

**What has been done on the relationship
between business model innovation, industry recipe and
organizational identity: Literature review**

Authors:

Jong-Seok KIM
Chungnam National University
99 Daehak-ro, Yuseong-gu, Daejeon 34134, South Korea
kimjongseok0924@daum.net

Min-Jeong Kang
Korea University
145 Anam-ro, Seongbuk-gu, Seoul, 02841, South Korea
kmj26701@korea.ac.kr

Hyunkyu Do
Kyunghee University
26, Kyungheedaero-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul, 02447, South Korea
hkd337@gmail.com

What has been done on the relationship between business model innovation, industry recipe and organizational identity: Literature review

Abstract:

Many existing studies have investigated the relationship between business model innovation (hereafter BMI) and managerial cognition. Although those studies are contributed to our theoretical and practical understanding of the role of managerial cognition on BMI, they have been suffered from the limitations in explaining the mechanism of how managerial cognition on industry recipe and identity influences the selection between architectural and modular BMI. In order to understand the current development and research gaps, this study reviewed existing studies on the integrative approach of literature review. It presents the results of literature review: relationship between industry recipe and BMI; relationship between organizational identity and BMI. The conclusion contains the implications.

Keywords: Business Model Innovation (BMI), Managerial Cognition, Industry Recipe, Organizational Identity, Architectural BMI, Modular BMI

Word count(excluding abstract, tables and references): 3369

What has done on the relationship between business model innovation, industry recipe and organizational identity: Literature review

1. Introduction

Many existing studies have investigated the relationship between business model innovation (hereafter BMI) and managerial cognition (Aspara et al., 2011; 2013; Egfjord and Sund, 2020; Hadida and Paris 2014; Kim and Kim, 2023; Matthyssens et al., 2006; Schneckenberg et al., 2019; Sund et al., 2021; Tikkanen et al., 2005). Although those studies are contributed to our theoretical and practical understanding of the role of managerial cognition on BMI, they have been suffered from the limitations in explaining the mechanism of how managerial cognition on industry recipe and identity influences the selection between architectural and modular BMI. Many organizations recognize that BMI is one of key activities to make their business operation effective and productive, achieve their business growth and achieve their competitive advantage (Amit and Zott, 2001; Speith et al., 2014; 2016; Foss and Saebi, 2018). They conduct a variety of BMI to introduce a new BM and improve existing BM. Foss and Saebi (2018) captured a variety of BMI on the scope of BMI. It can be classified into architectural and modular BMI. Architectural BMI is the introduction of a new BM, while modular BMI is the introduction or change of one (or two) component(s), which is the part(s) of existing BM architecture in an organization (Kim and Kim, 2013, p.3). Existing studies of relationship between BMI and industry recipe and organizational identity have addressed, through the role of managerial cognition on industry recipe or organizational identity, how similar or different BMI appear. Managerial cognition on industry recipe and organizational identity represent inside and outside organization on cognitive perspective (Rindova and Fombrun, 1999; Tikkanen et al., 2005). But they have failed to sufficiently explore how and why an organization comes up with architectural or modular BMI. Thus, in order to understand the current development and identify the potential contributions from existing studies, this study presented here reviewed existing studies of each relationship between BMI and managerial cognition – industry recipe and organizational identity.

The research methodology in this study is the literature review. This study adopted the integrative approach of literature review. This approach has an advantage of exploring new phenomena (Snyder, 2019). The search of literatures used google scholar by utilizing following keywords: *BMI(Business Model, Architectural BMI, Modular BMI, BM development, BM design, BM transformation BM convergence, BM improvement or change etc.)*, *managerial cognition (cognition structure, belief structure, belief system, mental model, sense-making, shared cognition, so on)*, *industry recipe (industry, recipe, cognitive community, cognitive structure of industry, etc.)* and *organizational identity (identity, identity trap, entrepreneurship identity, so on) and each relationships*. This article presents the results of literature review and research gaps. The results can be deployed into (i) the basic construct of industry recipe, organizational identity and architectural and modular BMI, (ii) architectural and modular BMI and industry recipe and (iii) architectural and modular BMI and organizational identity. The conclusion contains some implications.

