International Seminar & Workshop
PROCEEDINGS
Jl. Z.A. Pagar Alam No. 89 Gedong Meneng, Bandar Lampung

Business Model Innovation in the Digital Age: Optimizing Technology for Business Sustainability

Dery Dwi Hartanto[1]

derydwi@gmail.com
[1]Universitas Bandar Lampung

ABSTRACT

As the digital age redefines competitive landscapes, business model innovation (BMI) has become critical for long-term sustainability. This article explores how organizations are using technology not merely to digitize existing operations, but to reimagine value creation, delivery, and capture. Drawing on qualitative data from interviews and case studies, the article identifies key strategies, challenges, and success factors in leveraging technology for sustainable business models.

Keywords: *Business Model Innovatio;, Digital Transformatio; Sustainabilit; Platform Economy; Data Strategy; Organizational Culture.*

Introduction

The advancement of digital technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI), big data analytics, blockchain, Internet of Things (IoT), and cloud computing has radically transformed the global business landscape. These innovations have shifted organizations away from traditional, product-centered paradigms toward more dynamic, adaptive, and value-driven models. In this context, Business Model Innovation (BMI) emerges not only as a mechanism for maintaining competitiveness but also as a strategic response to uncertainty, sustainability imperatives, and technological disruption (Teece, 2018; Foss & Saebi, 2017).

As organizations navigate the turbulence of the 21st century—marked by climate change, supply chain volatility, and shifting consumer values—BMI has become essential to achieving long-term viability. Unlike incremental process improvements or digital upgrades, BMI entails a fundamental rethinking of how value is created, delivered, and captured (Bocken et al., 2014; Massa & Tucci, 2013). In the digital age, this rethinking is often catalyzed by technology but ultimately anchored in organizational culture, leadership vision, and sustainability goals.

From a philosophical standpoint, thinkers such as Michel Foucault (1977) have emphasized how systems of knowledge and power shape organizational behavior. In the context of digital transformation, power is increasingly distributed through algorithmic infrastructures, demanding new forms of transparency, accountability, and ethical consideration. Meanwhile, Bernard Stiegler (2010) warned of the "pharmacological" nature of technology—simultaneously enabling and destabilizing human systems—which makes critical reflection essential in any innovation discourse.

Recent research underscores that successful digital transformation requires more than adopting new tools. It necessitates aligning digital capacity with social and environmental responsibility. For instance, Loebbecke and Picot (2015) argue that the digital economy has introduced new logics of scalability and data-centric value creation, yet these logics must be balanced with ethical governance and sustainability commitments. In the Southeast Asian context, scholars such as Nugroho et al. (2021) and Wicaksono (2022) have highlighted the importance of culturally sensitive, locally embedded innovation strategies that go beyond technological determinism.

Despite growing attention to BMI, academic literature remains heavily skewed toward quantitative performance metrics, with insufficient qualitative insight into how innovation is experienced and implemented by business leaders on the ground. Moreover, many studies are overly focused on Western case studies, failing to account for

ISSN 2987-6761

how BMI unfolds in emerging markets such as Indonesia, where infrastructure, regulation, and socio-cultural dynamics create unique conditions for transformation (Tambunan, 2019).

This study seeks to address these gaps by exploring how organizations in various sectors—ranging from fintech and manufacturing to logistics and digital commerce—leverage digital tools to transform their business models. Using qualitative methods including in-depth interviews and case study analysis, the research captures the lived experiences of decision-makers involved in innovation processes. Rather than treating technology as a neutral enabler, this study examines how it interacts with leadership mindsets, stakeholder expectations, and the broader imperative of sustainable development.

Ultimately, this article aims to contribute to the discourse on digital-era business strategy by reframing BMI not only as a technological challenge but as a socio-organizational endeavor. It argues that sustainable business transformation requires holistic thinking: one that integrates digital capacity with ethical foresight, systemic agility, and a redefinition of value in environmental and societal terms. In doing so, it positions BMI as a critical competency for organizations striving to remain relevant, resilient, and responsible in a fast-evolving global economy.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research methodology, rooted in interpretivist epistemology, to explore how organizations reconfigure their business models through digital innovation in pursuit of sustainability and resilience. The interpretivist paradigm is particularly appropriate in this context, as it allows for the exploration of subjective experiences, meaning-making processes, and organizational narratives in response to technological disruption (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Denzin & Lincoln, 2017). Rather than aiming to generalize findings through statistical inference, the research seeks to provide rich, contextualized insight into the lived strategies of corporate actors as they navigate transformation in dynamic environments.

