities with external digital opportunities to co-create and capture new forms of value.

### 6.3 Strategic Considerations in Digital Markets

The pandemic underscored the fragility of rigid business models. Organizations that survived and thrived were those that could adapt quickly, leverage digital technologies, and co-create with ecosystem partners. The conceptual models emphasize that resilience and adaptability are now strategic imperatives. Rather than resisting change, firms must develop internal cultures and systems that embrace uncertainty and promote experimentation[47].

Digital markets also demand a rethink of customer relationships[48]. Today's customers expect real-time personalization, seamless digital experiences, and value-driven engagement. Firms must use data intelligently and ethically to meet these expectations while maintaining trust and transparency[49].

### 6.4 Limitations and Boundaries

While the conceptual models offer valuable insights, they are not without limitations. They are theoretical constructions that require empirical validation before widespread application. Additionally, the models may not fully capture industry-specific nuances or cultural variables that influence BMI in different regions or sectors[50]. For example, regulatory environments, technological maturity, and workforce digital literacy vary significantly across geographies[51].

Another limitation is the potential temporal relevance of the models. As digital technologies continue to evolve e.g., with the rise of generative AI, blockchain, and decentralized platforms new constructs may emerge that demand model adaptation. Thus, the frameworks must be treated as dynamic and evolving rather than static prescriptions.

## CONCLUSION

The unprecedented disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic have irrevocably altered the landscape of global commerce, necessitating profound shifts in how businesses operate, compete, and deliver value. As digital technologies become ever more integral to economic recovery and growth, Business Model Innovation (BMI) emerges as a central strategic imperative. This paper sought to address the theoretical and practical void in guiding such innovation by developing conceptual models that capture the key dynamics of BMI in post-pandemic digital markets. The proposed conceptual models anchored in the foundational theories of Dynamic Capabilities, Resource-Based View (RBV), and Digital Ecosystem Theory provide a structured framework for understanding how firms can realign their value propositions, reconfigure internal capabilities, and engage with dynamic digital ecosystems to sustain competitiveness. These models synthesize multidisciplinary insights into a three-layered innovation framework encompassing foundational enablers, transformational innovation activities, and ecosystem-based interactions. Together, they serve not only as diagnostic tools for assessing organizational readiness and strategic fit but also as prescriptive guides for navigating the complex terrain of digital transformation.

A major contribution of this study lies in its holistic approach to BMI. Rather than treating innovation as a linear or isolated event, the models emphasize the iterative, interconnected, and systemic nature of business model evolution. This approach reflects the new digital reality, where change is constant, customer preferences shift rapidly, and technological advancements demand continuous adaptation. From a practical standpoint, the models offer actionable insights for decision-makers. Organizations can utilize the framework to map their current business model

configurations, identify capability gaps, and chart a path for strategic reinvention. Additionally, by emphasizing ecosystem engagement and co-creation, the models encourage firms to move beyond organizational silos and embrace open innovation strategies that leverage the strengths of diverse digital partners. The study also opens avenues for future research. While the conceptual models presented are robust and grounded in existing literature and case insights, empirical validation remains necessary to refine their utility across different sectors and geographies. Future studies may conduct cross-industry case analyses, longitudinal studies, or mixed-methods research to test the model's components and predictive value in real-world settings. Moreover, as new digital paradigms such as generative AI, metaverse commerce, and quantum computing emerge, the models will require evolution to remain relevant.