2. Results of Literature Review and Research Propositions

2.1. Basic Construct: Managerial Cognition, Architectural and Modular BMI

2.1.1. Managerial Cognition: Industrial Recipe and Organizational Identity

Many studies noted that managerial cognition is the unique product of an organizational knowledge structure, which shapes managerial cognition (Hodgkinson and Sparrow 2002; Sund et al. 2018; Weick 1995). Managerial cognition in an organization works as a filter of inputs from outside (Lamberg and Tikkanen 2006; Schneckenberg et al. 2017; Sund et al. 2018, 2021). Hodgkinson and Sparrow (2002) pointed out that managerial cognition plays a role in

interpreting knowledge and translating it into each action. Porac et al (2002) and Tikkanene et al (2005) argued that managerial cognition can be constructed through belief systems: industry recipe, boundary belief, reputational rankings and product ontology. They are a form of managerial cognition shaped by the knowledge of practices shared among managers or stakeholders (Aspara et al. 2011). Rindova and Fombrun (2013) pointed out that socio-cognitive factors from organizational and industrial level influence managerial cognition. This study presented here focuses on industry recipe and organizational identity respectively representing industry and organization-level. An industry recipe is a belief related to the logic of the economic, competitive, and institutional environment as well as its effects on the focal organization (Spender, 1989; Tikkanene et al. 2005, p. 792). An industry recipe can be shared among managers within and between organizations (Porac et al. 2017). Bezjian et al. (2020) point out that an industry recipe is an adopted configuration of practices utilized by a firm and its rivals to produce similar products or services within a given industrial environment. The effect of industry recipes on each of them can be reflected on the actions of each firm. This study follows Bezjian et al.'s (2020) definition of an industry recipe. Organizational identity can be defined as a shared belief among an organization members about who we are, which are the central, enduring and distinctive features of an organization (Albert and Whetten, 1985; Frare and Beuren, 2022; Snihur, 2019). Organizational identity can be shaped through the actions (Snihur, 2019). Organizational identity gives the members of an organization coherent and enduring guiding points about outside inputs or their action. This study deals with the managerial cognition of industry recipe and organizational identity as a belief of industry and organization.

2.1.2. Architectural and Modular BMI

Existing studies have examined various business model innovations (BMIs) (Kim and Kang, 2022; Loon and Chik, 2019; Magni et al., 2022; Schneckenberg et al., 2022; Spieth et al. 2014; 2016). BM in organization indicates the architecture with which organization creates and captures value. BMI is defined as the innovation of organization to introduce a new BM or improving the existing BM (Foss and Saebi, 2018; Kim and Kang, 2022; Kim and Kim, 2023). An organization is involved in a variety of BMIs. For example, newly adding advertising model while maintaining an existing subscription-based pricing model in the mobile content business model of LG U+, which is a mobile service provider in South Korea; advancing existing machine-learning technique to provide customer-tailed recommendations to users. Those indicate the different-level changes of BM. The changing scope of BM can be classified as architectural and modular BMI (Foss and Saebi, 2018). Architectural BMI is the introduction of a new BM in an organization, while modular BMI is the introduction or change of one (or two) component(s), which is the part(s) of existing BM architecture (Kim and Kim, 2023, p.3). Modular means that if a part of a BM can be changed in a modular mode, other parts do not change because the complementary to other parts are not strong, although strong independence in each modular can be identified (Foss and Saebi, 2018, p.15). For example, architectural BMI is the introduction of new BM in Nokia as Finland mobile handset manufacturer by creating or re-configuring all components of Nokia BM architecture (Aspara et al., 2011). Modular BMI is to introduce price policy for the revenue model of Tving and Wavve BM, which are over-the-top service providers in South Korea (Kim and Kim, 2023). This can help firms solve the inefficiency, ineffectiveness or lower performance of BM in an organization (Loon and Chik, 2019; Kim and Kim, 2023). As noticed, many organizations conduct architectural or modular BMI.

