

University of Groningen

Firm responses to disruptive innovations

Geurts, Amber

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Geurts, A. (2017). *Firm responses to disruptive innovations: Evidence from the music industry*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen, SOM research school.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Propositions

1. When responding to disruptive innovations, prior commitments and incumbency should not be seen as inhibiting or inertial forces, as many do, but rather as stimuli for firms to engage in action (Chapter 2)
2. Whereas the decision to pursue a *defensive* response results from a complex interplay between the firm's awareness of the disruption, its capability to respond and its motivation to respond, the decision to pursue an *offensive* response is decoupled from the firm's awareness and capability to respond and results mainly from its motivation to respond (Chapter 2)
3. When a disruption challenges the guiding role of organizational identity, firms have to undertake the difficult task to shift their organizational identity to adapt to the disruption (Chapter 3)
4. Organizational identity shifts in response to disruptions explain why similar firms develop different firm responses to disruptiveness, *as well as* why different firms develop similar firm responses to disruptiveness (Chapter 3)
5. In response to identity-challenging disruptions, the type of organizational identity shift that a firm opts for guides its activities, which will include ones that were considered illegitimate and in conflict with the organizational identity before the disruption (Chapter 3)
6. Coopetition is a viable strategic response to disruption for firms that do not have the resources and capabilities to pursue disruptive opportunities by itself (Chapter 4)
7. When coopetitors develop a collective response to disruption they experience a paradox because collaboration becomes more important despite an increase in competition (paradox of coopetition) (Chapter 4)
8. Disruptive innovations generate distributed opportunities, which can be pursued not only by disruptors and new entrants, but also by incumbents (this dissertation)
9. Doing a PhD resembles kitesurfing: you take a leap of faith [i.e. jump] only to find your kite move out of your wind window; it's how you handle those moments that lands the trick (own experience as kite surfer)