

Owner Identity and Interdependent Markets

an examination of ownership filters of institutional complexity, coalitional change and value creation in disrupted two-sided market categories

Eigendomsidentiteit en onderling afhankelijke markten

een onderzoek naar eigendomsfilters van institutionele complexiteit, veranderende coalities en waarde-creatie in ontworpen tweezijdige markt-categorieën

Thesis

to obtain the degree of Doctor from the Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam
by command of the
rector magnificus

Prof. dr. F. van der Duijn Schouten

and in accordance with the decision of the Doctorate Board.

The public defence shall be held on

Friday 9 April 2021 at 13:00 hrs

by

Mathilde Sanders

born in Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Doctoral committee

Promotors:

Prof.dr. J. van Oosterhout

Prof.dr.ir. V.J.A. van de Vrande

Other members:

Prof.dr. H.L. van Kranenburg

Prof.dr. E. Raviola

Dr. F.H. Wijen

Erasmus University Rotterdam

© 2020, Mathilde Sanders

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the author.

PREFACE

In the year 2000, when the dot.com bubble reached its peak, I graduated at the Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR) as a professional newspaper journalist. In the years after that, technological disruption started to result in a structural decline of jobs in newsrooms. Only a handful of my very talented fellow journalist EUR-classmates have a regular job at a newspaper today. The majority was unable to make a proper living in this vanishing profession. To date, my drive as a researcher has been to solve the problem of the disrupted business model for quality journalism. I wanted to find out how to make journalism ‘great’ (and profitable) again in times of fake news and what type of organization would be optimal to achieve this. Over time, it became increasingly clear to me that some shareholders or ownership types are probably more suitable for solving this problem than others.

After the second World War, non-profit ownership was introduced in the Dutch news industry in order to protect the democratic mission of the press. After the collaboration of the newspaper *De Telegraaf* with the German occupiers, several newspapers that had been part of the resistance movement (*Het Parool en Trouw*) wanted to be owned by foundations that would guard their identity and ideal mission. It was argued that for-profit ownership would make publishers more vulnerable to right wing influence. It was this idea that inspired me to start with my research for this dissertation. Around the time of the Murdoch phone hacking scandal in the UK, I had already started investigating media ownership as a journalist. I invited Prof. dr. Hans van Oosterhout (now my first promotor) as a panelist for a debate at the launch of my crowdfunded book about this topic. He declined politely but gave me a wonderful reading suggestion; a book (Hansmann, 1996) that made me come back for more great reading. This is how I was drawn back into academic literature and theory.

The Stimuleringsfonds voor de Journalistiek (SVDJ) granted me a subsidy to start with scientific research on my media ownership topic. I am immensely grateful for this startup funding that other foundations such as FBJP, Lucas Ooms Fonds and the Nederlands Vereniging van Journalisten (NVJ) contributed to as well. Without it, this dissertation would not exist. To my great pleasure, Hans and his colleague Prof. dr. Pursey Heugens were willing to provide me with guidance during this project. I am still immensely grateful for all their help, guidance, patience and unconditional support: not only as excellent scholars but also as backers in my attempts to get more funding to continue my research. The financing of this PhD was a truly challenging quest, and there have been many times that I paused my research or nearly gave up on it. It was the always unexpected, educational and inspiring feedback on my work by Hans that kept me going. Thank you for spending so much of your time on my dissertation and for not giving up on me, Hans. Then entered Prof. dr. ir. Vareska van de Vrande who became my co-promotor in 2015 when Hans worked at Wharton for some time. Her positive, practical and constructive attitude and new perspective on my research were a great motivation for me to carry on. Vareska wanted to learn how to write like a journalist and taught me how to write as an academic. I am extremely grateful and consider it a privilege to have worked with my two promotors and other RSM professors.

Another important motivator and savior of my PhD-project was Piet Bakker, then professor at Utrecht’s Journalism School (HU). He invited me to join his group of researchers and this allowed me to continue my research in the perfect setting. I am truly grateful for this. He introduced me to media scholars and experts Yael de Haan and Klaske Tameling who gave me great feedback and did friendly reviews of my papers in an early stage. Very valuable feedback and help I also received from fellow (PhD) researchers, such as Renee van der Nat, Els Diekerhof, Chris van der Heijden, Marco van Kerkhoven, Elvira van Noort, Carien Touwen, Ernst-Jan Hamel, Kiki de Bruin, Anne Nienhuis, Laurens Vreekamp, Sebastiaan van der Lubben en Daniela van Geenen.

I am also grateful for all the inspiring academic conferences that I could attend and for the feedback from many media scholars I met there (such as Patricia Thornton, Elena Raviola, Leona Achtenhagen, Lucy Küng, Mathieu Lardeau, Erik Hitters, Sven Ove Horst, Hans van Kranenburg, Aske Kammer, Tom Evens, and Joaquin Cestino). Also, Mark Deuze invited me to join his Dauphinerkreis, which was a great setting for debate with journalist-PhD researchers such as Devid Ilievski, Stijn Postema, Wiel Schmetz and Erwin van ‘t Hof. Similarly, at RSM many fellow PhD-students and former colleagues (Carolien, Patricia, Ellen, Alina, Thijs, Ilaria, Omar, Taco, Jurriaan, Joris, Richard, Ingrid, Brian, Tom, Taco, Magdalena, Mallory, Jacomijn, Joost, Stefan, ‘Z’, Rene,

Justin, Wenjie, Siyu, Radina, Jitse, Suzana and Michael): I am truly grateful for all your help in all forms and the pleasant chats we had on the 7th floor of the Mandeville building over the past years. In particular, I want to thank Frank Wijen, who gave me very valuable advice and is a top teacher of qualitative research methods.

I am extremely much indebted to all the media experts that I interviewed for my PhD research. As I guaranteed them anonymity, I cannot mention their names here, but I hope they understand that our conversations were truly inspiring and valuable for my research. The same goes for the help and talks with many others who are passionate about journalism: Toon Schmeink, Joost Ramaer, Frederique de Jong, Dolf Rogmans, Thomas Bruning and Rosa García López in particular. Also, I want to thank the media measurement experts at GfK for their support during my final PhD sprint.

Of all my friends, Julie Ferguson, is the person who was there from the beginning until the end on my PhD journey. Her PhD defense inspired me to get started and she helped me to enter the scientific world to become a thesis supervisor at prof.dr. Tom Elfring's department at de Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam. On many occasions Julie gave me helpful and honest advice for which I am immensely grateful. Other friends and cousins may not have always understood why I was spending all my free time on this project but supported me in all sorts of ways, maybe even without knowing it. I count myself very lucky for our friendship, Marieke, Karijn, Eva, Femke B., Carla, Annigje, Marije, Celine, Femke D., Janine, Julie, Deedee, Chretienne, Karianne, Daniëlle, Dela, Mathilde, Madeleine, Anouk, Marjon, Manuella and Marona.

Finally, I want to thank my wonderful family. I am extremely grateful to be part of such a loving, loyal, cheerful, fun to be with, sweet, inspiring, adventurous family and family-in-law with the best sense of humor. Of all my academic family members, Oom Andy was also indispensable as a PhD coach. Thank you for being so kind, helpful and for reading my work, Andy. Suzette, Barbara, Thijs, Manuela, Pieter, Mark, Jeroen, Anna B and Ricus; I am blessed with you as my family - you are the best! Lieve Doesjka en Jan; how can I ever begin to thank you for all your gifts, great spirits and for being my 'back-up' mother and father? Without your help this book would not have been written. Lieve Pappa, you never knew I started a PhD trajectory, but I think you were the source of my drive to complete this. I missed you on this part of my journey, but hopefully, we can discuss it in the afterlife. Without your loving care, liefste Mamma, this accomplishment would not have been possible either. Your support is always unconditional and anything a daughter could wish for. And last but not most important, my soulmates and sweethearts Jan, Christiaan and Anna. Forgive me for being such a crazy wife and mother who spent far too much of our valuable free time on writing this book. I love you.