2.2. BMI and Managerial Cognition: Industry Recipe and Organizational Identity

2.2.1. Role of Managerial Cognition and BMI

Many studies examined the relationships between managerial cognition and BMI (Aspara et al. 2011; 2013; Kim and Kim, 2023; Martins et al. 2015; Matthyssens et al. 2008; Sabatier et al. 2010; Shepard et al. 2021; Sund et al. 2018; 2021; Tauscher and Abdelkafi 2017; Tikkanen et al. 2005). Some existing studies noted that BM is the outcome of managerial cognition involving in BMI (Kim and Kim, 2023; Sund et al. 2018; 2021; Tikkanen et al. 2005). They indicate a BM as the cognitive architecture or template in which an organization creates or captures value. It is used in this study. Existing studies noted that managerial cognition is engaged in the decision-making of BMI (Habstay 2012; Matthyssens et al. 2008; Martins et al. 2015; Reyman et al. 2017; Schneckenberg et al. 2017; Spieth et al. 2014). They referred a decision-making as the selection of an optimal alternative based on problem recognition (Reyman et al. 2017; Schneckenberg et al. 2017). The different decision-makings of BMI lead to different levels of problem recognition and decisions: e.g. the problem of adopting a technology would lead to a change in a component, which is a part of BM in an organization (Andries and Debackere 2013). Based on their argument, an organization conducts various decision-makings of BMI at architectural and modular-level (Aspara et al. 2011, 2013; Egfjord and Sund, 2020; Foss and Saebi 2018; Schneckenberg et al. 2017; Sund et al. 2018). However, a decision-making can be deployed into a series of inter-related sub decision-making process through iterative loops (Mintzberg et al., 1976). Thus, managerial cognition takes a role of BMI decision-makings, eventually leading to the production of a BM.

2.2.2. Architectural and Modular BMI and Industry Recipe

Existing studies examined how industry recipe can influence an organization's activities such as decision-making, strategy and production (Kim and Kim, 2023; Monaghan and Tippmann, 2018; Spender, 1989; Tikkanen et al., 2005). Some of those studies investigated the relationship between BMI and industry recipe (Hadida and Paris, 2014; Kim and Kim, 2023; Leminen et al., 2016; Matthyssens et al., 2006; 2008; Tikkanen et al., 2005). Tikkanen et al. (2005) argued that industry recipe produces similar BMIs. The similarity of BMs between organizations will enhance when industry recipe becomes stronger. In the meanwhile, the alternative options of BMI from industry recipe can become fewer when existing industry recipe is stabilized. Kim and Kim (2023) examined the production of similar modular BMI from existing industry recipe through the cases of over-the-top service providers in South Korea. Although those studies are contributed to our theoretical understanding of relationship between BMI and industry recipe, they failed to explain the emergence of new BM different from existing industry recipe.

Existing studies attempt to look how organizations produce different BMIs from existing industry recipe. Hadida and Paris (2014), by investigating the new entrants of digital music industry, they presented the case of BM creation in the new entrants, which is different from existing industry recipe. Their study implies, based on the relationship between industry recipe and BMI, that manager's cognition in the incumbent organizations of digital music industry conducts similar BMIs because their managerial cognition becomes hardened in existing industry recipe. On the other side, because manager's cognition in new entrants would be free from the existing industry recipe of digital music industry, they are able to create new BM different from incumbent BMs. Leminen et al. (2016) examined the influential role of industry recipe on publishing company and media company in digital publishing industry as the phenomena of industrial convergence. Their study notices that the BMs of new entrants from

telecommunication industry are different from the BM of publishing company, developed from the existing industry recipe of publishing industry. However, in the phenomena of industrial convergence, the effect of existing industry recipe on managerial cognition become less. The contribution from those studies is to explain how new entrants comes up with their BMs different from the BMs of incumbent organizations in an industry by showing the decoupling cases of relationship between industry recipe and managerial cognition. However, because their studies deal only with the new entrants of existing industry, they have the limitations in explaining how managerial cognition in the incumbent organization of existing industry produces a new BM, which is different from existing industry recipe. Some studies try to understand how an incumbent organization create a new BM different from existing industry recipe (Matthyssens et al., 2006; 2008). They investigated the BMI of suppliers in food industry. Their results indicate that managers in the suppliers of food industry were continuously struggled with existing industry recipe to produce the new value creation of BM (Matthyssens et al., 2008). Their study imply that the continuous efforts to separate their consciousness from existing industry recipe bring about the new BM

