Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs

Diah Fatma Sjoraida (1) and Anggun Yolistina, S.Kom (2) (1) Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung | (2) Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP

Diah.fatma@unpad.ac.id ; Anggun_yolistina@gmail.com

Abstract

This integrative evidence review examines digital market intelligence and business model adaptation in smes by asking how digital market intelligence is connected to business model adaptation and which conditions determine whether that connection becomes operationally meaningful. The article synthesizes peer-reviewed and institutional literature relevant to customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, emphasizing mechanisms, boundary conditions, and measurement choices rather than a universal average effect. Evidence associated with Lemon et al., 2016 and Hajli, 2015 is read with the wider source set to distinguish formal adoption from effective use, short-term response from durable capability, and observed association from causal interpretation. The synthesis identifies complementary roles for channel integration and consistency, channel maturity, and governance or coordination routines. No survey, interview, experiment, proprietary dataset, or regression estimate is represented as having been collected for this conceptual review.

Keywords: digital, market, intelligence, business, model, adaptation, smes, business, integrative review

Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs addresses a contemporary question in customer, market, channel, and business-model systems. The title implies a relationship between digital market intelligence and business model adaptation, but the direction and magnitude of that relationship cannot be assumed from terminology alone. This review identifies mechanisms that plausibly connect the two, conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker, and measurements needed to evaluate them without overstating evidence. Context, timing, implementation quality, and decision rights are therefore treated as analytical variables.

1. Introduction

The introduction defines the decision problem and explains why a conditional interpretation is preferable to a deterministic one.

The synthesis treats digital market intelligence as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business model adaptation. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, ecosystem coordination changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while channel maturity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

A recurring issue in research on Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Digital Market Intelligence may be

associated with business model adaptation, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when brand credibility is weak. The mechanism examined here is customer-journey coordination, which connects the focal practice to changes in customer trust.

For Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking digital market intelligence with business model adaptation. Trust formation and risk reduction provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on partner dependence, brand credibility, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Kraus et al., 2022 and Lemon et al., 2016

suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of conversion quality.

For Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking digital market intelligence with business model adaptation. Market sensing and rapid experimentation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on customer heterogeneity, customer heterogeneity, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by OECD, 2023 and Hajli, 2015 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of retention.

The synthesis treats digital market intelligence as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business model adaptation. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, channel integration and consistency changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while digital capability shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

2. Conceptual and Literature Review

The literature review organizes evidence around mechanisms, complementary capabilities, and boundary conditions.

A recurring issue in research on Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Digital Market Intelligence may be associated with business model adaptation, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when channel maturity is weak. The mechanism examined here is customer-journey coordination, which connects the focal practice to changes in customer trust. Sources such as Verhoef et al., 2021 and Lemon et al., 2016 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, digital market intelligence can influence business model adaptation through trust formation and risk reduction. The pathway is conditional on brand

credibility and channel maturity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Kraus et al., 2022 and Hajli, 2015 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce conversion quality.

A recurring issue in research on Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Digital Market Intelligence may be associated with business model adaptation, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when partner dependence is weak. The mechanism examined here is market sensing and rapid experimentation, which connects the focal practice to changes in retention. Sources such as OECD, 2023 and Morhart et al., 2015 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

For Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking digital market intelligence with business model adaptation. Channel integration and consistency provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on customer heterogeneity, digital capability, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of market access.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, digital market intelligence can influence business model adaptation through relationship repair and switching-cost management. The pathway is conditional on digital capability and channel maturity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response

or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce service recovery.

3. Research Method

This manuscript is a conceptual narrative draft revised through a chronological source filter. Bibliography entries dated after 31 December 2023 and sentences explicitly invoking those years have been excluded. Original pre-cutoff references have been retained, with a limited historical source context added separately. This revision does not constitute a new systematic search, a meta-analysis, or a reproducible coding exercise. The historical source cutoff is stated here so that the scope of the discussion is explicit.

The remaining discussion proposes mechanisms and research questions. It does not supply new observations, estimated coefficients, or verified causal effects. Earlier reference entries retained from the source draft are retained as supplied and should be assessed against the original publications when interpreting specific claims. Sources added during this revision support only the historical context

described in the dedicated source-context section.

4. Evidence Synthesis: Mechanisms

The first synthesis layer asks how the proposed relationship works in practice and which intermediate processes can be observed before the final outcome changes.

From a governance perspective, Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Market sensing and rapid experimentation is most credible when supported by channel maturity and channel maturity. The reviewed literature (OECD, 2023; Kraus et al., 2022) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

A recurring issue in research on Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Digital Market Intelligence may be associated with business model adaptation, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when brand credibility is weak. The mechanism examined here is channel integration and consistency, which connects the focal practice to changes in market access.

From a governance perspective, Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Relationship repair and switching-cost management is most credible when supported by partner dependence and digital capability. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

For Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking digital market intelligence with business model adaptation. Ecosystem coordination provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on customer heterogeneity, channel maturity, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of commercial resilience.

The most decision-relevant question concerns the conditions under which the proposed relationship strengthens, weakens, or reverses. In Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, digital market intelligence can influence business model adaptation through customer-journey coordination. The pathway is conditional on digital capability and partner dependence; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Hajli, 2015 and Lemon et al., 2016 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce customer trust.

5. Evidence Synthesis: Boundary Conditions

The second synthesis layer examines why results may differ across settings even when the focal intervention appears similar.

The synthesis treats digital market intelligence as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business model adaptation. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, channel integration and consistency changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while channel maturity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

From a governance perspective, Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Relationship repair and switching-cost management is most credible when supported by brand credibility and customer heterogeneity. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

Observed performance becomes interpretable only when implementation quality is separated from nominal adoption. In Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, digital market intelligence can influence business model adaptation through ecosystem coordination. The pathway is conditional on partner dependence and competitive intensity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Lemon et al., 2016 and Lemon et al., 2016 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce commercial resilience.

For Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking digital market intelligence with business model adaptation. Customer-journey coordination provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on customer heterogeneity, brand credibility, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Hajli, 2015 and Hajli, 2015 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of customer trust.

For Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking digital market intelligence with business model adaptation. Trust formation and risk reduction provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on digital capability, customer heterogeneity, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Morhart et al., 2015 and Morhart et al., 2015 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of conversion quality.

6. Integrated Discussion

The integrated discussion reconciles different findings by distinguishing mechanism, context, timing, and measurement.

From a governance perspective, Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Relationship repair and switching-cost management is most credible when supported by channel maturity and partner dependence. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

From a governance perspective, Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when

performance deviates from expectation. Ecosystem coordination is most credible when supported by brand credibility and digital capability. The reviewed literature (Lemon et al., 2016; Hajli, 2015) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

Observed performance becomes interpretable only when implementation quality is separated from nominal adoption. In Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, digital market intelligence can influence business model adaptation through customer-journey coordination. The pathway is conditional on partner dependence and channel maturity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Hajli, 2015 and Morhart et al., 2015 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce customer trust.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, digital market intelligence can influence business model adaptation through trust formation and risk reduction. The pathway is conditional on customer heterogeneity and partner dependence; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Morhart et al., 2015 and Verhoef et al., 2021 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce conversion quality.

From a governance perspective, Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Market sensing and rapid experimentation is most

credible when supported by digital capability and digital capability. The reviewed literature (Verhoef et al., 2021; Kraus et al., 2022) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

7. Measurement and Decision Framework

A decision framework links leading process indicators, outcome indicators, and explicit assumptions about causality.

The synthesis treats digital market intelligence as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business model adaptation. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, ecosystem coordination changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while channel maturity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Lemon et al., 2016 and Morhart et al., 2015 and is especially relevant in smes. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

From a governance perspective, Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Customer-journey coordination is most credible when supported by brand credibility and competitive intensity. The reviewed literature (Hajli, 2015; Verhoef et al., 2021) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

From a governance perspective, Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Trust formation and risk reduction is most credible when supported by partner dependence and brand credibility. The reviewed literature (Morhart et al., 2015; Kraus et al., 2022) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The synthesis treats digital market intelligence as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business model adaptation. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, market sensing and rapid experimentation changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while customer heterogeneity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Verhoef et al., 2021 and OECD, 2023 and is especially relevant in smes. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

Observed performance becomes interpretable only when implementation quality is separated from nominal adoption. In Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, digital market intelligence can influence business model adaptation through channel integration and consistency. The

pathway is conditional on digital capability and competitive intensity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce market access.

8. Practical Implications and Research Agenda

The practical implications translate the evidence into staged actions while preserving the limits of a literature-based design.

The most decision-relevant question concerns the conditions under which the proposed relationship strengthens, weakens, or reverses. In Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs, digital market intelligence can influence business model adaptation through customer-journey coordination. The pathway is conditional on channel maturity and digital capability; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Hajli, 2015 and Kraus et al., 2022 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For business owners, marketing leaders, service managers, and entrepreneurs, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce customer trust.

From a governance perspective, Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Trust formation and risk reduction is most credible when supported by brand credibility and channel maturity. The reviewed literature (Morhart et al., 2015; OECD, 2023) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The synthesis treats digital market intelligence as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business model adaptation. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, market sensing and rapid experimentation changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while partner dependence shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

The synthesis treats digital market intelligence as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business model adaptation. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, channel integration and consistency changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while customer heterogeneity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

The synthesis treats digital market intelligence as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business model adaptation. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, relationship repair and switching-cost management changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while digital

capability shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with OECD, 2023 and Lemon et al., 2016 and is especially relevant in smes. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

9. Conclusion

The conclusion summarizes the evidence logic and priorities for author verification and future empirical work.

A recurring issue in research on Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Digital Market Intelligence may be associated with business model adaptation, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when channel maturity is weak. The mechanism examined here is trust formation and risk reduction, which connects the focal practice to changes in conversion quality.

A recurring issue in research on Digital Market Intelligence and Business Model Adaptation in SMEs is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Digital Market Intelligence may be associated with business model adaptation, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when brand credibility is weak. The mechanism examined here is market sensing and rapid experimentation, which connects the focal practice to changes in retention.

The synthesis treats digital market intelligence as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of business model adaptation. In customer, market, channel, and business-model systems, relationship repair and switching-cost management changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while customer heterogeneity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with OECD, 2023 and Hajli, 2015 and is especially relevant in smes. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

Historical source context and interpretation

The mechanism discussion is conceptual and must be read alongside the pre-cutoff works listed in References. Removing later sources does not establish a new empirical finding, a pooled effect or comprehensive coverage of the literature. Organization-specific claims require additional evidence before publication.

References

Lemon, K. N., & Verhoef, P. C. (2016). Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey. Journal of Marketing, 80(6), 69-96. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0420

Hajli, N. (2015). Social commerce constructs and consumer's intention to buy. International Journal of Information Management, 35(2), 183-191. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2014.12.005

Morhart, F., Malar, L., Guevremont, A., Girardin, F., & Grohmann, B. (2015). Brand authenticity: An integrative framework and measurement scale. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 25(2), 200-218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.11.006

Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. Journal of Business Research, 122, 889-901. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022

Kraus, S., Durst, S., Ferreira, J. J., Veiga, P., Kailer, N., & Weinmann, A. (2022). Digital transformation in business and management research: An overview of the current status quo. International Journal of Information Management, 63, 102466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102466

OECD. (2023). OECD SME and Entrepreneurship Outlook 2023. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/342b8564-en