Mathilde Sanders
28 June, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1. General introduction	7
1.1 Research topic: News media ownership and disrupted markets.....	7
1.2 Theoretical background and research questions.....	9
1.3 Dissertation overview.....	12
1.4 Declaration of contributions.....	15
Chapter 2. The owner-category fit and responses to pluralism in two-sided markets	19
2.1 Introduction.....	10
2.2 Theoretical background.....	22
2.2.1 Institutional pluralism and complexity.....	23
2.2.2 Owner identity and field position.....	24
2.2.3 Institutional logics and categories.....	26
2.3 Methods.....	28
2.3.1 Research setting.....	29
2.3.2. Data sources.....	29
2.3.3 Data analysis.....	31
2.4 Findings.....	35
2.4.1 Investor owner: decoupling response.....	38
2.4.2 Non-profit and customer owners: selective decoupling.....	44
2.4.3 Employee cooperatives: no decoupling.....	46
2.5 Discussion.....	48
2.5.1 Limitations and future research.....	51
Chapter 3. Markets, lower echelons and owners as brokers of coalitional attention	53
3.1 Introduction.....	55
3.2 Theoretical background.....	57
3.2.1 Disruption multiple market environment.....	59
3.3 Methods.....	61
3.3.1 Research setting.....	62
3.3.2 Data collection.....	63
3.3.3 Data analysis.....	65
3.4 Findings.....	68
3.4.1 Phase one: Non-profit ownership.....	70
3.4.2 Phase two: Financial investor ownership.....	78
3.4.3 Phase three: Strategic investor ownership.....	81
3.5 Discussion.....	87
Chapter 4. Demand- and supply-side value creation in old and new market categories	93
4.1 Introduction.....	94
4.2 Theoretical background.....	95
4.2.1 Demand- and supply-side value creation.....	97
4.2.2 Old and new market categories.....	101
4.3 Methods.....	103
4.3.1 Research setting.....	104
4.3.2 Case sampling.....	104
4.3.3 Data sources.....	108

4.3.4 Data analysis	110
4.4 Findings.....	114
4.4.1 Print advertising category.....	115
4.4.2 Online advertising category	119
4.4.3 Online subscription category	121
4.4.4. Print subscription category	125
4.5 Discussion.....	128
References.....	20
Summary (English).....	34
Summary (Dutch).....	35
About the Author.....	36
Appendix.....	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 List of organizations studied.....	150
Table 1.2 Summaries of three studies	12
Table 1.3 Summary key-take-aways.....	15
Table 2.1 Summary of results.....	36
Table 2.1a Comparative table public investor owners.....	151
Table 2.1b Comparative table private investor owners.....	152
Table 2.1c Comparative table non-profit owners.....	153
Table 2.1d Comparative table customer owners.....	154
Table 2.1e Comparative table employee owners.....	155
Table 2.2 Detail coding scheme owner mission and logic.....	39
Table 2.3 Detail coding scheme conflicting logics and complexity.....	40
Table 2.4 Detail coding scheme governance practices.....	42
Table 3.1 Phase one: detail coding structure - 2000-2004.....	71
Table 3.2 Phase two: detail coding structure - 2004-2009.....	77
Table 3.3 Phase three: detail coding structure - 2009-2016.....	83
Table 4.1 Data sources per market category.....	109
Table 4.2 Summary of results.....	115
Table 4.3 Elements demand-side value proposition.....	117
Table 4.4 Detail data structure.....	118
Table 4.5 Elements supply-side value proposition.....	120
Appendix I Elements content prototype value proposition.....	156
Appendix II Primary content topics and overlap.....	157
Appendix III Averages articles newsletters.....	157

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Data structure analysis round 1.....	32
Figure 2.2 Data structure analysis round 2.....	34
Figure 2.3 Ten most pure cases, their governance practices and market categories.....	37
Figure 2.4 Conceptual model.....	48
Figure 3.1 Data structure.....	66
Figure 3.2 Market changes and phases process.....	69
Figure 3.3 Process model.....	87
Figure 4.1 Data structure.....	112

CHAPTER 1

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research topic: News media ownership and disrupted multiple markets

This dissertation is about how news media organizations with divergent owner identities respond to technological disruption in their two-sided and interdependent markets. For organization scientists, the news media sector is a truly rewarding empirical field to study, because it is one of the first industries that had to deal with the negative effects of technological disruption and ‘platformization’ (Nieborg & Poell, 2018). It is also a relevant context because centuries before platforms existed, newspapers already served two-sided markets (Rochet & Tirole, 2003) that are linked to two distinct organizational goals, coalitions and owners with conflicting market and professional logics (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999).

On the one hand, there is the social mission of a news media firm that employs the press which should serve as the Fourth Estate in a parliamentary democracy. Its journalists serve citizens and subscribers by offering information that should not be controlled by the government nor any other stakeholder, but which should be objective and unbiased. On the other hand, most news media firms also have a for-profit mission as do other publicly or privately-owned firms in other sectors. This for-profit mission may, however, create a dependency on a revenue source additional to subscriptions: the market for advertising. Without any income from advertisers, news broadcasting and publishing is not (very) profitable.

Like platforms, newspapers and other legacy media, have always been intermediaries that facilitate transactions between two markets: advertisers and subscribers. As such, they do

not only create value on the ‘supply-side’ as traditional pipe-line businesses that produce media content, but they also create value on the ‘demand-side’ by selling the audience for this content to advertisers (Massa, Tucci & Afuah, 2017; Zhao, Von Delft, Morgan-Thomas & Buck, 2019).

The introduction of new technologies and the rise of online platforms have, however, disrupted the news industry’s business model worldwide and this resulted in increasing ownership concentration. In the Dutch newspaper media sector, for instance, the total number of Dutch newspaper publishers declined from 41 in 1945 to only two large newspaper publishing groups and a handful of niche players today (Heijkant, Balder & Leunissen, 2017).

Due to internet disruption, the demand for both print advertising and subscriptions structurally declined from the late 1990s onwards. Newspaper publishers lost their monopoly in publishing as news became available for free online. Despite the fact that yearly spending on media advertising in The Netherlands, for instance, doubled from 3 billion euro to 6 billion euro, total revenues coming from advertising at Dutch news media firms fell from 1,1 billion euro in 2000 to 200 million euro in 2017 (NDP, 2001; NDP, 2018)*. The number of paying newspaper readers in the Netherlands also declined over the same period: from 4,5 million in 2000 to 2,5 mln in 2016. Despite this near halving of the number of paying readers, total revenues coming from the subscription or reader market actually increased from approximately 800 mln euro in 2000 to approximately 900 mln in 2016 (NDP, 2001; NDP, 2017). Many newspaper publishers increasingly used their revenues from the subscription side to subsidize the decline in revenues on the advertising side. Before 2003, the opposite was true as revenues from advertising exceeded those coming from the reader market.

*NDP-members are 15 Dutch news media firms that include press agencies, TV and radio broadcasters, print and online news publishers that together own 40 news brands. It needs to be noted that not all newspaper titles in the Netherlands are included in these NDP-numbers.

In this dissertation I focus on how changes in these two interdependent markets interacted with media organizations' owners with divergent goals and how this in turn affected the formation of opposing editorial and market coalitions and their interdependent value propositions. Due to technological change, news publishers have not only lost their monopoly power in the market for advertising, but the nature of their value proposition in the advertising market-side has also changed fundamentally. As a result, the traditional norms and values of the editorial staff in the newsroom that serves the subscriber market-side, was put under pressure. My research illustrates that particular types of ownership and business models may counter this.

1.2 Theoretical background & research questions

This dissertation addresses three research gaps by answering three research questions which are about how media organizations with divergent owner identities respond to developments in their environment that result from changes in 1) their interdependent two-sided markets and 2) technology. The following types of responses to these two factors were analyzed in this dissertation:

- 1) Corporate governance practices to counter institutional complexity
- 2) Shifts in the dominant coalition and its attention structures
- 3) Value creation on the supply- and demand-side

I shall now present the three research questions of my dissertation and the lacunas in the literature that they each address.