In conclusion, this paper underscores the critical role of Business Model Innovation in shaping resilient, adaptive, and competitive enterprises in the post-pandemic digital age. By offering theoretically grounded and practically adaptable conceptual models, it contributes to the ongoing discourse on how firms can not only survive but thrive amidst digital disruption. It is hoped that these models will inspire both scholars and practitioners to further explore, test, and refine the pathways to sustainable innovation in the digitally transformed global economy.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] D. I. Ajiga, "Strategic Framework for Leveraging Artificial Intelligence to Improve Financial Reporting Accuracy and Restore Public Trust," *Int. J. Multidiscip. Res. Growth Eval.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 882–892, 2021, doi: 10.54660/IJMRGE.2021.2.1.882-892.
- [2] F. U. Ojika, W. O. Owobu, O. A. Abieba, O. J. Esan, B. C. Ubamadu, and A. Ifesinachi, "A Conceptual Framework for AI-Driven Digital Transformation: Leveraging NLP and Machine Learning for Enhanced Data Flow in Retail Operations," vol. 4, no. 9, 2021.
- [3] F. U. Ojika, W. O. Owobu, O. A. Abieba, O. J. Esan, B. C. Ubamadu, and A. Ifesinachi, "Optimizing AI Models for Cross-Functional Collaboration: A Framework for Improving Product Roadmap Execution in Agile Teams," vol. 5, no. 1, 2021.
- [4] V. Basile, "The triple layered business model canvas in smart agriculture: the case of Evja startup," *Piccola Impresa Small Bus.*, no. 2, Art. no. 2, Oct. 2021, doi: 10.14596/pisb.2844.
- [5] A. L. A. March, "Advancing the Blue Economy Approach to Tackle Global Ocean Crises".
- [6] P. Bamberger, "From the Editors Beyond Contextualization: Using Context Theories to Narrow the Micro-Macro Gap in Management Research," *Acad. Manage. J.*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 839–846, Oct. 2008, doi: 10.5465/amj.2008.34789630.
- [7] Y. G. Hassan, A. Collins, G. O. Babatunde, A. A. Alabi, and S. D. Mustapha, "AI-driven intrusion detection and threat modeling to prevent unauthorized access in smart manufacturing networks," *Int. J. Multidiscip. Res. Growth Eval.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1197–1202, 2024, doi: 10.54660/IJMRGE.2024.5.1.1197-1202.
- [8] N. Nakicenovic *et al.*, "Innovations for Sustainability: Pathways to an efficient and post-pandemic future," International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Laxenburg, Austria, Report, Jul. 2020. doi: 10.22022/TNT/07-2020.16533.
- [9] "A Process View of Business Model Innovation - ProQuest." [Online]. Available: <https://www.proquest.com/openview/4e0760f866fb7ce2e31d9fe576f0b3b2/1?cbl=18750&diss=y&pq-origsite=gscholar>
- [10] O. Ammar and P. Chereau, "Business model innovation from the strategic posture perspective: An exploration in manufacturing SMEs," *Eur. Bus. Rev.*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 38–65, Jan. 2018, doi: 10.1108/EBR-09-2016-0119.
- [11] Pengyi Zhang, Yan Qu, and Chen Huang, "Designing a Multi-Layered Ontology for the Science and Technology Innovation Concept Knowledge-Base," in *2011 44th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, Kauai, HI: IEEE, Jan. 2011, pp. 1–10. doi: 10.1109/HICSS.2011.147.
- [12] Christian Chukwuemeka Ike, Adebimpe Bolatito Ige, Sunday Adeola Oladosu, Peter Adeyemo

- Adepoju, Olukunle Oladipupo Amoo, and Adeoye Idowu Afolabi, “Redefining zero trust architecture in cloud networks: A conceptual shift towards granular, dynamic access control and policy enforcement,” *Magna Sci. Adv. Res. Rev.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 074–086, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.30574/msarr.2021.2.1.0032.
- [13] Sunday Adeola Oladosu, Christian Chukwuemeka Ike, Peter Adeyemo Adepoju, Adeoye Idowu Afolabi, Adebimpe Bolatito Ige, and Olukunle Oladipupo Amoo, “Advancing cloud networking security models: Conceptualizing a unified framework for hybrid cloud and on-premise integrations,” *Magna Sci. Adv. Res. Rev.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 079–090, Oct. 2021, doi: 10.30574/msarr.2021.3.1.0076.
- [14] “Relevance of Business Model Innovation for Sustainable Entrepreneurship: A Perspective - ProQuest.” [Online]. Available: <https://www.proquest.com/openview/63e3e85cd57ca06e6dffcaaldfef92b0/1?cbl=54457&pq-origsite=gscholar>
- [15] N. Srinivasan and L. Eden, “Going digital multinationals: Navigating economic and social imperatives in a post-pandemic world,” *J. Int. Bus. Policy*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 228–243, 2021, doi: 10.1057/s42214-021-00108-7.
- [16] Afees Olanrewaju Akinade, Peter Adeyemo Adepoju, Adebimpe Bolatito Ige, Adeoye Idowu Afolabi, and Olukunle Oladipupo Amoo, “A conceptual model for network security automation: Leveraging ai-driven frameworks to enhance multi-vendor infrastructure resilience,” *Int. J. Sci. Technol. Res. Arch.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 039–059, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.53771/ijstra.2021.1.1.0034.
- [17] IPCC, Ed., *Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability*. in *Climate change 2001: contribution of Working Group ... to the third assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, no. Working Group 2. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001.
- [18] W. Cukier, K. E. McCallum, P. Egbunonu, and K. Bates, *The mother of invention: skills for innovation in the post-pandemic world*. in *Skills for the post-pandemic world*. Ottawa, ON: Public Policy Forum, 2021.
- [19] V. N. Azarov, Y. L. Leokhin, and A. V. Chekmarev, “Construction of Distributed Enterprises in Pandemic and Post-Pandemic Periods,” in *2021 International Conference on Quality Management, Transport and Information Security, Information Technologies (IT&QM&IS)*, Sep. 2021, pp. 576–584. doi: 10.1109/ITQMIS53292.2021.9642897.
- [20] D. A. Whetten, “Organizational comparative analysis: Investigating similarities and differences among organizations,” in *Studying Differences between Organizations: Comparative Approaches to Organizational Research*, vol. 26, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2009, pp. 63–87. doi: 10.1108/S0733-558X(2009)0000026005.
- [21] B. Nicoletti, *Banking 5.0: How Fintech Will Change Traditional Banks in the “New Normal” Post Pandemic*. Springer Nature, 2021.
- [22] E. E. Kossek and M. B. Perrigino, “Resilience: A Review Using a Grounded Integrated Occupational Approach,” *Acad. Manag. Ann.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 00–00, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.5465/19416520.2016.1159878.
- [23] M. Ahmad *et al.*, “Intention-Based Critical Factors Affecting Willingness to Adopt Novel Coronavirus Prevention in Pakistan: Implications for Future Pandemics,” *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 18, no. 11, Art. no. 11, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.3390/ijerph18116167.
- [24] A. Aagaard, “The Concept and Frameworks of Digital Business Models,” in *Digital Business Models: Driving Transformation and Innovation*, A. Aagaard, Ed., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 1–26. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-96902-2\_1.
- [25] Sunday Adeola Oladosu, Christian Chukwuemeka Ike, Peter Adeyemo Adepoju, Adeoye Idowu Afolabi, Adebimpe Bolatito Ige, and Olukunle Oladipupo Amoo, “The future of SD-WAN: A conceptual evolution from traditional WAN to autonomous, self-healing network systems,” *Magna Sci. Adv. Res. Rev.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 095–107, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.30574/msarr.2021.3.2.0086.
- [26] K. O. Ogunsola and E. D. Balogun, “Enhancing Financial Integrity Through an Advanced