Data collection was conducted using three complementary qualitative methods designed to enable methodological triangulation and enhance the credibility of findings (Patton, 2015). First, semi-structured interviews were carried out with 14 key informants comprising business strategists, innovation consultants, and C-level executives from diverse sectors including fintech, manufacturing, logistics, and e-commerce. These industries were selected for their high exposure to digital transformation and their strategic relevance in Indonesia's evolving digital economy (World Bank, 2021; McKinsey, 2022). Informants were selected through purposive and snowball sampling techniques to ensure a balance of perspectives across both private enterprises and public-private partnerships. Interview sessions, conducted between March and May 2024, lasted between 60 to 90 minutes and were conducted in either Bahasa Indonesia or English depending on participant preference. Questions were designed to explore respondents' perspectives on digital strategy formulation, risk management, value creation, and sustainability integration within business model innovation.

Second, a document and case study analysis was conducted on 10 Indonesian and multinational firms that have publicly reported successful business model transformations between 2020 and 2024. These included firms such as Gojek, Telkom Indonesia, Unilever Indonesia, and Grab, which have demonstrated substantial adaptation in response to technological change and evolving market conditions. Sources included annual sustainability reports, press releases, strategic white papers, investor presentations, and third-party analyses. The inclusion of document analysis provided empirical grounding and allowed cross-validation of themes emerging from interview data (Bowen, 2009). Furthermore, it enabled the research to capture organizational discourses and innovation narratives not always evident in individual interviews.

Third, all qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis, employing Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework: familiarization with the data, initial coding, theme identification, theme review, theme naming, and final synthesis. An inductive coding approach was applied, allowing patterns to emerge organically from the data rather than being constrained by a predetermined theoretical model. Themes were identified in relation to three core constructs: digital innovation strategy, organizational change processes, and sustainability-oriented outcomes. NVivo 12 software was utilized to manage and organize the coding process, ensuring transparency, traceability, and analytical rigor.

Methodologically, this study is also informed by the conceptual insights of Zuboff (2019), who argues that digital transformation is entangled with shifts in institutional logic and data capitalism, and by Amit and Zott

ISSN 2987-6761

(2012), who view business models as dynamic systems of interdependent activities. These frameworks supported the interpretation of findings within broader socio-economic and technological contexts. Additionally, Indonesian-specific scholarly considerations from Setiawan and Soemartono (2021) were integrated to reflect local cultural norms and regulatory frameworks influencing innovation diffusion.

Ethical clearance was obtained prior to data collection, and all participants provided informed consent. Anonymity and confidentiality were maintained throughout the research process, with names and affiliations replaced by codes to protect sensitive information. Data sources used for document analysis were publicly available or obtained with permission where applicable.

In sum, this qualitative and interpretivist methodological framework offers a comprehensive lens through which to investigate how digital technologies are not merely tools of operational efficiency, but catalysts for deeper strategic and sustainability-driven transformation in contemporary business model innovation. The findings presented in the following section reflect the voices, strategies, and real-world choices of practitioners at the forefront of digital transformation in Indonesia and the broader Southeast Asian region.

Findings

The qualitative analysis of interviews and supporting documents yielded five core themes that illuminate how organizations are leveraging digital technologies to innovate their business models for sustainability, agility, and growth. These themes reflect not only technological advancements but also organizational, cultural, and strategic shifts required to make innovation meaningful and durable.

1. Shifting from Product-Centric to Platform-Centric Models

A recurring pattern across interviews was the strategic transition from traditional product-based value propositions to platform-centric models. Participants explained how digital platforms facilitate network effects, value co-creation, and scalable service ecosystems. Rather than merely selling discrete products, companies are increasingly positioning themselves as enablers of value exchange between multiple stakeholders—customers, partners, and third-party providers. This transformation is enabled by cloud technologies, API-based integration, and real-time data flows.

