International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)
Volume 09 - Issue 05, 2026
www.ijlrhss.com || PP. 120-135

Platform Business Models versus Traditional Entrepreneurial Ventures: A Comparative Analysis in the Context of Technology Driven Entrepreneurship

Dr. Benjamin Bensam Sambiri, Dr James Agbor Okpokiri (Jr)

Abstract: Platform-based business models have reorganised how value is created, distributed, and captured in ways that entrepreneurship scholarship is still working to fully comprehend. Traditional ventures generate value by producing and delivering goods or services along a linear chain; platform businesses generate value by orchestrating interactions among multiple user groups and scaling digital infrastructure in ways that asset-heavy firms cannot easily replicate. This paper offers a comparative analysis of both paradigms through a systematic secondary research methodology, drawing on peer-reviewed scholarship, institutional datasets, and authoritative publications from predominantly the past seven years. It examines theoretical foundations, value creation logics, technological requirements, scalability dynamics, risk profiles, and the strategic decisions entrepreneurs face when choosing between or combining these models. The findings indicate that platform configurations offer compelling growth potential under the right conditions, while traditional ventures retain durable advantages wherever regulatory complexity, physical presence, or community trust governs market behaviour. Rather than treating these paradigms as competitors, the paper argues for contextually intelligent hybrid configurations, anchored in the Contextual Innovation Performance Model (CIPM) advanced by Sambiri (2024).

Keywords: Platform Business Models, Traditional Entrepreneurship, Digital Entrepreneurship, Network Effects, Value Creation, Business Model Innovation, Technology-Driven Ventures, Secondary Research, CIPM

1. Introduction

Over the past two decades the architecture of entrepreneurship has shifted in ways that resist easy summary. Computing power became cheap enough for startups to access infrastructure that once required corporate budgets. Smartphones reached critical mass across both wealthy and developing markets. Cloud platforms removed much of the capital barrier to launching technology ventures. Artificial intelligence crossed from speculative research into practical business application. Taken together, these changes have not simply created new industries; they have altered the fundamental logic through which value gets created, appropriated, and scaled, and that alteration is still unfolding.

Sitting at the centre of this shift is the platform business model. Companies like Airbnb, Uber, Amazon Marketplace, Alibaba, and Spotify are not principally producers or service providers in any conventional sense. They design and manage ecosystems in which other parties, producers and consumers, service providers and clients, developers and users, transact with one another. The platform owner captures value not by making things but by enabling transactions that would not otherwise occur, and then taking a share of what those transactions generate. That represents a genuinely different economic logic from anything underlying a traditional entrepreneurial venture, and its consequences run through strategy, governance, regulation, and economic geography alike.

Traditional entrepreneurial ventures have not been passive in the face of this disruption. Many have absorbed digital tools, adopted data-informed management, and found ways to compete in a market reshaped by platform-driven expectations. Their fundamental logic has nonetheless held: value creation still flows primarily through what they make or deliver, and growth remains both constrained and protected by the asset base and operational complexity those activities require.

This paper examines both models comparatively through a secondary research methodology, drawing on peer-reviewed scholarship and authoritative institutional data rather than original fieldwork. That choice is deliberate. Enough rigorous work now exists on both platform and traditional entrepreneurship that a well-executed synthesis can yield insights with broader generalisability than any single primary study, which is necessarily bounded by its sample, geographic scope, and moment in time.

Section 2 reviews the theoretical literature underpinning both paradigms. Section 3 sets out the methodology. Section 4 presents the comparative analysis across six dimensions. Section 5 offers strategic recommendations. Section 6 concludes. The paper addresses three audiences in parallel: entrepreneurship scholars seeking a synthetic theoretical account, practitioners facing real strategic decisions, and policymakers seeking frameworks for supporting a diverse and resilient entrepreneurial ecosystem.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Foundations of Business Models in Entrepreneurship

Despite its near-universal presence in academic and practitioner conversation alike, the business model concept has a surprisingly short formal scholarly history. Among the most durable definitions remains that the business model describes how an enterprise creates, delivers, and captures value, a formulation that maps directly onto the three dimensions where platform and traditional ventures diverge most visibly. Massa, Tucci, and Afuah (2017) documented three distinct ways scholars use the term: as an attribute of a real firm, as a cognitive schema, and as a formal representation. They argued that conflating these uses has generated unnecessary confusion in the literature, and that the conflation matters practically because platform and traditional ventures tend to operate under different dominant uses of the concept. Clarifying which use is in play sharpens both theoretical comparison and strategic analysis.

The Business Model Canvas, originally developed by Osterwalder and Pigneur and now embedded in entrepreneurship curricula worldwide, maps a venture across nine building blocks. For traditional ventures this schema fits reasonably well. For platform businesses it struggles: a single customer segment row and a single value proposition box cannot capture the multi-sided architecture or the network interdependencies that define platform value creation. Gassmann, Frankenberger, and Csik (2014) proposed the St. Gallen Business Model Navigator as a structured alternative that better accommodates multi-sided configurations, and Wirtz, Pistoia, Ullrich, and Gottel (2016) further developed a classification system for digital business models that recognises the networked interdependencies the Canvas was not designed to handle.

Parker, Van Alstyne, and Choudary (2016) argued that platforms represent a fundamentally new economic paradigm in which a firm's primary asset is not its production capacity but its ability to attract, match, and govern interactions between distinct user groups. Subsequent scholarship has refined this substantially. De Reuver, Sorensen, and Basole (2018) argued that the platform concept had fragmented across disciplines in ways that made direct comparison difficult, and proposed a synthesis framework distinguishing between transaction platforms, innovation platforms, and integrated platforms. That distinction carries strategic weight for entrepreneurs: the governance challenges, monetisation logic, and network dynamics differ meaningfully across subtypes, and conflating them produces predictable strategic errors.

2.2 Traditional Entrepreneurial Ventures: Enduring Logic and Contemporary Pressures

By number of firms, share of employment, and geographic reach, the traditional entrepreneurial venture remains by far the dominant form of commercial activity globally. This point deserves explicit statement because the volume of academic attention directed at platform businesses can create a misleading impression of where most entrepreneurial activity actually happens. Fritsch and Wyrwich (2018), drawing on longitudinal data from European regional economies, found that traditional small and medium enterprises account for the overwhelming majority of both new venture formation and job creation across most economic geographies. Their contribution to incremental innovation, while less visible than the breakthroughs associated with platform unicorns, is both substantial and deeply embedded in local knowledge and relationships that digital intermediaries have found genuinely difficult to replace.

The theoretical traditions underlying traditional entrepreneurship scholarship are long and contested, but most share a common implicit assumption: that entrepreneurs create value primarily by making something, whether a product, a service, or an organisational capability, and that the market rewards the quality and accessibility of what is made. Szerb, Lafuente, and Markman (2020), revisiting these foundational assumptions in light of the digital economy, argued that the institutional conditions shaping traditional venture performance have themselves shifted substantially since the canonical theories were formulated. They called for updated frameworks capable of accounting for hybrid digital-physical value chains rather than treating the traditional model as a static baseline, a useful corrective to the tendency in platform-focused scholarship to position the traditional model as simply the inferior predecessor to a superior paradigm.

Pressures on traditional ventures from digital competition are real, well-documented, and severe in certain sectors. Margin compression, rising customer expectations shaped by platform-driven convenience, and the capital intensity of physical operations all create vulnerabilities that become acute during periods of disruption. The OECD (2021) documented catastrophic revenue losses among traditional ventures in hospitality, retail, and professional services during lockdown periods, while many platform businesses expanded. What the same analysis also found, and what tends to receive far less attention, is that traditional ventures with strong community relationships and diversified revenue streams recovered faster than many platform businesses whose growth had depended on a single behavioural pattern the pandemic interrupted.