1) When organizations are confronted with incompatible prescriptions from multiple logics in their environment (pluralism) they may experience ‘institutional complexity’ (Greenwood, Raynard, Kodeih, Micelotta, & Lounsbury). This can lead to paralyzing conflicts among coalitions with diverging logics inside the organization (Pache & Santos, 2010). Logics are ‘overarching sets of principles that prescribe how to interpret organizational reality, what constitutes appropriate behavior and how to succeed’ (2011Greenwood et al., 2011:318; Thornton, 2004; Friedland & Alford, 1991). It is known that a firm’s response to competing logics in its environment is partially determined or ‘filtered’ top-down by its type of ownership (Greenwood et al., 2011). How bottom-up prescriptions coming from the market categories that an organization serves, affect this response, has been explored less, however, because most research on institutional logics assumes that market audiences are more homogeneous than they may be in reality (Durand & Thornton, 2018). There is a lack of logics studies with a focus on organizations that serve two-sided markets (Rochet & Tirole, 2003; Eisenmann, Parker & Van Alstyne, 2006) or interdependent market categories. I address this lacuna in the literature with the first question of this dissertation: *how does the owner identity of organizations affect their response to institutional pluralism in two-sided markets?*

2) The fragmented and interdisciplinary literature on coalitions describes how both internal (upper echelon) and external (market and ownership) sources of power affect organizational decision-making and responses to the environment (Jara-Bertin, López- Iturriaga & López-de Foronda, 2008; Fiss & Zajac, 2004; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Few of these studies, however, consider both internal and external power sources simultaneously, as the interplay between the organization and market forces is still an underdeveloped part of the behavioral theory of the firm (Gavetti, Greve, Levinthal & Ocasio, 2012). Existing research on coalitions focuses mainly on characteristics of the upper echelon or top management team (TMT) and

organizational performance as an outcome (Wry, Cobb & Aldrich, 2013; Zhang & Greve, 2019). It explains insufficiently how the input of issues emerging from the external environment influences coalitional change (Gaba & Greve, 2019). Inside the organization opposing coalitions may form around competing issues and goals that are linked to the service of multiple and interdependent markets (Achtenhagen & Raviola, 2009; Battilana & Dorado, 2010; Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012; Trieschmann, Dennis, Northcraft & Niemi, 2000). More scholarly attention is needed to explore how organizations deal with such multiple goals of equal importance (Greve & Gaba, 2017; Gaba & Greve, 2019). To address this lacuna in the literature I formulate the second research question of this dissertation: *How does technological disruption in the environment drive change in the dominant coalition in a firm that serves two interdependent markets?*

3) While a traditional pipeline business creates value on the ‘supply’ or producer side via the linear buyer-supplier chain, a platform is an intermediary that creates value on the ‘demand’ side of the customer via the so-called ‘network effect’ (Caillaud & Jullien, 2003, Massa, Tucci & Afuah, 2017; Parker & Van Alstyne, 2006; Zhao et al., 2019). A product exhibits network effects “if its value to users depends not only on the benefits of the product itself, but also on access to the network of people using that product or a compatible one” (Afuah, 2013: 257). As a result of this network effect, the value of a platform to users will increase with its number of users and complementors. So, it is the customer base in itself (which was traditionally viewed as the demand-side) that is the value proposition offered to third parties. Organizations that exploit these network effects often serve two-sided or interdependent markets, where prices and strategies in one market-side are linked to those on the other side (Godes, Ofek & Sarvary, 2009; Hagiu, 2009). To date, few studies explore how value creation on the demand- and supply-side influence each other over time in two-sided markets. The main focus of business scholar research on platforms has been on contemporary intermediary

or multi-sided platforms rather than on manufacturing platforms that also produce and (re)sell their own products or services. A more historical perspective of how platforms have evolved over time with technological transition is also lacking (Nieborg & Poell, 2018). In order to address this lacuna in the literature, I formulate the third research question of this dissertation: *How has the shift from old to new market categories on the demand-side affected the value proposition on the supply-side in manufacturing platforms?*

Table 1.2
Summary of three studies

Study	Theoretical lense	Level / Unit of Analysis	Method	Data source	Sample
1 - Owner-category fit and responses to pluralism in two-sided markets (Chapter 2)	Institutional theory: logics and categories	Meso / newsroom	Cross sectional comparative case study	28 interviews; 35 annual reports; 17 editorial statutes	20 News media firms
2 - Markets, lower echelons and owners as brokers of coalitional change (Chapter 3)	Behavioral Theory of Firm; dominant coalitions	Macro and Meso / market and firm	Longitudinal process study	2855 articles sector media; 17 sector reports; 24 annual reports case; 17 interviews	1 Newspaper publisher - 2000-2016
3 - Demand-side and supply-side value creation in analogue and digital categories (Chapter 4)	Business model and Institutional market category literatures	Meso / value proposition platform	Qualitative content analysis / comparative case study	232 secondary documents; 703 newsletter articles; 17 interviews	4 Journalistic platforms

1.3 Dissertation overview

To address my research questions, I conducted three empirical studies (see Table 1.2) which I shall now briefly summarize. Over the past years, I spoke to 62 experts in the European media sector in the period from 2013 to 2019. These were mainly the owners, publishers and editors-in-chief of thirty news producing media organizations (see Table 1.1 in Appendix). Of these thirty organizations 17 are Dutch and 13 are not (Belgian, Swiss, English, German, Danish,

Italian and Spanish cases). Approximately half of these firms were founded after 1999, and thus considered disruptors or entrant in the news media sector. Most of the others were founded decades before that year and considered incumbents. In addition, I analyzed thousands of secondary data documents over the same period (see Table 1.2). The theoretical contributions studies of this dissertation (see Table 1.3) are discussed more in-depth in Chapter 2, 3 and 4 respectively.

Study One: The owner-category fit and responses to pluralism in two-sided markets

This study investigates how the owner identity of organizations affects their response to institutional pluralism in two-sided markets. For this purpose, a qualitative comparative multiple case study with a focus on corporate governance practices was conducted in the European news media sector. Results indicate that divergent prescriptions coming from distinct market categories have different effects inside the organization depending on the combination of owner identities and market categories. The main contribution of this study is that it puts forward a category-based explanation of why responses to pluralism diverge among organizations in the same field. First, this study posits that the institutional fit between owner identities and market categories determines the variance in institutional complexity (tensions among coalitions) inside the organization. Second, this study posits that a decoupling response is least likely when there is a very high revenue dependence on a market category that belongs to the same institutional order as the majority owner.

Study Two: Markets, lower echelons and owners as brokers of coalitional change

This study investigates how technological disruption in a two-sided market environment changes the dominant coalition in a firm. For this purpose, a longitudinal process study of a

Dutch newspaper publisher's response to internet disruption between 2000 and 2016 was conducted. Findings indicate that non-profit and non-dedicated financial investor owners delay the coalitional change process, while an engaged (CEO majority) strategic investor owner with industry expertise and complementary assets accelerates it. The main contribution of this study is that divergent types of ownership lead to divergent outcomes in the process of coalitional change. This study posits that upper echelons can be sidelined by lower echelons that form a dominant coalition with non-profit owners and that dominant coalitions are not entirely broken until they lose both their financial (market) and political (ownership) power base. The managerial contribution is that this study illustrates how ownership may be a crucial element of an innovation strategy.

Study Three: demand- and supply-side value creation in analogue and digital categories

This study investigates how the shift from old to new market categories on the demand-side affected the value proposition of manufacturing platforms on the supply-side. For this purpose, a comparative case-study with a content analysis was conducted with four Dutch media firms that operate in two-sided or interdependent market categories for print and online advertising and subscriptions. The first contribution of this study is that the simultaneous exploitation of the demand-side (advertising) and supply-side (subscriptions) results in genre-spanning value propositions on the supply-side. The second contribution is that the value proposition in the online subscription market category (supply-side) is an explicit take-off on this genre-spanning. With the shift from print to online, the exploitation of the demand-side is ended in order to create more value on the supply-side. This study puts forward that some users may actually be attracted to the absence of particular complementors in a smaller network with strong ties. Firms that exploit large networks with weak ties on the demand-side

only, have more trouble to survive technological disruption than genre-spanners that also exploit the supply-side.