For example, one mid-sized manufacturing firm implemented IoT-enabled machinery that allowed them to shift from a transactional model to a subscription-based offering. Instead of selling equipment, they began providing predictive maintenance and operational analytics as a service, charging clients based on usage and performance insights. This pivot not only diversified revenue but also created deeper, ongoing relationships with clients. As one CEO put it, “It’s not just what we sell anymore—it’s how we enable others to grow.” The platform model was widely regarded as a resilience-enhancing strategy, especially under conditions of market volatility and supply chain disruption.

2. Data as a Strategic Asset

Another major theme concerned the central role of data in business model innovation. Participants emphasized that data analytics, machine learning, and AI capabilities were not simply operational tools but critical enablers of strategic agility. Organizations that had embedded data into their core processes described being able to rapidly identify emerging trends, customer needs, and operational inefficiencies.

A retail executive recounted how their company restructured its product lines based on customer behavior data, phasing out underperforming goods and introducing new service bundles. “Our customer data told us what products we should stop making and what services we hadn’t considered,” they explained. Data was not treated as a secondary output of transactions, but as a foundational asset that drove innovation and decision-making. Several companies also reported establishing internal data governance protocols and investing in talent skilled in data interpretation, recognizing that the mere accumulation of data without actionable insight offered limited strategic value.

3. Integration of Environmental and Social Goals

A particularly salient finding was that digital transformation, when aligned with sustainability principles, enabled organizations to embed environmental and social responsibility into their business models. Participants described using blockchain, AI, and geospatial technologies to enhance supply chain transparency, monitor carbon emissions, and engage ethically with stakeholders. Far from being an external add-on or compliance requirement, sustainability was seen as a value proposition in itself.

ISSN 2987-6761

For instance, a logistics startup implemented blockchain to verify the origin and carbon footprint of goods in real time, thereby building trust with environmentally conscious clients. Other firms reported using digital twins and resource optimization algorithms to reduce waste and energy consumption. These practices were framed not only as environmentally necessary but also as commercially advantageous, helping attract investors, talent, and partners aligned with ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance) standards.

4. Cultural and Organizational Adaptation Is Critical

While digital tools were integral, participants consistently noted that true business model transformation required internal cultural change. Innovation efforts were most successful in organizations that invested in soft capabilities—such as change management, leadership development, and interdepartmental collaboration. Participants cited cross-functional teams, agile project cycles, and open innovation practices as mechanisms that helped overcome resistance to change.

One digital transformation lead described the shift from a hierarchical, risk-averse structure to one that encouraged experimentation and learning from failure. “We had to shift from risk-avoidance to calculated risk-taking,” they shared. In these organizations, leadership played a crucial role in modeling openness, supporting capacity building, and aligning incentives with innovation outcomes. Firms that failed to address cultural inertia often experienced stagnation, despite having the technological infrastructure in place.

5. Challenges: Fragmentation and Legacy Systems

Despite overall optimism, many respondents acknowledged substantial challenges in executing business model innovation. Chief among these were issues related to system fragmentation and legacy infrastructure. Older firms, in particular, struggled with integrating new digital tools into existing enterprise architectures, leading to inefficiencies, redundancies, and delays. In several cases, promising digital initiatives were undercut by incompatible systems or lack of cross-departmental coordination.

Moreover, several interviewees pointed to the difficulty of aligning short-term ROI expectations with long-term innovation goals. C-level leaders often faced internal pressure to demonstrate immediate performance gains, which made sustained investment in transformational initiatives more difficult. Overreliance on digital tools, without strategic alignment or workforce readiness, frequently led to resistance or underutilized solutions. As one executive remarked, “It’s easy to adopt the tool; it’s much harder to change the mindset.”

Discussion

The findings of this study reinforce the notion that digital technologies, while central to transformation, do not function as inherently disruptive or sustainable agents in isolation. Rather, their impact is conditioned by the strategic orientation, organizational culture, and ethical framing adopted by decision-makers. Business model innovation (BMI) in the digital age is therefore not simply a matter of technological acquisition, but a deeper organizational recalibration—wherein firms reimagine how they deliver value, engage stakeholders, and ensure long-term resilience.