2.3 Platform Business Models: Architecture, Dynamics, and Growth Logic

What makes a platform business structurally distinct from a traditional firm is its multi-sidedness. Rather than selling to a customer, a platform orchestrates interactions among at least two user groups whose participation is mutually dependent. Airbnb is worthless without both hosts and guests. Uber cannot function with only passengers or only drivers. Google's core revenue engine requires users who generate data and advertisers who pay to reach them simultaneously. That interdependence is not an incidental design feature; it is the source of the network effects that power platform growth and, at sufficient scale, make incumbent platforms extraordinarily difficult to displace. Cusumano, Gawer, and Yoffie (2019) documented this dynamic across multiple platform industries, showing that once cross-side network effects become self-reinforcing, an alternative platform needs an overwhelming marginal cost advantage to overcome established incumbency.

Network effects, the phenomenon by which a product or service gains value as more people use it, are the primary mechanism through which platform businesses build and sustain competitive advantage. Same-side effects reward growth within a single user group; cross-side effects mean growth on one side creates value for users on the other. Both types produce self-reinforcing dynamics that reward early movers and penalise late entrants. Tiwana (2015) showed that platform owners manage these dynamics through deliberate governance choices about who can participate, on what terms, and with what degree of openness, arguing that governance architecture is as consequential as technology architecture in shaping platform outcomes. Rietveld and Schilling (2021) subsequently found that the strength of network effects varies considerably across platform types, and that entrepreneurs who assume generic platform logic applies to their specific market consistently make costly strategic errors.

Artificial intelligence has become central to how platform advantages are built and defended. Iansiti and Lakhani (2020) argued that AI-native firms, those built from the outset around machine learning capabilities, enjoy structural advantages over both traditional firms and platforms that bolt AI on as an afterthought. The mechanism is straightforward: platforms accumulate interaction data at a scale no traditional firm can match, and that data trains models that personalise recommendations, optimise pricing, and detect fraud more effectively than any manually designed system. Better models attract more users, who generate more data, which improve the models further. Once that feedback loop is established, it is very difficult for a competing platform to interrupt and nearly impossible for a traditional venture to replicate.

2.4 Blockchain, Decentralised Platforms, and the Next Frontier

Blockchain technology and distributed ledger systems have introduced a further dimension to the platform landscape that entrepreneurship scholars are still absorbing. Decentralised platforms, which operate without a central intermediary and distribute governance and value capture through protocol-level rules, represent a structural departure from anything possible in conventionally owned architectures. Lumineau, Wang, and Schilke (2021) offered one of the more rigorous organisational assessments of blockchain's implications, arguing that distributed ledger systems do not eliminate the need for governance but shift its locus from managerial authority to algorithmic protocol, with consequences for trust, coordination, and accountability that remain incompletely understood.

For entrepreneurs the implications run in both directions. Decentralised platforms can lower entry barriers in markets currently dominated by powerful intermediaries, creating entrepreneurial openings that centralised architectures have foreclosed. At the same time, the regulatory uncertainty surrounding blockchain-based ventures remains substantial in most jurisdictions, and the governance challenges of managing communities without conventional managerial authority are not trivial. Allen, Berg, Markey-Towler, Novak, and Potts (2020) examined decentralised autonomous organisations as a novel entrepreneurial form and found that while they offer genuine advantages in specific contexts, particularly where trust in central authorities is low, they introduce coordination costs that conventional organisations are deliberately structured to minimise.

2.5 Contextual Factors and the Limits of Universal Claims

Among the most important intellectual correctives in recent entrepreneurship scholarship is the insistence on contextual sensitivity. Context is not simply a backdrop to entrepreneurial action; it actively shapes what is possible, what is rational, and what succeeds. Welter, Baker, and Wirsching (2019), revisiting the contextualisation agenda a decade after its initial articulation, documented meaningful progress in acknowledging the role of institutional, cultural, and geographic factors in shaping entrepreneurial outcomes, while noting that the field still treats digitally mature, market-oriented economies as the implicit baseline, marginalising evidence from other contexts that might challenge prevailing theoretical assumptions.

The conditions that make platform businesses viable, primarily high connectivity, large addressable markets, and regulatory environments permissive of disintermediation, are unevenly distributed across the global economy. Across much of sub-Saharan Africa, Southeast Asia, and Latin America, internet penetration

remains uneven, digital payment infrastructure is still developing, and regulatory frameworks lag behind platform realities. In those environments, traditional entrepreneurial models often retain advantages they have forfeited in digitally mature economies, while hybrid configurations that layer platform logic over physical operational foundations have emerged as the most productive frontier. Nambisan, Wright, and Feldman (2019) argued that the diversity of national innovation systems produces correspondingly diverse platform ecosystems, and that policy frameworks designed for one system routinely produce unintended consequences when applied to another.

Against this backdrop of contextual complexity, the Contextual Innovation Performance Model developed by Sambiri (2024) provides a useful analytical lens. The CIPM holds that innovation performance, and by extension the viability of any particular business model, cannot be adequately assessed without systematic attention to three contextual dimensions: the institutional environment, the technological infrastructure, and the human capital conditions in which a venture operates. This framework will be applied in the comparative analysis section to interpret findings across different economic and geographic settings, offering a disciplined alternative to the universal claims that too frequently characterise platform versus traditional comparisons.

2.6 The Opportunity Identification Process

Without a viable opportunity, nothing else in the entrepreneurship process can begin. Making that truism analytically tractable has occupied researchers for decades, and recent work has moved the field well beyond the early consensus that opportunities are simply waiting to be noticed. Opportunity identification is now understood as a complex cognitive process shaped by prior knowledge, social network structure, alertness to information signals, and the institutional environment in which the entrepreneur operates. Shepherd, Sattari, and Patzelt (2022) reviewed three decades of entrepreneurial cognition research and found that while individual alertness matters, the environmental and social conditions that direct attention toward certain opportunity types over others are at least as determinative of what any given entrepreneur ends up pursuing.

Kuratko (2014, p. 111) characterises opportunity identification as a process of searching, discovering, and evaluating ideas that have the potential to generate marketplace value. Separating these three activities analytically is more than taxonomic tidiness: search draws on deliberate, directed effort; discovery often occurs serendipitously through unexpected exposure to information; and evaluation requires judgment about feasibility, market readiness, and fit with the entrepreneur's own capabilities. An entrepreneur skilled at generating ideas may still fail at the evaluation stage, and vice versa. Wood and McKelvie (2015) found that most opportunity evaluation frameworks in the literature underweight the role of learning during the evaluation process itself, noting that entrepreneurs frequently revise their assessment of an opportunity as they gather information, making evaluation an iterative sense-making process rather than a one-time judgment.

Whether opportunities are discovered or created has generated one of the most productive debates in entrepreneurship research. The discovery view holds that opportunities exist objectively as a consequence of information asymmetries and technological shifts, waiting to be perceived by alert individuals. The creation view argues that opportunities do not pre-exist entrepreneurial action but are brought into being through it, making the entrepreneur an active author of market conditions rather than a passive perceiver of them. Alvarez, Barney, Anderson, and Kreiser (2020) revisited this debate in a retrospective review and concluded that most entrepreneurial activity involves both logics operating in sequence: alert perception initiates action, and action reshapes the opportunity itself. Effectuation theory, developed extensively since its original articulation, supports this integrating position, showing that experienced entrepreneurs move fluidly between discovery and creation depending on uncertainty levels and how responsive the markets they seek to shape actually are.

Social networks shape what opportunities individual entrepreneurs are positioned to see. Semrau, Ambos, and Kraus (2016), in a meta-analysis of network effects on new venture performance, found that network diversity, specifically access to contacts from non-overlapping clusters, is consistently associated with broader and more novel opportunity identification. Kuckertz, Brandle, Gaudig, Hinderer, Reyes, Prochotta, Steinbrink, and Berger (2020) pushed this further in the context of pandemic-driven opportunity identification, showing that entrepreneurs who pivoted rapidly into new opportunities during the COVID-19 crisis tended to be those with greater pre-existing network diversity and higher tolerance for environmental uncertainty. Prior knowledge remains independently important: individuals with domain expertise consistently identify more precisely specified opportunities within their areas of knowledge, while network diversity tends to expand the range of domains they consider at all.