Table 1.3
Summary key take-aways three studies

Study	Gaps literature	Contributions study
1) Owner-category fit and responses to pluralism in two-sided markets (Chapter 2)	<p>A) How bottom-up prescriptions coming from the categories that an organization serves, affect responses to institutional complexity, has been illuminated insufficiently because most research on institutional logics assumes that market audiences are more homogeneous than they may be in reality (Durand & Thornton, 2018).</p> <p>B) There is a lack of logics studies with a focus on organizations that serve two-sided markets (Rochet & Tirole, 2003; Eisenmann, Parker & Van Alstyne, 2006) or interdependent market categories.</p>	<p>A) Propose that the institutional fit between owner identities and market categories determines the variance in institutional complexity (tensions among coalitions) inside the organization.</p> <p>B) Put forward that a decoupling response is least likely when there is an extremely high revenue dependence on a market category that belongs to the same institutional order as the majority owner.</p>
2) Markets, lower echelons and owners as brokers of coalitional change (Chapter 3)	<p>A) Few studies focus on interplay between the organization and market forces in the behavioral theory of the firm (Gavetti et al., 2012).</p> <p>B) Existing research explains insufficiently how the input of issues emerging from the environment influences coalitional change (Gaba & Greve, 2019).</p> <p>C) More research is needed to explore how organizations deal with multiple goals of equal importance (Greve & Zhang, 2017) linked to interdependent markets.</p>	<p>A) Develop process model that explains how divergent ownership types lead to diverging outcomes in the process of coalitional change.</p> <p>B) Propose that non-profit and non-dedicated financial investor ownership delay the process of coalitional change, while an engaged (CEO majority) strategic investor owner with industry expertise and complementary assets accelerates it.</p> <p>C) Propose that the upper echelon can be sidelined by lower echelons that form a dominant coalition with non-profit owners and that dominant coalitions are not entirely broken until they lose both their financial (market) and political (ownership) power base.</p>
3) Demand- and supply-side value creation in old and new market categories (Chapter 4)	<p>A) Few studies explore how value creation on the supply- and demand-side influence each other over time in 'manufacturing' platforms that operate in two-sided markets (Nieborg & Poell, 2018; Rietveld, 2018; Rochet & Tirole, 2003; Zhao, Von Delft, Morgan-Thomas & Buck, 2019).</p> <p>B) Previous research on market categories mainly focused on prototypical categories in one-sided market contexts (Hsu, 2006; Negro, Hannan & Rao, 2010). Goal-based categories in more complex markets have been researched less extensively (Durand & Khaire, 2017).</p>	<p>A) Challenge the applicability to manufacturing platforms of the universal assumption that both sides of two-sided markets are mutually attracted to each other and always benefit equally from a larger network size.</p> <p>B) Propose that the simultaneous exploitation of the demand-side and supply-side results in genre-spanning value propositions. This does not necessarily affect financial performance as negatively as pure playing in the old technology demand-side market category.</p>

1.4 Declaration of contributions

In this section, I (henceforth, 'the author') declare my contributions to the chapters of this dissertation and gratefully acknowledge the contribution of my supervisory team (first promotor: Prof. dr. Hans van Oosterhout; and second promotor: Prof. dr. ir. Vareska van de

Vrande). Both promoters provided theoretical and methodological guidance for all three chapters of this dissertation. The introduction to this dissertation was written entirely by the author with feedback from her two promoters. Most of the work for study one, two and three (Chapters 2, 3 and 4) was completed by the author. This includes the identification of the research gap, research question, literature review, data collection, analysis, and the writing of the manuscript.

The first promotor was present at several interviews that were held for Chapter 2. Prof. dr. Pursey Heugens also gave feedback and advice during the first round of analysis of this study. The results of the first analysis round of Chapter 2 were published in a report sponsored by Stimuleringsfonds voor de Journalistiek (SVDJ). SVDJ also financed part of the data collection and analysis of this chapter, which has been submitted to a management journal. Other organizations that sponsored the report are Lucas-Ooms Fonds/LOF Stichting and Nederlandse Vereniging van Journalisten (NVJ). The author is the first author, the first promoter the second author, and the second promotor third author.

Part of the data collection of Chapter 3 was financed by the Journalism School of the University of Applied Sciences in Utrecht. This chapter got a nomination for the Best Paper Award at the Emma 2020 conference. It is currently under review at a management journal and the author is the first author, the first promoter second author, and the second promotor third author.

In a preliminary version, part of the first round of analysis of Chapter 4 was published in Dutch in the journal *Tijdschrift voor Communicatiewetenschap*. Part of the data collection and analysis of Chapter 4 was financed by the Journalism School of the University of Applied Sciences in Utrecht and Fonds Bijzondere Journalistieke Projecten (FBJP). Four Master thesis students in Strategic Management and Entrepreneurship (Esra Akbaba, Nils Moleman, Jasper Heemskerk and Kevin van den Boogaard) were present at eight interviews for Chapter 4 and

assisted with the data collection. This paper has been submitted to a management journal.

The author is the first author, the second promotor the second author and the first promotor the third author.

Chapter 2, 3 and 4 are under embargo (submission at journals)

REFERENCES

- Achtenhagen, L., & Raviola, E. (2009). Balancing tensions during convergence: Duality management in a newspaper company. *The International Journal on Media Management*, 11(1): 32-41.
- Afuah, A., & Tucci, C. L. (2012). Crowdsourcing as a solution to distant search. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(3): 355-375.
- Afuah, A. (2013). Are network effects really all about size? The role of structure and conduct. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(3): 257-273.
- Alvesson, M. (2003). Beyond neopositivists, romantics, and localists: A reflexive approach to interviews in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 28: 13–33.
- Anderson, Chris (2006). *The Long Tail: Why The Future of Business Is Selling Less of More*. New York, NY: Hyperion.
- Ansari, S., & Phillips, N. (2011). Text me! New consumer practices and change in organizational fields. *Organization Science*, 22(6): 1579-1599.
- Ansari, S., Wijen, F., & Gray, B. (2013). Constructing a climate change logic: An institutional perspective on the “tragedy of the commons”. *Organization Science*, 24(4): 1014-1040.
- Argentesi, E., & Filistrucchi, L. (2007). Estimating market power in a two-sided market: The case of newspapers. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 22(7): 1247-1266.
- Argote, L., & Greve, H. R. (2007). A behavioral theory of the firm - 40 years and counting: Introduction and impact. *Organization Science*, 18(3): 337-349.
- Armstrong, M., & Wright, J. (2007). Two-sided markets, competitive bottlenecks and exclusive contracts. *Economic Theory*, 32: 353-380.
- Autio, E., Thomas, L., & Gann, D. (2016). *Ecosystem value co-creation*. I&E Working Papers. London: Imperial College Business School.
- Barron, J. M., Chulkov, D. V., & Waddell, G. R. (2011). Top management team turnover, CEO succession type, and strategic change. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(8): 904-910.
- Baker, C.E. (2007). *Media Concentration and Democracy: Why Ownership Matters*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1): 99-120.
- Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. (2010). Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6): 1419-1440.

- Bayus, B. L. (2013). Crowdsourcing new product ideas over time: An analysis of the Dell IdeaStorm community. *Management Science*, 59(1), 226-244
- Berger, B. K. (2005). Power over, power with, and power to relations: Critical reflections on public relations, the dominant coalition, and activism. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 17(1): 5-28.
- Besharov, M. L., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Multiple institutional logics in organizations: Explaining their varied nature and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(3): 364-381.
- Boudreau, K. J., & Jeppesen, L. B. (2015). Unpaid crowd complementors: The platform network effect mirage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(12): 1761-1777.
- Bourgeois III, L. J., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (1988). Strategic decision processes in high velocity environments: Four cases in the microcomputer industry. *Management Science*, 34(7): 816-835.
- Burkart, M., Gromb, D., & Panunzi, F. (1997). Large Shareholders, Monitoring, and the Value of the Firm, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(3): 693–728.
- Brants, K., & Van Praag, P. (2006). Signs of media logic half a century of political communication in the Netherlands. *Javnost-The public*, 13(1): 25-40.
- Brynjolfsson, E., Hu, Y., & Smith, M. D. (2010). Research commentary—long tails vs. superstars: The effect of information technology on product variety and sales concentration patterns. *Information Systems Research*, 21(4): 736-747.
- Busterna, J. C., Hansen, K. A., & Ward, J. (1991). Competition, ownership, newsroom and library resources in large newspapers. *Journalism Quarterly*, 68(4): 729-739.
- Caillaud, B., & Jullien, B. (2003). Chicken & egg: Competition among intermediation service providers. *RAND Journal of Economics*: 309-328.
- Cannella, A. A., Jones, C. D., & Withers, M. C. (2015). Family-versus lone-founder-controlled public corporations: Social identity theory and boards of directors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(2): 436-459.
- Calvino, F., C. Criscuolo & Menon, C. (2015). “Cross-country evidence on start-up dynamics”, *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers*, 2015/06, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Carruthers, B. G., & Stinchcombe, A. L. (1999). The social structure of liquidity: Flexibility, markets, and states. *Theory and Society*, 28(3): 353-382.
- Cennamo, C., & Santalo, J. (2013). Platform competition: Strategic trade-offs in platform markets. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(11): 1331-1350.
- Chesbrough, H. (2010). Business model innovation: opportunities and barriers. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3): 354-363.