The transition from product-centric to platform-centric models observed in this study reflects a broader evolution in economic logic, wherein value is no longer confined to transactions but is co-created through ecosystems of users, data, and services (Teece, 2018; Parker, Van Alstyne, & Choudary, 2016). Platforms not only allow scalability but also foster more durable customer relationships and adaptive revenue streams—qualities that are increasingly vital in volatile markets. As Loebbecke and Picot (2015) argue, digital infrastructures generate new forms of connectivity and coordination that challenge traditional notions of firm boundaries and control.

Moreover, the prioritization of data as a strategic asset supports the argument that datafication is a cornerstone of modern organizational intelligence (Zuboff, 2019). Yet the real value lies not in data accumulation but in its strategic interpretation and ethical application. Organizations that embed data into the fabric of decision-making processes exhibit higher levels of agility, customer responsiveness, and innovation capacity. These dynamics echo Foucault’s (1977) insight that power and knowledge are mutually constitutive—suggesting that those who control the flow and interpretation of data shape organizational priorities and social relations alike.

In line with sustainable development goals (SDGs) and the rise of stakeholder capitalism, the integration of environmental and social objectives into the core business model marks a significant shift from CSR as peripheral practice to sustainability as strategic identity (Bocken et al., 2014). Digital technologies such as blockchain, AI, and digital twins allow for real-time resource tracking, supply chain transparency, and impact

ISSN 2987-6761

reporting, which in turn appeal to both ethically motivated consumers and institutional investors. As Stiegler (2010) warned, however, the same technologies that enable optimization can also accelerate alienation or ecological degradation if not grounded in a moral and ecological framework.

The study's emphasis on cultural adaptation and organizational mindset change aligns with current literature emphasizing the social foundations of innovation (Foss & Saebi, 2017). Organizations that embrace learning cultures, iterative experimentation, and cross-functional collaboration are better positioned to realize the transformative potential of digital tools. This supports the argument by Amit and Zott (2012) that business models should be seen as dynamic systems rather than static templates—requiring constant feedback and adaptation.

The challenges identified—particularly those related to legacy infrastructure and the pressure for short-term ROI—underscore the limitations of techno-centric approaches to innovation. As pointed out by Chesbrough (2010), innovation must be aligned with organizational incentives and structural flexibility; otherwise, it risks superficial implementation or internal resistance. These findings also reveal the tension between the speed of digital innovation and the slower pace of cultural and institutional change, especially in legacy organizations or highly regulated sectors.

From a philosophical perspective, the findings resonate with Byung-Chul Han's (2015) critique of digital acceleration and performative culture. In his view, the overemphasis on productivity and optimization can lead to burnout, depersonalization, and diminished social cohesion. For business model innovation to be genuinely sustainable, it must also address these human dimensions—not only in consumer value propositions but in internal work design and leadership ethics.

Finally, the Indonesian context adds another layer of complexity, as highlighted in studies by Nugroho et al. (2021) and Setiawan and Soemartono (2021). Business transformation in emerging markets often occurs amid infrastructural gaps, institutional inertia, and cultural nuances that demand locally sensitive strategies. Rather than importing Western-centric innovation models, organizations must design hybrid approaches that blend global best practices with local realities.

In sum, this study confirms that digital technologies can be powerful catalysts for business model innovation—but only when embedded within a coherent strategic vision that prioritizes sustainability, ethical responsibility, and human adaptability. The challenge for contemporary firms is not simply to digitize their offerings, but to reimagine their organizational logic for a world where technological dynamism and socio-environmental fragility coexist.

Conclusion

Business model innovation (BMI) in the digital era represents not merely a technical shift but a profound strategic and cultural transformation. As this study demonstrates, the effective use of digital technologies—such as artificial intelligence, data analytics, platform infrastructures, and blockchain—enables organizations to redefine how they create, deliver, and capture value. Yet, the transformative power of these tools lies not in their novelty or efficiency alone, but in how they are integrated into broader visions of resilience, sustainability, and stakeholder inclusion.

The findings underscore that companies at the forefront of innovation are those that move beyond product-centric thinking to adopt platform-based ecosystems that foster value co-creation and long-term engagement. These firms treat data as a strategic compass, guiding agile decision-making and customer-centered innovation. Importantly, they do not view environmental and social objectives as peripheral to profitability; rather, they embed these concerns into their core business logic, using digital technologies to enable transparency, accountability, and measurable impact.