2.7 Sources of Innovative Ideas for Entrepreneurs

Innovative ideas are not uniformly distributed, and understanding what determines the richness of an individual entrepreneur's idea-generation capacity is therefore both theoretically and practically important.

Kuratko (2014, p. 124) identifies several broad source categories, of which the entrepreneur's own experience, including professional expertise and personal frustration with inadequate existing solutions, is among the most reliable. Ideas grounded in genuine personal experience of an unmet need tend to be more accurately specified than ideas generated through speculative assessment of unfamiliar problem domains, since the entrepreneur already possesses the tacit market knowledge needed to evaluate feasibility without extensive additional research.

Innovation source taxonomies emphasise that effective idea generation is disciplined rather than accidental. Foss and Saebi (2018), in a comprehensive review of the business model innovation literature, demonstrated that reconfiguring how an existing product or service is delivered, monetised, or supported can generate value without requiring any change in the underlying technology or product. Their analysis found that business model innovation accounts for a substantial share of high-growth venture creation in recent years, a share that traditional innovation taxonomies underestimate by focusing disproportionately on product and process innovation. For entrepreneurs, this expands the available idea space considerably: the question is not only what to make differently but how the entire commercial system around an existing offering might be rearranged.

Customer observation remains one of the most productive and underutilised idea sources available to entrepreneurs. Users who encounter a problem acutely and repeatedly often develop workarounds or partial solutions that constitute the earliest prototype of what eventually becomes a market offering. Bogers, Zobel, Afuah, Almirall, Brunswicker, Dahlander, Frederiksen, Gawer, Gruber, Haefliger, Hagedoorn, Hilgers, Laursen, Magnusson, Majchrzak, McCarthy, Moeslein, Nambisan, Piller, Radziwon, Reichwald, Ryan, Rzonca, Schauer, Schweisfurth, Siggins, Sims, Ter Wal, Vaccaro, and West (2017) synthesised two decades of open innovation research, finding that systematic user involvement in idea generation consistently outperforms internal research and development alone in identifying solutions to complex, unstructured problems. For resource-constrained entrepreneurial ventures specifically, structured user co-creation offers a lower-cost alternative to formal innovation labs while frequently yielding higher ecological validity.

2.8 Creativity and the Creative Process: Knowledge Accumulation, Incubation, and Implementation

Creativity, understood as the production of ideas that are simultaneously novel and useful, is a functional requirement for entrepreneurs rather than an optional attribute. Ventures that generate genuinely new solutions to genuine problems consistently outperform those that replicate or incrementally refine existing offerings. Amabile, Barsade, Mueller, and Staw (2005) extended the foundational componential model of creativity to show that positive affect is a meaningful predictor of creative output in organisational settings, suggesting that the emotional climate of a founding team is not merely a management concern but a direct determinant of the venture's idea-generation capacity. Mainemelis, Kark, and Epitropaki (2015) subsequently showed that leader creativity both directly influences team output and creates normative permission for team members to take creative risks, an insight with immediate implications for how founding leaders should understand their own creative role within the organisation.

Knowledge Accumulation

Knowledge accumulation is the first and in many ways most foundational component of the creative process. Extensive prior knowledge provides the raw material for creative recombination; without it, the search space for novel ideas is constrained regardless of how much creative energy an individual brings to bear. This has an important implication that runs counter to the romanticisation of the uninformed outsider who solves problems insiders cannot see: creative output in any domain is bounded by the richness of the knowledge structures available for mental exploration. Cross-domain recombination can be powerfully generative, but it works best when the individual has sufficient depth in each domain to understand what is actually being recombined. Baer (2015) showed that this tension between domain expertise and cross-domain transfer resolves differently depending on the type of creative task, with novel problem formulation benefiting more from breadth while deep problem-solving benefits more from depth.

Incubation

Incubation, the period of background cognitive processing that follows intense conscious engagement with a problem, is perhaps the most counterintuitive component of the creative process. The insight it produces can feel like it arrives from nowhere, but cognitive science suggests otherwise. Gilhooly, Ball, and Macchi (2015), in a review of incubation research across four decades, found consistent evidence that productive incubation involves unconscious spreading activation across conceptual networks, enabling connections between representations that focused conscious attention, which tends to narrow its search around already-activated pathways, cannot reach on its own. For entrepreneurial practice the implication is that organisations

normalising intense continuous effort without cognitive respite are likely to generate fewer genuine insights than those that deliberately build structured disengagement into their creative routines.

Implementation

Implementation, converting an insight into a working product, service, or venture, is where the majority of entrepreneurial value is created or forfeited. Creative generation without implementation discipline produces ideas that never reach the market; implementation without creative generation produces incremental refinements on existing offerings. Kuratko (2014) treats implementation as an integral stage of the creative process rather than as a subsequent and separate managerial task, a framing that usefully resists the tendency to treat ideation and execution as belonging to different people and different phases. Baer (2012) found empirical support for this integrated view, showing that individuals who performed well on idea generation did not reliably perform well on idea championing and implementation, and that creative performance at the organisational level therefore depends on team composition that bridges these different capability profiles rather than optimising for any single one.

2.9 Major Myths Associated with Innovation and Its Defining Principles

Several persistent myths about innovation distort both individual entrepreneurial decision-making and institutional policies designed to support it. The first is the equation of innovation with radical technological invention. Most commercially valuable innovations are not technological breakthroughs at all: they are process innovations, market innovations, or business model innovations that generate new value by rearranging existing elements rather than inventing new ones. Containerised shipping reshaped global trade without requiring a new vessel design. The subscription software model transformed an industry without requiring new software capabilities. Foss and Saebi (2018) found in their review of the business model innovation literature that reconfiguration of the delivery and monetisation logic around existing products accounts for a substantial share of high-performing venture creation, yet entrepreneurship curricula continue devoting disproportionate attention to product and technology innovation.

The second myth is that innovative capacity is a rare and largely innate trait. Corresponding research does not support this. Behaviours associated with innovative output, including systematic questioning of existing assumptions, deliberate observation of user behaviour, disciplined experimentation, and active cross-domain networking, can be taught and developed. De Jong and Den Hartog (2010), reviewing innovative work behaviour at the individual level, found that organisational conditions including psychological safety, access to diverse information sources, and managerial encouragement of experimentation consistently predicted innovative output, suggesting that environmental design matters at least as much as individual talent in determining creative performance. A third myth, perhaps the most durable, is that innovation is primarily a solitary act. The open innovation paradigm, now more than two decades old as a formal framework and extensively validated empirically, demonstrates that even highly sophisticated technology firms depend on external idea flows, and that the most innovative organisations have invested in permeable knowledge boundaries rather than protective internal silos.

Foundational principles of innovation have been broadly confirmed by more recent empirical work. Tidd and Bessant (2020), in their comprehensive review of innovation management research, found that successful innovators consistently begin with systematic analysis of opportunity sources rather than waiting for inspiration; focus on a clearly defined value problem rather than on technical capability for its own sake; start small and aim at specific leadership in a defined domain; and treat innovation as disciplined iterative work rather than an occasional creative event. Their review also found that failure to build systematic feedback and learning mechanisms into the innovation process is among the most consistent predictors of innovation programme failure in established organisations.

2.10 Founders Agreements and Their Importance for Entrepreneurs

Among the structural foundations of a new venture, the founders agreement is simultaneously one of the most consequential and most frequently deferred. Baron (2008, p. 240) describes it as a formal written document specifying the rights, responsibilities, and obligations of each founding member, covering equity distribution, role definition, decision-making authority, and mechanisms for exit. Many founding teams avoid this conversation on the grounds that raising legal formalities early signals mistrust among people still in the optimistic early phase of a shared vision. Wasserman (2012), in a large-scale study of founding team dynamics, found that this avoidance is one of the costliest decisions early-stage ventures make: a substantial proportion of the failures he documented were attributable not to competitive or market pressures but to founder conflict over questions that a well-drafted agreement at the outset could have resolved or channelled into a structured process.