- Internal Audit Risk Assessment and Governance Model,” *Int. J. Multidiscip. Res. Growth Eval.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 781–790, 2021, doi: 10.54660/IJMRGE.2021.2.1.781-790.
- [27] N. J. Foss, *Resources, Firms, and Strategies: A Reader in the Resource-based Perspective*. Oxford University Press, 1997.
- [28] B. I. Adekunle, E. C. Chukwuma-Eke, E. D. Balogun, and K. O. Ogunsola, “A Predictive Modeling Approach to Optimizing Business Operations: A Case Study on Reducing Operational Inefficiencies through Machine Learning,” *Int. J. Multidiscip. Res. Growth Eval.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 791–799, 2021, doi: 10.54660/IJMRGE.2021.2.1.791-799.
- [29] J. Barney, “Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage,” *J. Manag.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 99–120, Mar. 1991, doi: 10.1177/014920639101700108.
- [30] A. Hein *et al.*, “Digital platform ecosystems,” *Electron. Mark.*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 87–98, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1007/s12525-019-00377-4.
- [31] S. Nambisan, S. A. Zahra, and Y. Luo, “Global platforms and ecosystems: Implications for international business theories,” *J. Int. Bus. Stud.*, vol. 50, no. 9, pp. 1464–1486, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.1057/s41267-019-00262-4.
- [32] F. Sussan and Z. J. Acs, “The digital entrepreneurial ecosystem,” *Small Bus. Econ.*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 55–73, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.1007/s11187-017-9867-5.
- [33] E. C. Chukwuma-Eke, O. Y. Ogunsola, and N. J. Isibor, “Designing a Robust Cost Allocation Framework for Energy Corporations Using SAP for Improved Financial Performance,” *Int. J. Multidiscip. Res. Growth Eval.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 809–822, 2021, doi: 10.54660/IJMRGE.2021.2.1.809-822.
- [34] [Online]. Available: [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Nnaemeka-Egbuhuzor/publication/389906574\\_Cloud-based\\_CRM\\_systems\\_Revolutionizing\\_customer\\_engagement\\_in\\_the\\_financial\\_sector\\_with\\_artificial\\_intelligence/links/67d84acc7d56ad0a0f059b5d/Cloud-based-CRM-systems-Revolutionizing-customer-engagement-in-the-financial-sector-with-artificial-intelligence.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Nnaemeka-Egbuhuzor/publication/389906574_Cloud-based_CRM_systems_Revolutionizing_customer_engagement_in_the_financial_sector_with_artificial_intelligence/links/67d84acc7d56ad0a0f059b5d/Cloud-based-CRM-systems-Revolutionizing-customer-engagement-in-the-financial-sector-with-artificial-intelligence.pdf)
- [35] F. Nachira, P. Dini, and A. Nicolai, “A Network of Digital Business Ecosystems for Europe: Roots, Processes and Perspectives”.
- [36] O. O. Elumilade, I. A. Ogundeji, G. O. Achumie, H. E. Omokhoa, and B. M. Omowole, “Enhancing fraud detection and forensic auditing through data-driven techniques for financial integrity and security,” *J. Adv. Educ. Sci.*, vol. 1, no. 2, Art. no. 2, Dec. 2021.
- [37] “A Systematic Methodology for Doing Qualitative Research.” [Online]. Available: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348157169\\_A\\_Systematic\\_Methodology\\_for\\_Doing\\_Qualitative\\_Research](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348157169_A_Systematic_Methodology_for_Doing_Qualitative_Research)
- [38] Christian Chukwuemeka Ike, Adebimpe Bolatito Ige, Sunday Adeola Oladosu, Peter Adeyemo Adepoju, Olukunle Oladipupo Amoo, and Adeoye Idowu Afolabi, “Redefining zero trust architecture in cloud networks: A conceptual shift towards granular, dynamic access control and policy enforcement,” *Magna Sci. Adv. Res. Rev.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 074–086, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.30574/msarr.2021.2.1.0032.
- [39] “(PDF) AI-driven intrusion detection and threat modeling to prevent unauthorized access in smart manufacturing networks,” ResearchGate. [Online]. Available: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388678014\\_AI-driven\\_intrusion\\_detection\\_and\\_threat\\_modeling\\_to\\_prevent\\_unauthorized\\_access\\_in\\_smart\\_manufacturing\\_networks](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388678014_AI-driven_intrusion_detection_and_threat_modeling_to_prevent_unauthorized_access_in_smart_manufacturing_networks)
- [40] S. Arima and Y. Itoh, “A study on a ‘Three-Layered-Structure Open Innovation Foundation’ accelerating the interaction of Innovation,” in *2010 10th International Symposium on Communications and Information Technologies*, Oct. 2010, pp. 833–838. doi: 10.1109/ISCIT.2010.5665104.
- [41] O. Troisi, M. Grimaldi, and F. Loia, “Redesigning Business Models for Data-Driven Innovation: A Three-Layered Framework,” in *Research and Innovation Forum 2020*, A. Visvizi, M. D. Lytras, and N. R. Aljohani, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021, pp. 421–435. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-62066-0\_32.