Existing studies are contributed to our theoretical and practical understanding of relationship between BMI and industry recipe. They provide us an explanation of how managerial cognition on industry recipe shared among organizations in an industry leads similar BMs among them. In the meanwhile, some pay attention to that, by decoupling managerial cognition with existing industry, an organization can create a different BM from existing industry recipe. Although existing studies noticed the different changing scope of BMI (Foss and Saebi, 2018), the studies of relationship between industry recipe and BMI insufficiently examined the discrepant effect of industry recipe on architectural and modular BMI. They do not explain how managerial cognition on industry recipe influences the selection between architectural and modular BMI. Additionally, they focus mostly on BMI at architectural-level rather than modular-level. It limits our understanding of BMI in terms of managerial cognition.

2.2.3. Architectural and Modular BMI and Organizational Identity

Existing studies examined how organizational identity influences strategy, employee relationship and innovation in an organization (Anthony and Tripsas, 2016; Bouchikhi and Kimberly, 2003; Snihur, 2018). Recent studies have explored the relationship between BMI and managerial cognition on organizational identity (Biloslavo et al., 2019; Guerrero and Santanmria-Velasco, 2021; Hacklin and Wallnofer, 2012; Sinhur, 2016; 2019). They argued that organizational identity influences the content of BMI in an organization. Biloslave et al. (2019) presented how the organizational identity of Muji corporation, which is established at 1980 in Japan, influenced the content of sustainable BMI. Guerrero and Santanmria-Velasco (2021) partly captured the indirect impact of social identity on BMI with stakeholders of social community through the case of 44 social enterprises. Sinhur (2019) looked into the management of organizational identity in relation with BMI through the case of four ventures. Existing studies are ground on the alignment between managerial cognition and organizational identity. They imply that managerial cognition on organizational identity in an organization leads to produce its different BM, which is distinguished from the BMs in other organizations. Although their studies are contributed to understanding the role of organizational identity against BMI, those studies fail to address the emergence or change of new BM, which is not aligned with existing organizational identity.

Existing studies paid their attention to the trap of organizational identity (Bouchikhi and Kimberly, 2003; Sinhur, 2018; van Boxtael and Benoo, 2020). Their argument is that an organization continuously conducts similar BMs aligning with organizational identity, while

an organization's alignment with its identity would be contributed to the production of unique BM distinguished from other organizations. However, existing studies pointed out that an organization encounters the difficulty, when it tries to conduct a new BMI different from existing BMs aligned with organizational identity. They identified that managerial cognition on organizational identity works as the hindrance of BMI. This raises the problem of alignment between managerial cognition and organizational identity. Bouchikhi and Kimberly (2003) introduced the case of Polaroid, which was well known for its instant camera and film. The organizational identity of Polaroid was closely related to its core competence, which helps develop its unique strategy and BM. However, their study pointed out that Polaroid failed to transform the existing BM due to its organizational identity. Sinhur (2018) study articulated, through the case of Borders as a publishing firm, the failure of changing existing organizational identity caused the failure of changing existing BM in Borders, because its organizational identity constrained the direction and content of organizational learning. Their studies imply that the introduction of a new BM distracting from existing BMs in an organization needs to be free from existing organizational identity. It indicates the need of new identity-shaping action to conduct BM transformation or introduce a new BM different from existing BMs aligning with existing organizational identity (Snihur, 2018). Those studies are contributed to our understanding of how to emerge a new BMI different from existing BMs coupled with an organizational identity.