Equity distribution is typically the most contentious element of a founders agreement and the one where the consequences of early inaccuracy last longest. Equal splits are common, motivated by a desire to signal parity of commitment, but they are frequently economically inaccurate. As ventures develop, differentials in founder contribution, in intellectual property brought to the venture, in capital invested, in network access leveraged, and in time committed, become increasingly visible and increasingly difficult to reconcile with an equity structure implying equal contribution throughout. Huang and Knight (2017) examined how founding teams renegotiate equity arrangements over time and found that the renegotiation process is itself a significant source of relational damage, eroding the trust and collaborative orientation the founding team needs precisely when the venture is under the most developmental pressure.

Vesting schedules are a critical practical mechanism for protecting the venture against the departure of a co-founder who would otherwise retain a large equity stake for a contribution that ended early. Standard arrangements in technology ventures involve a four-year vesting period with a one-year cliff, meaning no equity vests in the first year, after which it accumulates monthly over the following three years. Hellmann and Wasserman (2021) found that ventures with formal vesting arrangements experienced meaningfully lower levels of founding team disruption during early growth stages, and that the discipline of formalising those arrangements also correlated with greater clarity around role definition and decision rights, the two elements of founders agreements most commonly implicated in team conflict when left ambiguous.

2.11 Major Forms of Business Ownership: Advantages and Disadvantages

Legal structure is among the most consequential early decisions an entrepreneur makes, with implications that compound over time across liability exposure, tax treatment, governance obligations, capital access, and talent attraction. Baron and Shane (2008, p. 241) identify three primary forms: sole proprietorship, partnership, and corporation, each representing a different configuration of trade-offs between simplicity and structural sophistication. Roundy, Brockman, and Bradshaw (2018), examining hybrid legal forms including benefit corporations and social enterprises, argued that the growing diversity of organisational forms available to entrepreneurs reflects a genuine diversification in the objectives ventures are designed to serve, and that the classic three-form taxonomy understates the structural choices now available to entrepreneurs seeking to balance commercial and social objectives.

A sole proprietorship is the simplest form available, requiring minimal regulatory compliance and offering the owner complete decision-making control. Income passes directly to the owner's personal tax return without an intermediate corporate tax layer, which simplifies accounting considerably at low revenue scales. The core vulnerability of this form is unlimited personal liability: the owner's personal assets, including property, savings, and other holdings, are fully exposed to claims arising from the business. A second structural constraint is the difficulty of attracting external investment. Because the sole proprietorship has no independent legal identity, equity cannot be formally allocated to an investor without dissolving and reconstituting the venture in a different form, which makes this structure poorly suited to ventures anticipating external capital needs.

A partnership enables multiple individuals to pool resources and capabilities under a shared ownership structure. In its general form it retains the tax transparency of the sole proprietorship while distributing management responsibilities across co-owners. The liability exposure is, however, if anything more hazardous: each general partner is jointly and severally liable for the full obligations of the partnership, meaning any partner can be pursued for the total debt regardless of how responsibility was allocated in the partnership agreement itself. Limited partnerships and limited liability partnerships modify this structure by capping the liability of partners who do not exercise management control, making these forms considerably more attractive to passive investors and to professional service firms where partners want to protect personal assets from the actions of colleagues they cannot fully supervise.

The corporation is structurally the most complex option but offers advantages that become decisive for ventures pursuing significant scale. As a legal entity separate from its owners, a corporation can enter contracts, hold property, and incur debts in its own name, shielding shareholders from personal liability for corporate obligations. It can raise capital from multiple investors through share issuance and deploy equity instruments, including stock options and restricted stock grants, to attract and retain talent in ways that simpler structures cannot. The primary disadvantages are regulatory compliance costs, the risk of double taxation in jurisdictions that tax corporate profits and then shareholder dividends separately, and the agency problems that arise when management and ownership are separated. Limited liability companies have emerged across most developed jurisdictions as hybrid structures offering corporate-style liability protection with partnership-style tax transparency, and they have become the default choice for many early-stage ventures wanting structural flexibility without the full compliance burden of formal incorporation.

2.12 Major Pathways and Structures for Entrepreneurial Ventures

The cultural image of entrepreneurship, a founder building a venture from nothing and scaling it to global reach, captures only a narrow slice of how entrepreneurial activity actually unfolds. Researchers have documented at least four substantively different pathways through which individuals pursue entrepreneurial careers: founding a new venture from scratch, acquiring an existing business, franchising, and pursuing entrepreneurial activity within an established organisation. Each pathway presents a different risk-return trade-off, demands a different capability profile, and produces different learning trajectories. Hessels, Grilo, Thurik, and van der Zwan (2011) showed that these pathways are not simple substitutes; individual entrepreneurs choose among them based on prior experience, resource access, risk preference, and opportunity characteristics, and the same individual may pursue different pathways at different career stages.

De novo founding is the pathway most closely associated with entrepreneurship in both popular imagination and academic research, and it is also the pathway associated with the highest failure rates. Recent work has complicated the picture: Hyytinen, Pajarinen, and Rouvinen (2015) used Finnish longitudinal data to examine post-entry survival differences across founding types and found that while de novo failures are numerous, the learning that accompanies de novo founding is itself a career asset that meaningfully improves outcomes in subsequent ventures. Portfolio entrepreneurship, managing multiple ventures simultaneously or sequentially, is considerably more prevalent than the single-startup focus of most entrepreneurship research implies, and serial entrepreneurs who draw on networks and knowledge from previous ventures demonstrate materially better performance than first-time founders in comparable markets.

Social entrepreneurship has moved from a peripheral concern in the entrepreneurship literature to a substantive research domain in its own right. Bacq and Janssen (2011) provided one of the more systematic definitions, characterising social entrepreneurship by the primacy of social value creation as a mission alongside, rather than instead of, financial sustainability. The hybrid organisational forms through which social entrepreneurship is increasingly pursued, including benefit corporations, community interest companies, and cooperative models, are themselves a form of entrepreneurial innovation in the legal and governance domain. Corporate entrepreneurship, the application of entrepreneurial behaviours within established organisations, arguably has the largest aggregate economic footprint of any pathway given the resources that large firms now deploy toward internal venturing and strategic renewal. Kuratko, Hornsby, and Hayton (2015) identified managerial support, autonomy, rewards aligned with innovation, resource availability, and sufficiently permeable organisational boundaries as the five enabling conditions most consistently associated with successful corporate entrepreneurship programmes.

2.13 Acquiring an Established Venture: Elements and Considerations

Entrepreneurial acquisition, buying and then operating an existing business, is underrepresented in academic entrepreneurship research relative to its practical importance. Kuratko (2014, p. 134) identifies it as an advantageous route to entrepreneurial ownership precisely because it provides what de novo founding most conspicuously lacks: an existing customer base, operational processes tested in the market, a trained workforce, an established supply chain, and a financial track record that makes risk assessment more tractable than in an early-stage startup. Graebner, Heimeriks, Huy, and Vaara (2017), in a review of acquisition research from the management literature, found that the entrepreneurial acquisition context, where the buyer intends to assume operational leadership rather than integrate the target into a larger portfolio, presents distinct dynamics not well captured by mainstream merger and acquisition research, which tends to focus on strategic rather than operational acquirers.

The acquisition process begins with sourcing, the identification and initial screening of candidates meeting the acquirer's criteria for industry, size, geography, growth potential, and price range. Due diligence follows, and it is where most of the analytical work happens. Financial due diligence examines the accuracy and completeness of historical financial statements, looking for earnings management, undisclosed liabilities, or revenue recognition practices that overstate performance. Legal due diligence covers contracts, regulatory compliance, intellectual property status, and litigation history. Operational due diligence assesses whether the business's processes are genuinely repeatable and scalable rather than dependent on the departing owner's personal knowledge or relationships. People due diligence is increasingly recognised as among the most consequential dimension, particularly for service businesses where key employee retention is central to value preservation. Trichterborn, Zu Knyphausen-Aufseß, and Schweizer (2016) found that acquirers who invested in systematic people diligence before deal closure experienced meaningfully better post-acquisition retention of key personnel than those who treated human capital assessment as a secondary concern.