However, digital transformation is not without its barriers. Legacy systems, organizational inertia, and short-term performance pressures often constrain innovation. This reinforces the critical role of leadership, culture, and change management in sustaining transformation. As the research reveals, successful BMI efforts are distinguished by their emphasis on mindset shifts—toward calculated risk-taking, cross-functional collaboration, and ethical reflection.

In essence, sustainable business model innovation in the digital age is not a matter of following trends or acquiring the latest tools. It requires organizations to fundamentally rethink their purpose, strategies, and relational dynamics in a world where environmental fragility, social inequity, and technological disruption are increasingly

interwoven. Firms that align technological capability with a values-driven mission will be better positioned to navigate complexity, adapt to change, and remain socially relevant in the decades to come.

Future research may expand on this by exploring comparative case studies across sectors and geographies, particularly in emerging markets where digital transformation follows distinct cultural and infrastructural trajectories. Likewise, longitudinal studies could help assess how BMI evolves over time and how digital practices translate into sustained environmental, social, and financial performance.

Ultimately, business model innovation is not merely a response to digital change—it is a strategic lever to shape more inclusive, resilient, and regenerative economic futures.

References

Amit, R., & Zott, C. (2012). Creating value through business model innovation. MIT SLOAN MANAGEMENT REVIEW, 53(3), 41–49.

Bocken, N. M. P., Short, S. W., Rana, P., & Evans, S. (2014). A literature and practice review to develop sustainable business model archetypes. JOURNAL OF CLEANER PRODUCTION, 65, 42–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.11.039

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH JOURNAL, 9(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH IN PSYCHOLOGY, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Chesbrough, H. (2010). Business model innovation: Opportunities and barriers. LONG RANGE PLANNING, 43(2–3), 354–363. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.010

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). QUALITATIVE INQUIRY AND RESEARCH DESIGN: CHOOSING AMONG FIVE APPROACHES (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2017). THE SAGE HANDBOOK OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Foss, N. J., & Saebi, T. (2017). Fifteen years of business model innovation research: Current status and future challenges. JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT, 43(1), 200–227. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316675927

Foucault, M. (1977). DISCIPLINE AND PUNISH: THE BIRTH OF THE PRISON. Pantheon Books.

Han, B.-C. (2015). THE BURNOUT SOCIETY (E. Butler, Trans.). Stanford University Press.

Loebbecke, C., & Picot, A. (2015). Reflections on societal and business model transformation arising from digitization and big data analytics: A research agenda. JOURNAL OF STRATEGIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS, 24(3), 149–157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2015.08.002

Massa, L., & Tucci, C. L. (2013). Business model innovation. In M. Dodgson, D. Gann, & N. Phillips (Eds.), THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF INNOVATION MANAGEMENT (pp. 420–441). Oxford University Press.

McKinsey & Company. (2022). DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA: ACCELERATING TO UNLOCK VALUE. https://www.mckinsey.com

Nugroho, Y., Siregar, R., & Aditya, A. (2021). Digital transformation and inclusive innovation in Indonesia: A contextual perspective. JOURNAL OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN STUDIES, 52(2), 305–323.

Parker, G. G., Van Alstyne, M. W., & Choudary, S. P. (2016). PLATFORM REVOLUTION: HOW NETWORKED MARKETS ARE TRANSFORMING THE ECONOMY AND HOW TO MAKE THEM WORK FOR YOU. W. W. Norton & Company.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). QUALITATIVE RESEARCH & EVALUATION METHODS (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Setiawan, B., & Soemartono, D. (2021). Localizing business innovation in Indonesia: Navigating institutional and cultural barriers. ASIAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION & POLICY, 10(1), 67–85.

Stiegler, B. (2010). TAKING CARE OF YOUTH AND THE GENERATIONS. Stanford University Press.

Tambunan, T. T. H. (2019). Innovation and small and medium enterprises in Indonesia. JOURNAL OF INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP, 8(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-019-0095-7

ISSN 2987-6761

Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. LONG RANGE PLANNING, 51(1), 40–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.06.007

World Bank. (2021). BEYOND UNICORNS: HARNESSING DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES FOR INCLUSION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA. https://www.worldbank.org

Zuboff, S. (2019). THE AGE OF SURVEILLANCE CAPITALISM: THE FIGHT FOR A HUMAN FUTURE AT THE NEW FRONTIER OF POWER. PublicAffairs.