Existing studies expand our understanding of relationship between BMI and organizational identity. They are able to explain how managerial cognition on organizational identity shared among members in an organization leads the introduction of new BM, which is different from other organizations. Existing studies provide us the theoretical and practical implications of identity-management actions to create a new BM or transform the existing BM from existing organizational identity in an organization. They imply the dual approach of cognitive process and BMI process. However, although there are different changing scope in BMI (Foss and Saebi, 2018), existing studies of relationship between organizational identity and BM are limited to catch the discrepant effect of organizational identity on architectural and modular BMI. They failed to explain how managerial cognition on organizational identity influences the selection between architectural and modular BMI. Additionally, existing studies deal with architectural BMI, rather than modular BMI. It limits our understanding of BMI in terms of organizational identity.

4. Conclusions: Theoretical and Practical Implications

This study makes some theoretical contributions to the body of knowledge on each relationship between BMs and managerial cognition – industry recipe and organizational identity. This study identified the theoretical gap of each relationships. It requires expanding our research scope of the relationship managerial cognition and BMI into architectural and modular BMI. But this study noticed that the attention to the relationship between BMI and industry recipe and organizational identity has not been made. Because industry recipe and organizational identity represent a belief of industry and organization, when an organization is engaged in BMI, there would be the effect of managerial cognition negotiated between industry recipe and organizational identity in BMI. It can be another research gap in existing studies. Additionally, the understanding of relationship between managerial cognition and architectural and modular BMI can give the practical implications to executive officers, managers and entrepreneurs, who need to deal with both architectural and modular BMI.

Secondly, this study noticed two-level actions of managing managerial cognition. Based on Anthony and Tripsas (2016), BMI is related to management of managerial cognition such as

strength of or stretching identity. In other side, as Sinhur (2019) pointed out, by strategically managing belief structure, an organization can conduct better BMI. Two different-levels should be distinguished. However, those can give important theoretical and practical implication to executive officers, managers and entrepreneurs.

Lastly, this study has some limitations. This needs to explicitly develop research propositions, based on the research gap identified in this study. Additionally, the advantage or disadvantage of research methodology has not been discussed. However, when the future empirical studies of the research gaps identified in this study can be organized through a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods, they would contribute to our theoretical and practical understanding of BMI, industry recipe and organizational identity.

Acknowledgement:

This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF 2024S1A5B5A16028068). Their thank goes to the Chungnam National University's Science Technology Knowledge Research Institute.

Reference

- Albert, S. and Whetten, D. (1985) Organization identity, in Cummings, L. L. & Staw, B. M (eds.) *Research on Organizational Behavior*, Greenwich, CT: U.S.A. p.263-295.
- Amit, R., & Zott, C. (2001). Value creation in e-business. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6-7), 493-520.
- Andries, P & Debackere, K. (2013). Business Model Innovation: Propositions on the Appropriateness of Different Learning Approaches, *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 22(4), 337-358.
- Anthony, C., & Tripsas, M. (2016). Organizational identity and innovation. *The Oxford handbook of organizational identity*, 1, 417-435.
- Aspara, J., Lamberg, J. A., Laukia, A., & Tikkanen, H. (2011). Strategic management of business model transformation: lessons from Nokia. *Management Decision*, 49(4), 622-647.
- Aspara, J., Lamberg, J.A., Laukia, A., & Tikkanen, H. (2013). Corporate business model transformation and inter-organizational cognition: The case of Nokia. *Long Range Planning*, 46(6), 459-474.
- Bezjian, J., Stoyanova, V., McKiernan, P., & MacKay, R.B. (2020). Synthesizing scenario planning and industry recipes through an analysis of the Hollywood film industry. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 150, 119777.
- Biloslavo, R., Edgar, D., & Bagnoli, C. (2019). Organizational identity and value triangle: management of jungian paradoxes to enable sustainable business model innovation. *Sustainable Business Models: Innovation, Implementation and Success*, 277-316
- Bouchikhi, H., & Kimberly, J. R. (2003). Escaping the identity trap. *MIT Sloan Management Review*.
- Dmitriev, V., Simmons, G., Truong, Y., Palmer, M., & Schneckenberg, D. (2014). An exploration of business model development in the commercialization of technology innovations. *R&D Management*, 44(3), 306-321.
- Egffjord, K.F.-H., & Sund, K.J. (2020). Do you see what I see? How differing perceptions of the environment can hinder radical business model innovation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 150(1), 1–10.
- Frare, A. B., & Beuren, I. M. (2022). Effects of corporate reputation and social identity on innovative job performance. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 25(5), 1409-1427.
- Fink, A. (2003). *The survey handbook*. Sage Publication.
- Foss, N.J., & Saebi, T. (2018). Business models and business model innovation: Between wicked and paradigmatic problems. *Long Range Planning*, 51(1), 9-21.
- Guerrero, M., Santamaría-Velasco, C. A., & Mahto, R. (2021). Intermediaries and social entrepreneurship identity: Implications for business model innovation. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 27(2), 520-546.
- Habtay, S.R. (2012). A firm-level analysis on the relative difference between technology-driven and market-driven disruptive business model innovations. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 21(3), 290-303.