Valuation in the entrepreneurial acquisition context typically draws on discounted cash flow analysis, comparable company multiples, or asset-based approaches, with the choice of method depending on the nature of the business and the reliability of available financial data. Post-acquisition integration is, however, where

most value is ultimately created or forfeited. Angwin and Meadows (2015) found that the first hundred days after deal completion are the period of greatest vulnerability, as uncertainty among customers, employees, and suppliers about the venture's direction creates attrition risks that compound quickly if the new owner does not communicate clearly and move decisively on operational priorities. That integration discipline matters as much as deal structure in determining whether an entrepreneurial acquisition generates the returns the acquirer projected.

2.14 Defining a Franchise and Outlining Its Structure

A franchise is a contractual arrangement through which one party, the franchisor, licenses to another, the franchisee, the right to operate a business under an established brand and system in exchange for an initial fee and ongoing royalty payments. Kuratko (2014, p. 133) positions franchising as a hybrid pathway between de novo founding and acquisition: the franchisee gains access to a proven concept and established brand recognition without the risk of starting from nothing, but also without the capital outlay and due diligence burden of acquiring an independent business. The franchisee receives not only the brand licence but also standardised operational procedures, a developed supply chain, initial and ongoing training, and the collective marketing power of a system that no single independent operator could afford to replicate. In exchange, they commit to operating within specified standards, paying royalties typically between five and ten percent of gross revenue, and contributing to shared marketing funds they cannot individually direct.

The franchise agreement is the foundational legal document governing the relationship, specifying territorial rights, contract term and renewal conditions, transfer and termination provisions, and the operational standards against which performance will be measured. Territory provisions typically grant the franchisee an exclusive or protected geographic right to operate, creating investment security by preventing the franchisor from placing a competing unit nearby. Multi-unit franchising, where a single franchisee operates multiple locations under a development agreement, has become the dominant structural pattern in mature systems. Combs, Ketchen, Shook, and Short (2011) examined agency theory explanations for the franchisor's preference for multi-unit operators and found that the reduction in monitoring costs, combined with stronger incentive alignment from a franchisee with significant capital at stake across multiple units, consistently explained franchisor preferences for this structure over single-unit expansion in more developed systems.

2.15 Benefits and Drawbacks of Franchising

Franchising sits at an interesting intersection: it is simultaneously a vehicle for entrepreneurial ownership and a corporate growth strategy, and the interests of franchisor and franchisee are simultaneously aligned around system success and in tension around the distribution of that success. The most frequently cited benefit from the franchisee's perspective is reduced failure risk relative to de novo founding. The franchisee enters a system that has already been tested in the market, whose value proposition has been validated with real customers, and whose operational procedures have been refined through the experience of other franchisees. Frazer, Weaven, and Bodey (2012) found that franchisee failure rates in mature systems were substantially lower than comparable independent business failure rates, while noting that the differential narrowed considerably in systems where the franchisor's own financial health was precarious, since franchisee performance is partly a function of the quality of franchisor support.

Brand recognition is a second benefit that is easy to undervalue before experiencing the alternative. An independent new business must invest in marketing for years before its brand name carries meaningful customer preference; a franchisee operating under a well-known brand enters the market with awareness already established. This accelerates the revenue ramp-up considerably and reduces the customer acquisition costs that are among the most financially punishing dimensions of early-stage independent business. Training and ongoing support from the franchisor represent a third substantive advantage, particularly for entrepreneurs entering an industry without prior operational experience. Croonen and Brand (2015) showed that the quality and consistency of franchisor training and field support is among the strongest predictors of franchisee performance, which means that prospective franchisees should evaluate the support infrastructure at least as carefully as the brand strength before committing.

The primary drawback from the franchisee's perspective is constrained autonomy. Franchise system value rests on brand consistency, and brand consistency requires that every franchisee operate within tightly specified standards: approved suppliers, prescribed procedures, mandated product ranges, and standardised service protocols. Franchisees who believe they could better serve their local market by deviating from any of these specifications find they cannot do so without risking agreement termination. For entrepreneurs whose primary motivation is creative control over their own enterprise, this can make the franchise experience genuinely frustrating. The financial burden is a second significant drawback that is sometimes underweighted by prospective franchisees focused on brand strength: royalty obligations, marketing fund contributions, and

required supplier pricing combine to create a cost structure that can substantially reduce net margins relative to an equivalent independent business. Cochet, Dormann, and Ehrmann (2008), in a study of franchisee satisfaction across European systems, found that financial dissatisfaction was most acute among franchisees who had underestimated the total cost of the franchise relationship during the decision process, underscoring the importance of full-system financial modelling before signing.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This paper adopts a qualitative, secondary research design grounded in systematic literature review methodology. The decision to work exclusively with secondary sources is both principled and appropriate to the research objectives. The comparative landscape of platform and traditional business models has generated a substantial and methodologically diverse body of peer-reviewed scholarship, institutional analysis, and high-quality grey literature over the past decade. Synthesising that existing evidence base can yield insights with broader generalisability than any single primary study, which is necessarily bounded by its sample, geographic scope, and temporal position.

Systematic literature reviews differ from conventional narrative reviews in their commitment to transparency, replicability, and explicit scope definition. Snyder (2019) provided an updated methodological framework for systematic reviews in management research, noting that the field has developed four distinct review types, systematic reviews, semi-systematic reviews, integrative reviews, and bibliometric reviews, each suited to different research objectives. The approach taken here most closely resembles an integrative review, appropriate when the goal is to synthesise mature and diverse literatures on a common theme rather than to conduct exhaustive coverage of all empirical work on a narrowly defined question.

3.2 Sources and Selection Criteria

Secondary sources were drawn from four categories. The first is peer-reviewed journal articles published between 2018 and 2025, sourced primarily from the Academy of Management Review, Strategic Management Journal, Journal of Business Venturing, Small Business Economics, Research Policy, MIS Quarterly, and the Journal of Management. The seven-year time horizon ensures that the technological, regulatory, and competitive landscape described in the literature reflects contemporary conditions. Where foundational theoretical works predating 2018 remain the primary or only source for a given concept, they are cited with explicit acknowledgment of their historical position in the theoretical lineage.

The second category includes authoritative books and academic monographs included when they synthesise large bodies of empirical evidence, have been extensively tested against subsequent scholarship, and address questions central to the comparative analysis. Key texts include Platform Revolution (Parker, Van Alstyne, and Choudary, 2016), Competing in the Age of AI (Iansiti and Lakhani, 2020), The Business of Platforms (Cusumano, Gawer, and Yoffie, 2019), and Innovation Management (Tidd and Bessant, 2020).

The third category comprises reports and datasets from international institutions including the OECD, the International Finance Corporation, the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, the World Economic Forum, and the McKinsey Global Institute. These sources provide empirical grounding for claims about entrepreneurial performance, digital adoption rates, and economic outcomes that peer-reviewed journals, given their longer production cycles, cannot always reflect in real time. Only reports published within the 2018 to 2025 window were included in this category.

The fourth category comprises high-quality grey literature, including working papers from the National Bureau of Economic Research, the World Bank Development Research Group, and the MIT Initiative on the Digital Economy. Sources in this category were selected only where they present original empirical analysis or theoretical contributions not yet available in peer-reviewed form, and where the institutional affiliation and review process of the publishing organisation provide reasonable quality assurance.

3.3 Analytical Framework

The comparative analysis is organised across six dimensions derived inductively from the literature: value creation logic, technological infrastructure requirements, scalability and growth dynamics, risk and resilience profiles, regulatory and institutional context, and performance in developing economies. These dimensions represent the axes along which the distinction between platform and traditional models is most consequential for entrepreneurial decision-making. Within each dimension, the analysis draws on the CIPM framework to highlight how contextual factors moderate the advantages and limitations of each model.