- Chesbrough, H., & Rosenbloom, R. S. (2002). The role of the business model in capturing value from innovation: evidence from Xerox Corporation's technology spin-off companies. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(3): 529-555.
- Chung, C. N., & Luo, X. (2008). Institutional logics or agency costs: The influence of corporate governance models on business group restructuring in emerging economies. *Organization Science*, 19(5): 766-784.
- Christensen, C. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Christensen, C. M., & Bower, J. L. (1996). Customer power, strategic investment, and the failure of leading firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(3): 197-218.
- Combs, J. G., Ketchen Jr, D. J., Perryman, A. A., & Donahue, M. S. (2007). The moderating effect of CEO power on the board composition–firm performance relationship. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(8): 1299-1323.
- Corts, K. S., & Lederman, M. (2009). Software exclusivity and the scope of indirect network effects in the US home video game market. *international Journal of industrial Organization*, 27(2): 121-136.
- Cyert, R. M., & March, J. G. (1963). A behavioral theory of the firm. *Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey*.
- Demers, D. P. (1991). Corporate structure and emphasis on profits and product quality at US daily newspapers. *Journalism Quarterly*, 68(1-2): 15-26.
- Deuze, M. (2007). *Media work*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Dorado, S. (2005). Institutional entrepreneurship, partaking, and convening. *Organization studies*, 26(3): 385-414.
- Douglas, M. (1986). *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse University Press.
- Doz, Y. L. (1996). The evolution of cooperation in strategic alliances: initial conditions or learning processes?. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S1): 55-83.
- Duran, P., Kammerlander, N., Van Essen, M., & Zellweger, T. (2016). Doing more with less: Innovation input and output in family firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(4): 1224-1264.
- Durand, R., & Jourdan, J. (2012). Jules or Jim: Alternative conformity to minority logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6): 1295-1315.
- Durand, R., & Paoletta, L. (2013). Category stretching: Reorienting research on categories in strategy, entrepreneurship, and organization theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(6): 1100-1123.
- Durand, R., & Khaire, M. (2017). Where do market categories come from and how? Distinguishing category creation from category emergence. *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 87-

110.

Durand, R., & Thornton, P. H. (2018). Categorizing institutional logics, institutionalizing categories: A review of two literatures. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(2): 631-658.

Edmondson, A. C., & McManus, S. E. (2007). Methodological fit in management field research. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4): 1155-1179.

Eisenmann, T. R., Parker, G., & Van Alstyne, M. (2009). Opening platforms: how, when and why?. *Platforms, markets and innovation*, 6, 131-162.

Eisenmann, T., Parker, G., & Van Alstyne, M. W. (2006). Strategies for two-sided markets. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(10): 92.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 532-550.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bourgeois III, L. J. (1988). Politics of strategic decision making in high-velocity environments: Toward a midrange theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31(4): 737-770.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1): 25-32.

Eisenmann, T., Parker, G., & Van Alstyne, M. W. (2006). Strategies for two-sided markets. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(10): 92.

Elberse, A. (2008). Should you invest in the long tail? *Harvard Business Review*, 86(7/8): 88.

Elberse, A. & Oberholzer-Gee, F. (2007). Superstars and Underdogs: An Examination of the Long Tail Phenomenon in Video Sales. *2007 ASSA Conference Paper Harvard Business School Working Paper Series*, No. 07-015.

Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27(1): 31-41.

Eocman, Hoho & Jongseok (2006). Reconsideration of the Winner-Take-All Hypothesis: Complex Networks and Local Bias. *Management Science*, 52(12): 1838-1848.

Evans, D. S. (2003). Some empirical aspects of multi-sided platform industries. *Review of Network Economics*, 2(3).

Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Separation of ownership and control. *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 26(2): 301-325.

Fiss, P. C., & Zajac, E. J. (2004). The diffusion of ideas over contested terrain: The (non) adoption of a shareholder value orientation among German firms. *Administrative science quarterly*, 49(4): 501-534.

Foss, N. J., & Saebi, T. (2017). Fifteen years of research on business model innovation: how far have we come, and where should we go?. *Journal of Management*, 43(1): 200-227.

Frankenberger, K. & Sauer, R. (2019). Cognitive antecedents of business models: Exploring the link between attention and business model design over time. *Long Range Planning*, 52(4): 283-304.

Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices and institutional contradictions. In W.W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Gaba, V., & Greve, H. R. (2019). Safe or Profitable? The Pursuit of Conflicting Goals. *Organization Science*. 30(2): 1-21.

Gabszewicz, J. J., Laussel, D., & Sonnac, N. (2001). Press advertising and the ascent of the 'Pensée Unique'. *European Economic Review*, 45(4-6): 641-651.

Gabszewicz, J. J., Laussel, D., & Sonnac, N. (2005). Does advertising lower the price of newspapers to consumers? A theoretical appraisal. *Economics Letters*, 87(1): 127-134.

Gavetti, G., Greve, H. R., Levinthal, D. A., & Ocasio, W. (2012). The behavioral theory of the firm: Assessment and prospects. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 6(1): 1-40.

Gawer, A., & Cusumano, M. A. (2014). Industry platforms and ecosystem innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 31(3): 417-433.

Gehman, J., Glaser, V. L., Eisenhardt, K. M., Gioia, D., Langley, A., & Corley, K. G. (2018). Finding theory–method fit: A comparison of three qualitative approaches to theory building. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 27(3): 284-300.

Gehman, J., Treviño, L. K., & Garud, R. (2013). Values work: A process study of the emergence and performance of organizational values practices. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(1): 84-112.

Glaser, V. L., Krikorian Atkinson, M., & Fiss, P. C. (2019). Goal-Based Categorization: Dynamic Classification in the Display Advertising Industry. *Organization Studies*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840619883368>

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Godes, D., Ofek, E., & Sarvary, M. (2009). Content vs. advertising: The impact of competition on media firm strategy. *Marketing Science*, 28(1): 20-35.

Goldfarb, A., & Tucker, C. (2011). Online Display Advertising: Targeting and Obtrusiveness. *Marketing Science*, 30(3): 389-404.

Greenwood, R., Díaz, A. M., Li, S. X., & Lorente, J. C. (2009). The multiplicity of institutional logics and the heterogeneity of organizational responses. *Organization Science*, 21(2): 521-539.

Greenwood, R., & Empson, L. (2003). The professional partnership: relic or exemplary form of governance? *Organization Studies*, 24(6): 909-933.

- Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R., & Lounsbury, M. (2011). Institutional complexity and organizational responses. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1): 317-371.
- Greve, H. R., & Zhang, C. M. (2017). Institutional logics and power sources: Merger and acquisition decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(2): 671-694.
- Greve, H. R., & Gaba, V. (2017). Performance feedback in organizations and groups: Common themes. *The Oxford Handbook of Group and Organizational Learning*.
- Hannan, M. T. (2010). Partiality of memberships in categories and audiences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36: 159-181.
- Hansmann, H. (1996). *The Ownership of Enterprise*. Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press.
- Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. A. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2): 193-206.
- Heijkant, Balder & Leunissen (2017). Van Krantjes tot Mediagiganten. Retrieved on 10 April 2019 at: <https://www.volkskrant.nl/kijkverder/2017/persfusies/>
- Hagiu, A. (2009). Two-sided platforms: Product variety and pricing structures. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 18(4): 1011-1043.
- Hagiu, A., & Yoffie, D.B. (2009). What's Your Google Strategy? *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved on 12 June 2020 from: <https://hbr.org/2009/04/whats-your-google-strategy>
- Hillman, A. J., Withers, M. C., & Collins, B. J. (2009). Resource dependence theory: A review. *Journal of management*, 35(6): 1404-1427.
- Hillman, A. J., & Dalziel, T. (2003). Boards of directors and firm performance: Integrating agency and resource dependence perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(3): 383-396.
- Hoffman, A. J. (1999). Institutional evolution and change: Environmentalism and the US chemical industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4): 351-371.
- Hsu, G., & Hannan, M. T. (2005). Identities, genres, and organizational forms. *Organization Science*, 16(5): 474-490.
- Hsu, G. (2006). Jacks of all trades and masters of none: Audiences' reactions to spanning genres in feature film production. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(3): 420-450.
- Hwang, H., & Powell, W. W. (2009). The rationalization of charity: The influences of professionalism in the nonprofit sector. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(2), 268-298.
- Jara-Bertin, M., López-Iturriaga, F. J., & López-de-Foronda, Ó. (2008). The contest to the control in European family firms: How other shareholders affect firm value. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 16(3): 146-159.