- [42] X. Bai, W. T. Tsai, R. Paul, K. Feng, and L. Yu, "Scenario-based modeling and its applications," in *Proceedings of the Seventh IEEE International Workshop on Object-Oriented Real-Time Dependable Systems. (WORDS 2002)*, San Diego, CA, USA: IEEE Comput. Soc, 2002, pp. 253–260. doi: 10.1109/WORDS.2002.1000060.
- [43] [Online]. Available: <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=d22a95ee302325ebf020e8ee625fc0e3b78e7d0e>
- [44] "Examining the Role of Business Resilience and Digital Transformation Intention on Business Model Innovation in Post-Pandemic Era | SpringerLink." [Online]. Available: [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-65314-8\\_11](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-65314-8_11)
- [45] D. Klimanov and O. Tretyak, "Pandemic-driven business model sustainability: a review," *J. Bus. Amp Ind. Mark.*, vol. 39, no. 8, pp. 1645–1668, doi: 10.1108/JBIM-11-2022-0492.
- [46] A. Nayak and I. Canales, "NON-COGNITIVE MICROFOUNDATIONS: UNDERSTANDING DYNAMIC CAPABILITIES AS IDIOSYNCRATICALLY REFINED SENSITIVITIES AND PREDISPOSITIONS".
- [47] "Search - International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and ..." Accessed: May 04, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.allmultidisciplinaryjournal.com/search?q=MGE-2025-2-154&search=search>
- [48] S. Liebowitz, "Rethinking the Networked Economy: The True Forces Driving the Digital Marketplace."
- [49] R. Palmatier and L. Steinhoff, *Relationship Marketing in the Digital Age*. New York: Routledge, 2019. doi: 10.4324/9781315143583.
- [50] P. A. Dutil, C. Howard, J. Langford, and J. Roy, "Rethinking Government-Public Relationships in a Digital World," *J. Inf. Technol. Amp Polit.*, Apr. 2008, doi: 10.1300/J516v04n01\_06.
- [51] S. Alavi, "New paradigm of digital marketing in emerging markets: from social media to social customer relationship management," *Int. J. Manag. Pract.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 56–73, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1504/IJMP.2016.074889.