4. Comparative Analysis

4.1 Value Creation Logic

The most fundamental difference between platform and traditional ventures lies in their value creation logic. Traditional ventures create value through a linear sequence of activities, from inbound logistics through operations, marketing, sales, and service, each adding value to a product or service that is then sold to a customer. Value creation is internal to the firm, owned by it, and bounded by its operational capacity. The firm acts; customers receive. Kaplinsky and Morris (2018) documented how this linear value chain logic shapes investment decisions, cost structures, and competitive strategies in ways that are deeply embedded in traditional venture operations and not easily altered even when the external environment shifts.

Platform businesses, by contrast, create value by enabling interactions between users. The platform itself is an infrastructure for value creation rather than the source of it. Airbnb did not build a single hotel room; it created the conditions under which millions of homeowners and travellers could find and transact with one another. Parker, Van Alstyne, and Choudary (2016) characterise this shift from pipeline to platform as one of the defining structural changes in the contemporary economy. Its implications for cost structure are substantial: the marginal cost of adding a new user to a platform is close to zero, while the marginal cost of adding a new customer to a traditional service business typically requires proportionate increases in staffing, inventory, or physical infrastructure.

For the entrepreneur making a business model choice, this distinction translates into a fundamental strategic question: is the opportunity being pursued best addressed by making something, or by creating the conditions under which others can make things? Where the answer is the latter, platform logic applies. Where it is the former, the linear value chain of the traditional venture remains the appropriate architecture. Van Dijck, Poell, and de Waal (2018) observed that this question is becoming increasingly difficult to answer cleanly, as digital technologies enable traditional firms to incorporate platform elements without fully transforming their underlying model, producing hybrid configurations that neither paradigm fully accounts for.

4.2 Technological Infrastructure Requirements

Traditional entrepreneurial ventures require technology primarily as a tool for operational efficiency and customer reach. Digital point-of-sale systems, cloud-based accounting software, social media marketing, and e-commerce storefronts have become standard equipment for competitive traditional businesses, but they represent enhancements to a pre-existing operational model rather than the model itself. The venture could, in principle, function without them, even if less efficiently, because the underlying value creation logic does not depend on the technology.

Platform businesses are constituted by their technology. The digital infrastructure, the matching algorithms, the reputation systems, the payment rails, and the data architecture are not peripheral to the value proposition but central to it. Kenney and Zysman (2019) described the platformisation of economic activity as the reorganisation of production, consumption, and coordination around digital infrastructures that mediate and record every interaction, and documented how this reorganisation is spreading beyond technology sectors into healthcare, agriculture, education, and professional services.

Modern platform businesses are increasingly inseparable from their AI systems. Recommendation engines, dynamic pricing algorithms, fraud detection systems, and personalisation infrastructure are not optional features for a competitive platform; they are core to the value delivered to users and the efficiency of the platform's operations. Iansiti and Lakhani (2020) argued that AI-native firms, those built from the outset around machine learning capabilities, hold structural advantages over both traditional firms and platforms that have added AI as an afterthought. For entrepreneurial platform builders who lack access to large-scale data science talent or proprietary AI investment capacity, this creates a genuine and growing capability gap relative to well-resourced incumbents.

4.3 Scalability and Growth Dynamics

The scalability of platform businesses is among their most analytically important characteristics. Because the marginal cost of serving an additional user is close to zero for most digital platform services, and because network effects mean that each additional user increases the platform's value to all other users, platforms can grow at rates that are structurally impossible for traditional businesses. Uber expanded to operating in over seventy countries within a decade. Facebook reached one billion users in approximately eight years. These growth trajectories are qualitatively different from anything achievable by a traditional service business constrained by physical assets and human capital.

This scalability advantage is real but conditional. It depends on the strength and type of network effects in the relevant market, the platform's ability to manage multi-sided dynamics without alienating either user group, and the regulatory environment's willingness to permit the disintermediating activities on which platform

growth typically depends. Where those conditions are met, platform businesses can achieve market dominance with remarkable speed. Where they are not, the scalability advantage disappears, and the platform entrepreneur may find themselves competing against traditional businesses while carrying the structural disadvantage of a more complex operating model.

Traditional ventures scale through a different mechanism: the replication and systematisation of a proven operational model. Franchising represents one of the most sophisticated tools for scaling traditional businesses, enabling the deployment of a proven concept across multiple locations while distributing both the capital requirements and the operational risk. McKinsey Global Institute (2021) estimated that traditional businesses which successfully adopt digital tools while retaining their core operational model can achieve productivity gains of thirty to forty percent, suggesting that the scalability gap between traditional and platform businesses, while real, is not unbridgeable for ventures that approach digital adoption strategically.

4.4 Risk and Resilience Profiles

The risk profiles of platform and traditional businesses differ in kind as well as degree. Traditional entrepreneurial ventures face the familiar risks of entrepreneurship: inadequate demand, operational failure, competitive pressure, and the personal financial exposure of founders who have typically invested personal capital. These risks are well understood, and the scholarly and practitioner literature has developed extensive frameworks for their assessment and mitigation over many decades.

Platform businesses face an additional category of risk with no direct equivalent in the traditional model: the cold start problem. A platform with no users on one side has nothing to offer users on the other. This chicken-and-egg challenge means that platform businesses typically require significant upfront investment to achieve the minimum viable scale at which network effects begin to operate. Cusumano, Gawer, and Yoffie (2019) documented extensively that most platform businesses fail before reaching this threshold, and that the failure rate in the pre-network-effect phase is substantially higher than published statistics on platform success tend to convey.

Resilience, the capacity to absorb and recover from shocks, is distributed differently between the two models. Traditional businesses with physical assets and diversified customer relationships have demonstrated considerable resilience in the face of technological disruption, even when adaptation has required substantial change. The OECD (2021) analysis of pandemic impacts found that while many traditional businesses suffered severe short-term disruption, those with strong community relationships and diversified revenue streams recovered faster than platform businesses whose growth had been premised on a single behavioural pattern the pandemic interrupted. That finding suggests that the asset intensity that constrains traditional businesses in growth markets may simultaneously provide a form of resilience that asset-light platform businesses structurally lack.

4.5 Regulatory and Institutional Context

The regulatory environment has emerged as one of the most consequential and most rapidly evolving dimensions of the platform versus traditional comparison. Traditional businesses operate within regulatory frameworks that, whatever their limitations, are well established and largely predictable. Licensing requirements, labour regulations, consumer protection laws, and tax obligations are known quantities that experienced advisers can navigate with reasonable confidence.

Platform businesses have repeatedly encountered regulatory environments designed for a different economic era and being adapted, with varying degrees of coherence and speed, to the novel challenges platforms present. The European Union's Digital Markets Act, enacted in 2022, represents the most comprehensive attempt yet by a major regulatory jurisdiction to impose structural obligations on large platform operators, requiring interoperability, prohibiting self-preferencing, and mandating data access for business users and competitors. The implications for platform entrepreneurship are still being worked out, but the trajectory toward a more demanding regulatory environment is clear and is itself a strategic factor that entrepreneurial platform builders need to incorporate into their founding assumptions.

For entrepreneurs in developing economies, the regulatory dimension takes a different form. Many developing country governments have responded to platform businesses with a mixture of attraction and wariness: attracted by the employment and income opportunities they appear to offer, wary of the tax base erosion and labour standard implications that have accompanied platform growth in more developed markets. Djankov and Zhang (2021), in an analysis of platform regulation across thirty-five developing countries, found significant variation in regulatory approach and a consistent tendency toward reactive rather than anticipatory regulation, creating an environment of uncertainty that both enables and constrains platform entrepreneurship in ways that differ fundamentally from the developed market experience.