Joseph, J., & Wilson, A. J. (2018). The growth of the firm: An attention-based view. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(6): 1779-1800.

Kaiser, U., & Wright, J. (2006). Price structure in two-sided markets: Evidence from the magazine industry. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 24(1): 1-28.

Karimi, J., Walter, Z., (2016). Corporate entrepreneurship, disruptive business model innovation adoption, and its performance: the case of the newspaper industry. *Long Range Planning*, 49(3): 342-360.

Katz, M. L., & Shapiro, C. (1994). Systems competition and network effects. *Journal of economic perspectives*, 8(2): 93-115.

Koch, J., (2011). Inscribed strategies: exploring the organizational nature of strategic lock-in. *Organization Studies*, 32(3): 337-363.

Kodeih, F., & Greenwood, R. (2014). Responding to institutional complexity: The role of identity. *Organization Studies*, 35(1): 7-39.

Kraatz, M. S., & Block, E. S. (2008). Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby & K. Sahlin, *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, 840: 243-275.

Kroezen, J. J., & Heugens, P. P. (2019). What is dead may never die: Institutional regeneration through logic reemergence in Dutch beer brewing. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 64(4): 976-1019.

Kwark, Y., Chen, J., & Raghunathan, S. (2017). User-generated content and competing firms' product design. *Management Science*, 64(10): 4608-4628.

La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (1999). Corporate ownership around the world. *The Journal of Finance*, 54(2): 471-517.

Lander, M. W., Koene, B. A., & Linssen, S. N. (2013). Committed to professionalism: Organizational responses of mid-tier accounting firms to conflicting institutional logics. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 38(2): 130-148.

Lander, M. W., Heugens, P. P., & van Oosterhout, J. (2017). Drift or alignment? A configurational analysis of law firms' ability to combine profitability with professionalism. *Journal of Professions and Organization*, 4(1): 123-148.

Langley, A. (1999). Strategies for theorizing from process data. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4): 691-710.

Langley, A. N. N., Smallman, C., Tsoukas, H., & Van de Ven, A. H. (2013). Process studies of change in organization and management: Unveiling temporality, activity, and flow. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(1): 1-13.

- Leblebici, H., Salancik, G. R., Copay, A., & King, T. (1991). Institutional change and the transformation of inter-organizational fields: An organizational history of the US radio broadcasting industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(3): 333-363.
- Liu, F., Dedehayir, O., & Katzy, B. (2015). Coalition formation during technology adoption. *Behavior & Information Technology*, 34(12): 1186-1199.
- Logger, B. & de Vries, R. (2011). *De laatste krant DAG: het miljoenen verslindende huwelijk tussen PCM en KPN*, Podium: Amsterdam.
- Lounsbury, M. (2001). Institutional sources of practice variation: Staffing college and university recycling programs. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(1): 29-56.
- Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 289-307.
- Malhotra, N., & Morris, T. (2009). Heterogeneity in professional service firms. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(6): 895-922.
- March, J. G., & Sutton, R. I. (1997). Crossroads—organizational performance as a dependent variable. *Organization Science*, 8(6): 698-706.
- March, J. G. (1962). The business firm as a political coalition. *The Journal of Politics*, 24(4): 662-678.
- Markides, C. C. (2013). Business model innovation: what can the ambidexterity literature teach us? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27(4): 313-323.
- Massa, L., Tucci, C. L., & Afuah, A. (2017). A critical assessment of business model research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(1): 73-104.
- Matthews, M. N. (1996). How public ownership affects publisher autonomy. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 73(2): 342-353.
- McIntyre, D. P., & Srinivasan, A. (2017). Networks, platforms, and strategy: Emerging views and next steps. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(1): 141-160.
- Mervis, C. B., & Rosch, E. (1981). Categorization of natural objects. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 32(1), 89-115.
- Miles, M., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miller, D. (1991). Stale in the saddle: CEO tenure and the match between organization and environment. *Management Science*, 37(1): 34-52.
- Miller, D., Breton-Miller, L., & Lester, R. H. (2011). Family and lone founder ownership and strategic behavior: Social context, identity, and institutional logics. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(1): 1-25.

Mooij, A. (2011). *Dag in Dag uit: een Journalistieke Geschiedenis van de Volkskrant vanaf 1980*. De Bezige Bij.

Napoli, P. M., & Seaton, M. (2006). Necessary Knowledge for Communications Policy: Information Asymmetries and Commercial Data Access Usage in the Policymaking Process. *Fed. Comm. LJ*, 59, 295.

Navis, C., & Glynn, M. A. (2010). How new market categories emerge: Temporal dynamics of legitimacy, identity, and entrepreneurship in satellite radio, 1990–2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(3), 439-471.

NDP Nieuwsmedia, (2001). *Jaarverslag NDP Nieuwsmedia 2000*, NDP Nieuwsmedia De brancheorganisatie voor nieuwsbedrijven, Amsterdam.

NDP Nieuwsmedia (2018). *Jaarverslag NDP Nieuwsmedia 2017*, NDP Nieuwsmedia De brancheorganisatie voor nieuwsbedrijven, Amsterdam. Retrieved on 12 June 2020 from: <http://ndpnieuwsmediajaarverslag.nl/jaarverslag2017/>

Negro, G., Hannan, M. T., & Rao, H. (2011). Category reinterpretation and defection: Modernism and tradition in Italian winemaking. *Organization Science*, 22(6): 1449-1463.

Negro, G., Hannan, M. T., & Rao, H. (2010). Categorical contrast and audience appeal: Niche width and critical success in winemaking. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 19(5): 1397-1425.

Negro, G., Koçak, Ö., & Hsu, G. (2010). Research on categories in the sociology of organizations. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 31(3): 3-35.

Nieborg, D. B., & Poell, T. (2018). The platformization of cultural production: Theorizing the contingent cultural commodity. *New Media & Society*, 20(11): 4275-4292.

Nielsen, R. K. (2015). *Local journalism: The Decline of Newspapers and the Rise of Digital Media*. London: IB Tauris.

Ocasio, W. (1994). Political dynamics and the circulation of power: CEO succession in US industrial corporations, 1960-1990. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(2): 285-312.

Ocasio, W., & Kim, H. (1999). The circulation of corporate control: Selection of functional backgrounds of new CEOs in large US manufacturing firms, 1981–1992. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(3): 532-562.

Ocasio, W., & Radoynovska, N. (2016). Strategy and commitments to institutional logics: Organizational heterogeneity in business models and governance. *Strategic Organization*, 14(4): 287-309.

Pache, A. C., & Santos, F. (2010). When worlds collide: The internal dynamics of organizational responses to conflicting institutional demands. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(3): 455-476.

Pache, A. C., & Santos, F. (2013). Inside the hybrid organization: Selective coupling as a response to competing institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(4): 972-1001.