- Hacklin, F., & Wallnöfer, M. (2012). The business model in the practice of strategic decision making: insights from a case study. *Management Decision*, 50(2), 166-188.
- Hadida, A.L., & Paris, T. (2014). Managerial cognition and the value chain in the digital music industry. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 83, 84-97.
- Harrison III, R. L. (2013). Using mixed methods designs in the Journal of Business Research, 1990–2010. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(11), 2153-2162.
- Hodgkinson, G.P. and Sparrow, P.R. (2002). *The competent organization: A psychological analysis of the strategic management process*. Open University Press.
- Jick, T.D. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(4), 602-611.
- Kaplan, S. (2011). Research in cognition and strategy: Reflections on two decades of progress and a look to the future. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(3), 665-695.
- Kim, J.S. (2021). Organising strategy decisions for complex product system innovation, influencing factors, and their impact on learning. *International Journal of Technology, Policy and Management*, 21(3), 195-213.
- Kim, J. S., & Kang, J. (2022a). Exploring the top-priority innovation types and their reasons. *Foresight and STI Governance*, 16(3), 6-16.
- Kim, J.S. & Kim, B.-K.(2022b). Examining Different Technology Transfer Capabilities and their Counterpart Works from Two Different Positions, *Technology in Society* 68 p.101856.
- Kim, J. S., & Kim, J. (2023). How industry recipe and boundary belief influence similar modular business model innovations. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 9(3), 100101.
- Lamberg, J.A., & Tikkanen, H. (2006). Changing sources of competitive advantage: cognition and path dependence in the Finnish retail industry 1945–1995. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 15(5), 811-846.
- Leminen, S., Huhtala, J. P., Rajahonka, M., & Westerlund, M. (2016). Business model convergence and divergence in publishing industries. *Media Convergence Handbook-Vol. 1: Journalism, Broadcasting, and Social Media Aspects of Convergence*, 187-200.
- Loon, M., & Chik, R. (2019). Efficiency-centered, innovation-enabling business models of high tech SMEs: Evidence from Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 36(1), 87-111.
- Magni, D., Palladino, R., Papa, A., & Cailleba, P. (2022). Exploring the journey of Responsible Business Model Innovation in Asian companies: A review and future research agenda. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 1-30.
- Martins, L.L., Rindova, V.P., & Greenbaum, B.E. (2015). Unlocking the hidden value of concepts: A cognitive approach to business model innovation. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 9(1), 99-117.
- Matthyssens, P., Vandenbempt, K., & Berghman, L. (2006). Value innovation in business markets: Breaking the industry recipe. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 35(6), 751-761.
- Matthyssens, P., Vandenbempt, K., & Berghman, L. (2008). Value innovation in the functional