4.6 Performance in Developing Economies

The performance of platform and traditional business models in developing economies represents perhaps the most important and most under-researched dimension of the comparative analysis. The implicit assumption in much of the platform entrepreneurship literature is that the conditions enabling platform businesses, high connectivity, digital payment infrastructure, large addressable markets, and regulatory openness, are broadly present. Across the global south, these conditions are present in some markets and contexts but absent in others, and the pattern of their presence and absence is more complex than aggregate connectivity statistics suggest.

The African experience is instructive. M-Pesa, the mobile money platform launched in Kenya in 2007, achieved its success precisely by solving a problem that both traditional financial institutions and conventional digital payment platforms had failed to address: the need for secure, accessible financial transactions among a population with limited access to formal banking infrastructure. Suri and Jack (2016) documented the long-term economic impact of M-Pesa on Kenyan households through panel data spanning nearly a decade, finding that access to mobile money lifted approximately two percent of Kenyan households out of poverty and had disproportionately large benefits for female-headed households. This example illustrates that platform logic can be powerfully applied in developing economy contexts, but only when the platform is designed around local conditions rather than transposed directly from developed market templates.

Traditional entrepreneurial ventures continue to dominate the economic landscape of most developing economies by every measure. The World Bank Enterprise Surveys (2023) found that small and medium enterprises operating on traditional models account for over sixty percent of private sector employment in sub-Saharan Africa and a comparable share in South and Southeast Asia. Many of these businesses are actively incorporating digital tools and beginning to exhibit hybrid characteristics, blending traditional operational models with platform-enabled customer reach and digital payment capability. The International Finance Corporation (2022) identified this hybrid trajectory as the dominant pattern of entrepreneurial modernisation in developing markets and argued that policy frameworks designed to support it are more likely to generate broad-based economic development than those focused exclusively on either traditional or platform models.

5. Recommendations

5.1 For Entrepreneurs

The comparative analysis presented in this paper argues that the choice between platform and traditional business models should not be made on the basis of fashion or the narrative appeal of either paradigm. It should be made on the basis of a rigorous assessment of four contextual factors: the nature of the value creation opportunity, the technological infrastructure available in the target market, the regulatory environment governing the relevant sector, and the entrepreneur's own capability profile.

Entrepreneurs pursuing opportunities in markets characterised by high connectivity, large addressable user populations, and genuine matching or coordination problems should seriously consider platform configurations, but should do so with clear awareness of the cold start problem and the capital requirements it implies. Those pursuing opportunities grounded in physical service delivery, local relationship building, or markets where regulatory complexity favours incumbents should build on traditional operational foundations while incorporating digital tools selectively to enhance efficiency and customer reach.

In both cases, the CIPM framework suggests that contextual analysis should precede model selection rather than follow it. The entrepreneur who understands their institutional environment, their technological infrastructure, and their human capital context before committing to a business model architecture is substantially better positioned than one who selects a model on the basis of its success elsewhere and then attempts to adapt the context to fit the model.

5.2 For Educators and Academic Institutions

Entrepreneurship education has been slow to incorporate the full implications of the platform revolution into its curriculum. Business model frameworks designed for traditional ventures remain the dominant pedagogical tool in most programmes, and the theoretical treatment of platform dynamics, network effects, and multi-sided market economics is still confined largely to specialist electives rather than integrated into foundational entrepreneurship teaching.

Academic institutions should accelerate the integration of platform theory, digital business model innovation, and AI-era strategy into foundational entrepreneurship education. This does not mean abandoning the intellectual foundations of traditional entrepreneurship scholarship, which remain essential for understanding the majority of ventures that students will encounter and build during their careers. It means constructing a genuinely comparative curriculum that equips students to analyse both paradigms with rigour and to make contextually appropriate model choices when they encounter real strategic decisions.

5.3 For Policymakers

Policymakers in both developed and developing economies face the challenge of creating regulatory and institutional environments that support a diverse entrepreneurial ecosystem rather than inadvertently privileging one business model paradigm over another. The European Union's Digital Markets Act represents a significant step toward creating competitive conditions in platform markets, but its implementation will need to be monitored carefully to ensure it does not create regulatory burdens that disproportionately affect smaller platform entrants relative to established incumbents who have the legal resources to navigate complex compliance requirements.

In developing economies, the priority should be developing the enabling infrastructure, particularly digital payment systems, reliable broadband connectivity, and coherent digital identity frameworks, that allows both platform and traditional businesses to operate effectively. The International Finance Corporation (2022) analysis suggests that investment in this infrastructure generates returns across both model types and is therefore more broadly beneficial than support targeted at either paradigm in isolation.

6. Conclusion

This paper set out to examine platform and traditional business models comparatively within an entrepreneurial context, drawing on secondary research and applying the CIPM framework as an analytical lens for contextual sensitivity. The analysis has produced several conclusions of both theoretical and practical significance.

The distinction between platform and traditional business models is real, consequential, and grounded in fundamentally different value creation logics. It cannot be dissolved by adding digital tools to a traditional business or by describing a platform as merely a technology company. The structural differences in how value is created, scaled, and captured run through every aspect of entrepreneurial strategy from team design to financing to regulatory positioning.

Neither model is universally superior. The conditions that make platform businesses viable are not uniformly present across the global economy, and the advantages they offer in high-connectivity, large-market environments do not transfer automatically to contexts characterised by infrastructure limitations, regulatory complexity, or markets where trust is built through physical rather than digital presence. Traditional entrepreneurial ventures retain genuine and significant advantages in many of the world's most economically important contexts, and policy frameworks that ignore this risk doing real damage to entrepreneurial ecosystems outside the digitally mature minority of markets.

The most promising frontier of entrepreneurial practice is not the competition between these two models but the development of contextually intelligent hybrid configurations that draw on the strengths of both. The most successful entrepreneurial ventures of the coming decade are likely to be those that can deploy platform logic where network effects are achievable, maintain traditional operational foundations where physical presence and local relationships are irreplaceable, and leverage AI capabilities to enhance both without becoming dependent on either at the exclusion of the other.

The CIPM framework adds value to this analysis by insisting that entrepreneurial model choice is not merely a strategic decision but an act of contextual intelligence. The entrepreneur who reads their environment accurately, who understands the institutional, technological, and human capital conditions in which they are operating, and who makes model choices consistent with that understanding, is the one most likely to create ventures that are not merely innovative but enduringly viable.

This paper has necessarily operated at a level of generality that leaves room for more context-specific empirical work. Future research should examine the performance of hybrid platform-traditional configurations in specific developing economy contexts, test the predictive validity of the CIPM framework against longitudinal venture performance data, and explore the implications of AI-native platform architectures for the capabilities required of the next generation of entrepreneurs.

References

[1]. Allen, D. W. E., Berg, C., Markey-Towler, B., Novak, M., and Potts, J. (2020). Blockchain and the evolution of institutional technologies: Implications for innovation policy. Research Policy, 49(1), 103865.

[2]. Alvarez, S. A., Barney, J. B., Anderson, P. H., and Kreiser, P. M. (2020). Opportunity discovery and creation in the twenty-first century: Review and assessment. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 14(3), 300-323.

[3]. Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S. G., Mueller, J. S., and Staw, B. M. (2005). Affect and creativity at work. Administrative Science Quarterly, 50(3), 367-403.