- Pallas, J., Fredriksson, M., & Wedlin, L. (2016). Translating institutional logics: When the media logic meets professions. *Organization Studies*, 37(11): 1661-1684.
- Parker, G. G., & Van Alstyne, M. W. (2005). Two-sided network effects: A theory of information product design. *Management Science*, 51(10): 1494-1504.
- Paoella, L., & Durand, R. (2016). Category spanning, evaluation, and performance: Revised theory and test on the corporate law market. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(1): 330-351.
- Pearce II, J. A. (1995). A structural analysis of dominant coalitions in small banks. *Journal of Management*, 21(6): 1075-1095.
- Peteraf, M. A. (1993). The cornerstones of competitive advantage: a resource-based view. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(3): 179-191.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations. A Resource Dependence Perspective*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Phillips, D. J., & Zuckerman, E. W. (2001). Middle-Status Conformity: Theoretical Restatement and Empirical Demonstration in Two Markets 1. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(2): 379-429.
- Picard, R. G. (1994). Institutional ownership of publicly traded US newspaper companies. *Journal of Media Economics*, 7(4): 49-64.
- Picard, R. G. (2011). *The economics and financing of media companies*. Fordham: Fordham University Press.
- Pontikes, E. G. (2012). Two sides of the same coin: How ambiguous classification affects multiple audiences' evaluations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 57(1): 81-118.
- Porter, M.E. (1985). *Competitive Advantage*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Przeworski, A., & Teune, H. (1970). *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York: Wiley.
- Priem, R. L., Wenzel, M., & Koch, J. (2018). Demand-side strategy and business models: Putting value creation for consumers center stage. *Long Range Planning*, 51(1): 22-31.
- Purdy, J. M., & Gray, B. (2009). Conflicting logics, mechanisms of diffusion, and multilevel dynamics in emerging institutional fields. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(2): 355-380.
- Ramaer, J. (2010). *De Geldpers: de Teloorgang van het Mediaconcern PCM*. Prometheus: Amsterdam.
- Raviola, E. (2012). Exploring organizational framings: Journalism and business management in newspaper organizations. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(6): 932-958.
- Raviola, E., & Norbäck, M. (2013). Bringing technology and meaning into institutional work: Making news at an Italian business newspaper. *Organization Studies*, 34(8): 1171-1194.

- Rietveld, J. (2018). Creating and capturing value from freemium business models: A demand-side perspective. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 12(2): 171-193.
- Rochet, J. C., & Tirole, J. (2003). Platform competition in two-sided markets. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 1(4): 990-1029.
- Rosen, S. (1981). The Economics of Superstars. *The American Economic Review*, 71(5): 845-858.
- Rysman, M. (2009). The economics of two-sided markets. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 23(3): 125-43.
- Sanders, M. (2014). News consumer is king. *Stakeholder ownership as a governance practice in Dutch news*. Stimuleringsfonds voor de Journalistiek: Den Haag.
- Sanders, M. (2018). Eigendom en businessmodellen van Europese journalistieke start-ups. *Tijdschrift voor Communicatiewetenschap*, 46(2): 154-172.
- Salvador, F., Piller, F.T. & Aggarwal, S. (2020). Surviving on the long tail: An empirical investigation of business model elements for mass customization, *Long Range Planning*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2019.05.006>
- Sauerwald, S., Van Oosterhout, J., & Van Essen, M. (2016). Expressive shareholder democracy: A multilevel study of shareholder dissent in 15 Western European countries. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(4): 520-551.
- Schaepman, K. & Spinhof, H. (2008). *De Grootste Kraak in Krantenland: het drama Apax bij PCM*. Heimdall: Waalre.
- Schilling, M. A. (2002). Technology success and failure in winner-take-all markets: The impact of learning orientation, timing, and network externalities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2): 387-398.
- Shen, W., & Cannella Jr, A. A. (2002). Revisiting the performance consequences of CEO succession: The impacts of successor type, post-succession senior executive turnover, and departing CEO tenure. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4): 717-733.
- Simon, H., & March, J. G. (1958). *Organizations*. Wiley-Blackwell: Cambridge MA.
- Smets, M., Jarzabkowski, P., Burke, G. T., & Spee, P. (2015). Reinsurance trading in Lloyd's of London: Balancing conflicting-yet-complementary logics in practice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(3): 932-970.
- Stevens, A. M., & Boland, R. (2016). *Antecedents and outcomes of perceived creepiness in online personalized communications*. Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University.
- Stevenson, W. B., Pearce, J. L., & Porter, L. W. (1985). The concept of "coalition" in organization theory and research. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(2): 256-268.
- Srnicek, N. (2016). *Platform Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Tameling, K. (2015). *En wat doen we online?: crossmediale dilemma's op de Nederlandse nieuwsredactie*. University of Groningen.
- Teece, D. J. (2010). Business models, business strategy and innovation. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3): 172-194.
- Teixeira, M. G., Roglio, K. D. D., & Marcon, R. (2017). Institutional logics and the decision-making process of adopting corporate governance at a cooperative organization. *Journal of Management & Governance*, 21(1): 181-209.
- Thomas, L. D., & Autio, E. (2015). The processes of ecosystem emergence. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2015, No. 1, p. 10453). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
- Thomsen, S. (2004). Corporate values and corporate governance. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 4(4): 29-46.
- Thomsen, S., & Pedersen, T. (2000). Ownership structure and economic performance in the largest European companies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(6): 689-705.
- Thompson, E. P. (1967). Time, work-discipline, and industrial capitalism. *Past & Present*, 38: 56-97.
- Thornton, P. H. (2002). The rise of the corporation in a craft industry: Conflict and conformity in institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1): 81-101.
- Thornton, P. H. (2004). *Markets from culture: Institutional logics and organizational decisions in higher education publishing*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958–1990. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(3): 801-843.
- Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Trieschmann, J. S., Dennis, A. R., Northcraft, G. B., & Nieme, A. W. (2000). Serving constituencies in business schools: MBA program versus research performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6): 1130-1141.
- Usher, N. (2013). Al Jazeera English online: Understanding web metrics and news production when a quantified audience is not a commodified audience. *Digital Journalism*, 1(3): 335-351.
- Van Dijck, J., & Poell, T. (2013). Understanding Social Media Logic. *Media and Communication*, 1(1): 2-14.
- Van Oosterhout, J. (2008). *Het disciplineringsmodel voorbij; over autoriteit en legitimiteit in Corporate Governance*. Rotterdam: Erasmus Research Institute of Management.

Vaskelainen, T., & Münzel, K. (2018). The effect of institutional logics on business model development in the sharing economy: The case of German carsharing services. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 4(3): 273-293.

Venkatraman, N., & Lee, C. H. (2004). Preferential linkage and network evolution: A conceptual model and empirical test in the US video game sector. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(6), 876-892.

Welbers, K., Van Atteveldt, W., Kleinnijenhuis, J., Ruigrok, N., & Schaper, J. (2016). News selection criteria in the digital age: Professional norms versus online audience metrics. *Journalism*, 17(8), 1037-1053.

Wirtz, B.W., Oliver, S. & Ulrich, S. (2010). Strategic development of business models: implications of the Web 2.0 for creating value on the internet. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2): 272–290.

Wry, T., Cobb, J. A., & Aldrich, H. E. (2013). More than a metaphor: Assessing the historical legacy of resource dependence and its contemporary promise as a theory of environmental complexity. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1): 441-488.

Xia, J., Ma, X., Lu, J. W., & Yiu, D. W. (2014). Outward foreign direct investment by emerging market firms: A resource dependence logic. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(9): 1343-1363.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Yiu, D. W., Wan, W. P., Ng, F. W., Chen, X., & Su, J. (2014). Sentimental drivers of social entrepreneurship: A study of China's Guangcai (Glorious) Program. *Management and Organization Review*, 10(1): 55-80.

Zhao, Y., Von Delft, S., Morgan-Thomas, A. & Buck, T. (2019). The evolution of platform business models: Exploring competitive battles in the world of platforms, *Long Range Planning*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2019.101892>

Zhang, C., & Greve, H. R. (2019). Dominant coalitions directing acquisitions: Different decision makers, different decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(1): 44-65.

Zucker, L. G. (1987). Institutional theories of organization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 13(1): 443-464.

Zuckerman, E. W. (1999). The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the illegitimacy discount. *American Journal of Sociology*, 104(5): 1398-1438

SUMMARY

For more than 25 years news media firms have attempted to find the right answer to the technological disruption of their business model with the rise of the Internet. These types of firms often have hybrid ownership with both for-profit and non-profit goals. In addition, incumbent media firms have exploited network effects in two-sided markets with conflicting demands (subscriptions and advertising) for centuries.