- foods industry: Deviations from the industry recipe. *British Food Journal*, 110(1), 144-155.
- Mintzberg, H., Raisinghani, D., & Theoret, A. (1976). The structure of "unstructured" decision processes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 246-275.
- Monaghan, S., & Tippmann, E. (2018). Becoming a multinational enterprise: Using industry recipes to achieve rapid multinationalization. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 49(4), 473-495.
- Porac, J.F., Ventresca, M.J., & Mishina, Y. (2017). Inter-organizational cognition and interpretation. *The Blackwell companion to organizations*, 579-598.
- Porac, J.F. and Thomas, H.(2002). Managing Cognition and Strategy: Issues, Trends, and Future Directions, in Pettigrew, A.M., Thomas, H. and Whittington, R.(eds.) *Strategy & Management*. London: SAGE publications.
- Randles, S., & Laasch, O. (2016). Theorising the normative business model. *Organization & Environment*, 29(1), 53-73.
- Reymen, I., Berends, H., Oudehand, R., & Stultiëns, R. (2017). Decision making for business model development: a process study of effectuation and causation in new technology-based ventures. *R&D Management*, 47(4), 595-606.
- Rindova, V. P., & Fombrun, C. J. (1999). Constructing competitive advantage: the role of firm–constituent interactions. *Strategic management journal*, 20(8), 691-710.
- Runfola, A., Perna, A., Baraldi, E., & Gregori, G.L. (2017). The use of qualitative case studies in top business and management journals: A quantitative analysis of recent patterns. *European Management Journal*, 35(1), 116-127.
- Schneckenberg, D., Matzler, K., & Spieth, P. (2022). Theorizing business model innovation: an organizing framework of research dimensions and future perspectives. *R&D Management*, 52(3), 593-609.
- Schneckenberg, D., Velamuri, V. K., Comberg, C., & Spieth, P. (2017). Business model innovation and decision making: uncovering mechanisms for coping with uncertainty. *R&D Management*, 47(3), 404-419.
- Schneckenberg, D., Velamuri, V., & Comberg, C. (2019). The design logic of new business models: Unveiling cognitive foundations of managerial reasoning. *European Management Review*, 16(2), 427-447.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Shepherd, D.A., Seyb, S., & George, G. (2021). Grounding business models: cognition, boundary objects, and business-model change. *Academy of Management Review*. 48(1), 100-122.
- Snihur, Y. (2018). Responding to business model innovation: Organizational unlearning and firm failure. *The Learning Organization*, 25(3), 190-198.
- Snihur, Y. (2019). Developing optimal distinctiveness: organizational identity processes in new ventures engaged in business model innovation. In *Entrepreneurial Identity and Identity Work* (pp. 83-109). Routledge.
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines.

- Journal of business research*, 104, 333-339.
- Spender, J.C. (1989). *Industry recipes*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Spieth, P., Schneckenberg, D., & Ricart, J.E. (2014). Business model innovation—state of the art and future challenges for the field. *R&D Management*, 44(3), 237-247.
- Sund, K.J., Galavan, R.J. & Bogers, M. (2021), Exploring the Connections Between Business Models and Cognition: A Commentary, IN Sund, K.J., Galavan, R.J. & Bogers, M. (Eds.) *Business Models and Innovation* (PP.1-13) New Horizons in Managerial and Organizational Cognition, Vol. 4.
- Sund, K.J., Galavan, R.J., and Brusoni, S. (2018). Cognition and Innovation: A Framework and Invitation to Explore. In K.J. Sund, R.J. Galavan, and S. Brusoni (Eds.), *Cognition and Innovation*, Emerald Group Publishing.1-11.). New Horizons in Managerial and Organizational Cognition Vol. 3.
- Tsang, E.W. (2014). Generalizing from research findings: The merits of case studies. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 16(4), 369-383.
- Taeuscher, K., & Abdelkafi, N. (2017). Visual tools for business model innovation: Recommendations from a cognitive perspective. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 26(2), 160-174.
- Tikkanen, H., Lamberg, J.A., Parvinen, P., & Kallunki, J.P. (2005). Managerial cognition, action and the business model of the firm. *Management Decision*, 43(6), 789-809.
- van Boxstael, A., & Denoo, L. (2020). Escaping the founder identity trap: A process view on business model design during new venture creation. In *Business models and cognition* (Vol. 4, pp. 57-94). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Weick, K.E. (1995) *Sensemaking in Organizations*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Walsh, J. P., & Fahey, L. (1986). The role of negotiated belief structures in strategy making. *Journal of management*, 12(3), 325-338.