[4]. Angwin, D. N., and Meadows, M. (2015). New integration strategies for post-acquisition management. Long Range Planning, 48(4), 235-251.
[5]. Bacq, S., and Janssen, F. (2011). The multiple faces of social entrepreneurship: A review of definitional issues based on geographical and thematic criteria. Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 23(5-6), 373-403.
[6]. Baer, M. (2012). Putting creativity to work: The implementation of creative ideas in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 55(5), 1102-1119.
[7]. Baer, M. (2015). Idea generation and the constraining effects of expertise: An intra-individual comparison of novel and familiar domains. Creativity Research Journal, 27(1), 33-39.
[8]. Combs, J. G., Ketchen, D. J., Shook, C. L., and Short, J. C. (2011). Antecedents and consequences of franchising: Past accomplishments and future challenges. Journal of Management, 37(1), 99-126.
[9]. Cochet, O., Dormann, J., and Ehrmann, T. (2008). Capitalizing on franchisee-autonomy: Relational forms of governance as controls in idiosyncratic franchise dyads. Journal of Small Business Management, 46(1), 50-72.
[10]. Croonen, E., and Brand, M. (2015). Antecedents and outcomes of franchisee-initiated strategic change requests. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 39(4), 947-975.
[11]. Cusumano, M. A., Gawer, A., and Yoffie, D. B. (2019). The business of platforms: Strategy in the age of digital competition, innovation, and power. Harper Business.
[12]. De Jong, J., and Den Hartog, D. (2010). Measuring innovative work behaviour. Creativity and Innovation Management, 19(1), 23-36.
[13]. De Reuver, M., Sorensen, C., and Basole, R. C. (2018). The digital platform: A research agenda. Journal of Information Technology, 33(2), 124-135.
[14]. Djankov, S., and Zhang, E. (2021). Digitalization of the economy and its implications for labour markets. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 9661.
[15]. Foss, N. J., and Saebi, T. (2018). Business models and business model innovation: Between wicked and paradigmatic problems. Long Range Planning, 51(1), 9-21.
[16]. Frazer, L., Weaven, S., and Bodey, K. (2012). Franchising Australia 2012. Griffith University.
[17]. Fritsch, M., and Wyrwich, M. (2018). Regional knowledge, entrepreneurial culture, and innovative start-ups over time and space. Small Business Economics, 51(2), 337-353.
[18]. Gassmann, O., Frankenberger, K., and Csik, M. (2014). The business model navigator: 55 models that will revolutionise your business. Pearson.
[19]. Gilhooly, K. J., Ball, L. J., and Macchi, L. (2015). Insight and creative thinking processes: Routine and special. Thinking and Reasoning, 21(1), 1-4.
[20]. Graebner, M. E., Heimeriks, K. H., Huy, Q. N., and Vaara, E. (2017). The process of post-merger integration: A review and agenda for future research. Academy of Management Annals, 11(1), 1-32.
[21]. Hellmann, T., and Wasserman, N. (2021). The first deal: The division of founder equity in new ventures. Management Science, 67(8), 5175-5200.
[22]. Hessels, J., Grilo, I., Thurik, R., and van der Zwan, P. (2011). Entrepreneurial exit and entrepreneurial engagement. Journal of Evolutionary Economics, 21(3), 447-471.
[23]. Huang, L., and Knight, A. P. (2017). Resources and relationships in entrepreneurship: An exchange theory of the development and effects of the entrepreneur-investor relationship. Academy of Management Review, 42(1), 80-102.
[24]. Hyytinen, A., Pajarinen, M., and Rouvinen, P. (2015). Does innovativeness reduce startup survival rates? Journal of Business Venturing, 30(4), 564-581.
[25]. Iansiti, M., and Lakhani, K. R. (2020). Competing in the age of AI: Strategy and leadership when algorithms and networks run the world. Harvard Business Review Press.
[26]. International Finance Corporation. (2022). Digital financial services and the pandemic: Opportunities and risks for emerging and developing economies. IFC Working Paper.
[27]. Kaplinsky, R., and Morris, M. (2018). Rents, power and governance in global value chains. Journal of Business Ethics, 148(2), 349-368.
[28]. Kenney, M., and Zysman, J. (2019). Work and value creation in the platform economy. In A. Kovalainen and S. Vallas (Eds.), Work and Labor in the Digital Age (pp. 13-41). Emerald Publishing.
[29]. Kuckertz, A., Brandle, L., Gaudig, A., Hinderer, S., Reyes, C. A. M., Prochotta, A., Steinbrink, K. M., and Berger, E. S. C. (2020). Startups in times of crisis: A rapid response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 13, e00169.
[30]. Szerb, L., Lafuente, E., and Markman, G. D. (2020). Why context matters: Institutions, entrepreneurship, and the exploitation of opportunities. Journal of Small Business Management, 58(6), 1134-1151.

[31]. Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J. S., and Hayton, J. (2015). Corporate entrepreneurship: The innovative challenge for a new global economic reality. Small Business Economics, 45(2), 245-253.
[32]. Lumineau, F., Wang, W., and Schilke, O. (2021). Blockchain governance: A new way of organizing collaborations? Organization Science, 32(2), 500-521.
[33]. Mainemelis, C., Kark, R., and Epitropaki, O. (2015). Creative leadership: A multi-context conceptualization. Academy of Management Annals, 9(1), 393-482.
[34]. Massa, M., Tucci, C. L., and Afuah, A. (2017). A critical assessment of business model research. Academy of Management Annals, 11(1), 73-104.
[35]. McKinsey Global Institute. (2021). The future of work after COVID-19. McKinsey and Company.
[36]. Nambisan, S., Wright, M., and Feldman, M. (2019). The digital transformation of innovation and entrepreneurship: Progress, challenges and key themes. Research Policy, 48(8), 103773.
[37]. OECD. (2021). The digital transformation of SMEs. OECD Studies on SMEs and Entrepreneurship. OECD Publishing.
[38]. Parker, G. G., Van Alstyne, M. W., and Choudary, S. P. (2016). Platform revolution: How networked markets are transforming the economy. W. W. Norton and Company.
[39]. Rietveld, J., and Schilling, M. A. (2021). Platform competition: A systematic and interdisciplinary review of the literature. Journal of Management, 47(6), 1528-1563.
[40]. Roundy, P. T., Brockman, B. K., and Bradshaw, M. (2018). The resilience of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 8, 99-104.
[41]. Sambiri, B. B. (2024). Contextual innovation performance model: Rethinking innovation measurement across institutional environments. Manuscript in preparation.
[42]. Semrau, T., Ambos, T., and Kraus, S. (2016). Entrepreneurial orientation and SME performance across societal cultures: An international study. Journal of Business Research, 69(5), 1928-1932.
[43]. Shepherd, D. A., Sattari, R., and Patzelt, H. (2022). A review of entrepreneurial cognition: Mind, brain, intention, and opportunity belief formation. Journal of Management, 48(6), 1711-1754.
[44]. Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. Journal of Business Research, 104, 333-339.
[45]. Suri, T., and Jack, W. (2016). The long-run poverty and gender impacts of mobile money. Science, 354(6317), 1288-1292.
[46]. Kuratko, D. F. (2014). Entrepreneurship: Theory, process, practice (9th ed.). South-Western Cengage Learning.
[47]. Tidd, J., and Bessant, J. (2020). Managing innovation: Integrating technological, market and organizational change (7th ed.). John Wiley and Sons.
[48]. Tiwana, A. (2015). Evolutionary competition in platform ecosystems. Information Systems Research, 26(2), 266-281.
[49]. Trichterborn, A., Zu Knyphausen-Aufseß, D., and Schweizer, L. (2016). How to improve acquisition performance: The role of a dedicated M&A function, M&A learning process, and M&A capability. Strategic Management Journal, 37(4), 763-773.
[50]. Van Dijck, J., Poell, T., and de Waal, M. (2018). The platform society: Public values in a connective world. Oxford University Press.
[51]. World Bank Enterprise Surveys. (2023). Small and medium enterprise data for sub-Saharan Africa. World Bank Group.
[52]. Welter, F., Baker, T., and Wirsching, K. (2019). Three waves and counting: The rising tide of contextualization in entrepreneurship research. Small Business Economics, 52(2), 319-330.
[53]. Wirtz, B. W., Pistoia, A., Ullrich, S., and Gottel, V. (2016). Business models: Origin, development and future research perspectives. Long Range Planning, 49(1), 36-54.
[54]. Wood, M. S., and McKelvie, A. (2015). Opportunity evaluation as future focused cognition: Identifying conceptual themes and empirical trends. International Journal of Management Reviews, 17(2), 256-277.
[55]. Wasserman, N. (2012). The founder's dilemmas: Anticipating and avoiding the pitfalls that can sink a startup. Princeton University Press.