There is lacuna in the management literature concerning existing knowledge on the influence of more rare forms of ownership (such as foundations, associations, customer or employee cooperatives) on the complexity (clash of coalitions) that organizations experience because they serve multiple and interdependent markets with conflicting demands. In this dissertation I address this gap by taking the theoretical perspective of institutional logics, categories, business models and platform strategies to answer the following three questions:

- 1) How does the owner identity of organizations affect their response to institutional pluralism in two-sided markets?
- 2) How does technological disruption drive change in the dominant coalition in a firm that serves two interdependent markets?
- 3) How has the shift from old to new market categories on the demand-side affected the value proposition on the supply-side in manufacturing platforms?

The three studies of this dissertation investigate the empirical context of European journalistic startups and incumbent or legacy news media firms. This resulted in the following findings and contributions. First, I discovered that the lowest level of institutional complexity (clash between coalitions with diverging logics) is experienced inside organizations where the owner identity and logics are combined with a market category from the same institutional order. Complexity is highest in organizations with market logics and profit maximization goals that get a large share of their revenues from market categories where non-market logics dominate (e.g. categories that belong to the institutional orders of the professions, communities or religion).

Second, I present a process model of coalitional change inside organizations in which the interaction between the market and organization plays a central role. This model describes how both the political source (ownership) and financial power source (markets) of coalitions need to be broken to change the dominant coalition. A non-profit and non-dedicated financial investor owner delay this process, while an engaged strategic investor (CEO majority) owner with industry expertise and complementary assets accelerates it. Lower management echelons may form a dominant coalition with owners that can sideline the top management team.

Third, my dissertation explains how the simultaneous exploitation of the demand- and supply-side by manufacturing platforms results in genre-spanning value propositions. With the shift from print to online, entrants end the exploitation of network effects on the demand-side with their advertising free value proposition which is a take-off on this genre-spanning. This enables them to create more value on the supply-side in small networks with strong trust and network ties. Manufacturing platforms that only exploit the demand-side in old tech markets, have more trouble surviving technological disruption than organizations that also exploit the supply-side.

In sum, the content of this dissertation illustrates that there are promising avenues for future research to explore the interaction or match between the identity of owners and customers of an organization. The lessons of this research are based on the empirical context of old media, but are also truly relevant for business and society because these also seem applicable in online platform environments.

SAMENVATTING (DUTCH SUMMARY)

Al meer dan vijftig jaar zoeken nieuwsmediabedrijven naar het juiste antwoord op de ontwrichting van hun businessmodel door de komst van het Internet. Dit soort bedrijven heeft ook vaak hybride vormen van eigendom met zowel een maatschappelijke (non-profit) als een winstdoelstelling. Bovendien exploiteren mediabedrijven al sinds het einde van de negentiende eeuw netwerkeffecten in tweezijdige markten (adverteerders en lezers).

De management literatuur kent hiaten in de bestaande kennis over de invloed van meer zeldzame vormen van eigendom (zoals stichtingen, verenigingen en coöperaties van werknemers of klanten) op de complexiteit die organisaties ervaren doordat zij tegelijk meerdere markten met tegenstrijdige wensen bedienen. In dit proefschrift vul ik deze kennislacune aan met de theoretische invalshoek van institutionele logica, categorieën, businessmodellen en platformstrategie om de volgende drie vragen te beantwoorden:

1) Hoe beïnvloedt de combinatie van marktcategorie en eigendomsidentiteit de mate waarin een organisatie institutionele complexiteit ervaart?

2) Hoe verandert technologische ontwrichting de dominante coalitie in een organisatie die tweezijdige markten bedient?

3) Hoe heeft de verschuiving van oude naar nieuwe markt categorieën aan de vraagzijde de waardepropositie aan de aanbodzijde beïnvloed bij ‘producerende platforms’?

Mijn drie studies voor dit proefschrift richten zich op de empirische context van Europese journalistieke startups en gevestigde nieuwsmediabedrijven. Concreet leverden deze de volgende bevindingen op. Ten eerste, ontdekte ik dat de minste complexiteit (botsing tussen coalities) wordt ervaren in organisaties wiens eigendomsidentiteit en logica stroken met die van de marktcategorie die de organisatie bedient. Complexiteit is het hoogste in organisaties met marktlogica die winstmaximalisatie nastreven en hiervoor de meeste omzet halen uit markten waarin andere logica (zoals die van de professie, gemeenschap, religie of wetenschap) domineren.

Ten tweede, presenteer ik een procesmodel van coalitievorming binnen organisaties waarin de interactie tussen markt en organisatie centraal staat. Dit model beschrijft dat dominante coalities pas worden gebroken zodra zij zowel hun politieke machtsbron (eigendom) als de financiële machtsbron (markten) hebben verloren. Het soort eigenaar geeft de doorslag als coalities weerstand bieden tegen veranderingen die nodig zijn door neergaande markten. Non-profit eigenaren en investeerders op afstand vertragen dit veranderingsproces, terwijl een DGA met strategische doelstelling coalitievorming versnelt. Een dominante coalitie tussen lage managementlagen en non-profit eigenaren kan het topmanagement buitenspel zetten.

Ten derde blijkt uit mijn proefschrift dat de combinatie van exploitatie aan zowel de vraag- als aanbodzijde resulteert in een vermenging van genres in de (content) waardeproposities van producerende platforms. Na de transitie van print naar online hebben journalistieke platforms afscheid genomen van exploitatie van netwerkeffecten aan de vraagzijde om meer waarde te kunnen creëren aan de aanbodzijde in kleine netwerken met veel vertrouwen en sterke banden tussen gebruikers. Producerende platforms die netwerkeffecten exploiteren aan enkel de vraagzijde in oude technologie markten, zullen meer moeite hebben om technologische ontwrichting te doorstaan dan organisaties die ook aan de aanbodzijde exploiteren via abonnementen bijvoorbeeld.

Samengevat tonen de bevindingen van dit proefschrift aan dat er veelbelovende mogelijkheden zijn voor meer onderzoek naar de wisselwerking of ‘match’ tussen de identiteit van de aandeelhouders en klanten van een organisatie. De lessen die dit onderzoek baseert op de empirische context van ‘oude’ media, zijn van belang voor het bedrijfsleven en de samenleving omdat deze ook van toepassing lijken in een online platform-omgeving.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Mathilde Sanders-van Balkom (1974) obtained her Masters degree in Political Science at the University of Amsterdam (UvA) in 1998. In 2000, she received a post MA degree in Journalism (PDOJ) at the Erasmus University Rotterdam. After a career as an investigative journalist, she started her external PhD trajectory at the department of Strategic Management and Entrepreneurship of RSM. Mathilde's general research interests center around ownership, social enterprises and organizations that combine multiple goals (social and for profit) in multiple markets. She focuses on (news) media management in particular. Her expertise lies in qualitative research methods (comparative case-studies and process studies) and she has extensive experience in teaching bachelor and master students. In August 2020, Mathilde started working as a researcher at the think tank Rathenau Institute to further explore the impact of innovation and technology on society in general and, more particularly, the ownership, governance, business models and intellectual property of AI and big data in online platforms or ecosystems.



APPENDIX

CHAPTER 1

Table 1.1
List of organizations per interview round

	OrganizationRespondent	Round 1 (2013)	Round 2 (2016)	Round 3 (2018)	Round 4 (2019)
1	ND	2			
2	BDU	1			
3	NRC	3			3
4	HDC	1			
5	DPD	1			
6	FD	2			
7	RD	1			
8	LC	1			
9	PCM /Persgroep	4		13	
10	RTL	1			
11	ANP	2			
12	NOS	1			
13	NU	1			2
14	De Correspondent	1			2
15	Apache	1			
16	Metro				1
17	FTM		1		
18	WOZ		1		
19	Il Manifesto		1		
20	Watson		1		
21	Krautreporter		1		
22	Zetland		1		
23	Medor		1		
24	The Conversation		1		
25	El Espanol		1		
26	Coop-News		1		
27	Positive News		1		
28	Il Critic		1		
29	Bellingcat		1		
30	Kaas & Mulvad		1		
	OTHER (Sector Experts)			4	
	TOTAL	23	14	17	8